LEABHARLANN CHOLÁISTE NA TRÍONÓIDE, BAILE ÁTHA CLIATH | TRINITY COLLEGE LIBRARY DUBLIN
Ollscoil Átha Cliath | The University of Dublin

Terms and Conditions of Use of Digitised Theses from Trinity College Library Dublin

Copyright statement

All material supplied by Trinity College Library is protected by copyright (under the Copyright and Related Rights Act, 2000 as amended) and other relevant Intellectual Property Rights. By accessing and using a Digitised Thesis from Trinity College Library you acknowledge that all Intellectual Property Rights in any Works supplied are the sole and exclusive property of the copyright and/or other IPR holder. Specific copyright holders may not be explicitly identified. Use of materials from other sources within a thesis should not be construed as a claim over them.

A non-exclusive, non-transferable licence is hereby granted to those using or reproducing, in whole or in part, the material for valid purposes, providing the copyright owners are acknowledged using the normal conventions. Where specific permission to use material is required, this is identified and such permission must be sought from the copyright holder or agency cited.

Liability statement

By using a Digitised Thesis, I accept that Trinity College Dublin bears no legal responsibility for the accuracy, legality or comprehensiveness of materials contained within the thesis, and that Trinity College Dublin accepts no liability for indirect, consequential, or incidental, damages or losses arising from use of the thesis for whatever reason. Information located in a thesis may be subject to specific use constraints, details of which may not be explicitly described. It is the responsibility of potential and actual users to be aware of such constraints and to abide by them. By making use of material from a digitised thesis, you accept these copyright and disclaimer provisions. Where it is brought to the attention of Trinity College Library that there may be a breach of copyright or other restraint, it is the policy to withdraw or take down access to a thesis while the issue is being resolved.

Access Agreement

By using a Digitised Thesis from Trinity College Library you are bound by the following Terms & Conditions. Please read them carefully.

I have read and I understand the following statement: All material supplied via a Digitised Thesis from Trinity College Library is protected by copyright and other intellectual property rights, and duplication or sale of all or part of any of a thesis is not permitted, except that material may be duplicated by you for your research use or for educational purposes in electronic or print form providing the copyright owners are acknowledged using the normal conventions. You must obtain permission for any other use. Electronic or print copies may not be offered, whether for sale or otherwise to anyone. This copy has been supplied on the understanding that it is copyright material and that no quotation from the thesis may be published without proper acknowledgement.

Isolated in Academia:

An Analytical Study of the Mechanisms of Academic Boycotts

Being a thesis submitted for the
Degree of Doctor in Philosophy
in the University of Dublin

Megan J. McKenzie

May 31, 2006

TRINITY COLLEGE
10 NOV 2006
LIBRARY DUBLIN
THOS S
7987.

Declaration

I hereby declare that this thesis has not been submitted as an exercise for a degree at this or any other university and it is entirely my work. I agree that the library may lend or copy the thesis upon request.

Megan J. Mckenzie

Signed

10-08-2006

Date

Summary

Academic boycotting is withdrawing support for or participation in one or more aspects of academia in order to make specific changes. Support is restored after those who are boycotted make the desired changes. The mechanisms of academic boycotts are poorly understood, and thus, they tend to be used indiscriminately and ineffectively. This thesis argues that the sole function of academic boycotting is to create the conditions required for functional discussion after an impasse is caused by non-existent or failed discussion. As a powerful and coercive instrument for change, boycotts are blunt and thus incapable of transmitting complicated ideas, dealing with multifaceted problems or delicate nuances, or engaging in interactive dynamic negotiation. However they can increase factors, such as awareness or reasons to engage, which are required in order for discussion to be fruitful. This makes them particularly suited to surfacing types of latent conflict that are often insufficiently addressed in academia. Consequently, while academic boycotts alone cannot realise complex goals directly, the resulting discussion may be able to achieve such goals.

Wise strategising and careful planning around implementation are critical. Academic boycotts are only able to create these conditions required for discussion if a number of criteria are met. These factors include exhausting all options for discussion; dependence of the boycotted on the boycotters; adequate ethical acceptance; sufficient directness; essential information; favourable situational factors; carefully selected criteria; and transparency. Academic boycotting must be a suitable method for the outcomes and goals stipulated in the boycotters' strategy. The boycotted must be able to make the changes requested and the boycotting group must remain functional throughout the boycott. The boycott cannot alienate the boycotted, as the goal is functional discussion. In addition, there are 12 steps that need to be taken to successfully implement the boycott.

The theories of academic boycotting presented in this thesis resulted from the examination of 59 cases of academic boycotting. In addition to searches on databases and the Internet, case studies were most often discovered during informal conversations with students and academics from approximately 40 countries. In order for a case to be included, information such as why and how the boycott was called, who called it against whom, and whether the boycott was actually called (not just discussed or threatened) had to be available. Any cases that did not meet a strict definition of academic boycotting were also excluded.

The information for the examples comes from a broad range of sources including journal, newspaper and newsletter articles; resolutions from boycotting organisations; letters between boycotters and boycotted; radio broadcasts; presentations; press releases; and boycotters' websites. Gaps in information were filled by directly contacting boycotters and others involved in the boycotts. This communication included letters, informal interviews, emails, and other forms of personal interaction.

Many of the lessons about the importance of situational analysis, clever strategising, clear outcomes/goals, analysis about suitable actions, careful implementation, and ongoing evaluation fill current gaps in non-violence theory.

Acknowledgments

When I am surrounded and held by people who love me, who believe that we are called to nurture goodness in this world, and that justice is more than outlandish dream, I do not fear falling and I am free to live boldly. These beloved have continually lavished support, love, and careful attention upon both me and my thesis, even through the times that they could not make head nor tails of either. This movement backing me is large and diverse. It includes my partner, mother, friends, family, programme co-ordinator, advisor, colleagues, and kind strangers who have shared their wisdom and passion with me. I am in awe of their commitment, cleverness, patience, and hard work. To them I say, "Thank you and be well."

Table of Contents

Introduction

Chapter 1 – Background to Academic Boycotting

Chapter 2 – Non-violence/Violence Continuum Theory

Chapter 3 – Non-violence Theory

3.1 – Discussion

3.2 – Non-violent Action after Discussion Fails

3.3 – Categories of Non-violent Action

Chapter 4 – Addressing Conflict in Academia

Chapter 5 – Criteria for the Successful Use of Academic Boycotts

Chapter 6 – Academic Boycotts against South Africa

Chapter 7 – Academic Boycott against the Technical University of British Columbia

Chapter 8 – Academic Boycotts Against Israel

Conclusion

Introduction

From Publicans, to Christian monks, to English landlords, to large corporations, people throughout history have been "isolated from their kind", "put into moral Coventry", "let severely alone", "ostracised", or what has come to be known as "boycotted". Boycotting is a non-violent type of *non-cooperation* that is done collectively in concert with others. By withdrawing support until the boycotted meet certain conditions, it is used to pressure a person or group of people into changing a behaviour (or behaviours) that those who are boycotting find unacceptable. There are numerous forms of boycotts including consumer, cultural, sport, military, producers', and government boycotts. This thesis is a study of boycotting that occurs in the realm of academia. Academic boycotts include such actions as the refusal of researchers, professors, students and academic institutions to collaborate with, recognise degrees from, fund, accept positions at, and publish work from targeted academic institutions.

Academic boycotts, despite being perceived as simple and straightforward, are in fact complex. The mechanisms of academic boycotts are poorly understood, and thus, they tend to be used indiscriminately and ineffectively. This thesis will argue that the sole function of academic boycotting is to move a conflict situation in academia from an impasse caused by non-existent or failed discussion to functional discussion. Discussion is a central norm of academia; it is controversial to breach such a norm. If boycotters attempt to implement an academic boycott before discussion has reached an impasse, the purpose of the boycott may be overshadowed by such controversy. As an instrument for change, boycotts are blunt and thus incapable of transmitting complicated ideas, dealing with

multifaceted problems or delicate nuances, or engaging in interactive dynamic negotiation. However, they are powerful and coercive enough to often be able to create the conditions necessary for functional discussion to occur. While academic boycotts in themselves cannot achieve complex goals directly, the resulting discussion may be able to achieve such goals.

There are instances in which a party calls for an academic boycott not really intending to implement an academic boycott, but rather using the call as a form of consciousness-raising or protest. In such cases, the call for the academic boycott is not an act of non-cooperation, but instead is an attempt to cause controversy to surface the conflict. With such an action, the party is often trying to get the root problem mentioned in the news, even if only as a minor sideline to the controversy that they have caused. Such 'media stunts' are only able to let a broader audience know that "something" is wrong, that a conflict is present, but it is unlikely to be able to accomplish much else as most of the media focus will be the controversial nature of the action, not the root problem. Calling an academic boycott is a high-risk act to do for publicity, especially since often, the consequences are often not well thought out. Such 'media stunt' uses of academic boycotts have much of the ethical controversy of a 'real' academic boycott.

The focus of this thesis is academic boycotts used as a form of non-cooperation, called for the purpose of implementing an actual boycott. However, there are numerous instances in which is unclear as to whether the boycott was called as a 'media-stunt', with the exclusive intent of implementing a boycott, or a combination of the two. Thus, calling an academic boycott as a form of protest or consciousness-raising was considered when examining all calls for academic boycotts, though it is not the focus of this study.

The theories of academic boycotting presented in this thesis resulted from the examination of 59 cases of academic boycotting. In addition to searches on databases and the Internet, case studies were most often discovered during informal conversations with students and academics from approximately 40 countries. Cases with inadequate information were excluded. In order to be included, information such as why and how the boycott was called, who called it against whom, and whether the boycott was actually called (not just discussed or threatened) had to be available. Excluding those that did not meet the definition of academic boycotting presented in chapter 1 then further narrowed the cases down.[1]

The information for the examples comes from a broad range of sources including journal, newspaper and newsletter articles; resolutions from boycotting organisations; letters between boycotters and boycotted; radio broadcasts; presentations; press releases; and boycotters' websites. Some of these sources are rigorous and academic, while others are more propaganda-like and far from scholarly. By investigating all of the arenas in which academic boycotts are debated and executed, one is able to understand more completely the intricacies of their use. As a form of non-cooperation that is heavily inter-connected with public opinion, it is critical to see how the public views the boycott as much as it is important to understand how the boycotters actually implemented the boycott. If those directly or indirectly involved find the boycott ethically or strategically problematic, the boycott may fail. Regardless of how accurate propaganda-like documents posted on the Internet may or may not be, they contribute to people's perception of the boycott, and therefore, were analysed as part of this study. There are also instances when mainstream supporters or opponents of a boycott co-opted

[1] Chapter 1 includes some examples of excluded cases.

mainstream news articles and posted them on their website. The supporters or opponents did this to bolster their position by placing a favourable article in a certain context and directing it at a specific audience. These articles are referenced to the website on which they were posted to show the form and context in which the article most notably appeared.[2] Gaps in information were filled by directly contacting boycotters and others involved in the boycotts. This communication included letters, informal interviews, emails, and other forms of personal communication.

Compared to other types of boycotts, there are relatively few recorded cases of academic boycotts in history. Academic boycotts that occur in two-thirds world are also seldom recorded in English media. There have been a number of instances where the author of this thesis has heard about cases of academic boycotting in the two-thirds world, but has been unable to find any written record of it or to locate the persons involved in it.[3] Thus, cases of academic boycotting from the two-thirds world are underrepresented in this thesis and those cases that are included often do not have as extensive of documentation as boycotts that occurred in Western Europe or North America.

Almost all of the documented cases involve tertiary level education. It is likely that there are many elementary school level boycotts, but these are not in the media or academic journals like those at the tertiary level. The people involved in them do not usually consider them "academic boycotts" and these actions are often on a local level rather than international. These factors combined make elementary

[2] Readers should be able to find the original article with little problem using the name of the newspaper, author, article title, and date provided.

[3] These limitations may be in part due to the exclusive use of English in researching, the location of the author, and the resources available for the author's use.

school level academic boycotts difficult to locate and thus, they are underrepresented in this thesis.

Of the cases of academic boycotts at the tertiary level that have been recorded in media and journals, few of these have more documentation than a couple of press releases and newspaper articles. When academic boycotts are written about, they are usually reflected on as individual cases in isolation from each other. The one substantial except to this is the case of recent boycotting against Israel, which is often compared to the boycotts of South Africa during apartheid.

The two most notorious instances of academic boycotts were against South Africa and Israel. Both cases are extremely well documented. For instances, F.W. Lancaster and Lorraine J. Haricombe conducted research about the extent to which scholarship in South Africa may have suffered as a result of academic boycotts. The results of their findings appear in their book *Out in the Cold: Academic boycotts and the isolation of South Africa.* Peter Ucko examines one note-worthy instance of academic boycotting against South Africa in his book *Academic Freedom and Apartheid: The Story of the World Archaeological Congress*. Over the last three years, newspapers in the U.K. and in Israel have been filled with discussion about the academic boycotts of Israel. In addition to mainstream newspapers, the academic boycotts in South Africa and Israel have also received a great deal of attention in academic journals, in particular science journals. In both of these cases, the majority of the writing has focused on the ethical debates that surround them.

The theory that academic boycotts are only useful for moving a conflict situation towards discussion after other attempts at discussion have failed will be

examined in eight chapters. The first chapter presents the background to academic boycotting. This includes a history of the word *boycott*, characteristics of boycotts, and examples of boycotting in history. A definition of *academic boycott* is presented in the form of a list of characteristics that a boycott must have in order to be considered an academic boycott. This is a critical contribution that the thesis makes to academic boycotting theory, as a comprehensive definition *academic boycott* had been missing from non-violence theory. The series of characteristics presented helps to distinguish academic boycotting from other forms of boycotting and non-violent action. This chapter also examines the various ways that academic boycotts can be manifested while still possessing the characteristics required to be an academic boycott. Chapter 1 concludes with a discussion about the ethical controversies involved in academic boycotting. While ethics is not the focus of this thesis, these ethical controversies, as will be seen in chapter 5, can assist or hinder the implementing of a successful boycott.

Chapter 2 is the first of two chapters to present non-violence theory that will provide a theoretical framework in which boycotting can be better understood. Chapter 2 examines the violence/non-violence continuum. The placement of boycotting on this continuum helps to identify some of the reasons why boycotting is controversial and ethically problematic. As this continuum also shapes the order in which non-violent actions are utilised, this chapter is the foundation for some of the reasoning that discussion should be exhausted before academic boycotting is used. These topics are further examined in chapter 3, where three aspects of non-violence are covered: discussion; non-violent action after discussion fails; and categories of non-violent action. In a vein similar to chapter 2, but more in-depth, the non-violence theory presented in chapter 3 provides a theoretical basis as to

why academic boycotting should be used only after discussion fails to move towards constructive discussion.

The focus of chapter 4 is how visible and latent conflict is addressed in academia. This chapter suggests that *visible conflict* is addressed using accepted stated norms of academia, while *latent conflict* is often dealt with in ways that contravene the expressed norms of academia. This theory pertains to academic boycotting as academic boycotting is often used to address latent conflict in academia. This chapter presents academic boycotting as a means of surfacing latent conflict. Other roles that academic boycotts can play are presented; in particular, the functions that academic boycotts can serve in creating the requirements for discussion are suggested. Chapter 4 also presents the idea that, although academic boycotts can hypothetically be used to achieve goals directly without discussion, there are no known instances of it.

There are numerous criteria that must be met in order for an academic boycott to successfully be implemented. These criteria are outlined in chapter 5, along with suggested steps for implementing an academic boycott. If these criteria and steps are achieved, an academic boycott may then be able to move a conflict situation from dysfunctional discussion to productive discussion.

Chapter 6 is an examination of academic boycotts called against South African academia during apartheid. These boycotts are historically significant as they were the first large-scale, international academic boycotts. It is these boycotts that popularised the phrase *academic boycott*. Many of the issues, including ethical, strategic, and logistical, which are experienced by most academic boycotts first occurred and were openly discussed during these boycotts.

Chapter 7 is a case study of an academic boycott in which, via academic boycotting leading to productive discussion, the boycotters were able to achieve their goals. It is the case of the Confederation of University Faculty Association of British Columbia and the Canadian Association of University Teachers boycotting the Technical University of British Columbia in Canada. This little known, but well-documented case is useful in demonstrating the potential for academic boycotting to achieve constructive discussion after discussion has failed, despite the extensive requirements for a successful boycott that are presented in chapter 5.

The final chapter is a case study of the April 2005 Association of University Teachers (AUT) academic boycott of parts of Israeli academia. This case study highlights the challenges of successfully executing an academic boycott, including ethical, strategic, and logistical concerns. When barriers to academic boycotting are present in a case, such as with this AUT boycott, academic boycotting may not be appropriate and it may be time to consider alternative methods of action. This thesis concludes by presenting alternatives to academic boycotting that may be better-suited or more feasible in scenarios where the criteria for successful academic boycotting cannot be met or the goals are unrealistic for an academic boycott.

Throughout this thesis, the interplay between non-violence theory and academic boycotting theory is examined. Thus, non-violence theory is used as a framework to determine the mechanisms of academic boycotting and, in return, academic boycotting theory is used to fill in gaps in or re-enforce non-violence theory. In doing so, while establishing that academic boycotting use is limited to moving a conflict through an impasse caused by failed discussion to productive

discussion, this thesis also contributes to non-violence theory in terms of choice of method of action, strategising, evaluating, and implementing non-violent actions.

Background to Academic Boycotting

Chapter 1

While individual academic boycotts have been studied, academic boycotting as a method of action has been virtually untouched by theorists. This is in sharp contrast to economic boycotts, which have been studied far more extensively. It is not feasible to develop in-depth theory on the mechanisms of academic boycotts without foundational definitions and understandings of academic boycotting. Thus, this background chapter will present the context from which academic boycotting emerges, including the history of the broader category of boycotting, using examples, and the characteristics of boycotting that distinguish it from other types of action.

In addition to non-violence theory, broader boycotting theory, and sanctions theory, both this background chapter and the theoretical aspects of this thesis were based on the study of 59 examples, three of which are presented as case studies at the end of this thesis. The three in-depth case studies were chosen for their diverse situations and approaches and the quantity and quality of information available for each. The other 56 examples, though not presented in detail, contributed substantially to this thesis. All 59 examples were analysed for patterns to develop theory about a number of aspects of academic boycotting. After constructing a hypothesis, the author tested the theory against each of the examples to see if it held up.

In additions to the basic elements of academic boycotting discussed extensively in this chapter, the 59 examples were used to construct theory about the

potential, limitations, strategising about and implementing of academic boycotts. Most examples of academic boycotting were able to achieve more than an article or two of press coverage and minimal consciousness-raising. Some cases, including the boycott of Universitas 21 in which the chairperson said a boycott never materialised, were unable to achieve any of their stated goals. However, these boycotts were helpful in determining barriers to successful academic boycotts.

While academic boycotts such as the NATFHE labour related boycotts and Kikuyu parents boycotting mission schools in Kenya beginning in 1929 provided insight into how to effectively mobilise many people to participate in a boycott, cases such as the boycott of a Women's Studies conference in the United States by Batya Weinbaum and a boycott by Giorgio Agamben to due border measures in the United States failed to mobilize many. In some cases, such as Igor Primoratz' boycott of Serbia, it was difficult to know the impact of the call for the boycott, as academic could have acted independently.

Some boycotts were able to contribute a great deal to surfacing a conflict. This was the case with the boycotts of UK universities by anti-smoking groups that were able to get extensive coverage in major media, such as BBC. It was also the case for smaller boycotts in more marginalised areas or issues. For instance, in India in 1999, an academic boycott by the Punjab and Chandigarh College Teachers Union brought to the attention of media a pay dispute that would have likely otherwise gone unreported. In a similar vein, the growing Maoist attacks on teachers would have likely received less press if it were not for an academic boycott by the Nepal Teachers' Association, Nepal National Teachers' Organisation, Nepal Teachers Forum and Nepal Revolutionary Teachers Association.

The Association of University Teachers boycotts of various UK universities including Nottingham, as well as boycotts called by NATFHE against UK universities such as Derby, London Metropolitan University, and Sheffield Hallam University demonstrated how academic boycotts can be used to improve the elements required for functional discussion as covered later in this thesis.

Boycotts, such as the one called against J. Phillipe Rushton, the boycott of the University of Toronto by AIDS activists, Peter B. Lewis' boycott of Case Western Reserve University were all direct primary boycotts. Examples such as the boycott of entomology and physics conference in China in 1992, the 2000 boycott of universities in Fiji, and the US boycotts of Cuba, Iran, Iraq, Libya, and Sudan offered lessons about the challenges of secondary. The complexity of boycotting was illustrated in the case of Luc Devroye's boycott of the Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers for participating in an academic boycott of academic papers from Iran, Libya, Sudan and Cuba as part of US sanctions against countries for their political policies.

While theorists have defined specific types of boycotting – in particular, economic boycotting – the careful classification of characteristics found in all types of boycotts, ranging from cultural to economic, is a contribution this thesis makes to boycotting and non-violence theory. Furthermore, this chapter presents the characteristics that distinguish academic boycotting from other types of boycotting. As elementary as this defining and classifying of the aspects of academic boycotting may seem, it is also novel work that is necessary for the further examination of academic boycotting. These characteristics were gleaned from the case studies examined in this thesis. Academic boycotting can be difficult to define because it has numerous potential manifestations. Many of the more recurrent

manifestations have been compiled and presented in this chapter, further contributing to a clearer understanding of the parameters of academic boycotting.

In order to conduct focused research on the *mechanisms* of academic boycotts in the absence of proper statistics and comprehensive research about academic boycotts, a brief overview of how academic boycotts have historically been used is included. The purpose of this section is not to present a comprehensive historical record of academic boycotts or to develop detailed statistical analysis of the previous utilization of academic boycotts. Rather, the intent of this compilation of cases is to provide general background information about the use of academic boycotts. The figures, based on the 59 case studies listed in the appendix, cover who calls boycotts against whom and the reason for the academic boycotts.

The final section is on ethics. Though ethics are a central concern with academic boycotting, it is not the focus of this thesis. The ethical controversies of academic boycotting are only discussed with regard to the impact that ethics can have on the strategising and execution of academic boycotts. The final section of this chapter will present some of the main ethical concerns of academic boycotting that will become pertinent when discussing how ethical controversy can impede an academic boycott in chapter 5.

Academic boycotts find their roots in a long history of boycotting. The word "boycott" originated in Ireland in the 1880s during a time of strife between landlords and tenants. In September 1880 in the County Clare town of Ennis, Charles Stewart Parnell, an active member of the Land League, made a famous speech about how to deal with a man who takes a farm from which another has been evicted. Parnell advocated:

> [L]eaving him severely alone, by putting him into a moral Coventry, by isolating him from the rest of his kind, as if he were a leper of old; you must show him that that is your detestation of the crime he has committed; and you may depend upon it, that if the population of an entire county in Ireland carry out this doctrine, there will be no man so full of avarice, so lost to shame, as to dare the public opinions of all right-thinking men within the country, and to transgress your unwritten code of laws.[1]

It is important to note that this was not a new idea for the Land League. Although this speech by Parnell is better known, this technique had been promoted by John Dillon in 1879 and had also been foreshadowed in speeches by Michael Davitt and Joseph Biggar.

This technique of isolation or 'leaving severely alone' was put into practice, not only against Irish land-grabbers, but also most famously against Captain Charles Cunningham Boycott, an English landlord on Lough Mask, County Mayo. Captain Boycott was one of Lord Erne's evicting landlords. This led him to be disliked by the tenants. Bernard H. Becker describes the boycotting that its namesake, Captain Boycott, faced in his 1881 book *Disturbed Ireland.*

> Already the stoutest hearted are yielding on every side to the dread of being "Boycotted," a doom which signifies simply that the victim must surrender or leave the country. It means that nobody will buy or sell with any member of the family which is declared "taboo"; that the farmer may drive his cattle and pigs to market, but will not find a purchaser; that he may reap his grain and pull his potatoes, but that not a soul in the country will buy them for fear of being "Boycotted" himself. It means that the baker will refuse him bread, and the butcher meat; that no draper who knows his wife by sight will sell her as much as a ribbon; that not a creature will buy her butter and eggs, chickens and turkeys, geese and ducks; that she will be unable to buy any article of food or luxury for her children, and that they will be "sent to Coventry" at school.[2]

Captain Boycott complained about the ostracism he was experiencing in a letter to *The Times* in London on October 14, 1880. "I can get no workmen to do anything, and my ruin is openly avowed as the object of the Land League unless I

---

[1] Charles Stewart Parnell, "The Initiation of Boycotting: Speech at Ennis, September 18, 1880", 11. It should be noted that there are a number of variations of this speech printed. Two interesting sources are the police note-takers quoted in F.L.S. Lyons, *Charles Stewart Parnell*, 134 and *The Times*, September 9, 1880.

[2] Bernard H. Becker, *Disturbed Ireland,* 260-1.

throw up everything and leave the country."[3] A group of Orange labourers from Ulster were brought in to harvest Captain Boycott's crops that fall. Becker recounts another story of boycotting in an article entitled "The Relief of Mr. Boycott" that was from November 10, 1880.

> From every quarter I hear acts of the so-called "staunchness" of the population. When Captain Tomkinson went over to Claremorris yesterday with dragoons to convey the carts and other impediments of the Ulster division, it happened that one of the cart-horses lost a shoe. Will it be believed that it was necessary to delude the only blacksmith who could be captured with a story that the animal belonged to the Army Service Corps? Simple and artless, the Claremorris blacksmith made the shoe: but before he could put it on he was "infawrrumd" that the beast he was working for was in an Ulster cart. Down fell the hammer, the nails, and the shoe. The blacksmith was immovable. Not a blow more would he strike for love or money; nor would any blacksmith for miles around this place. At last the shoe was got on to the horse's foot among the military and police; but not a soul belonging to this part of the country would drive a cart at any price.[4]

Captain Boycott was able to withstand what would come be known as "boycotting" for while, but in November 1880, he left Lough Mask for England.[5]

The Creating of a Word

There are two men who are responsible for coining the word "boycott," Father John O'Malley and James Redpath. Father John O'Malley, a Catholic priest in Ireland, encouraged his community to ostracise landlords and to withdraw labour from them rather than taken violent actions against them.[6] James Redpath, an American journalist, and O'Malley are said to have created "local enthusiasm" for social ostracism.[7] It was this conversation between them that lead to the creation of the term "boycott."

> "Well," I said "when a people ostracize a landgrabber we call it excommunication, but we ought to have an entirely different word to signify ostracism applied to a landlord or land agent like Boycott. Ostracism won't do. The peasantry would not know the meaning of the word, and I can't think of anything." "No," Father John said, "ostracism wouldn't do."

---

[3] Captain Charles Cunningham Boycott, quoted in Arthur Charles Boycott, *Boycott: The Life Behind the Word*, 232.
[4] Bernard H. Becker, *Disturbed Ireland,* 139-140.
[5] It is debatable whether some of the actions taken against Captain Boycott can or should be considered "non-violent." However, this debate is beyond the scope of this thesis.
[6] Joyce Marlow, *Captain Boycott and the Irish*, 138.
[7] Joyce Marlow. *Captain Boycott and the Irish*, 139.

> He looked downward, tapped his forehead, and then out it came. "How would it do to call it 'to boycott him?"[8]

Redpath began to use the term in his speeches and writings and use of the term spread quickly.

Though the word *Boycott* originated in the 1880s, the concept of boycotting was not new. In his book *Boycotts and the Labour Struggle*, Harry Laidler discusses boycotts called by farmers in the seventeenth and eighteenth century in France that were similar to the boycotts that occurred in Ireland in the 1880s.[9] Laidler provides a list of historical examples of boycotting.

> The Jews shunned the Samaritans, the Pharisees boycotted the Publicans, as far as social intercourse was concerned. In Greece, for many years, following the rule of Cleisthenes, the people ostracised their unsuccessful claimants for political preference, and in the Roman Empire, by the ignis et aquœ interdictio, many of the best Romans were rendered outcasts. Those incurring the wrath of the church of Rome during the Middle Ages, and receiving the interdicts of excommunication, may also be said to have felt the force of at least one form of this weapon.[10]

Laidler also cites an instance where the citizens of Canterbury boycotted the monks of Christ's Church in 1327.[11]

Gene Sharp provides many examples of boycotts in *The Politics of Nonviolent Action* including interesting historical boycotts. "Toward the end of the second century A.D., at Ephesus in Asia Minor, the shop managers of bakeries (most of whom were also owners) held meetings which were apparently concerned with common grievances, and collectively stopped making bread."[12] In the eleventh century, Norwegian peasants stopped wars by refusing "to deliver to the king either men or provisions for his military exhibitions against Denmark, Sweden and England."[13]

---

[8] James Redpath, quoted in Monroe Friedman, *Consumer Boycotts*, 5-6.
[9] Harry W. Laidler, *Boycotts and the Labor Struggle*, 27-8.
[10] Harry W. Laidler, *Boycotts and the Labor Struggle*, 27.
[11] Harry W. Laidler, *Boycotts and the Labor Struggle,* 28-9.
[12] Gene Sharp, *The Politics of Nonviolent Action: The Methods of Nonviolent Action,* 231.
[13] Gene Sharp, *The Politics of Nonviolent Action: The Methods of Nonviolent Action*, 231.

Some modern boycotts are renowned, such as the foreign cloth boycott, that Gandhi called in India in the 1930s. The Montgomery, Alabama bus boycott was lead in the 1950s by Martin Luther King to protest racial inequity in the southern United States.[14] A recent well-known consumer boycott is the Nestle boycott called by the Infant Formula Action Coalition (INFACT) in 1977 for Nestle's infant formula marketing.[15]

Characteristics of Boycotts

There have been a number of attempts to define "boycott" since Father John O'Malley and James Redpath first devised the word. Harry W. Laidler defines boycotts as "*an organized effort to withdraw and induce others to withdraw from social or business relations with another.*"[16] Gene Sharp defines economic boycotts as "the refusal to continue or to undertake certain economic relationships, especially the buying, selling, or handling of goods and services."[17] Although these definitions provide some parameters for the meaning of "boycott," they fail to distinguish boycotts from many other forms of action. There are a number of characteristics that are found in all boycotts; these attributes distinguish boycotts.

A boycott involves the withdrawal of obedience, support and cooperation from a group or person. Gene Sharp writes extensively about non-cooperation and describes a number of types of boycotts while discussing forms of economic, political and social non-cooperation in his book *The Methods of Nonviolent Action.* Though Sharp has made significant contributions to this field, he was not the first to write about what happens when groups of people no longer choose to cooperate

---

[14] A full account can be found in Martin Luther King, *Stride Towards Freedom.*
[15] Monroe Friedman, *Consumer Boycotts*, 176.
[16] Harry W. Laidler, *Boycotts and the Labor Struggle*, 27 (italics in original text).
[17] Gene Sharp, *The Politics of Nonviolent Action: The Methods of Nonviolent Action*, 219.

with those in power. In the 16th century, Etienne de la Boëtie wrote about a country's non-cooperation with tyrants: "There is no need of taking anything from him; only give him nothing."[18] De la Boëtie continues, "I do not advise you to shake or overturn him – forbear only to support him, and you will see him, like a great colossus from which the base is taken away, fall with his own weight and be broken into pieces."[19] Boycotts follow this thinking – do not actively resist or attempt to overturn, rather withdrawal the support and cooperation that enables them to continue their undesirable behaviour.

Theorists and practitioners of non-violence have diverse understandings of what constitutes as non-violent action. Boycotts, *as a form of non-violent action*, are not exempt from this debate. Over the course of his life, even Mahatma Gandhi changed his mind about what type of boycotts were acceptable forms of non-violent action. Gene Sharp notes how in the 1930-31 campaign to boycott foreign cloth Gandhi "still regarded an extensive economic boycott of the opponent as coercive and hence not permissible under his code of nonviolence"[20] Gandhi's opinion changed over time until eventually he agreed with extensive economic boycotting of an aggressor nation.

Practitioners and theorists of non-violence agree that death and physical harm are acts of violence.[21] Using this criterion, some sanctions, such as those imposed against Iraq during the 1990s, should not be considered non-violent because of the large numbers of casualties that have resulted from the sanctions. Many theorists and practitioners of non-violence, most notably Gandhi, would also

---

[18] Etienne de la Boëtie, "The Discourse of Voluntary Servitude", 140.
[19] Etienne de la Boëtie, "The Discourse of Voluntary Servitude", 142.
[20] Gene Sharp, *The Politics of Nonviolent Action: The Methods of Nonviolent Action*, 229.
[21] Though it is still debated whether self-harm and destruction of property are forms of non-violence.

insist that not only the consequences, but also the motives behind an action must be non-violent. They would consider any act that is revengeful, malicious or spiteful inherently violent and not acceptable as a form of non-violent cooperation. Gandhi warned against boycotts that are "retaliation pure and simple and as such punitive" and insisted that they must "be ruled out."[22]

In his speech in Ennis, Parnell discusses what will happen if "the population of a county" carries out the same doctrine together.[23] This is significant because, although boycotting is composed of actions of individuals, it is *the collective action* that gives boycotts their power. Hannah Arendt writes, "*Power* corresponds to the human activity not just to act but to act in concert. Power is never the property of an individual; it belongs to a group and remains in existence only so long as the group keeps together."[24] An act of non-cooperation by an individual is usually not a boycott until others act or are called to act in concert with that individual. However, there are exceptions to this. Boycotts are challenging to implement as a result of their collective nature. It is difficult to orchestrate many people to act in concert with each other towards a common goal, particularly when a project is as time and resource intensive and challenging as boycotting.

Boycotts are a result of someone's *behaviour*. Boycotts are done because of what someone does, not because of who they are. Boycotters call them because they deem another party's actions inappropriate. Boycotts are not called simply because of someone's identity. This is an important factor when acts of racism, discrimination and even attempts of genocide have been labelled "boycotts" in order to give the hateful behaviour more legitimacy or to make the act appear more

---

[22] Mahatma Gandhi, *Non-violent Resistance*, 145.
[23] Charles Stewart Parnell. "The Initiation of Boycotting: Speech at Ennis, September 18, 1880," 11.
[24] Hannah Arendt, *On Violence*, 44 (italics in original text).

benign. The most blatant example in history is the case of Hitler declaring a "boycott" of Jewish business' and Jewish people simply because they were Jewish.[25]

There are times when an identifiable group of people will be boycotted collectively as a result of the behaviour of the group, regardless of the degree of responsibility for the actions each member within the holds. When this is the case, there can be confusion about whether or not the boycott is about the group's identity or behaviour. In order to be a genuine boycott, the boycott must be focused on an identifiable set of actions or behaviours that the boycotted can change. If the boycott continues after the behaviour that it is supposedly objecting ends, it is not a true boycott.

This characteristic of respecting a party while attempting to change a wrongdoing is closely linked with one of features of non-violence identified by Martin Luther King Jr. in his book *Stride Toward Freedom*:

> It is evil that the nonviolent resister seeks to defeat, not the persons victimized by evil. If he [or she] is opposing racial injustice, the nonviolent resister has the vision to see that the basic tension is not between races. As I like to say to the people in Montgomery: "The tension in this city is not between white people and Negro people. The tension is, at bottom, between justice and injustice, between the forces of light and the forces of darkness. And if there is a victory, it will be a victory not merely for fifty thousand Negroes, but a victory for justice and the forces of light. We are out to defeat injustice and not white persons who may be unjust."[26]

Boycotters must separate the person from the problematic behaviour – or *evil* as King would say – and attend to the problematic behaviour, not attack the person.

Some types of non-violent action and non-cooperation depend on a certain amount of secrecy in order to be effective. Boycotts, on the contrary, depend on *transparency*. The boycotted must know that they are being boycotted. For example, a consumer boycott does not work if the only sign of the boycott to the

---

[25] Avraham Barkai, *From Boycott to Annihilation*, particularly chapter 1.
[26] Martin Luther King Jr., *Stride Toward Freedom*, 84.

boycotted company is that their profits are falling. The boycotted company may think the drop in their profits is a result of the economy, their marketing strategy, or the full moon. The boycotter and boycotted must clearly understand why the boycotted is being boycotted and what the boycotted must do in order for the boycott to be lifted. This requirement of transparency means that boycotts seldom capitalise on the element of surprise that other non-violent actions sometimes utilize.

Boycotts may be done in conjunction with other forms of non-violent action. The use of multiple forms of non-cooperation or other types of non-violent action is sometimes important for achieving objectives. For instances, F.S.L. Lyons writes about how "land agitation combined with a parliamentary campaign"[27] was an important combination in Ireland in the 1880s. The use of two or more forms of non-violent actions at once can cause added confusion when analysing boycotts and their impact, as is can blur the line between the effects of the boycott and the other forms of non-violent action.

Some types of non-violent action are conducive for use as an immediate response in a spontaneous conflict or sudden change in a conflict. Examples include offering hospitality, dancing, handing someone a baby, or removing ones clothes out of protest. On the contrary, boycotts are not usually used as an immediate response in a spontaneous conflict. Boycotts are usually not useful in such situations due to the research, strategising, organising and "recruiting" of people that is usually required to implement a boycott. In the case of academic boycotts, the norm of discussion is usually exhausted before a boycott is attempted.

---

[27] F.S.L. Lyons, *Charles Stewart Parnell,* 135.

Boycotts are not usually planned as a one-time event or short-term action. They are usually planned to last until the offensive behaviour is changed. An example of an exception to this would be if a boycott were called only for the purpose of consciousness-raising (a "media stunt") with no intention of following through with the boycott.

In order for an action to be a boycott, the boycotters must return the support they were withholding after the boycotted stop offensive behaviour. If there is no intention of ever offering support or stopping the "boycott," it is not a boycott. It is not a boycott if one withholds support and plans to never offer it for moral, religious, ethical or other reasons. An example of this would be pacifists who refuse to ever serve in the military because of the religious belief that war is wrong in all circumstances. They are not engaging in boycotting, but soldiers who refuse to serve until in the military until their military or government changes an offensive policy is boycotting. An example of a military boycott would be the soldiers who are refusing to serve in the Israeli army because of the nature of the occupation in the West Bank and Gaza.[28] Not eating meat because one believes killing animals is wrong is not boycotting, but it is a boycott to refuse to eat meat from a certain company until an inhumane slaughtering practice they utilize is stopped.

Thus boycotts are transparent, collective, non-violent acts of non-cooperation done to change an unwanted behaviour by withdrawing support until the behaviour is changed. These characteristics identify forms of boycotting as differentiates them from other types of action. These conditions will be used to distinguish academic boycotting from other types of action found within academia.

---

[28] For more information on the Refuseniks, see the Courage to Refuse website at www.couragetorefuse.org or Peretz Kidron, ed, *Refusenik!*

Using these criteria, one is also able to identify types of boycotting found throughout history.

Characteristics of Academic Boycotts

Academic boycotts have all of the characteristics that allow them to clearly fit in the broader category "boycott." As a form of non-violent non-cooperation, academic boycotts can be used to challenge actions that are perceived to be inappropriate, oppressive or unjust in the same way as cultural, economic, military or other types of boycotts by withdrawing support until an offensive behaviour is changed. In a vein similar to the boycott of Captain Boycott and other landlords in the 1880s, academic boycotts seek to show disapproval of and change someone's behaviour by isolating them from their community. Boycott and his contemporaries required their community to take in the harvest, put shoes on horses, deliver the post etc. and by boycotting, their community (the boycotters) removed these essential services and supports so that Boycott and his contemporaries were pressured to change the behaviours the boycotters deemed inappropriate. Academic boycotts isolate the boycotted from their academic community that supports them with resources and connections that are essential for participation in academia. This can include a number of manifestations that will be discussed in detail later. Academic boycotters figuratively refuse to shoe the horse by not publishing a boycotted academic's article or fail to deliver the mail by denying access to information resources (journals, books, conferences, collaboration etc.)

Academic boycotts share many similarities with other types of boycotting. For instance, like other types of boycotts, academic boycotts usually depend on the

power of collective action. They are typically called by a number of people acting in concert with each other. Numbers can range from a small group of less than 10 people to hundreds such as found when large faculty organisations call a boycott. There are exceptions to this; a single individual can call a boycott. For instance, in spring 2004, Italian philosopher Giorgio Agamben publicly refused to teach at New York University to protest new U.S. border-control measures.[29] Though Agamben was acting alone and it is unknown whether others joined him in boycotting, his act otherwise classifies as an academic boycott.[30] In instances such as these, other factors such as media and the reputation or position of the person can give the boycott more strength.

As with other forms of boycotting, academic boycotts are generally transparent in order to be effective. In *The Scientist* journal, Franklin Hoke discusses the thoughts of Richard Dicker, director of the Committee to End the Chinese Gulag from 1991-1993, on the case of a 1992 scientists' boycott of meetings in China. Hoke writes, "Dicker also emphasizes the importance of publicizing whatever individual action is taken: A decision to not attend a meeting as a way of protesting Chinese human rights policies may go unnoticed unless declared as such publicly."[31] However, there are exceptions to this transparency due to the controversial nature of academic boycotts.[32]

When an academic boycott is controversial, boycotters may boycott, but not want to have other academics, their home institutions or the media know that they are boycotting out of fear of being labelled as a "troublemaker" or other

---

[29] Aisha Labi, "Italian Scholar Cancels Visit to NYC to Protest U.S. Security Measures."
[30] Labi notes, "He [Agamben] has encouraged other intellectuals to join his boycott and said some have told him that they would do so." Aisha Labi, "Italian Scholar Cancels Visit."
[31] Franklin Hoke, "U.S. Scientists Wary of Traveling to China," 1.
[32] The ethical challenges that are specific to academic boycotts will be discussed later in this chapter.

repercussions. In cases such as the current academic boycotts against Israel, there are stories of academics not participating in Israeli conferences, collaborative projects, and other university activities without publicly declaring that they are in fact boycotting. When academics do not publicly declare their rationale for not participating, it is difficult to determine their reasons and whether or not they are in fact participating in the boycott. Andy Beckett writes about this in an article in *The Guardian* in December 2002:

> At the Academic Study Group on Israel and the Middle East, a fund for joint projects between Israeli and British universities, the number of people applying for grants has fallen by a third. "There is a palpable slowing down of academic activity," says John Levy, who helps run the fund. "We're not even attempting to set up (joint) workshops. What we're encountering is very many people saying, 'Can we simply delay matters?'"
> Not all of this change, Levy says, is directly because of the boycott. Anxiety about visiting Israel amid the current violence is putting off foreign academics, too. But security concerns can be a useful cover for people who want to withdraw cooperation without causing a fuss. "Since the intifada began we've had conferences that people have said they would come to but haven't," says Frank Schuldenfrei of the British Council in Tel Aviv. "If someone looks you in the face and says, "I'm not coming over because my wife doesn't want me to come,' who can say if that's the reason? ... In one of the curious symmetries of politics, strong supporters of the boycott offer the same sort of vague-but-potent anecdotes about its impact as the boycott's opponents.[33]

Academic boycotts are distinguished from other types of boycotting because they occur in the realm of academia. There are specific characteristics that distinguish them from other types of non-violent action that occurs in academia. Sometimes, the boundaries between groupings are indistinct. However, an action must have the following attributes in order to be categorized as an academic boycott. As well, specific types of actions that are excluded from the category of academic boycott are listed below along with pertinent examples.

Academic boycotts can occur at any level of education. Although they have been most prominent at the tertiary level, they can also occur at the elementary educational level. The author's mother introduced her to academic boycotting at the level of elementary education when she was 10 years old. Every year in her

[33] Andy Beckett, "Sacking of Israeli Scholars."

elementary school, the grade 5 class (10 year olds) would write to pen pals from another town throughout the year as part of an assignment. In the spring, the pen pals from the other town would come to her town to stay for a week. Later in the month, her class would travel to the pen pals' town and stay for a week. The problem that her mother had with this programme was that when visiting the other town, her daughter would be billeted out to the daughter's pen pals homes. Her mother strongly disapproved of the some of the local homes that visiting students were staying at in her town (domestic violence, excessive alcohol use etc.) and was given no reassurance that her daughter would not be staying at such a home in the other town; there was no criteria for or scrutiny of the homes in which she would be billeted. As a result, her mother refused to send her on the school trip unless her concerns were adequately addressed. They were not. By talking with other mothers, the author's mother quickly learned that she was not alone in her safety concerns. Of approximately 55 students, 10 or 12 other mothers also did not send their child on the trip that year.[34] Subsequently, the years of non-violent resistance by concerned mothers resulted in the programme being changed so that all the students would stay together with their classmates, pen pals and teachers at summer camp facilities – a situation that most mothers felt was an acceptable safer option. Though not a commonly reported type of academic boycotting, it does reflect all of the characteristics of an academic boycott.

Boycotts can involve any part of academia, although they most often affect academic institutions, academics, and sometimes students. Research can be involved as it is in some of the current Israeli boycotts in the form of calls to block

[34] In this particular year, the mothers actually went beyond boycotting and set up their own programme and series of local field trips for the week that the other students would be away on the official school trip.

funding for Israeli research.[35] Other aspects of academia can also be impacted. For instance, in South Africa in the 1980s and early 1990s, library and inter-library loans were involved[36] as was academic publishing.[37]

Academic boycotting only includes actions that directly affect the primary purposes of academia, such as teaching, researching, experimenting, and discussing involved in academic work. Thus, boycotts in such areas as universities' sports events, cafeterias, or bookstores will be excluded, as they do not affect the main purposes of academia. Divestment by universities from certain companies or countries is sometimes classified as a type of academic boycott.[38] An example of this is the petitions that were circulated in Princeton and Harvard/MIT universities urging their universities to divest from Israel until the rights of Palestinians are respected.[39] For the purpose of this research, such divestment by universities will not be considered an academic boycott. Although it is academic institutions that are divesting, the boycott is not affecting education, research or any other academic role the institutions may be responsible for. Divesting is primarily an economic boycott in which an academic institution may participate. However, divesting from another academic institutions research project would be considered an academic boycott as it is impacting research, but the cases of Harvard/MIT and Princeton divesting from Israel will not.

---

[35] Discussions of these particular boycotts have occurred in many newspapers including *The Independent, The Guardian, Ha'aretz,* and *The Times Higher Education Supplement* and in academic journals including *Nature* and *The Scientist.*

[36] Jeff Leeuwenburg, letter to the editor, 328.

[37] John Maddox, "Science in Apartheid," 273.

[38] Tanya Reinhart includes university divestment as a form of non-violent action in "Why Academic Boycott: A reply to an Israeli Comrade."

[39] See the Harvard/MIT divestment website www.harvardmitdivest.org and the SPEAC Princeton divestment website at www.princeton.edu/~speac/demands.htm for more information on these calls for divestment from Israel.

In a similar vein, an academic association or department boycotting a hotel, city, or conference centre during an annual meeting or conference is not considered an academic boycott in this research. Alan Wolfe provides examples of this in his article "The Risky Power of Academic Boycotts" including boycotting South Carolina, United States of America, for flying the confederate flag and the Adam's Mark Hotel in St. Louis in the United States of America.[40] Though it was an Organization of American Historians annual meeting, the boycott or the Adam's Mark Hotel had no connection with academic activities.

Academic boycotts also raise unique ethical questions that are a result of their involvement in academia that are not present in other forms of boycotting. There are concerns about academic freedom, academic norms, the potential of harm to academia (and its beneficiaries) and the failure to use the broad range of other options available to academics. These concerns will be examined later in this chapter.

For the purpose of this thesis, the case must be an actual call for a boycott, not just a threat to call a boycott in order to be included in analysis. For instance, in 2003 a threat to boycott national curriculum tests by the National Teachers Union was struck down by after too few voters backed the action.[41] As the boycott was not called, this case was excluded from this thesis. A second example would be an instance in July 2005 when *The Times Higher Education Supplement* announced that the Association of University Teachers may boycott the new research assessment exercise, but there was no indication in the article that the boycott was actually implemented.[42]

---

[40] Alan Wolfe, "The Risky Power of the Academic Boycott."
[41] Richard Garner, "Teachers' Union lift Threat to Boycott National Test."
[42] Phil Baty, "AUT may Boycott New RAE."

A case will be included in the study even if after a boycott was called, persons or institutions may or may not have followed through and actually boycotted. In some instances, such as when a conference or institution publicly boycotts, it is clear that a boycott has been fully realised. However, as academic boycotter Igor Primoratz notes,[43] in some cases it is difficult to know whether or not a boycott is being implemented. This is particularly so when individuals are may be taking action with no means of recording their boycott.

Actions that are Not Academic Boycotts

There are grey areas surrounding any definition of academic boycott; the following list of exclusions further narrows the classification. Academic boycotts exclude limitations put on academics by their own government. Even if these types of constraints otherwise meet the above criteria for boycotting and academic boycotting, they are a special case that are distinct from academic boycotting and should be dealt with separately.

Walk-outs and short-term protests, regardless if they occur in academia and otherwise meet the above criteria, are not considered an academic boycott. For instance, the Association of University Teachers Scotland called for a "two-day boycott" on July 8, 2005.[44] For the purpose of this study, this will not be considered a boycott as the practitioners of non-violence had only planned the action to be short-term and did not intend to continue the boycott until the behaviour change. For the same reasons, the walk-out or "boycott" of classes at the

[43] Igor Primoratz, personal communication with the author, December 23, 2004.
[44] Olga Wojtas, "AUTS Blames Govt for Boycott."

University of Massachusetts in April 2005[45] would be not be considered an academic boycott, but rather would be considered a walk-out.

For this thesis, academic boycotts exclude non-cooperation in which parties stop doing their regular duties, whether it is all normal work, research or study related activities. This type of action, though it could conceivability be considered a form of boycotting, is known as a 'strike' and has been studied extensively as its own phenomenon. Occasionally, the terms 'strike' and 'boycott' are used interchangeably, however, for the purpose of this study, strikes will be excluded. For instance, the teachers of Federal Urdu University of Arts, Science and Technology (FUUAST) refused to participate in university activities for one day to protest the treatment of their colleagues during exams.[46] Though the news article refers to this action as a boycott, is excluded from this thesis because the action was not going to continue until the behaviour changed, as required to meet the definition of a boycott. In addition, it better meets the definition of a strike, as the teachers were refusing to do all their normal duties. A second example would be the students of the University of Buea in Cameroon refused to attend classes on June 8, 2005.[47] This is an instance of a student strike as opposed to an academic boycott. Firstly, the students are refraining from undertaking all of their normal duties, as is done in a strike, and there is no indication that the intent is that the action will continue until the university makes a change, as would be required to meet the definition of academic boycott.

Acts of racism, sexism, xenophobia, homophobia, classism or any other type of exclusion based on someone's identity is not an academic boycott.

---

[45] See www.takebackumass.com/a21.html for more information on this action.
[46] *Karachi News*, "FUUAST Teachers to Boycott Academic Activities Today."
[47] Bouddih Adams and Effa Tambenkongho, "UB Students Boycott Lectures."

Although these actions are a form of social ostracism, academic boycotts are carried out because of a policy or someone's behaviour, not because of who the boycotted are. For example, the Nazi's practice of excluding or expelling Jewish academics (including scientists) from their positions leading up to WWII[48] cannot be considered academic boycotting because it was not based on a contested behaviour or policy that the boycotted was responsible for and could change.

It is also not an academic boycott if group withholds support from some aspect of academia and plans to never offer it for moral, religious, ethical or other reasons. In order for this action to be an academic boycott, the support that is being withheld will be returned – or at least the intent is to return it – after the boycotter stops the offensive behaviour. If there is no intention of ever offering support or stopping the "boycott," it is not a boycott. For example, scientists refusing to do Strategic Defense Initiative funded research in the mid-1980 would not be considered an academic boycott.[49] They were refusing to participate out of ethical concerns about nuclear war with no intention of ever conducting research on nuclear weapons. Quitting a current position with no intention of resuming the post if the conditions of the situation were to change will also be excluded from the definition of academic boycotting. For instance, in 2001, Richard Smith resigned from his post as chair at the University of Nottingham out of protest against the funding received by the university from tobacco companies.[50] When there is no

[48] Daniel Jonah Goldhagan, *Hitler's Willing Executioners*, 96.

[49] *The Scientist* journal has hosted discussion on this topic. In particular, Jack Ruina, "SDI Boycott Violates Academic Freedom;" John B. Kogut, "Say No to a 'Dumb, Dangerous' Program;" and Sharon Begley (with George Raine), "Resisting the SDI Temptress" have focused on the so-called "academic boycott" of the Strategic Defense Initiative.

[50] Richard Smith, "A Tainted University" and *BBC New Online*, "Professor Resigns in Tobacco Protest."

intent of returning support after the offensive action ends, it does not meet the most basic requirements for boycotting.

Manifestations of Academic Boycotts

Academic boycotts are complex. A call for an academic boycott is seldom a call for a singular activity. It is most often composed of a combination of two or more of the many possible manifestations of academic boycotts. Some manifestations are more commonly used than others are. The following are manifestations that have occurred in academic boycotts. This list is far from all encompassing, as many manifestations are possible, as long as they met the previously mentioned criteria for academic boycotts.

The refusal to collaborate or to undertake joint research is one of the most frequently used manifestations of academic boycotting. Collaboration and joint research are important as sources of information and other resources for furthering research; withholding these necessities for thriving research is isolating and troublesome for academics. In South Africa, this was one of the key manifestations of the academic boycott during apartheid.[51] F.W. Lancaster and Lorraine Haricombe write, "faculty of Trinity College, Dublin, were explicitly forbidden to collaborate with South Africans under risk of censure or even dismissal."[52] Igor

[51] Academic boycotts in South Africa began in the late 1950s, but did not gain substantial momentum until the 1980s.

[52] Lorraine Haricombe and F.W. Lancaster, *Out in the Cold*, 16. For this point in their book, Haricombe and Lancaster reference Ralph Crawshaw's article "Academic Sanction," which appeared in the *Journal of the American Medical Association* in September 1989. Crawshaw, in turn, references a letter to the editor from Nicholas E. Davis, from Atlanta, Georgia (United States), in *The New England Journal of Medicine* in October 1987. This letter is about a boycott of a South African that occurred at an American hypertension conference and fails to mention Trinity College or Ireland. Uncertain about whether this boycott did in fact occur, the author contacted Terence McCaughey, an academic at Trinity College at the time. McCaughey, a supporter of the boycotts, was able to confirm that a strict academic boycott call was made and was implemented by many. (Personal communication with the author, November 5, 2005).

Primoratz asked for this manifestation in his 1995 call for an academic boycott of Serbian academics.[53] NAFTHE[54] has used it as a key part of the academic boycotts they have called including ones against London Metropolitan University in 2004, Sheffield Hallam University in 2001/2002, and University of Derby 2000.[55]

Refusal to collaborate is a controversial part of the current academic boycotts called against Israeli universities. It has been debated in major academic journals including *Nature*.[56] Some argue that collaborations can prevail over political strife, while others feel that there are times when these collaborations need to be severed in the form of academic boycotting for genuine change to occur in a situation.

Many boycotters in a variety of situations have refused to attend a conference. In China in 1992, American entomologists and physicists, who were protesting the Tiananmen Square massacre – particularly of students – and other human rights offences, used this manifestation.[57] In this case, it was the only manifestation of academic boycotting in the call for the boycott.

The NAFTHE union for lecturers in the UK used this manifestation in conjunction with other manifestations in their academic boycotts of Sheffield Hallam University in 2001/2002, London Metropolitan University in 2004, and the University of Derby in 2000. All of these boycotts were a result of labour concerns; NAFTHE was calling for lecturers in their union to refuse to attend conferences at the boycotted university along with other actions, such as refusing to accept positions at the boycotted universities.

---

[53] Igor Primoratz, "Boycott of Serbian Academics."
[54] NATFHE was formerly known as the National Association of Teachers in Further and Higher Education. It is now known as NATFHE – The University and College Lecturers Union.
[55] See NATFHE website at www.natfhe.org.uk for details of NATFHE boycotts.
[56] For instance, see Jim Giles, "Across the Great Divide," 444-9.
[57] Franklin Hoke, "U.S. Scientists Wary of Traveling to China," 1.

In 2000, the Association of University Teachers (AUT) and Association of University Staff (AUS) used this manifestation in an academic boycott of the University of South Pacific in Fiji to protest human rights violations in Fiji. Similar to the NAFTHE boycotts, the associations were calling on its members to take actions including refusing to attend conferences, take appointments, or to undertake consultancy work. In a similar vein, this manifestation was also used in South Africa during apartheid along with a multitude of manifestations.

Barring the boycotted from attending conferences is a second manifestation involving conferences. In this manifestation, academics from the boycotted institutions or country are barred from attending conferences in other countries or at other institutions. One of the most well known cases was in September 1986 during the academic boycott of South Africa. As part of a movement to end apartheid, a group of South African academics were excluded from the World Archaeological Congress in Southampton in the U.K. There was a great deal of backlash to this decision. The International Union of Prehistoric and Protohistoric Science (IUPPS) removed support from the conference, a number of people refused to attend the conference, and some organising bodies resigned.[58] In some cases in South Africa, scholars were unable to attend conferences because they were denied visas from the host country without explanation. Lorraine Haricombe and F.W. Lancaster include an example of such a letter in their book *Out in the Cold.* The letter was to South African citizen Professor Timothy Dunne from the Consulate General of Finland. Dunne had had a paper accepted at the Second International Tampere Conference on Statistics. The letter simple reads, "We regret to inform you, that your application for a Finnish visa has not been accepted by the Finnish

[58] Lorraine Haricombe and F.W. Lancaster, *Out in the Cold*, 40.

authorities."[59] Igor Primoratz called for this manifestation during his 1995 call for an academic boycott of Serbian academics.[60] Faculty associations or unions such as NAFTHE usually do not call for the barring of academics from boycotted institutions when calling academic boycotts.

The refusal of academics to serve as external examiners has appeared in a number of boycotts, but is seldom one of the prominent actions. This was one of the more minor, less written about manifestations of the academic boycott in South Africa during apartheid. When NAFTHE boycotted the University of Derby in 2000, Sheffield Hallam University in 2001/2002, and London Metropolitan University in 2004, it was included in the list of actions they wanted their members to take, but was not the focus of the boycott. In the 2004 boycott of Hibernia College by the Council of the Irish Federation of University Teachers, it was one of the two actions it called upon its members to take. The other action was to not write or teach on Hibernia's programmes.

The refusal to recognise degrees is a manifestation that is seldom used. The boycott of South Africa during apartheid is one of the only major instances were it surfaced. Faculty unions generally do not use it during their academic boycotts for labour issues.

The denying of access to educational resources and institutions is a manifestation that was part of the academic boycott against South Africa during apartheid. Haricombe and Lancaster write that in South Africa, academics had publishers and agents explicitly refuse to supply textbooks, journals, computer software and other equipment. University Microfilms International explicitly

[59] Lorraine Haricombe and F.W. Lancaster, *Out in the Cold*, 42.
[60] Igor Primoratz, "Boycott of Serbian Academics."

refused to provide dissertations on microfilm. Libraries abroad declined to supply interlibrary loans. There were also instances of no response from libraries and publishers that librarians thought were a result of academic boycotting.[61] Denial of access can also mean institutions from abroad denying the boycotted access to their institutions.

As stated above, publishers can refuse to supply boycotted institutions with textbooks, journals, computer software and other equipment. This can lead to a full book boycott, as happened with some North American publishing houses in the United States during the South African boycott.[62] In some cases, academics were able to circumvent such actions by using third parties, friends, or front organisations or by writing textbooks for use by South African students. [63]

Publishers also refused to publish manuscripts from South Africa. These actions were not so easy to circumvent. Sometimes publishers clearly stated their reason for rejection, while other times, there was no clearly stated reason for rejection. There were instances where the manuscript was returned unopened or there was no response at all from the publisher or referee, suggesting that academic boycotting may be occurring. [64]

This manifestation has been a controversial aspect of the current boycott against Israel. Mona Baker, a professor of translation studies in Manchester, dismissed two Israeli academics from editorial board of the journal *The Translator*, which she edits. In addition, she refuses to publish articles by Israelis in her journals as part of the academic boycott.[65] Baker's publishing house, St. Jerome,

---

[61] Lorraine Haricombe and F.W. Lancaster, *Out in the Cold*, 89.
[62] Lorraine Haricombe and F.W. Lancaster, *Out in the Cold*, 89.
[63] Lorraine Haricombe and F.W. Lancaster, *Out in the Cold*, 92.
[64] Lorraine Haricombe and F.W. Lancaster, *Out in the Cold*, 83.
[65] Polly Curtis, "Academic's Death Adds Fuels to Israeli Boycott Campaign."

also stopped supplying books to Israeli universities.[66] There was an outcry calling her actions anti-Semitic. Baker was cleared of anti-Semitism and racism by an internal investigation at the University of Manchester Institute of Science and Technology, the university at which she was teaching.[67]

Tanya Reinhart describes this manifestation as the "most severe stage."[68] She considers it more severe than economic-type sanctions on academia or other manifestations of academic boycotts, such as academics refusing to attend a conference, because it involves the isolation of individual scholars. In an open letter to Baruch Kimmerling, replying to a letter Kimmerling wrote against the academic boycott, Tanya Reinhart writes:

> At the individual level, many Israeli academics oppose the occupation and Israel's brutality in the territories. A large minority of them is actively involved, like you, Baruch, in a daily struggle against all these. Furthermore, among the goals of academic boycott is to encourage the Israeli academics to take a more active part in struggle and resistance. For this, it would help if we feel part of a larger international community, sharing this cause, rather than completely isolated from it.[69]

Though Reinhart supports the academic boycott of Israel, she does not support this manifestation.

There is a unique case involving publishing, but this is a case where publishers were boycotted instead of being the boycotters. In 2003, Peter Walter and Keith Yamamoto called for a boycott of six biology journals out of protest of what they saw as too high of price for electronic access to journals. Walsh and Yamamoto called for scientist to refuse to submit articles to the journals, to resign from the editorial boards of the journals and to refuse to review manuscripts.

---

[66] Caroline Davis, "Baker Defends Actions and Denies Anti-Semitism."
[67] Polly Curtis, "Academic's Death Adds Fuels to Israeli Boycott Campaign."
[68] Tanya Reinhart, "Why Academic Boycott: A Reply to an Israeli Comrade," "Background on the Academic Boycott" section.
[69] Tanya Reinhart, "Why Academic Boycott: A Reply to an Israeli Comrade," "Background on the Academic Boycott" section.

One manifestation that can cut particularly deep is the withholding of funding from boycotted institutions. A range of boycotters in a range of situations had used it. Igor Primoratz called for the cutting off of financial assistance from abroad to Serbian institutions in his 1995 academic boycott of Serbian academics. The Cancer Research Campaign also used it in the late 1990s when they planned to withhold grants from faculty members and individual departments that accepted tobacco money.[70] In addition, it was a focus of the academic boycott of Israel called initially by Steven and Hilary Rose in the United Kingdom. Israel has the status of a European country for funding for some European research programmes and the boycott was calling to stop such funding until Israel changes its behaviour in the occupied territories. [71]

The refusal to recognise an academic institution as a university is a unique manifestation of academic boycotting that is rarely used. During the 1998 boycott of the Technical University of British Colombia (TechBC), Canada, the Canadian Association of University Teachers and the Confederation of University Faculty Association faculty groups calling the boycott refused to recognise TechBC as a university.[72] This manifestation was in addition to calling on association members to refuse positions at TechBC. This academic boycott was called because the new technical university had neither a traditional tenure system nor senate.[73] The associations were also concerned about the strong corporate presence on campus and the impact that it might have on academic freedom.

---

[70] *BBC,* "University Tobacco Boycott Looms" and James Meikle, "Professor Quits over Tobacco Firm's £3.8m gift to University."
[71] Tanya Reinhart, "Why Academic Boycott: A Reply to an Israeli Comrade."
[72] Craig Saunders, "Harsh Opposition Over New B.C. University Grows."
[73] See chapter 7 for a complete discussion of the TechBC case.

Most academic boycotts call for professors and lecturers take actions. When students do not apply to schools or register for courses, it is students that are taking the action. In 2003, the Headmasters' and Headmistresses' Conference and Girls' Schools Association called for a boycott of the University of Bristol as a result their policies that the boycotters find discriminatory against students from certain preparatory schools.

The Independent Student Association in Poland called a boycott of mandatory military classes in universities in Poland 1989. The Academic Coalition for Equality at the University of Western Ontario in Canada called for a boycott of a second year psychology course as long a J. Philippe Rushton taught it. The coalition was felt that Rushton's theories on race were racists.

There are many cases where professors and lecturers are asked to refuse positions or to refuse to even apply for positions. They are often part of NAFTHE boycotts. Other faculty unions and associations have also used this manifestation in places such as Ireland, Canada, and Fiji.

This manifestation has been used in a couple of unique situations. In February 2004, Giorgio Agamben refused a position at New York University to protest U.S. border measures that Agamben felt were unjust. It was also used by the Association for Asian American Studies to protest the security rules that apply to Asian-American scientists in federal labs. The association called for Asian-American scientists to not apply for jobs at federal labs.

Despite the diversity of these manifestations, they all meet the basic characteristics of academic boycotts. Reminiscent of other boycotts throughout history, they are non-violent acts of non-cooperation. In each manifestation, some type of interaction is suspended or support was withheld until the behaviour the

boycotters deem inappropriate is changed by the boycotted. Diverse boycotters can use each manifestation against a variety of boycotted in a range of situations. The next section explores assorted boycotters and boycotted that have been involved in academic boycotting.

Who calls Boycotts against Whom

Diverse people, institutions and organisations, including academics, students, NGOs, governments and universities have called academic boycotts. Student activism is well known and well recorded. In his book *Student Resistance: A History of the Unruly Subject*, Mark Edelman Boren covers extensive examples, ranging from medieval times through to the 20th century, of students affecting change through direct action.[74] More recently, the students of the University of Buea in Cameroon held a one-month strike of their university in May of 2005.[75] There are times when faculty at university are involved in such actions,[76] however, there is far less writing about academics engaging in activism than about student involvement. Academic boycotts are the exception to this as are used more often by academics than by students. Students tend to use methods such as protests, walk-outs and strikes of classes instead of academic boycotts to address conflict in academia. The following chart indicates the type of boycotters that called recorded boycotts.

[74] Mark Edelman Boren, *Student Resistance.*
[75] Bouddih Adams and Effa Tambenkongho, "UB Students Boycott Lectures."
[76] Alexander W. Astin, Helen S. Astin, Alan E. Bayer, and Ann S. Bisconti, *The Power of Protest,* 54-59.

Type of Boycotter	Number Recorded Academic Boycotts (n=59) (% of total recorded boycotts)
Academics/Academic Associations[77]	39 (66%)
Students/Students' Associations[78]	7 (12%)
Government	5 (8%)
NGO	4 (7%)
Other (U.N., alumnae and philanthropist)	4 (7%)

Boycotts have been called from around the world, though in the examples cited in this thesis, the majority come from the Western part of the world. Boycotts from the two-thirds world are underrepresented as few academic boycotts from those regions are reported on in English journals, newspapers, or reports. Boycotters were located in the following countries: the United States, the United Kingdom, South Africa, Canada, Argentina, Ireland, Chile, Italy, Israel, Poland, Australia, Kenya, Nepal, France and India. There was also a European organisation and two international organisations that called academic boycotts.

A variety of people, organisations, and institutions have bore the burden of being boycotted in academia. The chart below indicates the categories of boycotters and numbers of boycotters belonging to each category. The "other" category includes debating unions, labs, journals, elementary schools, academic associations and funding programmes.

[77] Two cases consisted of primarily academics with some student involvement.
[78] Two cases consisted of primarily students with some staff involvement, two were initiated strictly by students, student associations called two, while one case involved the parents removing their children from school.

Type of Boycotted	Number Recorded Academic Boycotts (n=59) (% of total recorded boycotts)
University	21 (36%)
Multiple universities	15 (25%)
Conferences/meeting/hearings	10 (17%)
Other	7 (12%)
Individual academics	3 (5%)
Exams	3 (5%)

Academic boycotts have been called against boycotted in the following countries: the United States, the United Kingdom, South Africa, Canada, Fiji, Israel, Argentina, Ireland, Serbia, Chile, Poland, Kenya[79], Nepal, China, India, Cuba, Iran, Iraq, Liberia, Libya, Sudan, and Yugoslavia. In addition, one international institution was boycotted.

Reasons for academic boycott

Academic boycotts have been called for numerous and diverse reasons. The following chart shows the general reasons for boycotting and the percentage of recorded boycotts that were called for each reason.

[79] The organisations were international, but were working in Kenya at the time of the boycott.

Reason for Boycotting	**Number of Recorded Academic Boycotts** (n=59) (% of total recorded boycotts)
Academic/Government Connections	**25** (42%)
Internal Politics	**19** (32%)
Social Diversity Conflict	**12** (20%)
Corporate Interests	**3** (5%)

Academic/government connections included a range of links between a university or universities and a department of defence; an apartheid regime; a government that was accused of committing human rights violations; a government's foreign policies; and a government with immigration policies that are perceived to be unjust. There was a case where a boycott was called because a government had replaced a university's rector for their own purposes and another in which the students were boycotting because of mandatory military classes. Internal politics included reasons such as an academic's debatable scholarship; numerous labour disputes; academic quality; lack of academic freedom; poor managing of finances; breaching scientific norms; questionable teaching methods such as distance education; graduating unqualified students; and discriminatory policies. The reasons for academic boycotting that fell under the category of social diversity conflict include anti-Semitism, racism, under representation of tenure women faculty, inadequate childcare, and speaking out against female circumcision. Corporate interests included accepting funding from tobacco companies and prohibitively expensive journals.

Ethical Controversies

Non-violence, in itself, is often chosen for ethical reasons. However, whenever anyone is taking action to "encourage," "make," or even "force" someone to change their behaviour, there are ethical questions that arise. This is particularly true of boycotts that are of a more coercive nature than many other methods of non-violent persuasion. The ethics of boycotts are complex leaving many – including non-violent activists like Gandhi – struggling to determine when boycotts are ethical. Indeed, the issues that boycotts are engaged in are often ethically charged in themselves. Boycotts in academia contain ethical concerns that are specific to their context and only lead to more uncertainty about ethics of using them. There are a number of areas that one must examine when considering the ethics of academic boycotts. Though this section will briefly introduce some of the ethical debates surrounding academic boycotts, the purpose of this section is not to debate the ethics of academic boycotts. Rather, this section will identify which ethical dilemmas arise and how they could interfere with the theory that academic boycotts can be used to move towards more productive academic discussion. Although the moral questions found in academic boycotts can range from ethical concerns with the purpose of the boycott to issues inherent in the method of academic boycotting, any of these moral problems can interfere with the use of academic boycotts primarily three ways: the controversy overshadowing the purpose; reduced participation by potential supports; and detrimental intervention by a third-party. It should also be noted that ethics are not just a barrier to boycotting. At times, common ethics can be a basis for ending an academic boycott and entering into the discussion sought by the boycotters.

There are times when academic boycotts cause an ethical uproar, not for the method, but rather because of the issues they challenge or their purpose. Academic boycotts can be utilised for a range of purposes; critics may find some of these aims morally questionable or even blatantly wrong. At times, both sides of a conflict have used academic boycotts for opposing purposes.[80] The public nature of boycotting gives opponents of the boycott's goal many opportunities to learn about and object to the goal and the boycott; this often occurs in the public arena. This leaves the boycott vulnerable to interference of all three of the types to be discussed. When the goal of a boycott is ethically highly controversial, there is little that boycotters can do to mitigate the potential harm of disturbances resulting from the moral outrage. For example, some critics consider the current academic boycotts against Israel to be acts of anti-Semitism and have compared them to the exclusion of Jewish academic by the Nazis.[81] In some instances, such controversy may be reason enough to select a less public method of action. The controversy around academic boycotting is not limited to the ethically challenging purposes; an academic boycott can be ethically problematic because of ethical dilemmas inherent in the method academic boycotting. The remainder of this section will deal with such questions.

One of the more common accusations of academic boycotts is that they breach the norms of academic discussion and academic freedom. Few academic boycotts have transpired without allegations of them breaching the

---

[80] This has occurred with parties advocating deferent positions in the current conflict involving Israel/the Occupied Palestinian Territories. See chapter 8 for a discussion of the AUT boycott and the Simon Wiesenthal Centre's "Boycott the Boycotters" campaign at www.wiesenthal.com/site/apps/s/content.asp?c=fwLYKnN8LzH&b=253162&ct=855233 for a discussion of the counter boycott.

[81] Jack Cohen, letter to the editor, 11.

norms academic freedom and/or academic discussion. In a 1995 article on academic boycotts, Michael Davis comments, "Academics as such have a commitment to open debate among all those competent to participate; criticism, not boycott, is ordinarily the means for correcting error. Boycott as such is not only foreign to academic ethics; it is, at least on the surface, inconsistent with it."[82] Davis continues by asking key questions that he never conclusively answers, "How then can academics justify an academic boycott? Are all academic boycotts, by definition, unethical?"[83]

There are many examples of such accusations throughout this history of academic boycotting. Baruch Kimmerling, for one, believes that academic boycotts are such a hazard. Kimmerling writes about his decision to speak out against academic boycotts in the context of Israel, "[I] acted immediately and actively against this [academic] boycott [of Israeli universities], because I saw this as a blatant violation of academic freedom, which is the essence of academic research and teaching..."[84] Claims such as these are particularly effective in persuading potential supporters of academic boycotts to withhold their support out of fear that they are breaching time honoured cornerstones of academia. This thesis challenges this familiar notion by suggesting that academic boycotts can be used to move towards better academic discussion and thus, greater academic freedom despite the ostensible contradictory facade.

Some opponents to academic boycotts are concerned not only about the breach of academic norms around academic freedom and discussion, but also by the potential unintended harm to the actual work of academia that may result

[82] Michael Davis, "Academic Boycotts", fourth paragraph.
[83] Michael Davis, "Academic Boycotts", fourth paragraph.
[84] Baruch Kimmerling, quoted in Tanya Reinhart, "Why Academic Boycott – A reply to an Israeli Comrade" (originally part of a letter appearing in *Ha'aretz*, May 2002).

from an academic boycott. Academic boycotts seek to isolate certain elements of academia until the boycotted change behaviour that is perceived to be unacceptable by the boycotters; such separation can be detrimental to aspects of academia that are reliant on the broader academic community for such functions as collaboration, sharing of information, and substantiation of findings by other academics. This damage can be not only immediate and last the duration of a potentially lengthy boycott, but the ripples of it can last long after the boycott has ended. Challengers of academic boycotts ask whether such direct harm to academia is permissible when the potential gains of boycotts are seldom instantaneous. Michael Davis summarises this concern: "An academic boycott, a complex social undertaking where harm is immediate and benefit comparatively far off and uncertain, might well have enough unwanted consequences to outweigh its political or moral justification."[85]

The impediment of some aspects of academia has caused more alarm than others have. There is particular concern about academic boycotts when they have possible humanitarian implications, such as when they are detrimental to fields such as social work or medicine or when they could potentially harm those who are already victimised or marginalized. F.W. Lancaster and Lorraine Haricombe provide a specific example in the case of South Africa: "Opponents of the boycott argued that ideas and knowledge should be treated differently than tangible commodities, that obstacles to information access could actually hurt the victims of apartheid (for example, retard medical research and, ultimately, reduce the quality of health care)."[86] As

[85] Michael Davis, "Academic Boycotts," paragraph 6.
[86] F.W. Lancaster and Lorraine Haricombe, "The Academic Boycott of South Africa," paragraph 5.

seen in a number of medical journals from the time, there were particular concerns about the impact of academic boycotts in South Africa on the subject of medicine.[87] However, as will be discussed in the case study of the boycotting of academia in South Africa, when those who may be most harmed by the boycott request or support a boycott – such as the African National Congress' calling for boycotts of South Africa – it lends legitimacy to the boycott.

Boycotters have attempted to mitigate the potential harm to academia by choosing the most direct route, preferably a carefully planned primary boycott, to lessen chances of harming those who are not involved. Some, such as boycotters in Australia who called for a boycott of Israeli academics, have acknowledged in their call for a boycott that there is potential harm in calling an academic boycott.[88] By proactively acknowledging that they have considered the unintentional consequences of their actions and that they regret them, but see them as a reasonable risk for the gains expected, boycotters may appease some of their critics or take some of the "bite" out of critics accusations.

Critics often assert that such harm should not come to academia as academia is often thought to be exempt from the political strife that occurs in society around it. It supposedly is not impacted by politics and is above engaging in politics. Michael McKinley, from The Australian National University, explains, "It is popular belief in modern democratic societies that the universities are unique as sites of teaching, inquiry, research, and writing,

[87] For examples of this concern, see John B. Barlow, letter to the editor, 1161; or Lorraine J. Haricombe and F.W. Lancaster, *Out in the Cold*, 81-82.
[88] John Docker, "Settler Colonialism as Genocide," 5.

and, above all, are marked by their independence from the various forces that influence so much of the life outside of the academy."[89]

There is plenty of evidence that proves that, in fact, the distance between academia and outside influences is often merely a fine crack, not a great void as idealists propose. Academics can be affected in the form of persecution. Robert Quinn, director of Scholars at Risk Network, writes, "Attacks on scholars and academic communities are not new. They date back at least as far as the 15th century when Greek scholars fled to Italy at the dawn of the Renaissance."[90] Other times, the gap is blurred by collaborations. For instance, science and military are often cited as bedfellows, with military funding supporting research and scientific discoveries enabling military advancement.[91] Herbert York and Allen Greb go as far to say that scientists are policymakers:

> Scientists and engineers, moreover, did not simply respond to the requests of government authorities for advice. Instead they became full partners in the policy-making process. Not only did they invent and build new weapons, they actively promoted them and participated in deciding when and even how these new instruments should be used.[92]

In addition, Stuart S. Blume investigates a range of connections between scientists and government in his book *Toward a Political Sociology of Science*.[93]

Academia both affects and is affected by the society in which it resides; it cannot exist in isolation, removed from happenings of society, including politics. Academia, it is argued, is a product of its cultural and social context.

---

[89] Michael McKinley, "The Co-option of the University and the Privileging of Annihilation," 151.
[90] Robert Quinn, "Defending 'Dangerous' Minds," 1.
[91] See Paul Hoch, *Academic Freedom in Action* and Joseph Rotblat, ed., *Scientists: The arms race and disarmament.*
[92] Herbert York and Allen Greb, "Scientists as advisors to governments," 83.
[93] Stuart S. Blume, *Toward a Political Sociology of Science.*

Robert K. Merton builds on Max Weber's idea that scientific truth is a product of a culture by stating:

> The persistent development of science occurs only in societies of a certain order, subject to a particular complex of tacit presuppositions and institutional constraints. What is for us a normal phenomenon which demands no explanation and secures many self-evident cultural values, has been in other times and still is in many places abnormal and infrequent.[94]

In return, academia affects society, not only by nurturing skills and knowledge, but also by shaping culture. Jürgen Habermas identifies this interpreting and diffusing of cultural traditions as one of the three main tasks of the university.[95] Raymond Polin writes, "The task of the university is not merely to preserve and transmit culture but also to enrich, create, and renovate. Indeed, part of the task of the university is to guide the evolution of culture."[96] Some academics see this influence as less about developing or interpreting culture and more for the purpose of maintaining status quo of social order in society or for advancing an ideology or government's political agenda. Oliver Thomson belongs to this group of thinkers. In his book *Easily Led: The History of Propaganda*, Thompson contends, "Educational subjects like history, literature, religion, geography have nearly always been taught in a biased manner, bringing up new generations to have attitudes compatible with the dominant group in society."[97] Philip M Taylor, along with many others, provides the example of the highjacking of academia by the Nazi regime before and during the Second World War.[98] Daniel Jonah Goldhagen clearly demonstrates that academia was

---

[94] Robert K. Merton, *Social Theory and Social Structure*, 591.
[95] Jürgen Habermas, *Toward a Rational Society*, 2.
[96] Raymond Polin, "Freedom of Mind and University Autonomy," 41.
[97] Oliver Thomson, *Easily Led: A History of Propaganda*, 4.
[98] Philip M. Taylor, *Munitions of the Mind*, 213.

not exempt from political anti-Semitism of this time in his book *Hitler's Willing Executioners: Ordinary Germans and the Holocaust.*[99]

The funding of academia is also inherently political. Funding can come from a variety of sources including the state, private endowments, fees, business, or industry. The influence that funding sources have academia can vary from slight to great control. In the most extreme, funders can control the type of research conducted and even which results can be "found" or released. Paul Hoch, in his book *Academic Freedom in Action*, provides examples from the late 1960s where the US Defense Department is funding research projects that "seem less academic."[100] Debate about the control of research results surfaced when the Cancer Research Campaign called for a boycott of British universities accepting money from the tobacco industry in the late 1990s. Boycotters were concerned that researchers would distort their research conclusions to satisfy corporate funders.[101] The influence of industry on academia was the point of contention that resulted in the academic boycott of the Technical University of British Columbia, a case that will be examined as a case study. Although there are plenty of challenges to the claim that academia is apolitical, this is still an issue that is often raised as an objection to academic boycotts, particularly in the fields of science as academic boycotts are seen as breaching the apolitical nature of science.

There are specific ethical issues that, while they do not apply to all academic boycotts, greatly affect some boycotts, either in an advantageous or

---

[99] Daniel Jonah Goldhagen, *Hitler's Willing Executioners*, 96.
[100] Paul Hoch, *Academic Freedom in Action*, 104.
[101] *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, "Cancer Charity to Withhold Grants from Universities that take Tobacco Money". Concerns about the impact of tobacco industry funding are articulate in Richard Smith, "A Tainted University."

hindering manner. These can be a result of a variety of factors, including cultural or situational. An instance of such a factor that is detrimental for the boycott has been occurring during the current boycotts of Israel. The current boycotts have been compared to and references made to the boycotting of Jewish people and business' and the exclusion of Jewish students and staff from academia prior and during World War 2. In a letter to *The Scientist* journal, Jack Cohen from the Hebrew University in Israel writes about the academic boycott of Israeli universities by academics from the United Kingdom. Cohen states, "...this so-called boycott is most akin to the Nazi exclusion of Jewish scientists from academic positions and publication prior to WWII for racial/political reasons. As such it should not just be opposed, it should be fought."[102] Boycotters Hilary Rose and Steven Rose explain the cause of such charges of anti-Semitism. "Such allegations conflate uncritical support for the Israeli state with Jewish identity, and are both repugnant and unjust."[103] Nevertheless, such allegations can cause ethical controversy that can lead to any or all of the three types of interference discussed in chapter 5. An instance of situational factors reducing ethical debate transpired during the academic boycott of the Technical University of British Columbia (TechBC) in Canada in the late 1990s. TechBC was still in the process of developing when the boycott was called. It was not yet a completed institution with academics and students. In this way, the boycott did not appear to be direct attack on actual people; this may have reduced ethical controversy.

[102] Jack Cohen, letter to the editor, 11.
[103] Steven Rose and Hilary Rose, letter to the editor, *Nature*, 221.

While some boycotts are fortunate enough to have some exclusive specific situational or cultural factor that helps to reduce ethical controversy, there are certain features that when present in any academic boycott consistently tend to reduce or minimise the ethical controversy surrounding that academic boycott. For instance, when a call for a boycott clearly shows how the boycotted is connected to the offensive behaviour and the reason for the boycott is apparent, that academic boycott will probably less ethically problematic than one with an obscure purpose. When the purpose is to achieve meaningful discussion and that goal is evident, the ethical controversy of an academic boycott may also be reduced. In a similar vein, a boycott will be less ethically problematic if the boycotters demonstrate that the boycott will lead to greater academic freedom.

Unlike some other forms of non-violent action, boycotts do not depend on elements of surprise or secrecy in order to be successful. Boycotts are more ethical when they are more transparent and expectations are clearly communicated. A high level of transparency helps to decrease the possibility of manipulation and coercion because both the boycotters and the boycotted are clear about expectations of what must happen for the boycott to end. Transparency also lets others in the community or world know about the expectations of the boycott so that both parties can be held accountable if they act is a disrespectful or unethical way. Boycotters who are forthright about their actions reduce the likelihood of accusations of deceitfulness or underhandedness and their intentions are less likely to be misconstrued.

Some of these factors can be altered, while others are either inherently part of or absent in a given situation. Chapter 5 will examine how the ethical

controversies discussed above can interfere with an academic boycott. The case study of the Technical University of British Columbia reveals a case of academic boycotting where ethical controversy is minimised both by characteristics of the situation and the nature of the boycott. On the contrary, the case study of Israel demonstrates how ethical controversy can be beneficial at drawing attention to a situation, but also how they can thwart a boycott.

Many of these ethical considerations first appeared during the academic boycott of South Africa during apartheid. The case study of academic boycotting against South Africa will examine the ethical dilemmas presented by the situation in addition to highlighting one of the most prominent, diverse cases of recorded academic boycotting.

Non-Violence/Violence Continuum Theory

Chapter 2

Many of the challenges faced by boycotters result from a lack of framework and understanding about the mechanisms of academic boycotts. Non-violent action is one type of response to conflict and academic boycotting is one of a plethora of non-violent actions; whilst there is no theory directly on the workings of academic boycotts, non-violence and conflict analysis theory can provide rich insights. The next two chapters deal with non-violence theory because it provides a framework in which to better understand academic boycotting.

This chapter will address possible responses to conflict. By addressing the controversial question "What is violent and what is non-violent?" one of the key ethical controversies and strategic dilemmas of academic boycotts will be revealed. Academic boycotts are often accused of crossing the line between violence and non-violence because of the potential harm they can cause. However, when inaction is chosen in the face of injustice, direct, structural or passive violence is allowed to flourish. Academic boycotts must be selected and implemented cautiously, yet courageously, in order to remain "non-violent action."

There has been a great deal written about the nature of conflict. One of the distinguished theorists, Johan Galtung, writes about the potential of conflict to create or destroy. Galtung describes how this constructive and destructive behaviour can be present in a conflict at the same time creating what he calls

"the doubleness of conflict." In his book *Peace by Peaceful Means*, Galtung writes:

> Conflict generates energy. The problem is how to channel that energy constructively. This is reminiscent of the classical Chinese double-character definition of 'crisis', a concept in the neighborhood of 'conflict', as 'danger' + 'opportunity'. 'Danger' is close to 'violence', and 'opportunity' reasonably close to 'challenge', the root of creation.[1]

Although conflict contains the capacity for both, how a conflict is addressed will contribute to determining which of these factors will emerge most strongly. One can respond numerous possible ways to conflict. Initial responses can essentially be broken down into three broad categories: violent responses, non-violent responses, or avoidance/inaction. With the exception of avoidance, potential responses have been charted on non-violence to violence continuums or spectrums. Avoidance, which is not part of such continuums,[2] will be explored first, followed by violence and then non-violence, the focus of this thesis.

Avoidance

When people find themselves in a conflict, they sometimes choose to disengage or avoid it. Conflict theorists suggest that people tend to avoid conflict when they have a low concern for their goals; avoidance also means a low concern for the relationship in which they are in conflict.[3] In addition, Roxane S. Lulofs and Dudley D. Cahn suggest that avoidance indicates a low concern for self and for the other,[4] observing that, "Behaviours indicative of this style include choosing to withdraw, being physically absent, avoiding

---

[1] Johan Galtung, *Peace by Peaceful Means*, 70.
[2] Lynne Woehrle and Susan French's continuum is an exception to this.
[3] A diagram of this is presented in Simon Fisher et al, *Working with Conflict*, 96. Kenneth W. Thomas and Ralph H. Kilman originally developed this framework.
[4] Roxane S. Lulofs and Dudley D. Cahn, *Conflict: From Theory to Action*, 103.

issues, or remaining silent."[5] Laurence Boulle and Miryana Nesic, similarly regard avoidance as an indication of a low concern about others outcomes and one's own outcomes.[6]

Theorists Lynne Woehrle and Susan French suggest that avoidance hovers in a grey area, floating somewhere between violence and non-violent action[7] and is located in the gaps between a power-over and a power-with model, reactive and proactive action, disempowerment and empowerment, fear and courage, and low and high self-esteem. Their model shows both the negative and positive potential of avoidance, depending on how and in which context it is used.

Avoidance can influence a conflict in several ways. William W. Wilmot and Joyce L. Hocker suggest that avoidance in a conflict can result in two possible cycles, which they call the *twin cycles of avoidance*. The first starts with avoidance, resulting in the issues not being addressed; this in turn leads to more avoidance, the issues not being resolved, and yet more conflict avoidance. The second cycle also starts with avoidance and a failure to address issues, but instead of resulting in more in immediate avoidance, it leads to escalation or attack, leaving the issues unresolved and producing more avoidance.[8]

Bernard Mayer deals with another risk of avoidance. Avoidance means that someone's needs, interests, and/or goals are not being met, creating the possibility of sudden outbursts or emotional backlashes when people are

---

[5] Roxane S. Lulofs and Dudley D. Cahn, *Conflict: From Theory to Action*, 101.
[6] Laurence Boulle and Miryana Nesic, *Mediation: Principle Process Practice*, 47.
[7] Lynne Woehrle, "Gender Studies," 49.
[8] William W. Wilmot and Joyce L. Hocker, *Interpersonal Conflict*, 137.

dissatisfied or frustrated by these results of their conflict avoidance. Mayer notes:

> The emotional and behavioural jump from avoiding conflict to engaging in it is often enormous. As a result, we sometimes observe what appear to be significant discontinuities in behavior, attitude, and interactional style when a conflict becomes manifest. We have all seen people who appear calm, easygoing, or accommodating until suddenly some switch seems to be thrown that unleashes a much more confrontational, emotional, or rigid approach.[9]

Under certain circumstances, avoidance can lead to new violent responses.

However, not all theorists see avoidance as entirely destructive. Alexia Georgakopoulos would argue that theories which claim avoidance is exclusively negative are rooted in a Western way of thinking. In an article entitled "The Role of Silence and Avoidance in Interpersonal Conflict", Georgakopoulos suggests that avoidance and silence can be effective ways of promoting peaceful relationships, especially when anger is involved and the conflict is likely to escalate. Avoidance is seen as a way to prevent conflict escalation in such a situation.[10]

As will be discussed in chapter 4, avoidance is regularly used in academia to address latent conflicts. Academic boycotting is an alternative to avoidance and these concerns that accompany avoidance, including breaking the cycles of avoidance mentioned above.

Violent Responses

There is much debate about the exact meaning of the word "violence" and which actions can be constituted as "violent." A brief etymological analysis of the roots of words for "violence" serves as a starting point. Ruben G. Apressyan writes,

---

[9] Bernard Mayer, *The Dynamics of Conflict Resolution*, 29.
[10] Alexia Georgakopoulos, "The Role of Silence and Avoidance in Interpersonal Conflict," 86.

> In both English and the Romance languages, the root of violence, *violence, violenza* goes back to the Latin *violentia,* and is related to *violatio*, corruption, infringement, violation. The corresponding term in German, *Gewelt*, means domination and power. The Russian word for violence is *nasilije* and is consonant with and related to the word for force, *sila.* Violence, therefore, usually means coercion, enforcement, compulsion; or restrictive, abusive, arbitrarily illicit action.[11]

Though some of this understanding of violence is valid, such as the connections of violence with corruption, infringement, violation, abuse and dominance, Apressyan fails to distinguish the nuances between power, coercion, and violence. The ability to execute violence is often equated with power, but there are many other types of very powerful power. Hannah Arendt, notable among others, has challenged this basic perception about the connections between violence and power. Arendt states:

> Indeed one of the most obvious distinctions between power and violence is that power always stands in need of numbers, whereas violence up to a point can manage without them because it relies on implements… The extreme form of power is All against One, the extreme form of violence is One against All.[12]

Coercion, though it can be, does not need to be violent. *Coercion* is the ability to make a party take action, to push them to behave in a desired way, or to compel to do something that they would not otherwise have done. Allowing another party to act according to their own free will, without interference is the opposite of coercion. While persuasion is a low coercion activity, acts of non-cooperation are increasingly more coercive. Given that acts of violence are highly coercive, violence and coercion are often seen as comparable. However, an act, such as an effective academic boycott, may be relatively coercive, yet not be violent.

Theories on violence are prevalent throughout history, as violence historically has viewed as the primary response to conflict. Gordon Fellman

---

[11] Ruben G. Apressyan, "Violent Speech," 587.
[12] Hannah Arendt, *On Violence*, 41-42.

bases his book *Rambo and the Dalai Lama: the Compulsion to Win and Its Threat to Human Survival* on the proposition, "*As essential piece of most encounters as they so far appear in history in most societies is that each party tries to overcome the other.*"[13] Much reflection on violence comes in the form of war theory and strategy. Theorists such as Clausewitz and Liddell Hart employ some of the traditional reasoning on war and violence, looking at maximizing potential gain from the use of violence. Most such theorising involves little examination of the longer-term impact of this violence on societies. Georges Sorel was the author of a foundational book on violence entitled *Reflections on Violence*. In 1906 Sorel wrote, "...the problems connected with violence have, until now, remained very obscure. To examine the effects of violence it is necessary to start from its long-term consequences and not from its immediate results."[14]

Brian Teixeira examines why people choose violence in this century to deal with conflict, and makes the distinction often made by social psychologists between instrumental and hostile aggression. The purpose of the former is not to harm the person, but rather to achieve some goal or reward, for example, some type of material or financial gain (as in a robbery, or street gang initiation rituals). The purpose of the latter, however, *is* to harm others. This type of aggression is usually provoked by anger, but can also result from pleasure derived by some from the act of harming others. Brian Teixeira explains:

> The harm [of violence] can result simply from uncontrolled *hostility*, associated primarily with anger, as seems to be the case with most homicides. It can also be *instrumental*, as a means associated with achieving a supposedly justifiable or useful end, for example, for peacekeeping, using violence to confine or suppress a greater

[13] Gordon Fellman, *Rambo and the Dalai Lama*, 9 (italics in original text).
[14] Georges Sorel, *Reflections on Violence,* 43.

> violence, to defend a vulnerable person, or to punish a wrongdoer in order to sway him/her away from some offensive behaviors.[15]

As a non-violent theorist, Teixeira is quick to temper the few of the benefits of using violence with its drawbacks. Teixeira observes that violence is sometimes regarded as a short-term solution acceptable in emergencies, (thus giving groups in the conflict "breathing space to make a new start at resolving their disagreements"),[16] but that violence can escalate tensions, intensify the conflict, and also strain relationships.

Recently, these foundational concepts of violence have been challenged. Theorists including Riane Eisler have emerged to contest the notion that the "dominator" model, as Eisler calls it, is the only model. Eisler suggests that a "partnership" model also exists.[17] Gordon Fellman writes, "That there is tension between adversarialism and mutuality is a very old idea. I suggest that now is the time to entertain the possibility that a historical attachment to the adversary model as primary can give way to an emphasis on mutuality as primary."[18]

Theorists and practitioners of non-violence have illuminated the negative impacts of violence on societies and have stressed the necessity of alternatives. In their article "Institutionalization of Nonviolence", Toh Swee-Hin and Virginia Floresca-Cawagas, write about the shift in thinking that moves voices advocating non-violence from the margins to a central position. They write:

> Over the thousands of years of recorded human history, communities and leaders of wisdom and faiths have been urging fellow human beings, rulers, and governments to abandon violence in their ideas and actions. But often, such voices have usually been

[15] Bryan Teixeira, "Nonviolent Theory and Practice," 556.
[16] Bryan Teixeira, "Nonviolent Theory and Practice," 555.
[17] Riane Eisler, *The Chalice and the Blade*, xvii.
[18] Gordan Fellman, *Rambo and the Dalai Lama*, 15.

> marginalized and overshadowed by the forces for and of violent disposition and dispensation. From current trends, the next century may well provide the critical spaces for the culture of non-violence and peace to grow and replace the culture of violence and war.[19]

Some theorists have tested established definitions of violence. Though violence is often thought of in strictly physical terms, Johan Galtung has done a great deal of writing that sheds light on structural and cultural violence and their interplay with direct violence. Galtung explains his basic understanding of "violence as avoidable insults to basic human needs, and more generally to *life*, lowering the real level of needs satisfaction below what is potentially possible. Threats of violence are also violence."[20] Galtung posits three types of violence that can be illustrated as a triangle with each point of the triangle bearing one of the labels "structural," "cultural," or "direct." Galtung further explains, "Violence can start at any corner in the direct-structural-cultural violence triangle and is easily transmitted to the other corners. With the violent structure institutionalized and the violent culture internalized, direct violence also tends to become institutionalized, repetitive, ritualistic, like a vendetta."[21] Galtung's theories challenged established, narrow definitions of violence, not only by broadening their scope, but also by deepening understanding about the interplay between direct and indirect violence.

In 1992, Lynne Woehrle and Susan French challenged the notion that violence is outward, offensive and about dominance. They argue that culture encourages men to engage in that type of violence, but that women are socialised to use another type of violence with a different target – to use passive violence against themselves. Woehrle and French label passive responses as

---

[19] Toh Swee-Hin and Virginia Floresca-Cawagas, "Institutionalization of Nonviolence," 212.
[20] Johan Galtung, "Cultural Violence," 40.
[21] Johan Galtung, "Cultural Violence," 52.

violent because, like outward violence, they are based on a power-over model, are reactive, and are used in response to disempowerment, low-self esteem and fear. This is radically different from the mainstream idea that passivity is the antithesis of violence and that violence is something that is done to someone else.

Academic boycotting is accused of treading a fine line between violence and non-violence because academic boycotting may cause harm to academia, individuals, or broader society. While seldom discussed, academic boycotting can prevent further passive inward violence by serving as an alternative to avoidance and subversive coping mechanisms, both of which are prevalent means of coping with latent conflict in academia. These means of dealing with latent conflict in academia will be addressed in chapter 4.

Non-violent Action

Though history books are full of violent responses to conflict, many types of successfully employed actions have involved neither passive withdrawal, nor violent/aggressive opposition. Behaviours that intentionally exclude violence for moral, religious, political or tactical reasons are referred to as "non-violent actions." Johan Galtung predicates his book *Peace by Peaceful Means* on the thesis that "*there is no viable alternative to creative conflict transformation.*"[22] Galtung challenges the "assumption that there is no alternative to violence (with 'win', 'lose', or 'stalemate' as the three possible

[22] Johan Galtung, *Peace by Peaceful Means*, 70 (italics in original text).

outcomes) or no violence, meaning being effectively deterred. There is, of course, the vast *tertium* of nonviolence..."[23]

Non-violence is *not* rooted in the direct attack of the so-called opponents with the intention of overcoming them, but rather is reliant on using creativity, persistence, strategy, flexibility and sometimes confidence in ethical beliefs to persuade or move them to think and/or act in a way that the practitioner of non-violence deems appropriate. There is much debate about a precise definition of "non-violent action," and which actions fall into the category of "non-violence." As Judith Stiehm outlines in her article "Nonviolence is Two", much of this confusion is based of the fact that there are two basic approaches to non-violence.[24] Though these two approaches have much in common, there are some fundamental distinctions. "They are different in their motivation, their assumptions, and their implications. As a result, they are in some ways incompatible. Because one may be forced to choose between these two types of thought, a careful delineation of each variety must be made."[25] Much conflict and confusion can result from ambiguously declaring actions or a movement "non-violent" without all involved parties knowing what approach to non-violence one is engaging in, and how one understands "non-violence".

Some practitioners of non-violence choose non-violence for moral or religious reasons. This first of two types Stiehm identifies, referring to this approach as "conscientious" non-violence. Stiehm writes, "Conscientious

---

[23] Johan Galtung, *Peace by Peaceful Means*, 91 (italics in original text).
[24] Since most academic boycotters appear to be using non-violence from the second "pragmatic" approach, this thesis presents non-violence from the pragmatic approach, although reference is made to "conscientious" non-violence and its theorists/practitioners when applicable.
[25] Judith Stiehm, "Nonviolence is Two," 449.

nonviolence is drawn from a religious or ethical injunction prohibiting injury… it prescribes a particular kind of behaviour rather than a particular goal… It is the urge to attain or maintain moral purity which brings about commitment to this type of nonviolence."[26] Practitioners of this type of non-violence are sometimes referred to as using "principled non-violence."[27] William Robert Miller writes about the history of such moral convictions in relation to non-violence.

> The history of the idea of nonviolence as a religious or philosophical doctrine has been traced by some authors as far back as the Chhandogya Upanishad of ancient Hinduism, the Chinese Tao Te Ching (Sixth Century B.C.) and other ancient texts, not to mention the Bible and the fathers of the early Christian Church. It has appeared in many forms, ranging from an exacting monastic discipline to a vague sort of advice, as in Plato, to overcome evil by good deeds.[28]

In modern times, Mohandas Gandhi was the most prominent proponent and practitioner of this type of non-violence. Instead of using words such as "non-violence," Gandhi formulated his own word "satyagraha," a compound of two words shared by Hindi and Gujarati. Satyagraha literally translates as "truth-force" or "soul-force," and is based on principles such as non-violence, truth, determination, non-possessiveness, and abstinence. For Gandhi, satyagraha was not merely a practical means of action, but was a moral code and philosophy to guide the way one lived both personally and politically.

The terminology of non-violence is often confusing and ambiguous. Gandhi writes about the difference between "passive resistance" and satyagraha stating:

> Satyagraha differs from Passive Resistance as the North Pole from the South. The latter has been conceived as a weapon of the weak and does not exclude the use of physical force or violence for the purpose of gaining one's end, whereas the former has

---

[26] Judith Stiehm, "Nonviolence is Two," 449-450.
[27] Robert Woito, "Nonviolence, Principled," 357-364.
[28] William Robert Miller, *Nonviolence: A Christian Interpretation*, 15.

> been conceived as a weapon of the strongest and excludes the use of violence in any shape or form.[29]

Though Gandhi was the leading authority on this type of non-violence, a number of theorists and practitioners of non-violence have since embraced non-violence either wholly or in part. In one of the classic books on non-violence, *The Power of Nonviolence*, Richard B. Gregg explains, "nonviolent resistance acts as a sort of moral jiu-jitsu. The nonviolence and good will of the victim act in the same way that the lack of physical opposition by the user of physical jiu-jitsu, does, causing the attacker to lose his [or her] moral balance."[30] Bryan Teixeira defines non-violence as "an evolving, holistic theory and practice of personal and social empowerment that rejects aggression and violence as a means of achieving goals or resolving conflicts."[31]

Judith Stiehm calls the second type "pragmatic" non-violence. Stiehm describes the difference between "pragmatic" non-violence and Gandhi's "conscientious" non-violence.

> It is less concerned with meeting exacting ethical requirements as to means than it is with waging an effective, goal-oriented struggle against a stronger opponent, or, minimally, against an opponent capable of inflicting severe damage if the conflict should become violent.[32]

One of the leading theorists of pragmatic non-violence is Gene Sharp. Though initially a devoted follower of Gandhi's conscientious non-violence[33], Sharp has come to define non-violent action in practical terms: "Nonviolent action is a technique for mobilizing and applying the power potential of people and groups

---

[29] M.K. Gandhi, *Non-violent Resistance*, 6.
[30] Richard B. Gregg, *The Power of Nonviolence*, 44.
[31] Bryan Teixeira, "Nonviolent Theory and Practice," 555.
[32] Judith Stiehm, "Nonviolence is Two," 452.
[33] Thomas Weber, "Nonviolence is Who? Gene Sharp and Gandhi," 251.

for pursuing objectives and interests by non-military 'weapons' – psychological, political, social, economic and spiritual."[34]

Non-violent action is frequently equated with satyagraha, because of the recognition and popularity of Gandhi's use of non-violence. Non-violence is also often thought to be synonymous with pacifism. However, Peter Ackerman and Christopher Kruegler note that 85% of non-violent acts were not done because of principles or morals:[35] "Historically, nonviolent sanctions have most often been used by people who needed to make practical choices under very difficult circumstances, rather than by people committed to the avoidance of bloodshed for ethical reasons."[36] Gene Sharp often refers to such tactical reasoning in his writings on non-violent action.

> Nonviolent action is commonly chosen to be used in a conflict because it is believed to be the most likely in the circumstances to achieve the objectives... Or, the resisters may see that the nonviolent technique will likely avoid much of the negative consequences of the use of violence.[37]

There are many additional historic examples of creative non-violent responses to conflict that, irrespective of moral or ethical motivation, were practical for the situation. The Hebrew Scriptures provide accounts of such instances. Pam McAllister writes about this in the context of women providing sanctuary as a form of non-violent resistance throughout history:

> In 1300 BC, male babies were condemned to death by law. An Egyptian princess and a Hebrew slave mother crossed ethnic and class lines to conspire to break the law. Women's hands reached through the bull-rushes, pulled a baby to safety, sheltered him from the pharaoh's wrath, from the soldiers' blade. This is the ancient art of providing sanctuary, the gesture of creating a safe place in a violent world.[38]

This is one of very few ancient stories of women's non-violence resistance that has survived. Like much of women's history, these stories of non-violence

---

[34] Gene Sharp, "Beyond Just War and Pacifism," 319.
[35] Peter Ackerman and Christopher Kruegler, *Strategic Nonviolent Conflict*, 17.
[36] Peter Ackerman and Christopher Kruegler, *Strategic Nonviolent Conflict*, 5.
[37] Gene Sharp, "Nonviolent Action," 568.
[38] Pam McAllister, "You Can't Kill the Spirit: Women and Nonviolent Action," 25.

have been lost. Books such as *Reweaving the Web of Life: Feminism and Nonviolence*[39], *Women, Violence and Nonviolent Change*[40], and *Keeping the Peace: A Women's Peace Handbook*[41] are important records of women's acts of non-violence.

In his book, *The Politics of Nonviolent Action: Power and Struggle*, Gene Sharp provides examples of non-violent responses to conflict throughout history, encompassing Roman times, through the Netherlands' resistance to Spanish rule from 1565-1576, and international examples from the 20th century. Sharp notes that, (although acts of non-violence occurred between Roman times and the late eighteen-century), "we lack a coherent account of instances of nonviolent action during these centuries. This still remains to be written. Careful search from this perspective even in existing historical studies might reveal a great deal."[42]

Michael Randle cites a number of historical examples of non-violent action in his book *Civil Resistance*, recounting an act of non-violence undertaken by women of a First Nation in North America. Randle describes how "around the year AD 1600, women of the Iroquois Indian nation refused to have intercourse with their warrior husbands, and thus to bear them warrior sons, until they obtained the right to decide on whether or not the nation should go to war."[43]

Many others have documented more contemporary examples of non-violent actions. Richard B. Gregg, in the second revised 1959 edition of *The*

---

[39] Pam McAllister, ed., *Reweaving the Web of Life: Feminism and Nonviolence.*
[40] Aruna Gnanadason, Musimbi Kanyoro, Lucia Ann McSpadden, eds., *Women, Violence and Nonviolent Change.*
[41] Lynne Jones, ed., *Keeping the Peace: A Women's Peace Handbook.*
[42] Gene Sharp, *The Politics of Nonviolent Action: Power and Struggle*, 76.
[43] Michael Randle, *Civil Resistance*, 19.

Power of Nonviolence, records examples from the mid-nineteenth century through the late 1950s, and including India, South Africa, the United States and many countries in Europe. Contributors to the encyclopaedia *Protest, Power and Change* provide fewer early historical examples, but give of detailed examples of non-violent responses to conflict from diverse contexts, up until the end of the 20th century. Gene Sharp chronicles a list of 198 methods of non-violent actions that have been frequently used in both historical and in modern times, all of which he addresses individually in the second book of his three book series entitled *The Politics of Nonviolent Action.*[44]

Non-violence to Violence Continuum

A number of non-violent theorists have constructed continuums or scales plotting responses to conflict according to their different degrees of violence or coercion. Often the continuum or scale has "non-violent action" and at one end and "violent action" at the other; several levels of action that contain increasing violence are indicated along the scale. Thus, actions such as discussion and persuasion, that appear at the lower end of the scale are less violent than acts of aggression or violation that are at the high level of violence end of the scale. In addition, the non-violent action end of the scale is often also marked as a low level of coercion, while the violent action end of the scale is denoted as a high level of coercion. This is not suggesting that all coercion is violent; rather, this is included to express that acts at the low end of the scale, such as discussion or persuasion, are based more on the respecting the uninhibited will of a party, while acts at the far other end of the scale are more

[44] Gene Sharp, *The Politics of Nonviolent Action: The Methods of Nonviolent Action.*

about compelling, coercing and pressuring the party to act, with little or no regard for the will of the party.

There are variations on this theme depending on the context in which it is utilised. Otomar J. Bartos and Paul Wehr focus on the coerciveness of the action in their book *Using Conflict Theory.* Their continuum starts with "'pure' cooperation" and moves through "promising a reward," "trying to persuade," "threat of coercion," "nonviolent coercion," and finally ends with "violent coercion" as the most highly coercive action.[45] In his book *The Mediation Process*, Christopher W. Moore starts his "Continuum of Conflict Management and Resolution Approaches" with "conflict avoidance" moving through eight other stages of decision making processes to "violence" at the extreme end, (indicating the highest level of coercion and likelihood of win-lose outcomes).[46] As a result of his focus on mediation, Moore divides types of verbal communication into separate categories including "informal discussion and problem solving", "negotiation" and "mediation." Though these are each distinct activities, they are combined on most continuums under a single heading, such as "negotiation," "persuasion," "discussion," or "dialogue."

Theorists have used these types of continuums and scale in isolation as well as in conjunction with other pieces of information to depict theory that is more complex. In his article "Mediation and Negotiation Techniques," Jacob Bercovitch combines a "degree of coercion" continuum with a "party control" continuum to produces a chart that includes many of the concepts utilised by Christopher Moore, but to a slightly different end; Bercovitch places avoidance,

[45] Otomar J. Bartos and Paul Wehr, *Using Conflict Theory*, 27.
[46] Christopher Moore, *The Mediation Process: Practical Strategies for Resolving Conflict,* 7.

adjudication, arbitration, mediation, and negotiation on the same level of coerciveness, but different levels of party control.[47] L.N. Rangarajan presents a complex model to depict aggression, conflict, negotiation, and order in the book *The Limitations of Conflict: A Theory of Bargaining and Negotiation*. Though much of the theory Rangarajan presents is beyond the scope of this thesis, it is useful to illustrate how such scales or continuums can be combined with other factors to demonstrate a multifaceted nature. Rangarajan's diagram illustrates how connections can be made between different types of actions – Rangarajan identifies three broad categories: war and similar acts, brinkmanship, and negotiation – and the nature of the situation, (disorder, conflict and order).[48] Despite their combination with other ideas, the basic concept of the continuum or scale remains the same in these situations; they are a range of increasing coercion from non-violent communication of some variety, intensifying to physical violence.

Challenging the Definition of Violence

Consistent with leading violence theorists Johan Galtung[49], Hannah Arendt[50] and Georges Sorel[51], the theorists constructing these non-violence to violent scales present violence as an offensive aggressive act against someone, often in attempt to dominate that person or group of people. Lynne Woehrle and Susan French challenge this notion by broadening the definition of violence to include passive behaviour as violence to self.

---

[47] Jacob Bercovitch, "Mediation and Negotiation Techniques," 404.
[48] L.N. Rangarajan, *The Limitations of Conflict: A Theory of Bargaining and Negotiation*, 28.
[49] Johan Galtung, "Cultural Violence," 40.
[50] Hannah Arendt, *On Violence*.
[51] Georges Sorel, *Reflections on Violence*.

Lynne Woehrle writes:

> The system of gender assignment often teaches women to be passive and to solve conflicts by avoiding violence to others and by absorbing the consequences oneself. Because of this, women's passivity is often seen as nonviolence when we think it really is another form of violence. On the other hand, masculinity teaches the equation being male with strength and dominance, which is portrayed by being an actor (not passive) and thus being on the offense.[52]

The non-violence continuum that Woehrle and French presented as part of the paper, "Unlocking the Paradox of Nonviolence and Self-Defense: A Feminist Analysis" included a new dimension that was absent from previous scales and continuums, and has challenged the continuum's traditional structure. Their continuum begins with "passive violence" moves through "nonviolent action" to end with "offensive violence".[53] They identify both ends, (the passive and offensive responses), as violence, while the middle section of the continuum, (the assertive responses), is considered non-violent action.

* * *

The importance of these continuums is twofold, first in terms of how non-violence is engaged and escalated, and secondly, for showing the range of grades of violence and non-violence. As demonstrated in the next chapter, much traditional non-violence theory presupposes that non-violent actions begin with methods at the low coercion end of the scale, and progress upward if actions prove unsuccessful. This theory of engagement is applicable to academic boycotting. Woehrle and French's component of passive violence, however, adds a new dimension to theory on the subject of engaging and escalating non-violent action that is particularly relevant to the context of

[52] Lynne Woehrle, "Gender Studies," 49.
[53] Lynne Woehrle, "Gender Studies," 49.

academic boycotting. Chapter 4 will examine further both passive violence and avoidance in the context of academia and conflict resolution in academia.

These continuums challenge the violence/non-violence dichotomy and show that there are, in fact, many degrees of levels of violence, illuminating the unclear areas between different methods of non-violent action, and the grey areas between non-violence and violence. The haziness between violence and non-violence, particularly when the Woehrle and French component of passive violence is included, is critical when analysing academic boycotts. Boycotts are close to the grey area leading to offensive violence, but much of the way that latent conflict is dealt with in academia falls within the ambiguity of passive violence. In these ways, academic boycotts negotiate a fine line between allowing passive violence to silently continue if not implemented effectively when needed, and transgressing the line towards threat, harm, or otherwise offensive violence if used destructively, too aggressively, or inappropriately. The tension of balancing between these two extremes will be discussed further in the context of academia in chapter 4. This place, in the grey areas, between violence and non-violence has resulted in a great deal of ethical controversy for a number of academic boycotts (as introduced in chapter 1 and demonstrated in the academic boycotts of South Africa in chapter 6), which can be detrimental to the success of an academic boycott in a number of ways (as discussed in chapter 5).

Non-violence Theory

Chapter 3

Academic boycotts are poorly understood and under-analysed. There is no broad theory about the mechanisms of academic boycotting. Academic boycotts, as a form of non-violent action, are subject to the theories of non-violence. Thus, non-violent action theory can serve as a framework for the analysis of and theorising about academic boycotts. In return, understandings about the mechanisms of academic boycotting can also be used to better understand the mechanisms of other types of non-violent action. Non-violence theory is particularly useful for certain purposes. Firstly, it can be used to understand order of engagement of non-violent tactics, namely identifying the potential benefits of attempting lower risk, lower coercion options, such as discussion, before engaging in more confrontational methods and the selection of an appropriate method given the situation. Secondly, non-violence theory can guide practitioners in ensuring that they have met all of the elements required for the effective implementation of various methods of action, including acts of non-cooperation such as boycotting. Thirdly, non-violence theory can shed light on the means by which a non-violent action works. This includes understanding how more confrontational methods, such as non-cooperation and non-violent intervention, can be used to balance power or increase consciousness. Finally, non-violence shows the importance of discussion, not only as a first low risk option for engagement, but also throughout other actions and as a means of addressing complex issues and multi-faceted concerns.

This chapter is divided into three sections. The first deals with why discussion is a first approach in classic non-violent escalation theory. It presents a working definition of *discussion* as well as of *academic discussion.* By establishing criteria for discussion, this section develops an understanding of why discussion fails when these elements are missing. Other factors that can impede discussion are also outlined. This section is the foundation for later analysis of what academic boycotting must be able to accomplish in order for boycotting to move a conflict past the impasse of dysfunctional discussion to functional discussion in academia.

The second section examines confrontation and the roles confrontation can play in a conflict, in particular in balancing power and raising consciousness levels. *Power balance* is an abstract concept that is used in many ways, with different meanings. This section establishes a working definition and presents some central understandings about power, including ways to change power imbalance. This section closes with an examination of the importance of not abandoning discussion, even when using more confrontational methods of engagement. The theory presented in this section is useful for developing more realistic expectations for academic boycotting and also informs, in part, the implementation of academic boycotts.

The final section attends to the categories of non-violent action. While presenting the main categories established by theorists of non-violence, it also highlights some of the "grey areas" where actions do not clearly fit into one category or when theorists categorise types of actions differently. This categorising helps identify the place and potential of academic boycotting in comparison to other types of non-violent action. A new category, creation non-

violence, is also suggested. This new category is useful at the end of this thesis when alternatives to academic boycotting are discussed.

Discussion

Section 3.1

In a conflict situation, there are certain types of non-violent actions that are usually tried before others. These first responses may be chosen over other options for a variety of reasons including: they are more likely to be successful; require less resources; are the norm for a given situation; are less ethically problematic; have been successful in the past; require less time; have less potential for harm; and are more consistent with the party's values. Practitioners of conscientious non-violence may also choose to use less coercive methods first because of their religious or moral beliefs. In classic non-violence theory, action begins with the lower end of some variation of the traditional non-violence continuum. It is only after these actions prove ineffective that other more coercive methods further up the continuum are attempted. Discussion is located at the preliminary, less coercive, less violent end of the continuum.

Practitioners of established non-violence begin action by engaging in some type of communication that uses verbal or written contact in order to give information to the other party; this communication is also often used to receive information in return. Bryan Teixeira writes, "In this early phase of nonviolent confrontation, the goal is to use consistent reasoning and communication skills in order to arrive at a mutually acceptable solution."[1] This communication can be used to educate, persuade, learn from, negotiate with, built relationship with, challenge, and/or negotiate with the other party. Practitioners only move onto

[1] Bryan Teixeira, "Nonviolence Theory and Practice," 562.

other more intense, coercive, and/or challenging actions if their communication fails to produce the desired results. Gandhi's approach was to begin satyagraha with discussion. Thomas Weber writes about Gandhi's stages of conflict resolution as "negotiation, followed by self-suffering and nonviolent direct action."[2] Gandhi's campaigns are examples of the use of discussion first.

This communication has many different labels depending on how and why it is used. These terms include dialogue, conscientisation, talks, negotiation, discussion, consultation, conversation, discourse, argument, debate, rapport building, cooperation, conference, networking, bargaining, community building, mediation, conferring, collaborating, meeting, sharing opinions, voicing concerns and persuasion. Specific terminology can lead to greater clarity about exact nature of the interaction. However, it can also contribute to confusion as there are no clear standards for terminology use and different theorists and practitioners use terms in varying ways with diverse meanings. For instance, non-violence theorists sometimes use the terms *conversion* and *persuasion* interchangeably. Other times, theorists use them to denote separate types of actions. According to Gene Sharp, conversion is "changing the opponents' opinions or beliefs."[3] George Lakey describes persuasion as a mechanism of non-violent action that involves getting someone to do what you want by neither converting them to your way of thinking nor by making or forcing them to through coercion:

> Sometimes situations occur in which one cannot say that the opponents have been coerced, for they could continue to oppose if they wanted to; but we cannot call it conversion either, for the opponents do not accept the point of view of the campaigners. Nevertheless, the campaigners succeed in achieving their aims. The

[2] Thomas Weber, "Gandhian Philosophy, Conflict Resolution Theory and Practical Approaches to Negotiation," 496.
[3] Gene Sharp, "Beyond Just War and Pacifism," 319.

> opponents can be overheard saying, "Let them have what they want; it's too much of a nuisance to continue the fight.[4]

Lakey uses the term *conversion* to indicate "a real change in the heart of the opponents."[5] William Robert Miller's definition of *persuasion* is more in harmony with Sharp's definition of *conversion* than with Lakey's definition of *persuasion*. Miller writes, "to persuade someone is to win him [or her] over, to help him [or her] to make a change of conduct that is based on an inner change of heart or will."[6] This definition is also consistent with Gandhi's use of the word *conversion* in the context of his non-violent struggles with Britain: "I have deliberately used the word *conversion*. For my ambition is no less than to convert British people through non-violence, and thus make them see the wrong they have done to India."[7]

The difficulties do not end with confusion between words such as conversion and persuasion. The words like *negotiation* raise many a quandary with their multiple meanings. Negotiation has two distinct meanings. *Negotiation* has traditionally meant *bartering, bargaining or compromising*. In this scenario, the parties in a conflict attempt to come some type of solution through bartering or working out some type of deal in which both parties get some of what they desire. This understanding of negotiation is based on *zero-sum*, in which whatever is lost by one side is gained by the other side, thus the net change is without exception zero. Adam Curle defines *bargaining* as, "This is the process of negotiation, or 'horse-trading' as it is commonly termed, through which two conflicting groups try to reach a settlement in which each

---

[4] George Lakey, "Sociological Mechanisms of Nonviolence," 67.
[5] George Lakey, "Sociological Mechanisms of Nonviolence," 66.
[6] William Robert Miller, *Nonviolence: A Christian Interpretation*, 39.
[7] M.K. Gandhi, *Non-violent Resistance*, 227.

gives as little as possible and gains as much as possible."[8] Gene Sharp calls this stage *accommodation*, which he defines as "compromising to gain part of one's objective."[9] Laurence Boulle and Miryana Nesic see *bargaining* as an option when a win/win solution is not possible. "Where the parties' needs and interests cannot be met by problem-solving negotiation, they will have to engage in distributive bargaining. This refers to the final transactional part of the negotiations when the parties attempt to use trade-offs, packaging and compromise to reach an agreement."[10] Johan Galtung describes this phenomenon as *compromise* and describes it by saying, "ambitions are lowered, then the goal is reduced, to the point that it may be attained."[11] Galtung argues that by using a means such as compromise, it is possible to resolve a conflict without affecting the conflict formation or the relationship of the actors.[12] L. N. Rangarajan uses the terms *bargaining* and *negotiation* interchangeably in his book *The Limitations of Conflict: A Theory of Bargaining and Negotiation.*[13]

Roger Fisher and William Ury challenged this notion and revolutionised how the public views negotiation. They suggest that negotiation need not be such a win/lose scenario. They suggest *principled negotiation* or *negotiation on merits* in which parties:

> decide issues on their merits rather than through a haggling process focused on what each side says it will and won't do. It suggests that you look for mutual gains wherever possible, and that where your interests conflict, you should insist that the result be based on some fair standards independent of the will of either side.[14]

---

[8] Adam Curle, *Making Peace*, 174.
[9] Gene Sharp, "Beyond Just War and Pacifism," 319.
[10] Laurence Boulle and Miryana Nesic, *Mediation: Principles Process Practice*, 135.
[11] Johan Galtung, *Peace by Peaceful Means*, 95.
[12] Johan Galtung, *Peace by Peaceful Means*, 114.
[13] L. N. Rangarajan, *The Limitations of Conflict: A Theory of Bargaining and Negotiation*, 21.
[14] Roger Fisher, William Ury, and Bruce Patton, *Getting to Yes*, xviii.

Diana Francis describes this phenomenon as *conflict resolution.* She distinguishes conflict resolution from negotiation in her book *People, Peace and Power: Conflict Transformation in Action.* Francis writes:

> Whereas negotiation may take the form of hard bargaining, in which the protagonists use their relative power to gain advantage over each other, its purpose in conflict resolution is to discover or develop common ground and reach a mutually acceptable agreement, through a co-operative process rather than a contest.[15]

The unique characteristics of each distinguished type of verbal or written communication listed above are not without use and consequence. For example, David W. Johnson, Roger T. Johnson and Dean Tjosvold provide a detailed breakdown of the terms "constructive controversy," "debate," "concurrence seeking," "individualistic processes," including distinct characteristics, implications, and consequences of each.[16] However, analysis of the intricate differences of these types of verbal or written communication is beyond the scope of the thesis.

For the purpose of this thesis, all communication that meets the following criteria will be called "discussion." There are other words that could be used to describe this type of communication. Practitioners and theorists refer to the types of communication that make up this broader category of "discussion" using terms such as dialogue, conscientisation, talks, mediation, sharing opinions, conferring, negotiation, discourse, argument, debate, rapport building, cooperation, conference, consultation, conversation, verbal persuasion, bargaining, community building, collaborating, meeting, voicing concerns and networking. Theorists, such as Linda Ellinor and Glenna Gerard, would disapprove of using the term *discussion* to describe other types of

---

[15] Diana Francis, *People, Peace and Power*, 30.
[16] David W. Johnson, Roger T. Johnson, and Dean Tjosvold, "Constructive Controversy: The Value of Intellectual Opposition," 67.

communication that they would describe as *dialogue*.[17] Though it may not be perfect, discussion was chosen because it is general enough to include the range of possible interaction in this category and yet is not likely to be confused with other terms that various non-violent theorists and practitioners have used to distinguish a particular type of communication. In order to be considered "discussion," ***the communication must intentionally convey substantial information in written or verbal form directly to the other party; an opportunity to receive information in return must exist.***

Firstly, the communication must be for the purpose of conveying meaningful information. The objective of the communication cannot be harassment, intimidation, annoyance, provocation, distraction, interruption etc. For instance, if a party were to release a controversial statement about an irrelevant matter in order to distract public attention away from another problem, the statement that they released would not be discussion. As well, it is not discussion to make several phone calls to exasperate or pester the other party.

Secondly, the non-violent practitioners must under take the communication intentionally. The communication cannot simply be the by-product of some other interaction. The communication must be planned and deliberately executed for a reason. Consider this scenario as an example that does not meet the criterion of intentional: Organisers of a protest place posters around a city to advertise the up coming protest to potential protesters. The police find out information about the protest from the posters. The organisers

[17] Linda Ellinor and Glenna Gerard. *Dialogue: Rediscover the Transforming Power of Conversation*, 21.

did not intentionally communicate with the police. The information gained by the police was a by-product of advertising to potential protesters.

The communication must also be done using words that are either written or oral. The use of symbols, caricatures, gestures, silence, or actions to communicate a message does not meet this criterion. The exception to this would be a language based on gestures, such as American Sign Language for persons who are deaf, hearing impaired or non-verbal. There are many examples of actions that are not discussion. For instance, though a rude gesture may communicate a party's discontent with a given situation quite clearly, it cannot be considered a form of discussion.

In order to be considered discussion, the communication must be substantial and of enough length to convey relevant information. (This usually means that it must be at least a few sentences in length.) Short forms of communication that are useful for sending very limited messages are not regarded as discussion. For instance, slogans, banners, signs, names, posters, skywriting, earthwriting, graffiti, and cheers are *not* included in this definition of discussion.

Discussion is a two-way street; an opportunity must exist for the practitioner of non-violence to receive information in return from their partner in discussion. This may mean an opportunity for a spoken response in the case of oral communication. In the case of a letter, fax or email, there must be a way for the recipient to respond. In the case of newspaper or journal articles, there should be either an opportunity for a letter to the editor, an article in response, or direct contact information so that a reply can be issued.

Finally the contact in discussion is usually direct. This can mean directly speaking with or writing to someone. It can also be publicly issuing information that the receiver is likely to access. Although a third party, such as a mediator, may be present during a discussion, information is not usually passed through a third party during discussion. Only in extreme circumstances where language, physical, political etc. barriers exist, does information pass indirectly to the recipient during discussion.

Discussion in academia is one of the central themes for this thesis. For the purpose of this dissertation, in order for a discussion to be considered *academic discussion*, it must meet all of the above criteria for discussion in addition to the following specific requirements. Each of the components of the definition provided will be discussed briefly. Creating a definition of discussion in academia is problematic as many of the terms, such as "competency", "reason", and "truth", used to delineate "academic" from the commonplace are contested. However, an in-depth discussion of these terms is beyond the scope of this paper. ***Academic discussion is discussion that is conducted by competent people, in academic language, in the context of academia. The discussion must be based on reason and be in the pursuit of truth in order to meet this working definition.***

The discussion must occur in the context of academia. John Henry Newman writes, "a University seems to be in its essence, a place for the communication and circulation of thought, by means of personal intercourse."[18] As a result, academic discussion could be in a variety of contexts including the

[18] John Henry Cardinal Newman, *The Idea of the University*, 464.

classroom, at conferences, in academic journals, laboratories, and during collaborations.

The people engaging in academic discussion must be competent, that is, have adequate knowledge or insights in the field of study so that they may understand and contribute to the discussion. Anthony O'Hear explains who is eligible to engage in academic discussion: "In Newman's university... the conversations will be between those disciplined and expert in the various central fields of human knowledge, and between people aiming to become so disciplined and expert."[19]

Academic discussion is to be conducted in academic language. Only those who have command of academic language are eligible to enter into academic discussion.[20] Discussion that does not include academic language cannot be considered academic discussion.

Academic discussion is to be based on reason. If logic, analysis, and questioning are absent, discussion cannot be considered academic. In an article entitled, "Free Speech and the Universities", Bhikhu Parekh writes, "...reason alone is entitled to be heard in the university; that is, only those who are willing to argue, persuade and be persuaded are entitled to its hospitality."[21]

Truth is sought via academic discussion. This truth is to be based on facts that can be verified. W. T. Couch writes:

> The obligations of the teacher are direct to truth, and the teacher who, in order to please anybody, suppresses important information, or says things he [or she] knows are not true, or refrains from saying things that need to be said in the interests of truth, betrays his [or her] calling and renders himself [or herself] unworthy to belong in the company of teachers.[22]

---

[19] Anthony O'Hear, "Academic Freedom and the University," 11.
[20] Bhikhu Parekh, "Free Speech and the Universities," 67.
[21] Bhikhu Parekh, "Free Speech and the Universities," 67.
[22] W.T. Couch, quoted in Russell Kirk ,"Academic Freedom", 1.

Traditionally this truth has seen as an objective, disinterested truth, but recent scholars, in particular feminist scholars, have began to question the objectivity and unbiased nature of this truth. For example, Mary Hawkesworth writes about the hidden biases that occur in academia concerning sexual harassment in her article entitled "The Politics of Knowledge: Sexual Harassment and Academic Freedom Reconsidered".

> Students must be taught to examine the processes by which knowledge has been constituted within determinate traditions and to explore the effects of significant omissions (such as the experiences of women and minorities) upon those traditions.[23]

Though many of the terms and concepts included in the above criteria are contested, these points can serve as guidelines for distinguishing academic discussion from other types of discussion.

This thesis is based on the theory that academic boycotting is only useful after discussion fails. Thus, it is important to understand why one might choose to engage in discussion before other methods of action; non-violence theory provides some reasons. Severyn T. Bruyn summarises classic non-violent escalation theory in an article entitled "Social Theory of Nonviolent Action: A Framework for Research in Creative Conflict":

> Progressive advancement of the movement through steps and stages determined to be appropriate within the given situation. Static conditions must be avoided and direct action launched only after all efforts to achieve an honorable settlement have been exhausted.[24]

Bruyn is not alone in his belief in the importance of engaging in discussion before engaging in more extreme forms of non-violent action; theorists and practitioners, of both pragmatic and conscientious non-violence, present a range of reasons for starting with discussion of some form. Classic non-violent theorist Joan Bondurant writes about the benefits of using discussion to reach a

---

[23] Mary Hawkesworth, "The Politics of Knowledge," 27.
[24] Severyn T. Bruyn, "Social Theory of Nonviolent Action," 38.

compromise instead of launching into direct non-violent action when concession would have been adequate to settle the dispute. In her famous book *The Conquest of Violence*, Bondurant explains:

> To use the direct action techniques of satyagraha where the practical arts of compromise could settle the dispute without effecting a grave injustice is a tactical error against which every satyagrahi need be forewarned... To go beyond compromise into later stages of direct action may be to introduce an atmosphere of self-righteousness, stiff-necked opposition hardly appropriate to the conditions of a minor dispute.[25]

Ethically, discussion tends to be less problematic than measures that are more coercive. Discussion is about conversion and education while other types of non-violent action become manipulative, destructive, risky and coercive. In addition, discussion tends to be more socially acceptable and adheres better to the norms of society than many other types of non-violent action. Ethical acceptability is an important criterion for conscientious practitioners of non-violence as well as for pragmatic practitioners that do not want ethical controversy to interfere with or overshadow their actions. Ethical controversy can lead to interference in the implementation, execution and the achievement of successful results from an action.

Discussion generally has less potential for harm and/or loss than measures that are more coercive. In an article entitled "Measures of Last Resort: Coercion and Aggression in Bargaining", James T. Tedeschi and Thomas V. Bonoma warn about the potential of unnecessarily escalating a conflict by resorting to coercive measure when they are not warranted. Conflict escalation can lead to increased risks of problems for practitioners of non-

[25] Joan Bondurant, *Conquest of Violence*, 221.

violence. Tedeschi and Bonoma write, "Coercion is usually not a preferred mode of influence because of the obvious dangers of escalation."[26]

Due to its interactive intimate nature, discussion is suited to a problem-solving approach to conflict. "*Problem solving* is a technique that encourages individuals in conflict to jointly define the conflict or problem, analyse its causes, suggest various options for solving the conflict, and then select and implement the preferred solution."[27] Discussion, when used with a problem-solving approach holds the potential for win/win type solutions. With win-win solutions, both parties are able to have their needs met. After a conflict escalates, the chances of win-lose results increases.

While other methods of non-violence are more forceful, coercive and confrontational, they are seldom as effective at communicating complex messages and receiving information in return as discussion. This makes it a suitable starting position in cases that require transferring large volumes or complex information. The two-way nature of discussion also allows parties to check in to be sure that they are understanding the nuances and details the other party is presenting.

Other practitioners choose to begin with discussion because they see it as an easier option than other types of action. This may be because discussion can be less resource and time intensive than many other methods. It has to potential for great gain, with little investment and modest risk. As will be investigated later in chapter 4 in the context of academia, there may also be environmental or case specific reasons for engaging in discussion first.

---

[26] James T. Tedeschi and Thomas V. Bonoma, "Measures of Last Resort: Coercion and Aggression in Bargaining," 215.
[27] Reina Neufeldt et al., *Peacebuilding*, 113, (italics in original text).

All of these reasons for attempting to engage in discussion first can apply to situations where academic boycotting may be used. Academic boycotting presents one additional reason for trying discussion first that may not be the case with other types of non-violent action. As explained in this thesis, though it is theoretically possible, it is unlikely that academic boycotting can be used to directly achieve a goal other than discussion. Thus, if the goal is discussion, it is logical to attempt discussion first – a less risky, less resource intensive endeavour – before investing in an academic boycott campaign.

Beginning with discussion will not result in the above-mentioned benefits if the discussion is ineffective. There are a series of requirements that are needed in order for effective discussion to occur. These conditions include interconnectedness, ability, communication skills, and a reason or desire to engage.

The first requirement of discussion may seem excessively apparent, but is the crucial foundation for any type of exchange of ideas. Those engaged in exchange must have some type of contact or interconnectedness with each other. The more direct or intimate the relationship, the more potential there is for communication.

Interconnectedness does not necessarily mean interdependence. For instance, workers at different firms in the same large office building may not be dependant on each other, but they are interconnected simply by virtue of the fact that they regularly share a common space, if only a common corridor or elevator. However, the points of interconnectedness and interdependence are often confused in the context of discussion. Parties often enter into discussion because, in addition to interconnectedness, they are somehow dependent on the

other party – that is, they have something to gain from the other party. Nevertheless, interdependence is not necessary. It is possible, for instance, for a party to enter into discussion only to please or gain reward from a third party. Interconnectedness, however, is required. There must be some common point of contact, if not a direct connection between the parties, in order for discussion to occur.

Secondly, parties in the conflict must recognise and acknowledge that there is a conflict occurring in order for discussion to happen. When a conflict is latent, that is hidden, this can be a problematic requirement. In latent conflict, the conflict must be brought to the surface before discussion can ensue.

Thirdly, those engaging in discussion must have the financial, physical, social, logistical, legal, and political means at their disposal if they are to engage in discussion. In some instances, such as neighbours greeting each other, these requirements are minimal. However, if academic discussion involves colleagues from various countries, these criteria become more demanding, complex and potentially inhibiting.

There are a number of factors that can inhibit a party that is otherwise willing to engage in discussion. Political barriers can exist. Someone may not be able to obtain a visa that is required to travel to a foreign country or a country can prevent or hamper its own citizens from travelling to a country that is considered hostile. Financial or logistical barriers can also inhibit participation in discussion. Examples of these include: students who cannot enter into academic discussion because they cannot afford the tuition fees; a person with a lower income not being able to engage in internet discussion because of the prohibitively high costs of a computer and internet connection; a

group being unable to meet due to a lack of transportation; or people with disabilities being excluded from discussion because the inaccessibility of a building. Sometimes laws can also impede certain types of discussion. This can range from restrictions imposed by a sexual harassment policy at a school to the severest of limitations forced upon a population by an oppressive state.

One must have the communication skills required to engage successfully in discussion with others. One must be able to utilise a common language at an adequate level. One's ability to engage could be limited by an inability to assert oneself in a socially or culturally appropriate manner or express one's views in an articulate manner. According to Diana Francis, "If there is to be constructive dialogue in conflict, the primary need is for articulate and constructive spokespeople for the different parties."[28]

Parties to discussion must have a reason to engage in discussion. This reason to engage must be more convincing than the options of avoiding, acting violently or pursuing some action other than discussion. For this to happen parties must see a problem, conflict or a need to discuss a matter; they may not as a result of denial or a genuine lack of awareness. Other times, someone may not engage because of apathy that results from of a lack of interest or concern.

If a party believes they have nothing to gain – and especially if they believe they have something to lose – they will not enter into discussion. Diana Francis agrees, writing, "But as Gandhi, King and others knew, those who benefit from oppressive or exploitative relationships do not readily enter into dialogue with a view to relinquishing their advantages. A change in power

[28] Diana Francis, *People, Peace and Power*, 101.

relations is likely to be needed before the process of dialogue will begin."[29] Incentive to engage can be a gain of any sort, including information, a sense of belonging or identity, financial or material reward, prestige, power of some sort etc.

As stated previously, when a party enters into discussion, it is often a result of interdependence; they have something to gain from the other party. Shelley L. Chaiken, Deborah H. Gruenfeld and Charles M. Judd write about negotiation in particular in their article "Persuasion in Negotiations and Conflict Situations": "In fact, interdependence is the impetus for negotiation. If parties were autonomous, decisions could be made independently without interaction, and negotiation would not be necessary."[30] Brian S. Mandell also describes how discussion in the form of negotiation will be either impossible or will fail if parties are not interdependent. "Negotiation takes place only under conditions of interdependence and where parties need to communicate for persuasion. If a disputant can achieve its goals without assistance, however, then negotiation will be neither feasible nor desirable."[31]

However, there are reasons other than interdependence for a party to engage in discussion. For instance, the party may enter into discussion to avoid negative repercussions from a third party. They may also engage out of feelings of duty, goodwill, guilt, or for a multitude of other reasons.

In addition to the absence or low levels of the above-mentioned required factors, there are other reasons why discussion can fail. These include a number of barriers that, when present, can inhibit discussion.

---

[29] Diana Francis, *People, Peace and Power*, 45.
[30] Shelley L. Chaiken, Deborah H. Gruenfeld, and Charles M. Judd, "Persuasion in Negotiations and Conflict Situations," 156.
[31] Brian S. Mandell, "Conflict Resolution," 112.

Often problems with discussion are attributed to "power imbalance" or "asymmetrical relations". Theorists have directed a great deal of energy to the study of power relations. When power imbalance in discussion is deconstructed and analysed, it appears that it what is often occurring is an imbalance or lack of one or more of the required elements for discussion. For instance, one party may have more ability – whether that is financially, socially, or politically – to engage than the other party has. One group may have more to lose and less to gain than the other group. There may be a discrepancy in the communication skill level, the amount of "noise" experienced during discussion or hindrance resulting from external factors. Discussion-inhibiting factors may also be present. One side could be inhibited by more denial or fear than the other may. Therefore, understanding the role that the required factors and other inhibiting factors play in discussion can be helpful is addressing power imbalance during discussion. In the second section in this chapter, there is more discussion about power and theories of how power works. When considering these more abstract theories of power, it is useful to keep in mind that power may materialize as the absence or imbalance of the factors required for discussion.

Discussion can be inhibited by "noise" during communication. There are many causes of metaphorical "noise" during discussion. "Noise" is anything that interferes with the process of communication. Diana Francis lists a number these barriers to constructive communication including "the effects of cultural differences and language; of strong emotions, such as fear, grief and anger; perceptions of power relations; feelings associated with identity and belonging, such as defensiveness, prejudice and the ready recourse to

stereotyping."[32] "Noise" can also be other issues that the listener is preoccupied with that can distract them. Such "noise" can prevent the listener from hearing the message as the speaker intended. In addition to those examples listed by Francis, instances of "noise" can also include disrespect, hatred, preconceptions, or even attraction.

There can be a lack of awareness about the conflict or issue at hand by any party in the discussion or by anyone refusing to participate in discussion that may be inhibiting or preventing discussion. Adam Curle, in his landmark book *Making Peace*, constructs a diagram that illustrates the need for a high level of awareness of conflict, along with a certain amount of power balance, before negotiation can lead to a sustainable solution. Sharp suggests that consciousness is different depending on whether or not the party experiencing the lack of awareness is in power or not. Curle suggests that confrontation can be used to educate those in positions of power that are not open to dialogue and other methods of conversion. Curle argues that masters – as he calls persons or groups in dominant positions – are not educated for awareness as those in subservient positions are, but rather "they are educated through confrontation".[33]

Increasing exploited people's awareness is critical for attempting meaningful discussion. Curle writes about the importance of using education to increase exploited people's awareness about how they are being exploited.

> There are two strands to this education. The first is to develop the perception of the ignorant peasant… until they realize that they are imposed upon, used and exploited; the second is to make them aware that they are not helpless. Given this understanding they can begin to hope, and hope is the most revolutionary force in the world; it drives

[32] Diana Francis, *People, Peace and Power*, 98.
[33] Adam Curle, *Making Peace*, 192.

> men [and women] to a desperation they did not dare to feel when they believed themselves to be impotent.[34]

Kenneth Boulding suggests in his book *Three Faces of Power* that this impotence can be damaging to the oppressed person saying, "impotence corrupts and absolute impotence leads to death."[35] As well, this powerlessness can result in external violence that is diametrically opposed to constructive discussion used in non-violent conflict resolving. Boulding maintains, "It is not altogether surprising, therefore, that when people grow up with a sense of powerlessness… there may be a temptation to relieve this powerlessness by dramatic destructive acts… The fact that destructive power is often easier than either productive or integrative power increases the temptation to indulge in it."[36]

Denial can cause discussion to fail. In his book *States of Denial: Knowing about Atrocities and Suffering*, Stanley Cohen identifies a number of elementary forms of denial including personal, official, and cultural denial.[37] If parties are in denial about a conflict or a situation, they will not be *required* to address it; at all levels, it is an escape from responsibility to take action. As long as parties deny the reason that necessitates discussion, they will not engage, either in part or at all, and discussion will be inhibited.

Those with more to gain and less to lose in discussion may only enter into discussion for reasons that are less than honest or respectable and/or may not behave honourably during discussions. They may resort to manipulative tactics. Adam Curle writes,

---

[34] Adam Curle, *Making Peace*, 192.
[35] Kenneth E. Boulding, *Three Faces of Power*, 65.
[36] Kenneth E. Boulding, *Three Faces of Power*, 83.
[37] Stanley Cohen, *States of Denial*, 10-11.

> Where the conflict situation comprises an unbalanced relationship, the peacemaking sequence is less predictable, and the techniques of education and confrontation will be required to stimulate awareness and to achieve the degree of balance without which conciliation and bargaining can be used by the powerful as tools of pacification.[38]

They may also be buying time, attempting to manipulate the other party, causing a distraction, hoping to get information, or putting on a good front for the purpose of public relations.

In their book *Collaborative Approaches to Resolving Conflict*, Myra Warren Isenhart and Michael Spangle provide a list of ways that these manipulative tactics can appear in discussion. These "dirty tricks", as Isenhart and Spangle call them, include a good guy/bad guy routine, bad faith negotiating, providing inaccurate data, and giving an information overload.[39]

Sometime interference from a third party or external factors can throw discussion off course. Whether deliberate or unintentional, outside interference can have a profound ability to derail discussion. Interference may include a large range of actions including distracting the parties, providing incorrect information, or physically intervening.

Fear can inhibit discussion. This might be fear of divulging information, of breaking silence, or breaching conformity[40], accepting responsibility, having to face difficult truths, or even merely fear of the process. Fear of losing becomes more prominent when there is little to gain. Fear of being taken advantage of is more likely when it has happened before or the fearful party has reason to believe that the other party is acting in bad faith.

One of the parties may not be engaging at all or only partially engaging for a large range of reasons. This brings discussion to a halt. They may have

---

[38] Adam Curle, *Making Peace*, 183.
[39] Myra Warren Isenhart and Michael Spangle, *Collaborative Approaches to Resolving Conflict*, 57.
[40] The large impact that conformity has on action is demonstrated in Cass R. Sunstein, *Why Society Needs Dissent*, 26-31.

something to gain – or something to keep from losing – by avoiding discussion. They may be dodging responsibility, they may be apathetic, or they may simply see no reason to engage. Perhaps other latent problems are inhibiting them.

Whether it is the lack of a required element, such as interdependence or awareness, the presence of barriers, such as denial, manipulative tactics, external interference or noise, or the inability to enter into discussion for financial, political, social or legal reasons, the effect is the same; discussion is inhibited, limited or prevented. Sometimes these reasons for failure can be overcome. Other times, another method of action must be attempted either to directly achieve the goal or to overcome barriers so that discussion can be tried again. As will be discussed in chapter 4, academic boycotts are ineffective at achieving goals directly, but can be a useful means of confronting the obstacles to functional discussion. If academic boycotting is able to create an environment that is conducive to effective discussion, the boycotters can then use discussion, with its capabilities of detailing with complexities, volumes of information, and nuances, to work towards their final goal.

An examination of the relationship between academic boycotting and discussion can also shed light on non-violence theory. Theorist and practitioners of non-violence, such as Gandhi and Martin Luther King Jr., never lost sight of the importance of discussion before, instead of, during, and after non-violent action. However, too often practitioners of non-violence focus on what kind of action they can take. They rush into action – believe that "doing something" is better than "just talking" – and in the process, they overlook the value, potential, and strengths of discussion. This can be seen in many academic boycotts, such as the AUT boycott discussed in chapter 8, where

boycotters move into boycotting before exhausting all opportunities for discussion. While developing and promoting various types of non-violent action, theorists of non-violent action need to re-examine and reinforce the importance of discussion, highlighting its role as an alternative, a supplement to, or as a goal of non-violent action. This thesis contributes to this aspect of non-violence theory by revealing the value of discussion in relation to non-violent action. In theory, many types of non-violent action, including academic boycotting, appear simple and straightforward enough. However, on the ground – in the implementation of non-violent action – complexities and confusion can arise. Thus, as demonstrated by academic boycotting, discussion is often also required for the successful execution of non-violent action. This thesis also demonstrates that some types of non-violent action, such as academic boycotting, in fact require discussion. When practitioners of non-violent action better understand the roles that discussion can play in creating the change they strive for, they can incorporate non-violence more effectively into their strategies.

Non-violent Action after Discussion Fails

Section 3.2

Confrontation

When discussion fails, practitioners of traditional non-violence move up the scale of coercion, attempting methods of non-violence that are more powerful, intense, and coercive. Confrontation is the process of challenging, questioning, defying, opposing, engaging with, objecting to or contesting the behaviour of, and/or facing up to another party in a conflict for the purpose of achieving a specific goal or to cause change. Confrontation becomes more intense as actions break further norms and becomes increasingly difficult to disregard.

In his article "Nonviolence Theory and Practice," Bryan Teixeira presents five levels of non-violent confrontation. Each level escalates the confrontation and results in higher degrees of nonconforming behaviour and new risks and challenges. The five levels, beginning from the least intense to the most escalated, are: persuasion and dialogue, negotiation, noncooperation, civil disobedience, and alternative social structures.[41] Each level is usually tried in turn. There are two broad categories of confrontation.

In his book *Making Peace,* Adam Curle calls the first type "moral confrontation." Moral confrontation relies on education, persuasion, conversion and awareness-raising, thus discussion and other non-discussion based forms of persuasion and protest part of the "moral confrontation" category. Curle writes:

---

[41] Bryan Teixeira, "Nonviolence Theory and Practice," 563.

> Moral confrontation aims not to destroy or overthrow, but rather to change the perceptions of the ruling group, to raise its level of awareness until it understands what it has done and accepts responsibility for the damage it has inflicted. And, of course, a full acceptance of responsibility will lead to a reapportionment of power and a restructuring of the relationship.[42]

Although Curle may be too optimistic believing that the acceptance of responsibility will most certainly lead to major changes in power and in the configuration of the relationship, it would be fair to say that the acceptance of responsibility for actions *may* lead to some shifts in power and reconfiguration in the relationship.

The task of moral confrontation is four fold. It seeks to educate those confronted, to change their perception of the situation, to cause them to accept responsibility for their actions, and to lead them to change their behaviour or do something to rectify the conditions that they have caused. Moral confrontation attempts to educate those who are confronted by bring to their attention the effects of their actions, thus enabling them to see the state of affairs that they are part of in a different light. It is a way of increasing their awareness about the harm that they are causing or negative results of their behaviours. This is particularly true in the case of academic boycotting. By publicly naming the boycotted responsible for the impacts of their conduct, academic boycotts hold the boycotted accountable for their actions. Coupled with this education about their role in the situation, confrontation is a demand by the boycotters that the boycotted accept responsibility and in turn *do* something about conditions that they are contributing to or causing. The basis of moral confrontation is

[42] Adam Curle, *Making Peace*, 201.

conversion, which Gene Sharp defines as "changing the opponents' opinions or beliefs"[43]

The second type of confrontation is more coercive than moral confrontation. Adam Curle calls this type "revolutionary confrontation":

> In revolutionary confrontation opposition is pushed to the point of absolute rebellion, though without violence. If the rulers cannot be brought to recognize the evils they condone and so to remove them out of conviction, life must be made so intolerable for them that they change the system out of necessity, or have to accept the change thrust upon them.[44]

Revolutionary confrontation, in sharp contrast to moral confrontation, looks to change the boycotted's behaviour by *coercion,* not *conversion.* Gene Sharp defines non-violent coercion as "forcing the opponents to grant the demands."[45] With moral confrontation, the academic boycott does not necessarily need to limit the boycotted's ability to act in order to make them change their behaviour; it needs only to affect them enough to make them reconsider the impact of their actions, ultimately to the point that they voluntarily change them. With revolutionary confrontation, it becomes critical to effectively burden the boycotted to the point that they are *required* to change their behaviour. The negative consequences of not changing and of continuing the problematic behaviour must become greater than the cost or consequences of changing in order for revolutionary confrontation to be effective.

Confrontation is sometimes needed to ensure that the requirements for discussion are achieved. This is particularly true when discussion fails because of power imbalance or systemic problems, and the other party is not responding to attempts at less confrontational education and persuasion. These will become critical points of discussion later in this thesis in the context of

---

[43] Gene Sharp, "Beyond Just War and Pacifism," 319.
[44] Adam Curle, *Making Peace*, 203.
[45] Gene Sharp, "Beyond Just War and Pacifism," 319.

academia and academic boycotts, as both power imbalance and systemic violence can be present in academia. Curle writes:

> In many particular institutions (academic, industrial, or bureaucratic) of otherwise healthy societies, moreover, the mechanisms of evolutionary adaptation may fail. In such situations some form of confrontation may be necessary.[46]

Discussion is weak at power redistribution and systemic change.[47] Confrontation can be used for these purposes thus creating an environment where discussion can be used to achieve goals, (such as the transmission of complex messages), that confrontation is unable to accomplish.

While there are many minor purposes that confrontation can play, the two main functions of confrontation are balancing power and challenging awareness levels. John Paul Lederach writes about these results of confrontation in the context of building sustainable peace.

> ... the pursuit of change involves some form of *confrontation.* Confrontation brings the conflict to the surface... Change will require a rebalancing of power in the relationship by which all those involved recognize one another in new ways. Such recognition will increase the voice and participation of the less powerful in addressing their basic needs and will legitimate their concerns.[48]

Balancing Power

As discussed in the previous section, *power* is a difficult concept to define, as there are many kinds of power and no single agreed upon definition. In the article "Alternative Theories of Power", Nancy Bell writes, "The concept of power is fundamental to discussions of politics, and it has been explored extensively by social and political theorists as well as by philosophers for literally centuries."[49] There is much debate about such points as whether power

[46] Adam Curle, *Making Peace*, 207.
[47] Brian Martin and Wendy Varney, "Nonviolent Communication," 218.
[48] John Paul Lederach, *Building Peace*, 64-65 (italics in original text).
[49] Nancy Bell, "Alternative Theories of Power," 99.

is held individually or communally[50], or the differences between "power over" and "power with".[51] The range of available in-depth analysis on the subject demonstrates the complex range of interpretations of power. In his book *Three Faces of Power*, Kenneth Boulding writes that power's "widest meaning is that of a potential for change."[52] Boulding identifies three types of power: destructive, productive, and integrative.[53] In a paper presented in 1925, Mary Parker Follett describes *power* as "control".[54] In the context of mediation, Sinéad Conneely writes, "...power is relational, relative, neutral and fluid. It is a benign force, unless misused and is constantly changing over and back between the parties."[55] Gene Sharp has done a great deal of work on power and, in particular, political power. Sharp defines "political power" as the "totality of influences and pressures available for use, especially by the institutions of government, by the state, or in opposition to them, to determine and implement policies for the society."[56]

Though they speak broadly about non-violence, these theorists' findings have much to contribute to understanding the mechanisms of academic boycotts. However, a detailed analysis of theories of power is a thesis onto itself. As a result, a brief summary of relevant points will be used here to show the key theories that have shaped thinking about academic boycotts. These points will be based on a working definition of "power".

---

[50] Hannah Arendt, *On Violence*, 44.
[51] Kathleen Maas Weigert, "Structural Violence," 431.
[52] Kenneth Boulding, *Three Faces of Power*, 15.
[53] Kenneth Boulding, *Three Faces of Power*, 23.
[54] Mary Parker Follett, "Power," 66.
[55] Sinéad Conneely, *Family Mediation in Ireland*, 67.
[56] Gene Sharp, "Nonviolent Action," 567.

For the purpose of this thesis, power is the ability to achieve ones goals in a given context. The context includes relational, societal, cultural, political, economic, legal, human etc. factors. One's goals can be as simple as meeting basic human survival needs to complex political and social revolution.

Power is a dynamic within relationships; it results from relationship. It is only in comparison to elements in a situation that a person's power is defined; power requires a point of reference. A person standing alone is inherently neither powerful nor powerless. However, in comparison to other people, animals, objects, or nature, the person may or may not be powerful, that is, able to achieve her or his goals in that context. Nancy Bell writes, "In other words, power is a *relational* phenomenon – it cannot be exercised by one person in isolation from others."[57] Community can also be a source of power for that person by contributing to the ability of the person to realise her or his goals or, on the contrary, can also take away power by interfering.

Power is based on the interdependence of people with each other and their environment. People have power when others are dependent on them, often either to give them something that they require, do something that they need done or to stop something or take something away that is undesirable. In this sense, power is complex. In any given situation, the most obvious sources of power, such as financial resources or social rank, often overshadow other types of power that exist in the relationship, such as emotional support or maintaining needed silence or secrecy. Barbara Ashley Phillips writes,

[57] Nancy Bell, "Alternative Theories of Power," 101 (italics in original text).

"Sometimes the apparently powerful party is utterly dependent on the seemingly weaker party."[58]

Power is also rooted in one's ability to act in a certain situation and is context specific. A judge is not as powerful in the dentist's chair as she is in the courtroom. An articulate man may find that he is taken advantage of when negotiating for foreign food in a market when he does not speak the vendor's language and the vendor knows that her buyer is not from the community. A world champion cyclist finds that her cycling skills do not help her control the ball when golfing. One's ability to act is often based on relevant factors such as resources (including human, financial, political, physical, military, informational), allies, moral sureness, skills, intelligence, courage, creativity, and determination. Elements that may be valuable in another scenario may or may not be relevant in a given context. One's ability to act in one context therefore does not necessarily indicate an ability to act in another situation, nor is it a sure sign that she or he will be continue to be able to act with the same ease if the circumstances were to change.

Elements that contribute to power in a given context are sometimes not apparent; power is not always typical and can be found in the most unlikely places. Nancy Bell writes, "Theoretically, the most important point here is that noncooperation, withdrawal of consent, and other forms of resistance to domination are not just *responses* to power, they are, in and of themselves, alternative *forms* of power."[59] Elements in a context that can affect a party's ability to act include: the ability and will of the other party to act; social,

---

[58] Barbara Ashley Phillips, *The Mediation Field Guide*, 199.
[59] Nancy Bell, "Alternative Theories of Power," 102 (italics in original text).

physical, political, cultural and environmental conditions; and interference or assistance from other people.

Kenneth Boulding is correct when he writes, "It is a great mistake to think of power as a stationary structure. Power is not static. The distribution of power among the inhabitants of the earth is subject to a constant whirlwind of change."[60] There are number of ways for a party to change power balance in a situation. The three main modes are changing the context, changing the other party's will or ability to act, and changing one's own ability to act.

People can change the context in which they are working in order to increase their chances for successfully functioning in the environment. This may mean challenging the nature of relationships. People can change their relationship with the party with whom they are in conflict or they can change their relationship with other people that are otherwise involved the conflict. This could include reducing interference from non-supportive parties or maximizing assistance from supporters or potential sympathisers. Changing the context may also mean challenging laws, confronting societal norms, transforming political structures, or modify the physical environment of a situation. In academia, changing the context can take many forms including educating a university community about an issue to maximize supporters and minimize opposition from non-supportive parties. It may also mean passing a resolution to make systemic change within the university.

There are two ways to change the other party in a meaningful way. One can challenge the other party's will to act. This is generally known as *conversion*, although it is possible to change a party's will to act by wearing

[60] Kenneth Boulding, *Three Faces of Power*, 45.

down their resolve through *coercive* means. Conversion may be engaging in academic debate to change others ideas and beliefs, while actions, such as a long standing student strike, may pressure the an exhausted and frustrated university board to change their actions regardless of whether the members of the board are convinced of the students' position.

The other option is to change the other party's ability to act. This is usually done through *coercion,* as the other party is seldom willing to volunteer to have someone limit their ability to act. For instance, the withdrawal of funding can impede a research project. Actions that can be used to change a party's ability to act include persuading others to remove their support or intervene, acts of non-cooperation, non-violent intervention, or creating alternative structures.

A practitioner of non-violence can increase their capacity or ability to take action by increasing required resources including financial backing, vital information, and physical and logistical support. They may also enlist the assistance of current or prospective allies. For academics, gaining support may mean enlisting the assistance of their colleagues or professional union.

Intra-group work is also important. Consciousness and morale raising activities may also contribute to a group's power to perform; this may be as simple as an article in a professional association's newsletter or informal discussion or may be a more complex education campaign. Groups can develop their group coherence and intra-group communication to enhance operation. In an age of technology, this may be as straightforward as an on-line list serve or it can take the form of a good old fashioned face-to-face meeting. The inner workings and dynamics of a group greatly affect its ability to act.

Thus, changing leadership, such as appointing a new head of a department, or decision-making structures, such as changing to a more participatory model, may also affect a group's performance.

Creating an effective strategy with appropriate tactics is another way that practitioners of non-violence can increase their ability to act in a given situation. This may mean re-evaluation and flexibility to change one's course of action mid-stream. Developing a successful strategy requires a group of people who possess the necessary wisdom or experience, creativity, and information.

There are an infinite number of ways to fail to affect power balance. There are two common methods, both of which can be found in academia. Some practitioners of non-violence naively believe that the powerful will be ready to concede or compromise during discussions even if the powerful have little to gain. However, this would require them handing over some of their power, and is not likely to happen. Peter T. Coleman writes, "The overwhelming evidence seems to indicate that the powerful tend to like power, use it, justify having it, and attempt to keep it."[61] The powerful not only want to maintain power, they will go to great lengths to maintain it. Aung San Suu Kyi writes, "It is not power that corrupts but fear. Fear of losing power corrupts those who wield it."[62] Examples of this are plentiful in academia. The chair of an academic department would realistically refuse to move to a more egalitarian or participatory method of decision making if she or he has nothing to gain by doing it or a Physics department would not give a portion of their funding to an

[61] Peter T. Coleman, "Power and Conflict," 124.
[62] Aung San Suu Kyi, *Freedom from Fear and Other Writings*, 180.

International Peace Studies department, no matter how much the International Peace Studies department needed it, if the Physics department has nothing to gain by doing so. The only way that powerful parties will surrender their power is if they can be persuaded or convinced that what they will gain is worth more to them than what they are surrendering or if the party is converted to the other parties way of thinking.

During a non-violent action, it is vital to continually monitor, re-evaluate and possibly modify ones tactics, strategy and goals to ensure that all is going as planned and that the plan is feasible. However, parties must be cautious that they do not compromise their goals to the point that, although the goals are achievable, they no longer contain the crucial elements and have become meaningless. Even if a party is able to achieve these new "goals," if they are hollow and useless, the party is in fact no more powerful than if they had achieved nothing. Therefore, it is critical that practitioners of non-violence do not surrender their goal and yield unnecessarily to the other party. Though Gandhi was open to hearing others opinions and changing his if convinced,[63] one of the fundamental rules that he adhered to was refusal to give up basic principles during discussion. Joan Bondurant explains Gandhi's "Refusal to surrender essentials in negotiation": "Satyagraha excludes all compromise which affects basic principles or essential portions of valid objectives."[64] Settling on an insufficient end that does not meet one's basic needs or desires does not change power relations.

[63] Joan Bondurant, *Conquest of Violence*, 196.
[64] Joan Bondurant, *Conquest of Violence*, 39.

Changing Awareness Levels

Practitioners of non-violence can use confrontation to increase other parties' awareness about the conflict. Confrontation can force a latent conflict, a conflict that is hidden from sight or is undisclosed, to the surface where it can be dealt with and people are more easily compelled to address it. This is done in a number of ways including via the use of incompatible behaviour, naming the problem, challenging the diffusion of responsibility, and increasing individual personal awareness.

As long as the practitioner of non-violence's behaviour is compatible with the other party's behaviour, the conflict can remain latent;[65] it can remain hidden below the surface and other involved parties do not have to acknowledge or address it. However, when the practitioners behave incompatibly, they confront the other party and challenge the other group with norm breaking actions. The conflict is then visible as the incompatible behaviours clash noticeably and it becomes more difficult to conceal the conflict. In academia, incompatible behaviour can be any type of breach in broader social customs or academic norms, such as students turning their backs to a speaker during commencement.

Naming the problem or otherwise publicly acknowledging it breaks the silence. The inaction of some encourages others to remain inactive; when everyone else is silent, no one wants to be the first one who blows the whistle, tattletales, snitches or rats on the situation. When people stand by in silence, they become latent allies. Arne Johan Vetlesen summarizes this aptly as "*not*

[65] Simon Fisher et al., *Working with Conflict*, 5.

acting is still acting"[66] as silent, inactive bystanders are affecting the situation; they are perpetuating the current state of the situation by doing nothing. However, once one person speaks out and steps out of line, others are then free to follow. In the book, *Why Societies Need Dissent,* Cass R. Sunstein writes about minority influence in social experiments, "*The existence of at least one voice of sanity dramatically reduced both conformity and error*... When one person reveals the truth, all or most might say what they really see or know to be true."[67]

Once a problem has been publicly acknowledged, it is not so simple to deny. Consciousness raising can combat denial by making it difficult for people to claim that they do not know what is happening.[68] It challenges the myths that people hide behind so that they may feel more comfortable and avoid challenge or change.

When a person is part of a crowd, she or he may feel that responsibility is dispersed to all in the group and, as a result, feels that she or he does not need to take responsibility and address the problem. Confrontation can tackle this diffusion of accountability by singling out people or groups, identifying the role that they are playing in the conflict and publicly naming them as responsible for their actions. It is far more awkward to shift the blame when one has been publicly held responsible. For instance, it is easy for a committee in academia to sustain an unacceptable policy when the committee members are undistinguished parts of the institutional machinery. On the other hand, if each member is publicly identified and asked to justify why they are remaining silent

[66] Arne Johan Vetlesen, "Genocide: A Case for the Responsibility of the Bystander," 522 (italics in original text).
[67] Cass R. Sunstein, *Why Societies Need Dissent,* 26-27 (italics in original text).
[68] Stanley Cohen, *States of Denial*, 11.

and uphold the policy, individual accountability is invoked, and members are more likely to take responsibility.

Confrontation can also challenge apathy in people and cause conversion. Part of confrontation and consciousness-raising is educating people about how they are contributing to the problem, but it is also teaching them what they can do to help. This is sometimes referred to as increasing personal awareness. Learning more about a problem and the role that one plays or could play in it can move a person to action as it can be inspiring or motivating. A case of this could involve a university's admissions policy that unintentionally discriminates against members of a First Nations indigenous community. Staff within the admission department may begin notice that a disproportional amount of First Nations students are being turned away from entering university; as the staff members' consciousness of the problem increases, so does their motivation to challenge the policies that cause this injustice.

Methods of action that are more confrontational– including non-violent action such as non-cooperation – become crucial in situations where power balancing or systemic change is required. Less confrontational methods – such as discussion – have a low capacity for both of these changes[69] and may prove to be inadequate under some circumstances. Therefore, balancing power and awareness raising that occurs during confrontation will become critical later in this thesis when questions begin to arise about what to do when less confrontational methods of dealing with conflict – namely academic discussions – fail to address systemic injustices and latent conflict in the context of academia.

[69] Brian Martin and Wendy Varney, "Nonviolence and Communication," 218.

Continuing Discussion during other Actions

Even when discussion fails and confrontation begins, discussion is never completely abandoned throughout the process of non-violent action. Discussion continues to be used or the potential for its use remains throughout other types of non-violent action. In a framework similar to the one presented by Teixeira, Mark Juergensmeyer sets out five steps in waging a large non-violent campaign: 1) negotiation; 2) mobilization; 3) demonstration; 4) noncooperation, 5) creation of a parallel entity. Juergensmeyer moves beyond Teixeira's model by stipulating that actors are only to move from step one to step two if negotiation fails; negotiation is also to carry on through all five of the stages. If stage five fails, Juergensmeyer writes, "RETURN to stage #1, increase strength and intensity as each step is repeated."[70]

Though at times this seems paradoxical, discussion can continue because non-violent action has the capacity to support contradictions in a way that violent action cannot. Violence demands that people separate themselves from those with whom they are in conflict; the "opponent" is seen as different or as "the other" to justify the harm that comes to them with the use of violence. Non-violence challenges people to break free from thinking in black/white, right/wrong, us/them type dichotomies. A group can act non-violently to challenge the other party to change their behaviour, all the while acknowledging their humanity and treating them with respect. Pam McAllister addresses this complicated nature of non-violence.

> What has drawn me most strongly to nonviolence is its capacity for encompassing a complexity necessarily denied by violent strategies… Violent tactics and strategies

[70] Mark Juergensmeyer, *Gandhi's Way: A Handbook of Conflict Resolution*, 57.

> rely on polarization and dualistic thinking and require us to divide ourselves into the good and the bad, assume neat, rigid little categories easily answered from the barrel of a gun. Nonviolence allows for the complexity inherent in our struggles…[71]

The ability of non-violence to support such contradictions means that it is possible to direct a non-violent action at group while keeping a relationship with them intact so that potential of discussion remains.

Non-violent action is often viewed as at odds with discussion and other forms of conflict resolution. Discussion is seen as de-escalating the conflict by constructively working in a socially acceptable means towards a peaceful solution to a conflict. Non-violence, on the contrary, is seen as confrontational and adversarial, resulting in conflict escalation. Brian S. Mandell challenges this notion. Mandell sees these differences in their methods and purposes, but he also indicates that non-violent action can be used to move a conflict past a moment of impasse by addressing factors that are required for successful conflict resolution. While other methods of non-violence are more forceful, coercive and confrontational, they are seldom as effective at communicating complex messages and receiving information in return as discussion. This often means that practitioners of non-violence must use more blunt, coercive means of non-violent action to return to discussion so that the intricacies or complexities of a problem can be addressed. Mandell writes,

> Nonviolent direct action (a contending and struggle-oriented approach) can serve as a precursor or catalyst to the more collaborative decision-making mode of conflict resolution. From this perspective, it is feasible to imagine nonviolent direct action accomplishing several tasks necessary for effective conflict resolution.[72]

---

[71] Pam McAllister, "You Can't Kill the Spirit," 18.
[72] Brian S. Mandell, "Conflict Resolution," 114.

Mandell goes on to highlight roles such as creating new power equilibrium, shifting attitudes so that enemies become negotiating partners, and creating space for parties to reach agreement.[73]

Mandell is not the first to suggest conflict resolution techniques such as discussion can be combined with non-violent action to successfully address a conflict. Adam Curle states, "[Non-violent] confrontation, if successful, leads to a complex period of conciliation and bargaining."[74] Brian Martin and Wendy Varney write that nonviolent action has, "the potential for redressing power imbalances and inequitable systems, which are the structural impediments to dialogue between equals."[75] Diana Francis writes, "In active nonviolence, dialogue comes first and last."[76] This has been and continues to be the approach taken by many practitioners of non-violence. As discussed previously, there are many reasons for discussion to fail or for a party to choose to refrain from engaging in discussion. Non-violence is often used as a means to get some form of discussion, including negotiation, from an impasse or a place of dysfunction to productive discussion or to move a potential discussion partner from avoidance or apathy into discussion.

History provides us with examples of this happening. Martin Luther King, Jr. and those involved in the desegregation movement in the southern United States often used some form of non-violent action to get their negotiating partners to the negotiating table. For example, there was non-violent action against segregation in Birmingham, Alabama. Coretta Scott King

---

[73] Brian S. Mandell, "Conflict Resolution," 114.
[74] Adam Curle, *Making Peace*, 207.
[75] Brian Martin and Wendy Varney, "Nonviolence and Communication," 219.
[76] Diana Francis, *People, Peace and Power*, 44.

explains the increased willingness of their negotiating partners to cooperate after the protest.

> After the sight of such large numbers of militantly nonviolent blacks, the white leaders returned in a much more reasonable mood. Martin and the others negotiated with them all night Wednesday, practically all day Thursday, and all Thursday night. On Friday, May 10, an agreement was announced. It was almost word for word an acceptance of the original demands of the Movement. The stores were to be desegregated, hiring of Negroes upgraded, charges dropped, and the Senior Citizens Committee or the Chamber of Commerce would meet regularly with black leaders to reconcile their differences.[77]

King further explains, "Peace finally came because *militant nonviolence* had forced negotiation and agreement."[78]

William Robert Miller stresses the importance of keeping the door to discussion open during non-violent action. "The attempt to begin negotiations should be pursued throughout the campaign until they occur and move to a satisfactory conclusion."[79] This is consistent with Gandhi's concept of non-violence that placed a great deal of importance on communication with those to whom the non-violent action is directed. It is only due to the nature of non-violence to be able to support such paradoxes that discussion is possible during confrontation and conflict escalation. The potential of non-violence to harbour this paradox is often questioned as it is difficult to comprehend, especially in a society that works out of a win/lose, violence-centred framework. Academic boycotting is a strong example of the existence of this paradox. This thesis demonstrates that while isolating a party in some ways, academic boycotters can, in fact, be creating the conditions required for discussion. Thus, academic boycotting re-enforces the potential of non-violent action to encompass apparent contradictions.

---

[77] Coretta Scott King, *My Life with Martin Luther King, Jr.*, 245.
[78] Coretta Scott King, *My Life with Martin Luther King, Jr.*, 246 (italics in original text).
[79] William Robert Miller, *Nonviolence*, 147.

Categories of Non-violent Action

Section 3.3

In order to understand when and why academic boycotting is used, it is necessary to understand when and why various categories of non-violent action are utilised. These categories of non-violent action include forms of action that can be used instead of or in conjunction with academic boycotting. One of the criteria for the successful use of an academic boycott, found in chapter 5, is ensuring that academic boycotting is indeed the best possible method. Without a clear understanding of the alternatives, this criterion cannot be met.

This section of chapter 3 includes a discussion of *creation non-violence*, a form of non-violence that is often overlooked. In some cases, creation non-violence may be a more suitable form of action than academic boycotting or may work well in conjunction with academic boycotting. Though forms of creation non-violence are used often, particularly by oppressed and/or insightful practitioners of non-violence, the term *creation non-violence* is new and the discussion of it as a distinct and fundamental form of non-violence has been neglected thus far by theorists of non-violence.

After discussion fails, practitioners of non-violence move to action that is more confrontational and, at the same time, move up the non-violence/violence continuum to more coercive/confrontational measures. Even though practitioners of non-violence employ methods of actions that are more coercive after discussion fails, they usually proceed up the continuum cautiously trying the next appropriate method, thus ensuring that they do not take unnecessary risks by becoming too coercive too quickly. While other

methods of non-violent action can be used in place of discussion to achieve a party's goals, often they are used to create an environment where discussion can occur. In the context of stalled negotiations, William Ury suggests using the absolute minimum power necessary to get one's negotiation partner back to the table. Ury warns, "*The more power you use, the more you need to defuse your opponent's resistance.*"[80] This applies not only to negotiation, but also to all types of discussion. Thus, methods of persuasion and/or protest that are not discussion-based are often tried after discussion fails. Methods of non-cooperation are then tried after persuasion and/or protest proves unsuccessful. Non-cooperation is followed by attempts at non-violent intervention or non-compliance. Though often used when discussion is not possible or after non-violent intervention fails, creation non-violence, an under-researched and poorly understood form of non-violence, can be used at any point. As these categories of non-violent action, with the exception of creation non-violence, have been dealt with extensively by theorists such as Gene Sharp, they will only be briefly touched upon as extensive elaboration would be redundant and outside the purpose of thesis.

While some theorists, such as Gene Sharp, combine all methods of persuasion and protest into one category, a distinction can be made between methods that are dependent on discussion and methods that are not. Discussion-based methods tend to be more prevalent and socially acceptable, while methods that are not discussion-based tend to break more social norms, be more attention grabbing, and generally be more "in-your-face" and thus confrontational. As a result of increased confrontation and norm-breaking, the

[80] William Ury, *Getting Past No*, 121 (italics in original text).

next step up the continuum after discussion fails is other methods of persuasion and/or protest that are not based on discussion. Though these types of action can be at an increased level of confrontation and may break more social norms, they still are based on conversion and education, as are discussion-based methods.

There are numerous examples of such non-violent actions. While too numerous to list, they include offering hospitality, dancing, crying, singing, removing clothing, marches, vigils, turning ones back, symbolic clothing, kissing, handing someone a baby, revolutionary quilting and subversive parenting. In his book *The Methods of Nonviolent Action*, Gene Sharp identifies, describes and provides examples of a number of such non-violent actions that are methods of protest and persuasion, but are not discussion-based.[81]

Distinguishing between these two types of persuasion/protest becomes crucial in the realm of academia as discussion-based methods are a strict overt norm and methods that are not discussion-based contravene this norm. For instance, students writing to university administration about their concerns or holding public speeches is discussion-based action and is more consistent with academic norms than is a student protest march or mock funeral,[82] both examples of persuasion/protest that are not discussion-based. When the distinction between discussion-based and non-discussion-based methods of persuasion/protest is not made in academia, after discussion-based methods fail,

[81] Gene Sharp, *The Politics of Nonviolent Action: The Methods of Nonviolent Action.*
[82] Mock funerals are not unheard of in academia; there was notorious mock funeral held at the author's undergraduate university many years ago to protest a university development project.

practitioners of non-violence tend to rush towards non-cooperation without adequately considering non-discussion-based methods.

If persuasion and protest proves unsuccessful, methods of non-cooperation are often implemented. Gene Sharp indicates that non-cooperation "means that the resisters in a conflict either deliberately withdraw some form or degree of existing cooperation with the opponents or the resisters refuse to initiate certain forms of new cooperation."[83] Ideas of non-cooperation are not new; in the 16th century, Etienne de la Boëtie wrote about non-cooperation in the context of dealing with a tyrant by failing to obey and support him.

> But yet there is no need of attacking this single tyrant, there is no necessity of defending oneself against him. He is defeated of himself, provided only the country does not submit to servitude. There is no need of taking anything from him; only give him nothing.[84]

Non-cooperation such as this is based on a consent theory of power. As the demonstrated by the above quote, the consent theory of power is based on the idea that power is spread throughout a society. The rulers only have power when their subjects obey, that is, give them power. Iain Atack writes about the consent theory of power: "According to this theory, ruling elites depend ultimately on the submission, cooperation and obedience of the governed as their source of power. If this cooperation is withdrawn, then this power is undermined."[85]

Though useful for understanding how non-cooperation works, the consent theory of power has its limitations. In some instances, those in positions of power, or the "tyrants" as Boëtie would call them, have sources of power other than their subjects. For instance, other nation states, large

---

[83] Gene Sharp, *Waging Nonviolent Struggle*, 54.
[84] Etienne de la Boëtie, "The Discourse of Voluntary Servitude," 140.
[85] Iain Atack, "Civil Society, Nonviolence and the Consent Theory of Power," 1.

corporations, power organisations, their wealthy or powerful families, the media, military or militia, or a number of other external forces may support leaders of a country. The false assumption that the consent theory of power applies to all situations is the basis for strategic error in some non-violent strategies. This may also be why some academic boycotts fail or are hindered. Boycotters may learn that they are not as powerful or irreplaceable as they had thought. For instance, librarians may participate in a boycott only to find out that academics were still able to get books, journals and other materials through friends, front organisations, third parties and other institutions.[86]

Methods of non-cooperation are more confrontational and, as a result, run an increased risk of conflict escalation. Non-cooperation often requires much time, skill, and the participation of many in order to work.[87] Despite these challenges, non-cooperation is useful for addressing deep-rooted, systemic, latent, great power imbalance or otherwise problematic conflict. It does this by reducing or removing critical support of a system or group. Gene Sharp writes, "The methods of noncooperation, widely applied, are likely to cause difficulties in maintaining the normal operation and efficiency of the opponents' political or economic system."[88]

There are many types of non-cooperation. Non-cooperation can be the political, social, and economic withholding of concrete resources such as skills, human wherewithal, knowledge, and material assets or it can be the suspension of intangible factors such as moral support, obedience, and unquestioning

[86] The survey conducted by Lorraine Haricombe and F.W. Lancaster revealed that the boycotted during the boycott of South Africa during apartheid were able to devise create alternatives to circumvent the boycott. Lorraine J. Haricombe and F.W. Lancaster, *Out in the Cold*, 92.
[87] Gene Sharp, *Waging Nonviolent Struggle*, 460.
[88] Gene Sharp, *Waging Nonviolent Struggle*, 460.

adherence to dogma or political beliefs. Non-cooperation methods include such actions as stalling and obstructing, refusing to act, reluctance and slow compliance, boycotting, severing relations, delaying and cancelling events or meetings, deliberate inefficiency, blocking information, withdrawing, hiding and escaping. While Gene Sharp provides many examples in chapters four through seven in his book *The Methods of Nonviolent Action*, there are many examples and types of non-cooperation that he does not include. For instance, the rural Shibokusa women of Mount Fuji in Japan provide an example of non-cooperation with police when arrested during their protesting the use of their land for military exercises. Leonie Caldecott recounts the women's stories of their responses to being arrested. "We never give our name, age or anything. We just say that we're so old, we can't remember when we were born or who we are..."[89]

Women in the state of Andhra Pradesh, India, have used a variety of non-violent methods to challenge the sale of arrack, which is a locally brewed alcoholic beverage, in their community. Among other tactics, they have implemented creative non-cooperation, including refusing to cook.[90] One classic type of non-cooperation is refusal to serve in the military. This has been written about by the likes of Leo Tolstoy[91] and Henry David Thoreau[92], and remains a current phenomenon throughout the world, with, for example, Israeli soldiers refusing to serve in places such as the West Bank.[93]

---

[89] Shibokusa women of Mount Fuji, quoted in Leonie Caldecott, "At the Foot of the Mountain: The Shibokusa women of Kita Fuji," 105.
[90] Anveshi Collective, Hyderabad, "India: Reworking Gender Relations, Redefining Politics," 91-95.
[91] Leo Tolstoy, *On Civil Disobedience and Non-Violence*, 9-17.
[92] Henry David Thoreau, "The Challenge to Governmental Power," 33.
[93] Peretz Kidron, ed, *Refusenik!*

Like persuasion and protest, non-cooperation can help prepare the way for eventually returning to functional discussion because of increased awareness. Brian Martin and Wendy Varney write, "methods of non-cooperation and intervention typically operate to pressure opponents to enter a dialogue or to take an existing dialogue more seriously."[94] Martin and Varney see the power balancing that can result from non-cooperation as a way of preparing for discussion.[95] Academic boycotts, like other types of non-cooperation, are confrontational and breach the standard custom of cooperating. As will be demonstrated with academic boycotts, acts of non-cooperation can force a party to acknowledge a conflict and motivate them to engage in discussion. Non-cooperation can also perform other functions, that will also be addressed later in this thesis, including emphasising or demonstrating the interconnectedness of parties and 'reminding' an uncooperative party how dependant they are on the other parties in a conflict.

The set of methods used after non-cooperation fails are known by several terms, although the basic actions that are included in this category are relatively consistent.[96] Louis Kriesberg refers to this category as *nonviolent action 3* or Nv[3] and describes it as *noncompliance*. In the context of segregation laws, Kriesberg writes, "noncompliance can be carried out in ways that disrupt or prevent those who would practice segregation from doing so."[97]

---

[94] Brian Martin and Wendy Varney, "Nonviolence and Communication," 219.
[95] Brian Martin and Wendy Varney, "Nonviolence and Communication," 229.
[96] There is always some variation between theorists when it comes to categorising individual types of non-violent actions. The critical factor is not where a theorist puts an action under the same category or method of action as her or his colleague, but rather it is important that both theorists understand how and when to use this action.
[97] Louis Kriesberg, *Constructive Conflicts: From Escalation to Resolution,* 113.

Bryan Teixeira uses the term *civil disobedience*.[98] Gene Sharp defines this category as *non-violent intervention*, as:

> methods that intervene directly to change a given situation. Negative interventions may disrupt, and even destroy, established behavior patterns, policies, relationships, or institutions. Positive interventions may establish new behavior patterns, polices, relationships, or institutions.[99]

Under the category of *intervention*, Sharp includes: psychological interventions, such as non-violent harassment and fasting; physical interventions, such as sit-ins and non-violent occupation; social interventions, such as speak-in, guerrilla theatre, and overloading facilities; economic interventions, such as the reverse strike and non-violent land seizure; and political interventions, such as seeking imprisonment and overloading administrative systems.[100] Sometimes acts of non-violent intervention are categorised under the category of *non-cooperation*. For instance, Mark Juergensmeyer includes "peaceful disruption" and "blockades" under non-cooperation[101] whereas Sharp might consider these types of actions non-violent intervention.

Non-violent intervention or non-compliance has the advantage of being more forceful, compelling, or powerful. Gene Sharp writes, "Certain methods of nonviolent intervention can pose a more direct and immediate challenge to the opponents than the methods of protest and noncooperation, and may thereby produce more rapid changes."[102] Such extreme coercion is not without risk. Sharp warns:

> The methods of nonviolent intervention are, however, usually both harder for the resisters to sustain and harder for the opponents to withstand. Use of these methods may bring speedier and more severe repression than the methods of nonviolent protest and persuasion and the forms of noncooperation.[103]

---

[98] Bryan Teixeira, "Nonviolence in Theory and Practice," 563.
[99] Gene Sharp, *Waging Nonviolent Struggle*, 62.
[100] Gene Sharp, *The Politics of Nonviolent Action: The Methods of Nonviolent Action*, 357-433.
[101] Mark Juergensmeyer, *Gandhi's Way: A Handbook of Conflict Resolution*, 57.
[102] Gene Sharp, *Waging Nonviolent Struggle*, 62.
[103] Gene Sharp, *Waging Nonviolent Struggle*, 62.

In academia, conflict seldom results in non-violent intervention, though there are examples. The author has been involved in student sit-ins, speak-ins at meetings of university administration, and the occupation of offices to protest increases in tuition fees and inadequate government student loans and grants from government sources.

In non-violence theory, there is a type of non-violence that is frequently overlooked. Here it will be called *creation non-violence*. Though utilised globally at the grassroots level, theorists of non-violence seldom acknowledge methods of creation non-violence. Methods of creation non-violence are intentional acts that – while excluding the use of violence – are used to ***change a situation, prevent trouble, or address a problem***, not by intervention, omission of support, protest, or persuasion, but rather by ***creating a new set of environmental conditions, an innovative framework, or a different reality***. Creation non-violence is often used in situations of great power disparity or low resources to create fertile ground for desired results and an inhospitable environment for the roots of undesired affects. Creation non-violence means nurturing, energizing, empowering, creating anew, loving, building-up, and/or spreading ideas, structures, relationships, people, environments and/or resources. One unique type of psychotherapy, solution-focused therapy, is contrary to conventional psychotherapy because it "builds on working solutions already available to the patient."[104] Creation non-violence is like solution-focused therapy in that it concentrates on strengthening, reinforcing, and utilizing the strengths of people or situations – instead of attacking their

[104] Steven J. Kingsbury, "What is Solution-Focused Therapy?"

weaknesses or the problem – in order to make them stronger, more resilient, and more likely to achieve the wanted goals. Creation non-violence can develop the potential for positive change in an existing structure or challenging systemic or structural problems by building viable alternatives.

Few traditional non-violent theorists acknowledge such forms of non-violence. Gene Sharp hints at creation non-violence when discussing the second of two types of non-violent intervention, negative interventions and positive interventions: "Positive interventions may establish new behavior patterns, policies, relationships, or institutions."[105] Despite including this category of intervention, the list of 40 examples Sharp cites is predominately negative interventions. Most writing on non-violence focuses on ending the problem by directly tackling it or withdrawing support from it. However, there are times when building the strengths and supports of the oppressed and the situation, as well as encouraging decency and humanity of the oppressor is a more strategic way of non-violently addressing a problem than trying to overcome or take power from the oppressor. In this framework, concepts that are often considered pre-cursors to "real" non-violent action, such as education, empowerment and community building, are seen as non-violent actions on their own, because they can be enough to make the necessary change without the use of additional methods of non-violent action. Gandhi's concept of constructive programme is as close as theorists of non-violence have come to capturing this idea in theoretical analysis.

> Gandhi's patient efforts to prepare Indian people for freedom have been called "the constructive program." This dealt at various times with a wide range of domestic reforms: Hindu-Moslem communal unity, elimination of untouchability, prohibition,

[105] Gene Sharp, *Waging Non-violent Struggle*, 62.

> home spinning, village industries, village sanitation, basic education, adult education, emancipation of women, education in health and hygiene, and other topics.[106]

Examples of creation non-violence have are beginning to be recorded as instances of non-violence in anthologies such as *Protest, Power, and Change: An Encyclopedia of Nonviolent Action from ACT-UP to Women's Suffrage*, *Frontline Feminisms: Women, War and Resistance*, *Women, Violence and Nonviolent Change*, and *Reweaving the Web of Life: Feminism and Nonviolence*. However, they are seldom included in theoretical analysis of non-violence. While non-violence theorists tend to overlook creation non-violence, conflict theorists have been exploring it extensively under the guise of c*onflict prevention* or *conflict provention.*

While some these types of creation non-violence prevent or reduce the likelihood of problems, others go deeper and address the hidden root causes of problems. This produces an environment or social context where these troubles *cannot* thrive; this is consistent with the idea of *conflict provention* as put forth by conflict theorist John Burton. Burton suggests that simply trying to prevent things from happening is not enough. David J. Dunn provides a definition of *provention.* "Provention is a preferred word because it suggests not a control or limit, but rather open-ended adaptation. It is akin in meaning to proactive as opposed to acting in response to a threat, problem or circumstance. It suggests taking the initiative…"[107] Adam Curle provides an example of this type of proventative creation non-violence in his book Taming the Hydra. Curle suggests that producing a peaceful society requires addressing the root causes of violence instead of merely addressing the symptoms.

---

[106] Homer A. Jack, "Introduction" viii
[107] David J. Dunn, *From Power Politics to Conflict Resolution*, 1.

Creation non-violence has often been excluded from traditional non-violence theory for a number of reasons. Firstly, it is often a private act that is done quietly and without recognition. It is difficult to report on, record, and theorise about when it happens in personal spaces. For instance, when an Aboriginal woman in an isolated community in northern Canada, in the absence of police protection, hides her children in the bush to protect them from an abusive husband, who is there to record the action? Secondly, it is frequently utilised by the marginalized of the marginalized. It is often women who live in the two-thirds world or are First Nations, an ethnic minority, lesbians, economically or politically oppressed, in abusive relationships, or sexually exploited who carry out creation non-violence. The actions of persons on the margins are seldom recorded or valued. When Drag Kings (biologically female male-impersonators) challenge gender roles and the oppression of women, their resistance to convention is seldom noted by mainstream culture. Thirdly, creation non-violence does not adhere to mainstream societal norms. Creation non-violence instead utilised ideas, people, values, resources etc. that are undervalued in society. For example, victim-offender mediation, where the purpose is to build human relationship in order to hold the offender accountable and empower the victim, is contrary to the norms of western cultures where retribution is valued. An action, such as offer hospitality or family-oriented tasks, may not be considered valuable as it is traditionally considered women's work. Fourthly, creation non-violence is often used to struggle against violence or problems that are not publicly acknowledged because it addresses a taboo topic or affects extremely marginalized people. For instance, street sex trade workers are often victims of violence, but are apprehensive about reporting the

assaults to police. In Canada, they regularly publish descriptions of their violent or aggressive "dates" or "johns" (their sexual clients) in a local newsletter to prevent other sex trade workers from going on "dates" with these dangerous men. The rape and assault of sex trade workers is overlooked and ignored by society. Theorists of non-violence are seldom keen on seeking out, acknowledging, and recording such acts of non-violent resistance and provention. It is easier and more comfortable for theorists to use more social acceptable topics.

There are many methods of creation non-violence. This may mean creating alternative social structures. Gene Sharp includes alternative social institutions, alternative communication systems, alternative markets, alternative transport systems, parallel government, and alternative economic institutions as methods of non-violent intervention.[108] However, one could argue that these methods are not truly "intervention" as they focus more on creating a new framework to adhere to or new conditions to live out of then stepping between, intruding, or interfering in a situation. They are also not directly[109] affecting or changing the problem, but rather it is working indirectly to create an alternative; setting up other options is not targeted interference.

Bryan Teixeira sees the creation of alternative social structures as a response to use *after* persuasion, non-cooperation, and civil disobedience has failed.[110] There are times when the creation of alternative social structures is attempted before non-cooperation or civil disobedience. The following examples show that when attempts at discussion or overt confrontation is a

[108] Gene Sharp, *The Politics of Nonviolent Action: Methods of Nonviolent Action*, 398-415.
[109] Sharp defines non-violent intervention as "methods that intervene directly to change a given situation." Gene Sharp, *Waging Nonviolent Struggle*, 62.
[110] Bryan Teixeira, "Nonviolence Theory and Practice," 563.

greater risk, creating alternative social structures is tried first because it is safer when one is extremely oppressed, isolated or marginalized. These alternative structures could be educational. For example, "In Somalia, under the separation and restrictions of fundamentalism, women are organizing and leading schools for girls."[111] It could be setting up informal economic structures, such as a system of bartering.

Creating safe places or providing sanctuary is a form of creation non-violence onto itself. While using the example from Hebrew scriptures of two women hiding Moses in 1300 BCE, in her article, "You Can't Kill the Spirit: Women and Nonviolent Action", Pam McAllister writes, "This is the ancient art of providing sanctuary, the gesture of creating a safe place in a violent world. The women were brave, clever, and creative in their resistance to the insanity of their day."[112] Creating a safe place could be hiding ones sons from the army[113] or providing sanctuary to abused women or fleeing refugees.[114]

Creation non-violence can be forms of self-empowerment or the empowering of others in the face of injustice. This can include learning new farming techniques[115], teaching little girls how to read[116] or passing on cultural ways or customs to prevent cultural destruction, violence or obliteration.[117] While female circumcision is often met with public protest, persuasion and occasionally direct intervention, "In Mali a one-to-one education campaign was

---

[111] Aruna Gnanadason, Musimbi Kanyoro, and Lucia Ann McSpadden, "Introduction," x.
[112] Pam McAllister, "You Can't Kill the Spirit," 25.
[113] Julie Mertus, "The Kitchen Cabinet," 209.
[114] Pam McAllister, "You Can't Kill the Spirit," 25.
[115] Julie Mertus, "The Kitchen Cabinet," 209.
[116] Julie Mertus, "The Kitchen Cabinet," 209.
[117] The author has seen this done in many places including with First Nations women in the inner city of her hometown, in the oppressed barrios of Barrancabermeja in Colombia, and in women's organisations in the refugee camps of the Gaza Strip.

used rather than confrontation to combat female circumcision."[118] Part empowerment, part persuasion, a programme like this would help nurture a culture where female circumcision would be unacceptable.

Creation non-violence often takes the form of community building. It can be organising and empowering each other within a community, as the Mothers' of the Disappeared did throughout Latin America.[119] This can also be offering hospitality, such as coffee on a cold night, to the "enemies" or the "others" in order to befriend them and reduce violence. Lucretia Mott shows such a brave act of non-violence in a story used to introduce an article by Margaret Bacon in the book *Reweaving the Web of Life: Feminism and Nonviolence*. Outside the New York Women's Rights Convention of 1853, Lucretia Mott, along with other well-known speakers including Sojourner Truth and Susan B. Anthony, faced an angry crowd. The story reads:

> The female speakers were afraid to leave. Lucretia immediately offered them her own escort and turned to the nearest bully saying, "This man will see me through." She slipped her hand under the man's arm. It was Captain Ryder [the leader of the gang] himself! Stunned by this uncompromising expectation of courtesy, Rynder escorted Lucretia to safety, a gruff, blushing puppet on the string of this brave woman.[120]

Creation non-violence also includes healing brokenness and preventing further harm. Healing circles and restorative justice are examples of these as are mentoring programmes for children at risk, which are also intentional actions that prevent or reduce the likelihood of further problems. Some parents and childhood educators are using cooperative games, non-violent toys and creative childminding with the hopes of creating a more peaceful society,[121] as

---

[118] Aruna Gnanadason, Musimbi Kanyoro, and Lucia Ann McSpadden. "Introduction," x.
[119] Pam McAllister, "You Can't Kill the Spirit," 26-29.
[120] Pam McAllister, introduction to "Nonviolence and Women: The Pioneers" by Margaret Bacon, 78.
[121] For instance, see the Building Peace through Play information at www.projectpeacemakers.org/play.

well as re-evaluating the positive messages students receive about violence during school.[122]

Currently, problems in academia are often dealt with in a reactive manner. Academic boycotts, in particular, are a response to a presenting problem. They are about withholding support or isolating in order to create new power equilibrium, increase awareness levels or otherwise confront a perceived injustice. Thus, pre/provention creation non-violence will be examined further in the conclusion, in the context of exploring alternatives to academic boycotting. Some types of non-violent action that could be considered *creation non-violence* will be among those under consideration as a means of moving towards functional discussion when previous attempts at discussion have failed.

Analysis about the importance of carefully considering a range of potential actions before settling on a method of action is critical for all types of non-violent action, not just academic boycotting. In this way, this examination of the limitations, potential, and mechanics of academic boycotting can serve as an example or a framework for all practitioners and theorists attempting to determine an appropriate type of non-violent action for any given situation. Before engaging in any type of non-violent action, a practitioner should understand their alternatives. They should also comprehend the mechanisms, strengths, limitations, potential outcomes, and the potential side-effects (both positive and negative) of their chosen method of action.

---

[122] For instance, see the example of Israeli education about war provided in Haggith Gor, "Education for War in Israel."

Returning to Discussion

In the case of straightforward conflicts with uncomplicated aims, these various types of non-violent action can be used to directly achieve a goal, or they can be used to return to discussion, where the details and nuances of a conflict can be effectively addressed. Bryan Teixeira writes, "If persuasion fails, then the confrontation may escalate to forms of nonconforming behaviour… Such nonconformity and noncooperation demonstrate at least a temporary breakdown in dialogue."[123] However, theorists of non-violence argue that confrontation is sometimes *needed* for discussion to occur. Throughout his book *Making Peace*, Adam Curle argues that education and then confrontation is needed to move a conflict from latent to overt and to balance power before negotiation can occur.[124] In a diagram entitled "life-cycles of peace," Ian Doucet illustrates that conscientisation, empowerment, and confrontation are required before negotiation can lead to social or political change.[125] If the above-mentioned criteria – interconnectedness, ability, communication skills, and a reason or desire to engage – are not met, non-violent confrontation or coercion may be able to promote these factors. Academic boycotts are one form of confrontation in the context of academia. As will be discussed, though ineffective at communicating detail or dealing with complex issues, boycotts have the capacity to enhance or create the requirements for discussion. In the context of academia, academic boycotts have the ability to move a conflict fixed at an impasse back towards the norm of discussion where complex ideas and multi-faceted problems can be addressed.

---

[123] Bryan Teixeira, "Nonviolence Theory and Practice," 563.
[124] Adam Curle, *Making Peace.*
[125] Ian Doucet, *Resource Pack for Conflict Resolution,* 29.

Addressing Conflict in Academia

Chapter 4

Understanding how conflict works in academia is important in order to understand academic boycotting. The research into conflict in academia is limited; the theory suggested here was constructed by combining non-violence theory with research into specific areas of conflict in academia. Thus, the types of conflict in academia can be categorized. Via the construction of overt and latent categories of conflict, one is able to see that certain responses are norms for overt conflict – namely the expressed norms of discussion or use of bureaucratic structures – while latent conflict is dealt with in more subversive, ineffective ways. Latent conflict, particularly that involving power imbalance and structural problems, is seldom fully addressed when it remains hidden. However, confrontation, such as academic boycotting, can surface the conflict where it can be better addressed. In fact, many of the main types of latent conflict found in academia are the very sorts of conflict that academic boycotting has been used to confront. As presented in this thesis, academic boycotting is a blunt instrument that is only useful for the creation of discussion. Academic boycotting is useful primarily for the surfacing of conflict, while it is less effective for conflict that is overt. Overt conflict already has relatively effective, accepted means for addressing it; academic boycotting has little to offer these types of conflict. However, for latent conflict, which is often dealt with via ineffective and passively violent means, academic boycotting holds more potential. It is this potential to increase

awareness, balance power, and create other conditions conducive to discussion that will be the focus of this chapter.

The theory that is constructed here is also vital for those using academic boycotting because of its non-violent nature. New non-violence theory informs an understanding that some of the covert norms used to address latent conflict tread the fine line into the category of passive violence. As demonstrated in some of the examples, subversive coping mechanisms and avoidance have caused passive violence. While practitioners of non-violence are reluctant to use academic boycotting because of its potential for harm, they must remain conscious that not acting may result in new or continued passive violence.

The categorising and theory presented in this chapter not only provides a framework for understanding in what situations and how academic boycotts are used, it also informs broader conflict theory about how conflict is – and is not – addressed in academia. This theory challenges a widely accepted notion that in academia, conflict is solely dealt with via discussion. It reveals the under-belly of conflict in academia and demonstrates that other more covert, destructive means of conflict resolution or suppression are also prevalent. This thesis presents the potential and the limitations of one possible alternative to the continued suppression or covert coping mechanisms that exist for certain types of conflict.

Akin to all other organisations, conflict is present in academia. In his book *Images of Organisation*, Gareth Morgan writes:

> Conflict will always be present in organizations. Conflict may be personal, interpersonal, or between rival groups or coalitions. It may be built into organizational structures, roles, attitudes, and stereotypes or arise over a scarcity of resources. It may be explicit or covert.[126]

[126] Gareth Morgan, *Images of Organization*, 167.

Conflict in academia can be divided into two broad categories: latent or overt. Kenneth Cloke and Joan Goldsmith illustrate latent and overt conflict in an iceberg diagram. While the issues of the conflict presents are represented by the tip of the iceberg that resides above the water surface, factors such as personalities, emotions, interests, needs, desires, self-perception, self-esteem, hidden expectations, and unresolved issues from the past remain hidden below water level.[127] This chapter will address how these two types of conflict are addressed differently academia. Though overt or acknowledged conflict is usually dealt with by using a set of expressed norms, latent conflict is more problematic. Latent conflict also functions under a set of norms, but these norms are unspoken and less clear. In some cases latent conflict is not addressed, while in other instances, it is dealt with quietly, in inconspicuous ways. Sometimes the conflict is surfaced – that is made overt – through one or more approaches, and is then addressed as a visible conflict, according to expressed norms.

Visible Conflict

Visible conflict is unconcealed and is in a position where it is possible to be directly addressed; parties in the conflict recognize and acknowledge it. There are two types of visible conflict, the first of which is surface conflict. Simon Fisher et al. say that surface conflict "has shallow or no roots and may be only a misunderstanding of goals that can be addressed by means of improved communication."[128] With a surface conflict, the goals of the two

[127] Kenneth Cloke and Joan Goldsmith, *Resolving Conflicts at Work*, 114.
[128] Simon Fisher et al., *Working with Conflict*, 6.

parties are compatible, but their behaviour is not.[129] The incompatibility of their behaviour makes the conflict visible even though the conflict is not in reality that substantial. Surface conflicts are common in academia and can be found in a number of situations including conflict over logistical details such as scheduling clashes, miscommunications about responsibilities with joint projects, or lack of consultation about the purpose of a gathering. In academia, like in the majority of organisations, most visible surface conflicts are dealt with using discussion. Only if discussion fails, is a formal complaint or bureaucratic conflict resolution system used. However, with surface conflicts, this is seldom necessary.

The second type of visible conflict, referred to as open conflict, is more embedded. Simon Fisher et al. write that open conflict "is both deep-rooted and very visible, and may require actions that address both the root causes and the visible effects."[130] In the case of an open conflict, the goals of the involved parties are incompatible; the conflict is visible because their behaviour is also incompatible.[131] Open conflict is more substantial. It requires more time and is resource intensive when it is fully addressed. There are two ways that open conflict is addressed in academia. Open conflict over academic ideas usually is addressed by academic discussion.[132] Academic discussion can take many forms including journals, conferences, informal meetings, seminars, and books. This is consistent with academic norms of discussion that can be traced back to early forms of academia. In the 4th century BCE, in the Academe Park in ancient Athens, Plato established a place to educate aristocratic students. For

[129] Simon Fisher et al., *Working with Conflict*, 5.
[130] Simon Fisher et al., *Working with Conflict*, 6.
[131] Simon Fisher et al., *Working with Conflict*, 5.
[132] See chapter 3.1 for a definition of *academic discussion.*

the next 800 years, discussion around topics such as philosophy, politics and science were held there. Academia has gone through many transformations since then, but the norm of meeting to discuss ideas remains. Although these encounters seldom occur in parks, but rather now in classrooms, in academic journals, in offices at universities, via email and telephone etc, the deliberation of knowledge in community with other interested, competent individuals is central to contemporary academia. Anthony O'Hear writes of Newman's vision of a university:

> The university envisaged by Newman is an institution in which conversations of a certain sort – about truth, beauty and goodness – will not simply be *possible*. Such conversations are always possible, even, one is almost tempted to say, in present-day universities. In Newman's university, though, conditions will be such as to *foster* such conversations… [133]

Open conflict of an institutional or organisational nature is usually dealt with via bureaucratic structures, policies, procedures and rules, including university governance. These structures and procedures are seen a consistent with the norms of academia. They help to ensure academic freedom as well as to maintain the norms of the university.

Academia is not alone in using such structures and procedures to address open conflict of this nature. In his book *Organizational Commitment and Conflict,* Omer Bin Sayeed writes about the strategy of following rules in organisations and those who use this strategy: "It is used by those who are very cautious and believe in maintenance of the status quo. These individuals rely heavily on rules and regulations, standardization and procedures and on precedents to manage conflicts."[134]

---

[133] Anthony O'Hear, "Academic Freedom and the University," 11 (italics in original text).
[134] Omer Bin Sayeed, *Organizational Commitment and Conflict*, 87.

Both academic discussion and the engaging of policies and procedures are not only acceptable ways to deal with conflict in academia, they are the expected ways; there is a strong expectation that all conflict in academia is dealt with by one of these means. While other means of addressing conflict in academia are accepted or rejected to varying degrees, *all* are seen as a breach of the norm. As there are often benefits to suppressing a conflict instead of risking challenging norms, conflicts that are not dealt with successfully in these two ways often are, or become, latent conflicts.

Latent Conflict

A latent conflict lies below the surface, hidden from recognition or acknowledgement. No matter how well it is cloaked, as Shay McConnon and Margaret McConnon write, "Unexpressed conflict is still conflict."[135] There is a range of reasons why conflict is latent. Joseph P. Folger, Marshall Scott Poole, Randall K. Stutman write, "Conflict is first **latent** in that some set of conditions such as insufficient resources or divergent goals comes to exist but is not yet perceived or acted on. Then the conflict is **perceived** when the latent issues reach awareness."[136] Omer Bin Sayeed presents the following understanding of latent conflict: "Normally, conflict is ignored when it is mildly threatening, but taken up for resolution when it attracts attention due to its negative repercussions either on the individual or his [or her] immediate vicinity in the organization."[137]

---

[135] Shay McConnon and Margaret McConnon, *Resolving Conflict*, 61.
[136] Joseph P. Folger, Marshall Scott Poole, Randall K. Stutman, *Working through Conflict*, 86-7 (bolding in original text).
[137] Omer Bin Sayeed, *Organizational Commitment and Conflict*, 85.

In the article "Productive Conflict: The Importance of Conflict Management and Conflict Issues", Carsten K. W. De Dreu suggests:

> Conflict parties often deny the existence of an issue, or reduce its importance in order to avoid dealing with it... The tendency to suppress conflict may be rooted in, for example, a lack of self-efficacy, fear of retaliation, an urge to reach decisions and to be productive, or a desire to maintain face.[138]

De Dreu further explains, "People often hesitate to actively stimulate conflict because they fear uncontrollable consequences, because it goes against a more general norm of behaving peacefully, and because they lack the skills required to stimulate social conflict in a controllable way."[139] Kenneth Cloke and Joan Goldsmith provide a number of reasons for avoiding or dodging conflict. Parties may avoid conflict if they see the issue as trivial, do not have the power to affect change, believe that the conflict will cause more damage than do good, or are waiting to address what they see as the root causes of the problem.[140]

Conflict may be latent as a result of denial. Stanley Cohen researches the concept of denial extensively in is book *States of Denial: Knowing about Atrocities and Suffering*. Cohen explains that denial can occur on a number of levels.[141] Though denial serves a purpose by giving a party an excuse not to act, denial is not without risk. Kenneth Cloke and Joan Goldsmith write, "Denying the existence of conflicts does not make them disappear, it gives them greater covert power."[142]

Conflict can be latent because of a lack of awareness about the situation and the implications of various elements of the situation. This lack of awareness can be on the part of any party in a conflict. Adam Curle explores

---

[138] Carsten K. W. De Dreu, "Productive Conflict," 10-11
[139] Carsten K. W. De Dreu, "Productive Conflict," 12.
[140] Kenneth Cloke and Joan Goldsmith, *Resolving Conflicts at Work*, 41.
[141] Stanley Cohen, *States of Denial*, 10-11.
[142] Kenneth Cloke and Joan Goldsmith, *Resolving Conflicts at Work*, 11.

lower awareness on the part of both the powerful and the oppressed throughout his book *Making Peace*.

Sometimes, keeping a conflict latent is in the best interests of parties that have the power to suppress it. It may be more convenient for them to ignore the conflict than to deal with, especially when dealing with the conflict means surfacing other hidden conflicts or controversies that are not flattering for those concealing the conflict.

Effective conflict resolution often requires conflict analysis skills, time, financial and/or human resources. Suppression of a conflict may be a result of a lack of resources to deal with it. Varieties of forms of conflict in academia have been made latent because of a lack of resources or the other above-mentioned reasons for concealment.

For the above-mentioned reasons, a conflict may be latent in academia. There may also be case specific motives for suppressing conflict as well. For instances, a labour conflict may be hidden in a university because of legal implications in a particular state. There are certain types of conflict in academia that tend to be latent as a result of the causes discussed. It is only after confrontation, awareness raising or the creation of a suitable forum that these types of conflicts become overt. Once surfaced, they are dealt with as overt conflict – that is, through discussion or the bureaucratic structures – or they are somehow covered up or overshadowed so that they return to a covert position. Understanding latent conflict is critical to understanding the reasons for academic boycotting; causes for academic boycotting are common forms of latent conflict found in academia. Though these types of conflicts are publicly discussed as proven by the articles and books referenced here, they are topics

that are surrounded by some type of taboo and are treaded upon carefully when the subjects are broached.

One of the most controversial and well-hidden forms of latent conflict results from government interference in academia or academia's connections with governments. Critics claim such connections jeopardise academic freedom, interfere with the pursuit of knowledge and highjack academic research, and thus causes conflict between the perceived and actual roles of academia in society. Robert Quinn writes, "In the information age, the scholar's role in shaping the quality and flow of information in society is an unquestionable source of power. Repressive authorities intent on controlling societies naturally seek to control that power."[143] Fear over government control of or interference with academia is found in a number of academic boycotts. For instance, during the 1992 academic boycott of the International Conference on the Physics of Semiconductors in China, there was, among other concerns, the fear that China would use the conference for their own propaganda.[144] Conflict resulting from academic/government connections is also seen when one government attempts to limit another government's power via limiting their academic institutions. For example, the United States government implemented a range of academic boycotts, as part of larger economic sanctions, on Cuba,[145] Iran, Iraq, Libya, and Sudan.[146]

One of the best-documented types of connections between government and academia is between governments and scientists, particularly nuclear scientists. This relationship usually consists of the government funding the

[143] Robert Quinn, "Defending 'Dangerous' Minds," 1.
[144] Franklin Hoke, "U.S. Scientists Wary of Traveling to China."
[145] Lorraine J. Haricombe and F.W. Lancaster, *Out in the Cold*, 16-21.
[146] Lila Guterman, "Embargo Imbroglio."

universities to do research that would benefit the government and thus the university becomes a pillar of support for the government and its actions or policies.[147] In his book *Academic Freedom in Action,* Paul Hoch provides the example of the United States government and its universities stating that, "the universities often seem to be in a state of holy wedlock with the Defense Department…"[148] Engelbert Broda, in a chapter entitled "The Dilemma of Scientists in the Nuclear Age"[149], explores the predicament faced by many scientists, including Albert Einstein, over the consequences of their contribution to nuclear weaponry.

Such conflict involving the government and academia is controversial because academia, and in particular science, is often thought of as apolitical or somehow removed or separate from the context and society in which it exists. This is thought to contribute to academic freedom, as academia is not bound to politics or society. John Ziman challenges this notion with his belief that "science is in politics up to its neck."[150] Ronald Barnett writes about academia in general, "In short, higher education in the modern world is inescapably bound into its host society. If the term 'academic freedom' ever implied the desirability for the academic community to separate itself off from wider society, that kind of aspiration must today be seen for the nonsense it is."[151] Regardless of the opinions of the likes of Ronald Barnett, some academics insist that academia is separate from society and is apolitical. Nevertheless, conflict results when politics and academia *brush past* or *collide* with each

---

[147] For a general overview of the relationship between government and scientists, see Stuart S. Blume, *Toward a Political Sociology of Science*, 177-214.
[148] Paul Hoch, *Academic Freedom in Action*, 101.
[149] Engelbert Broda, "The Dilemma of Scientists in the Nuclear Age," 71-99.
[150] John Ziman, "Basic Principles," 173.
[151] Ronald Barnett, "Limits to Academic Freedom: Imposed-Upon or Self Imposed?" 88.

other, depending on one's perspective. The controversy that frequently erupts each time demonstrates that something about the topic of government/academic connections is taboo.

Social diversity conflict, another type of latent conflict in academia, includes racism, sexism, homophobia, anti-Semitism, xenophobia, classism, ethnocentrism and any other form of discrimination or conflict that arises in situations where people are socially diverse. The inequity and sense of injustice that accompanies discrimination can cause inter-personal, intra-group and inter-group conflict in academia. Anne Donnellon and Deborah M. Kolb study social diversity conflict extensively in the article "Constructive for Whom? The Fate of Diversity Disputes in Organizations". Donnellon and Kolb discuss how difficult social diversity conflict is to address:

> The problem, however, is that the practices of constructive conflict management leave the type of dispute represented above [involving accusations of homophobia, racial conflict, and sexism] either essentially unaddressed or resolved in a way that is not constructive for all parties. The type of disputes that are problematic are those arising out of, or complicated by, social diversity.[152]

Racism is major obstacle to the full participation of some in academia. Sometimes racism is blatant while other times it is more concealed, but just as insidious. Racism can be structural, such as when present in the form of discriminatory policies. It can also be on the personal level, where stereotypes and prejudices cause individuals to discriminate against others on the basis of their race. Examples of obvious structural racism are found throughout apartheid in South Africa. E.S. Sachs, while reflecting on the extension of the University Education Act No. 45 of 1959, writes:

> The real purpose of this Act was to exclude Africans from any of the established universities, but it ostensibly was "to provide for the establishment, management and control of university colleges for non-white persons; for the admission of

[152] Anne Donnellon and Deborah M. Kolb, "Constructive for Whom?" 161-2.

> students to and their instruction at university colleges: for the limitation of admission of non-white students to certain university institutions."[153]

In the article, "Black Women as 'Other' in the Academy" Naz Rassool examines some of the more subtle forms of racism and responses to it, such as the "discourses of 'otherness' constructed within the daily routines and ethos of the academy, which serve to exclude and marginalize ethnic minority group experience."[154] Marilyn R. Schuster looks at who, including people of colour, is missing or excluded from curriculum.[155] Millsom Henry examines the problems faced by black women in academia. Henry explores several scenarios including how: "The make-up of staff and students in the natural sciences have tended to be white and male, consequently, black women who enter this arena feel that they have to justify their presence."[156]

Sexism is another social diversity conflict. Julie Kent and Anna Palmer examine the location of women in the research context finding that they are in positions of lower pay and lower grades.[157] Breda Gray examines how patriarchy and sexism has affected women's relationships with each other in academia.[158] Sexism is particularly blatant in fields such as science and engineering[159]

Another type of social diversity conflict in academia is a result of sexual orientation and homophobia. Homophobia is particularly well hidden because of compulsory heterosexuality[160] and heterosexism (the assumption that everyone is heterosexual) and the fear of homophobia that many homosexual

[153] E.S. Sachs, *The Anatomy of Apartheid*, 282.
[154] Naz Rassool, "Black Women as 'Other' in the Academy," 25.
[155] Marilyn R. Schuster, "Transforming the Curriculum," 192-208.
[156] Millsom Henry, "Ivory Towers and Ebony Women," 51.
[157] Julie Kent and Anna Palmer, "The Research Context," 19.
[158] Breda Gray, "Women in Higher Education," 75-88.
[159] Lucy McAuley and Lisa Looney, "Women and Education in Ireland," 89-107.
[160] Greta Gaard, "Anti-lesbian Intellectual Harassment in the Academy," 127.

people face if they were to come out or to be outed.[161] Greta Gaard provides a number of examples of both systemic and personal persecution faced by lesbian in academia in her article "Anti-lesbian Intellectual Harassment in the Academy."[162]

Though sexual harassment is increasingly being dealt with via policy and procedures in many organisations, including academia, it still is a frequent source of latent conflict.[163] The degree to which sexual harassment remains hidden in academia is demonstrated in Avril Butler and Mel Landells article "Taking Offence: Research as Resistance to Sexual Harassment in Academia."[164] Latent conflict in the form of sexual harassment has far reaching consequences for academia; for instance, the importance of addressing sexual harassment in order to protect academic freedom is explored by Mary Hawkesworth in her article "The Politics of Knowledge: Sexual Harassment and Academic Freedom Reconsidered."[165]

Anti-Semitism can limit the participation of Jews, those thought to be Jewish and allies of Jews in academia and academic discourse. The most blatant and frequently referenced examples of this occurred during the Holocaust. In his book *Hitler's Willing Executioners: Ordinary Germans and the Holocaust*, Daniel Jonah Goldhagen writes about the expulsion of Jewish from German academia; academia, at all levels, was not an exception to the Anti-Semitism:

---

[161] Chris Corin, "Fighting Back or Biting Back?" 63.
[162] Greta Gaard, "Anti-lesbian Intellectual Harassment in the Academy," 115-140.
[163] See example cited and analysis given in Anne Donnellon and Deborah M. Kolb, "Constructive for Whom?"
[164] Avril Butler and Mel Landells, "Taking Offence: Research as Resistance to Sexual Harassment in Academia," 156-168.
[165] Mary Hawkesworth, "The Politics of Knowledge," 17-30.

> Yet the initiative to eliminate Jewish influence from society was also taken by the most prestigious and best-educated professionals… University administrators, faculty, and students across Germany similarly applauded and contributed to driving their Jewish colleagues out from their ranks."[166]

Goldhagen describes how German governing student associations during the early 1920s, often with little opposition, "adopted 'Aryan paragraphs,' clauses that called for the exclusion of Jews or for their severe restriction, both from student organizations and from study at universities."[167] Although German academia during Hitler's reign contains some of the most notorious examples of Anti-Semitism, there are many other examples of Anti-Semitism in academia throughout the history of academia.

It is possible to have conflict or discrimination resulting from other social factors including class, religion, beliefs, marital status, family status, etc. In academia, there have also been cases of discrimination in which a university has been accused of discriminating in their admission policies based on the school that students previously attended.[168] To varying degrees, all of these forms of discrimination cause social diversity conflict.

Corporate interests can also be a type of latent conflict in academia. Universities are becoming increasingly dependant on corporate funding for its survival.[169] In return, "many universities are today playing an increasingly important part in the provision of research expertise and of high-level education and training for industry, commerce and the professions nationally and in their own areas."[170] This inter-dependant relationship can be a source of conflict when the interests of the university collide with the interests of their corporate

---

[166] Daniel Jonah Goldhagen, *Hitler's Willing Executioners*, 96.
[167] Daniel Jonah Goldhagen, *Hitler's Willing Executioners*, 83.
[168] *Chronicle of Higher Education*, "British Prep Schools Urge Boycott of U. of Bristol."
[169] Michael McKinley, "The Co-option of the University and the Privileging of Annihilation," 153.
[170] Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, *Universities under Scrutiny*, 59.

sponsor. The tobacco industries involvement in U.K. universities is an example of this type of conflict. There was concern by academics that a university taking money from the tobacco industry was unethical and could influence the results or reporting of results of studies from the university, leaving a bias towards the interests of the tobacco industry.[171] This conflict flooded newspapers and was the source of more than one academic boycott. The notoriety in the mainstream media of such cases demonstrates the controversy that results when such connections are brought to the surface.

Finally, conflicts involving internal politics are often hidden. Universities, departments and members of departments want to collaborate with each other for numerous reasons including to increase productivity, for access to special skills or materials, and to save time,[172] yet they are in competition with each other for limited resources. Conflicting interests about resources can lead to inter- and intra-departmental conflict.

Internal conflicts can also be caused by human resource concerns including wages, benefits, hours, working environment, assigning of duties etc. Personality clashes, disagreement over leadership or hierarchy, power imbalances and other types of "office politics" can also lead to latent conflict.

There can be conflict between academics over the norms of academia, such as who can participate and how academic discussion is engaged. Conflict over intra-university interference on academic freedom can also be a source of latent conflict. This may take such forms as undue interference by university or

[171] *BBC,* "University Tobacco Boycott Looms."
[172] Blaise Cronin, *The Scholar's Courtesy,* 7.

departmental management or lack of structures that protect academic freedom (such as a senate, tenure system, or formal complaints procedure).[173]

Latent conflict is difficult to address because it is hidden for one or more of the previously mentioned reasons and, therefore, it is in at least one of the party's best interests to keep it concealed. Secondly, at least some, if not all involved, do not know about it, will not acknowledge it, or do not want to deal with it. Bearing in mind these factors, there are essentially three ways to respond to latent conflict: avoidance or further suppression, subversively addressing it, or surfacing it.

Avoidance or continued suppression is a frequent response to latent conflict in academia. It involves perpetuating or avoiding the situation or "backing down" from the conflict. The benefit of avoidance or continued suppression is that no one has to actually address the problem. For instance, Mary Hawkesworth references a study from the University of Illinois in her article entitled, "The Politics of Knowledge: Sexual Harassment and Academic Freedom Reconsidered". This study found that of students who had experienced sexual harassment on campus, "23.4% altered their course selections in order to avoid the harasser; and 13.9% of the victims changed their major area of study and their career plans in order to escape further harassment."[174] When the victim merely avoids the harasser or further harassment, the problem is never really solved.

Despite all of the suggested reasons for a conflict to be suppressed, leaving conflict as latent can be problematic. The drawback with avoidance is

---

[173] See the Technical University of British Columbia case study (chapter 7) for an instance of this.
[174] Mary Hawkesworth, "The Politics of Knowledge," 19.

that the problem is not addressed and the negative consequences of the conflict continue. Neither the symptoms, nor the roots causes of the conflict are dealt with. The person who choices to avoid is left dissatisfied and there is nothing stopping the problem from resurfacing either with the same individual or with someone else. Carsten K. W. De Dreu writes:

> In fact, growing evidence suggests that conflict may be beneficial to performance in groups and organizations, and that avoiding and suppressing conflict reduces individual creativity, decision quality in teams, product development, and communication between work groups. Moreover, a case can be made that stimulating conflict sometimes enhances individual, group and organizational performance.[175]

Examples of avoidance having negative consequences in academia are numerous. For example, Chris Corin discusses various coping strategies that lesbians in academia use to cope with heterosexism and anti-lesbianism in academia in an article entitled "Fighting Back or Biting Back? Lesbians in Higher Education". Corin writes, "Avoidance strategies meant avoiding personal situations and social interactions with co-workers."[176] Sometimes avoidance means leaving academia all together. Corin references a story of a woman who made the difficult decision to quit her work as a physicist when faced with multiple barriers as a black lesbian doing physics at Harvard.[177] These avoidance-based responses neither address the heterosexism or anti-lesbianism, nor resolve the presenting conflict.

Avoidance and continued conflict suppression can result in passive violence as described by Lynne Woehrle.[178] This is violence to self, where because of fear, low self-esteem, and disempowerment, a person passively accepts violence and absorbs the consequences of a situation. In the article

---

[175] Carsten K. W. De Dreu, "Productive Conflict," 9.
[176] Chris Corin, "Fighting Back or Biting Back?" 63.
[177] Chris Corin, "Fighting Back or Biting Back?" 62.
[178] Lynne Woehrle, "Gender Studies," 49.

"Anti-lesbian Intellectual Harassment in the Academy," Greta Gaard provides examples of the ramifications of this passive violence in the case of harassment:

> ...negative effects on work performance and career advancement... serious mental health consequences of victimization, including sleep disturbances and nightmares, headaches, diarrhea, uncontrollable crying, agitation and restlessness, increased use of drugs, and deterioration in personal relationships.[179]

Both avoidance and the potential result of passive violence leave the underlying problems unaffected, structures unchanged, and the conflict in a latent form. The negative consequences of avoiding conflict, such as those mentioned above, usually are also hidden and not addressed.

When discussion fails in academia, often those who remain unheard develop covert coping mechanisms. For those interested in maintaining the status quo while remaining in academia, such responses have a great deal of appeal. These quiet means of managing with the problem at hand are comfortable for others in academic system. These coping mechanisms do not "rock the boat" by challenging the root causes of the perceived injustice or question the structures in academia that maintain silence about injustice. They keep the conflict or oppression hidden from public view. However, they may enable a party to quietly deal with some of the symptoms of the conflict that are most negatively affecting them. Anne Donnellon and Deborah M. Kolb write:

> Those who feel their lack of power often deal with conflict in the few ways that remain open to them... Given the limited possibilities to air conflicts that arise from gender and race, it is quite likely that members of minority groups make extensive use of these [private] spaces to network and commiserate about problems they share in common. While these possibilities may be individually gratifying, unless they get introduced into the public discourse, they have the effect of perpetuating existing practices that give rise to problems in the first place.[180]

Sometimes these subversive coping mechanisms are referred to as passive-aggressive responses. In there book *Conflict: From Theory to Action*, Roxane

---

[179] Greta Gaard, "Anti-lesbian Intellectual Harassment in the Academy," 119.
[180] Anne Donnellon and Deborah M. Kolb, "Constructive for Whom?" 174, note 2.

S. Lulofs and Dudley D. Cahn write, "When people engage in passive-aggressive communication, they do not openly and directly stand up for their interests, concerns, or rights but attempt to get what they want by underhanded means."[181] Examples of such coping mechanisms are plentiful. Lesbians in academia have developed some such means of dealing with heterosexism and anti-lesbianism in academia. Carolyn Britton writes, "For many lesbians, the only feasible strategy is non-disclosure of their lesbianism, rather than risking the problems of being an 'out' lesbian in a homophobic organization."[182]

The problem with such coping mechanisms is that by only minimally addressing the worst of the symptoms, the actual disease, so to speak, is left to rear its head again. Women in academia provide many examples of such creative veiled coping mechanisms that do little to remedy the root problem. Carolyn Britton writes about how women in research are coping with the masculine culture of research:

> One coping strategy which some women adopt is the position of honorary male, which involves avoiding identification with other women and adopting male criteria of success. Another possibility is simply to work harder to achieve recognition, to overcome the invisibility barrier and/or the lack of support they may encounter. These clearly have advantages for some women and may enable them to develop successful research careers, but will do nothing to support other women or to change the research culture which disadvantages women.[183]

The second major drawback is the lack of accountability that subversive coping mechanisms present to those who are believed to be at least partially responsible for the problem at hand. Covert coping mechanisms tend to attempt to minimise the superficial symptoms that are currently facing those developing the coping mechanisms without causing a public fuss or putting their users at risk of being further ostracised or oppressed. In doing so, these responses do

---

[181] Roxane S. Lulofs and Dudley D. Cahn, *Conflict: From Theory to Action*, 214.
[182] Carolyn Britton, "Supporting Women in Research," 71.
[183] Carolyn Britton, "Supporting Women in Research," 70.

not hold accountable those whose behaviour is oppressive/silencing or enables oppression/silencing to continue. This is in stark contrast to surfacing the conflict, in which the actions of all involved are pushed onto display, where parties are far more likely to be held accountable for their actions.

The final way to deal with a latent conflict is to bring it to the surface, that is, turn it into a visible conflict. Latent conflict in academia is usually transformed into an overt conflict by means of one – or a combination – of the following: naming or acknowledging the conflict; creating opportunities for discussion; or incompatible behaviour.

A latent conflict can be surfaced by naming it. This means that the conflict is identified, pointed out, or acknowledged privately or publicly, either by a party in a conflict, or by an outside, third party. Naming of a conflict can be done via many approaches, including education campaigns (fliers, teach-ins, articles, information tables, presentations etc), media press releases, by formally acknowledging the conflict at conferences or meetings, or by establishing that there is a need for a policy or procedure to address the conflict. This singling out or airing of a conflict can challenge denial and lack of awareness that may be keeping a conflict latent. Having one voice speak out also gives others space or 'permission' of sorts to act or to speak out too.[184]

When done publicly in a case where someone or some organization has been acting less than honourably, this is sometimes referred to as *whistleblowing*. Brian Martin writes, "Whistleblowing is speaking out in the public interest, typically to expose corruption or dangers to the public or

[184] Cass R. Sunstein, *Why Societies Need Dissent*, 26.

environment."[185] Carsten K. W. De Dreu and Nanne K. De Vries provide another definition:

> *Whistle blowing* is a form of dissent which may be defined as the disclosure by former or current members of an organization of illegal, immoral or illegitimate practices under the control of their employers, to persons or organizations that may be able to undertake action.[186]

One famous whistle blower is Mordechai Vanunu, who released information about Israeli nuclear weapons and received a lengthy jail sentence as a result.[187]

Publicly acknowledging a conflict can challenge a latent conflict in powerful ways. Whistleblowing or other means of openly naming a conflict not only challenges denial and lack of awareness, but also can increase accountability and undermine the convenience of ignoring a conflict. When others know a party is aware of a problem, it is difficult for that party to disregard the troubles without increased negative consequences. The party is no longer able to hide behind the veil of excuse of not knowing about the conflict. Public awareness of the conflict can pressure a party to re-evaluate the benefits of continued suppression of a conflict, to find the resources to deal with it and/or to take the initiative to act. The external pressure that comes from being held accountable publicly can contribute to the shifting of the power balance in a situation. Adam Curle identifies both the increase in awareness about a conflict situation and the balancing of power as necessary elements of resolving a conflict.[188]

There are many ways that latent conflict is named in academia. For instance, Avril Butler and Mel Landells conducted research on sexual

---

[185] Brian Martin, "Whistleblowing and Nonviolence," 15.
[186] Carsten K. W. De Dreu and Nanne K. De Vries, "Minority Dissent in Organizations," 73 (italics in original text).
[187] Felice Cohen-Joppa, "Vanunu's Release Date Nears," 9.
[188] Adam Curle, *Making Peace*, 183.

harassment in academia. Part of the goal of their research outlined in the article "Taking Offence: Research as Resistance to Sexual Harassment in Academia" was to document cases of sexual harassment in an English university "to challenge attempts to treat sexual harassment as an occasional, isolated phenomenon."[189] Organisations such as *Scholars at Risk* speak out publicly when the academic freedom or human rights of scholars are violated worldwide.[190] Unions, such as NAFTHE, issue press releases when academics experience labour conflict.[191] Scientists have spoken out against the role that scientists play in proliferating nuclear weaponry and governments' arms policies.[192]

A latent conflict can sometimes be addressed if an opportunity or an environment that is conducive to discussion is made. By directing resources towards the creation of a forum in which a latent conflict can safely be explored, awareness about the conflict can be increased and options for addressing it can be explored. Though this is not an approach to take when substantial shifts in power balance need to occur, it can have some impact on power imbalance in that raising awareness can empower the oppressed and organising or working together can also be empowering. Sometimes opportunities for discussion take the form of constructing a permanent structure to deal with a certain type of on-going latent conflict, such as incorporating a mediation programme into the universities channels of dealing with conflict. Alternatively, opportunities for discussion can be a one time event or meeting

[189] Avril Butler and Mel Landells, "Taking Offence," 156.
[190] Robert Quinn, "Defending 'Dangerous' Minds," 1.
[191] See www.natfhe.org.uk for examples of press releases.
[192] For examples of actions taken by individual scientists, see Herbert York and Allen Greb, "Scientists as Advisors to Governments," 95.

to concentrate on a specific concern. Anne Donnellon and Deborah M. Kolb provide an example where an ombudsman, after research both subtle and overt ways that an academic institution was creating an environment that was hostile to gays and lesbians, "was able to work with the entire department to design a set of interventions that enabled them to air and discuss these issues and to set up a process for situations that might arise in the future."[193]

Conflict can remain latent as long as the behaviours of involved parties continue to be compatible. Incompatible behaviours cause confrontation and an escalation in the conflict, thus pushing latent conflict to the surface. They disturb the status quo by breaking norms and intensify conflict. Many forms of non-violent action, including academic boycotting, are forms of incompatible behaviour. Simon Fisher et al. write:

> Sometimes it is necessary to intensify conflict. For example, when people are doing well and have enough power and resources to meet their needs, they do not notice, or refuse to acknowledge, that others are disadvantaged or marginalised. In this case, conflict needs to be introduced or brought into the open so that the necessary changes can be brought about.[194]

Like conflict naming, these types of actions challenge denial or a lack of awareness. They make suppressing conflict at a minimum inconvenient and, at times, completely impossible. Incompatible behaviours also have the potential to affect power balances in relationships in a way that creating opportunities for discussion do not. Such incompatible behaviours are forms of non-cooperation or non-violent intervention according to Gene Sharp's definitions, such as strikes, boycotts, walk-outs and sit-ins.

* * *

[193] Anne Donnellon and Deborah M. Kolb, "Constructive for Whom?" 170.
[194] Simon Fisher et al., *Working with Conflict*, 5.

In order to fully appreciate the context and use of academic boycotting, there are a series of myths that needs to be discredited. Discussion is not the only norm for addressing conflict in academia; there are other unmentioned malevolent means also used. Though these means may deal with the symptoms and ensure the conflict remains hidden, they seldom fully, effectively address the conflict, particularly when structural violence or power imbalance is occurring. These covert means, and their consequences, are frequently inconsistent with the so-called "norms of academic discussion" or "norms of academic freedom." The lack of discourse about these unspoken norms for dealing with latent conflict does not mean that they are not prevalent and significant.

In academia, the means of addressing latent conflict, including covert coping mechanisms and continued conflict suppression, are ineffective ways to addressing conflict. In order for latent conflict to be addressed completely, it needs to be surfaced so that it can be attend to using more effective explicit norms, including discussion and official bureaucratic systems, which are usually used to address overt conflict. When the reasons for academic boycotting, discussed in chapter 1, are compared to the types of latent conflict found in academia, one discovers that most of the reasons for academic boycotting are forms of latent conflict, the precise form of conflict that needs to be surfaced in order to be dealt with completely and satisfactorily. As a form of incompatible behaviour, one of the roles of academic boycotting is to surface these latent conflicts. In addition, academic boycotts are able to perform other functions that support the complete and effective resolution of conflict via functional discussion.

Akin to other forms of non-violent actions, academic boycotts are a type of incompatible behaviour that, among other purposes, is used to force latent conflict to the surface by confronting lack of awareness, denial, and power imbalance. Despite the fact that academic boycotts can be very powerful, they are ineffective at conveying complex messages and contending with nuances in situations, tasks better suited to discussion. Though critics of academic boycotting contend that it is the antithesis of discussion, in fact, one must struggle to separate academic boycotts from discussion. While it is theoretically possible to have a successful academic boycott without discussion, it is practically almost impossible due to the stringent requirements that the boycotted, boycotters, and the conflict must meet if a boycott is to be successful without discussion. If these requirements are *not* met, discussion is required at some stage(s) to serve one or more of the functions that discussion can perform. In practice, there is no case known to the author in which it has been demonstrated that a goal, other than discussion, has been achieved directly as a result of academic boycotting. Some cases required less discussion then others, but all required at least minimal discussion. In some cases, a further goal is reach via discussion; in other instances, discussion is the final goal. In each case in which the boycott was able to achieve any of the boycotters' desired outcomes, discussion served a particular purpose or set of purposes.

This dependency on discussion is a result of the number of roles discussion can serve in a conflict and in a non-violent action such as boycotting. A boycott or other form of non-violent action cannot accomplish many of these tasks. A summary of the key roles that discussion can play in an academic

boycott is presented below. In some specific situations, discussion can take on exceptional roles not covered in this inventory.

Many forms of non-violent action, such as protests, strikes, vigils, symbols, and boycotts can powerfully send simple messages. However, they are poor means of transmitting complex ideas and have few built-in mechanisms for receiving feedback from the other party. When dense or multifaceted issues must be addressed, actions that involve discussion are a far better means of engaging. These can include actions such as meetings, group gatherings, lobbying, mediation etc. Discussion is well suited to conveying complex ideas and receiving feedback.

Discussion can be used transmit messages to the boycotted in order to clarifying what the boycotters want the boycotted to do, how they want them to do it, and why. Discussion is a two-way mechanism, thus discussion is often imperative when conveying these messages because the boycotters can received feedback ensuring that the boycotted correctly understands their request. The boycotted can also ask clarifying questions that would otherwise be impossible during isolation of a pure boycott. All of these elements are missing when an ultimatum is presented, but discussion is absent.

Sometimes the boycotted have valuable information from which the boycotters could benefit. Discussion can enable the boycotters to learn from the boycotted. The boycotted are unlikely to offer up volumes of useful information in response to an ultimatum for an academic boycott. As a result, often this information can only gain during discussion.

Academic boycotting is a form of non-violent non-cooperation, a more coercive tactic than a persuasive one. However, boycotters can potentially

persuade the boycotted to take action during discussion, even mid-way through an academic boycott. Situations such as these demonstrate that the lines between persuasion and non-cooperation can be flexible and moveable.

Discussion with the boycotted and third parties can provide the boycotters with feedback about whether the boycott is having the desired effects and whether it is having undesirable consequences. Without some other type of reliable method of gaining feedback, direct discussion can serve as a valuable tool in this respect for the boycotters. It allows the boycotters to make necessary adjustments in their approach if the boycott or its fallout is not going as intended. If the boycott is proceeding on track, it encourages the boycotters to continue in that vain.

Discussion can also be an opportunity for the boycotters to help the boycotted take the actions that the boycotters desire. For instance, boycotters may be able to provide the boycotted with information that they need or if the boycotted need to justify their actions to someone else, the boycotters may be able to provide them with the justification they need to take action.

Discussion can increase the awareness of third parties about a conflict situation and why boycotters are choosing to boycott. This can help garnish support for an academic boycott both from the general public, from potential boycotters, and other potential allies. The increased awareness arising from discussion can also increase pressure on the boycotted to act.

Discussion can appear at a variety of stages, as part of the short-, mid- or long-term outcomes, and/or as the final goal. For instance, discussion could be part of the mid-term outcome while the eventual goal is policy change, or the final goal could be entering back into a collaborative relationship that includes

ongoing discussion. However, academic boycotts can only be used to achieve discussion and then discussion must be used to gain any further aim.

Academic boycotting is not the only type of non-violent action that requires discussion for successful use. Theorists and practitioners of all types of non-violent action need to evaluate the roles that discussion can play with non-violent action; many of the ones discussed above apply to other forms of non-violent action. Thus, this list of roles may serve as a guideline for examining the roles of discussion in terms of other types of non-violent action and evaluating the level of need for discussion in the strategy for a non-violent action.

While some types of discussion about the process of boycotting are useful during an academic boycott, academic boycotting can help create an environment that is conducive to fruitful discussion about the concern at hand. As seen in chapter 3.1, there are a set of requirements that are necessary for discussion to occur about a conflict, including interconnected of parties, acknowledgement of the conflict by parties, the ability to engage, adequate communication skills, and a reason to engage. There are also a number of barriers to successful discussion: inability; noise; lack of awareness; denial; manipulative tactics; external interference; fear; and disengagement for another reason. Academic boycotts have the ability to create some of the required conditions, but are unable to improve others. As well, academic boycotting can inhibit some of the barriers to discussion, but are futile in the presence of others. It is vital to understand these strengths and limitations when considering academic boycotting as part of a strategy.

As previously examined, non-violent confrontation can be used to bring conflict to the surface, and thus enabling the issue to be address more fully and satisfactorily. Academic boycotts are a particularly effect form of confrontation as they are often seen as a sharp contravention of academic norms. The controversy that surrounds them makes them clearly incompatible behaviour and extremely effective at drawing attention to the fact that there is a conflict of some type present. Unfortunately, at times this controversy can overshadow the issues that are the reason for the boycott. This ability to surface conflict is fitting considering that many of problems that result in academic boycotting are latent in academia, including racism, homophobia, internal politics etc. By surfacing the conflict, academic boycotts may be able to challenge denial and apathy, while increasing accountability. Once a conflict is in the public eye, it encourages parties to engage in a honourable way and take responsibility for their actions. It becomes more difficult for the boycotted to remain apathetic or in a comfortable state of denial when the problem visible and demanding attention. As the general public or others within the academic community find out about the boycott, it becomes increasingly difficult for the boycotted to deny their awareness of the conflict. Academic boycotts may also be able to reduce manipulative tactics by exposing the very tactics that the boycotted would prefer remain hidden. By raising the ante, academic boycotting informs the boycotted about the seriousness of boycotters and their concern.

Academic boycotts can also emphasize the interdependence between the boycotters and the boycotted. This reminder about the importance of their relationship with the boycotters may give the boycotted reason to participate in discussion. The problems caused by the withholding of communication during

the boycott may also reinforce for the boycotted the importance of maintaining communication with the boycotters in the future. Academic boycotting can also increase interdependence. In the case of the Technical University of British Columbia, there was little or no interdependence between the university and the lecturers associations until the associations called upon their members to boycott the university. Thus, via the associations' members, the university became more dependent on the associations and the university were given more reason to engage with the associations.

Academic boycotts increase the costs of not engaging and bring these costs to the boycotted's attention. By intensifying the costs of not engaging, academic boycotts give the boycotted a reason to engage. An academic boycott may also give the boycotted political justification to engage. The boycotted may be able to resort to telling those to whom they are accountable, "We have to enter talks because of the boycott."

When used appropriately as part of a strategy and implemented correctly, academic boycotts have the potential to help produce conditions that promote discussion. However, there are certain tasks that academic boycotts can seldom, if ever accomplish. As state before, academic boycotts are blunt and cannot be expected to take the place of discussion as they are not suited to tasks such as conveying complex messages. Academic boycotts cannot change the communication skill-level of either party. They cannot directly increase financial, logistical, or legal resources to enable discussion, but academic boycotts may encourage others to allocate such resources for fostering discussion.

While academic boycotts can contribute to the creation of fertile ground for discussion, they cannot guarantee that the discussion will be successful. The discussion that follows an academic boycott is a matter that must be considered and executed carefully in its own right. Academic boycotters cannot control all possible factors, including the response of the boycotted or third parties, external factors, human error within the boycott, unintended harm, and post-boycott discussion. This is partially what makes academic boycotts risky and a method that is only attempted after less precarious methods such as discussion fail. Theorists and practitioners of all methods of non-violence that are used to create the conditions required for discussions must keep this limitation in mind; academic boycotts are not the only form of non-violent action that, even if successful in establishing the conditions needed for discussion, cannot guarantee a productive results from the ensuing discussion. This distinction is often overlooked in non-violence theory, thus sometimes the non-violent action is accused of failing when, in fact, the action was successful, but the discussion was impotent.

Criteria for the Successful Use of Academic Boycotts

Chapter 5

There is no broad analysis of what academic boycotts require in order to be effective and guidelines for how academic boycotts should be implemented have been absent from non-violence theory. It is not enough to have an understanding about their theoretical limitations and potential (i.e. that they can only be useful for creating the conditions for discussion after discussion has failed). Theorists and practitioners also need to know how variables in their execution impose new limitations or maximise potential. The criteria and guidelines presented in this chapter fill in this gap in theory.

The analysis behind this chapter was constructed through the combining of sanctions theory, economic boycotting theory and implementation practices, non-violence theory, and social movement theory with the careful study of patterns in 59 academic boycotts. The theory developed about the required criteria for academic boycotting was then merged with effective practices found in cases of academic boycotting and broader project development and evaluation theory to construct the guidelines for implementation.

Much of what is presented in this chapter appears obvious and simple. However, despite its apparently straightforward nature, understanding of the factors indicated here is absent from academic boycotting theory and most academic boycotts fail because they are missing one or more of the required factors or one or more of the steps for implementation. As this chapter presents a methodical, logical way of strategising about and implementing a

form of non-violent action, the required criteria and procedures for implementation here have value beyond academic boycotting. While this framework was developed specifically for academic boycotting, much of it is also applicable to other types of non-violent action. Thus, it can serve as practical guidelines or a conceptual framework and approach for strategising about and implementing many other types of non-violent action. This chapter serves as a rare link between the wisdom of practitioners of non-violent action and non-violent theorists.

The case of the Technical University of British Columbia demonstrates that academic boycotts can be an effective method for getting another party to engage in meaningful discussion. The theory that academic boycotts can be used to move parties from dysfunctional or nonexistent discussion to functional discussion can only be realised if a set of criteria are met; an academic boycott may be rendered ineffective if even one of these criterion are not fulfilled. Despite appearing straightforward, academic boycotts are in fact complex and only thrive under particular circumstances.

This chapter will explore a wide range of conditions that are necessary for most academic boycotts. These compulsory criteria for all academic boycotts range from more abstract factors such as adequate ethical acceptance to concrete, measurable factors, such as sufficient allies and support. It will conclude with an examination of the steps required to implement a successful academic boycott.

In addition to those factors presented, there may be other factors that are required for certain academic boycotts to be successful that will not be explored in this chapter. These additional special requirements may be a result

of uniqueness in a particular boycotting situation, such as the relationship between boycotter and boycotted, external interference, or the power structure within a particular academic situation.

Sometimes academic boycotts are ineffective because they are simply the wrong method for a given situation; the criteria for a successful boycott cannot be met and there are other options for action that would be more effective. If boycotters are struggling to meet the decisive factors needed for an academic boycott to thrive, most likely, they need to return to the drawing board to re-evaluate other options. It is possible that when deciding to call an academic boycott, initiators of the boycott had not given other methods or approaches due consideration. What Janice Love says about sanctions, can also be applied to boycotts: "Such measures cannot be assessed in a vacuum; their costs and benefits should be calculated in relation to those associated with other alternatives available in the given situation."[1]

One of the more prominent individuals to suggest this is Noam Chomsky. While referring in particular to boycotting in the context of Israeli academia, Chomsky argues that academics have better alternatives to academic boycott at their disposal. "Academics in the West are uniquely privileged. Unlike their counterparts in the much of the world, they have innumerable ways to oppose crimes and atrocities, without fear of repression or worse."[2] With the high risk, ethical controversy and long list of requirements for an effective academic boycott, it is vital to be certain that an academic boycott is the best method available before embarking on one.

---

[1] Janice Love, "The Potential Impact of Economic Sanctions Against South Africa," 95.
[2] Noam Chomsky, quoted in Philip Fine, "Chomsky attacks boycott of Israel."

Non-violence theory offers a number of reasons to engage first in discussion when conflict arises before attempting other more confrontational methods of action. Discussion may address the conflict with less chance of escalating the conflict and is less likely to have unintended destructive consequences. Discussion is less likely to cause harm to the relationship and in fact, discussion often develops the relationship. Details and complexities are best dealt with via discussion. Discussion also harbours the potential for win/win solutions, in which both parties are able to meet their needs or desired outcomes. Even if initial attempts at discussion fail, they can open up channels for later discussion.

Discussion is also a norm of academia. As discussed in chapter 4, overt conflict in academia is often addressed with discussion and thus it becomes even more critical when dealing with conflict in academia to exhaust all options for discussion before attempting more confrontational methods of addressing the conflict. Conversion via discussion, not coercion is the norm in academic realms. Whenever these norms are breached, ethical controversy results. Critics often accuse those who breach these norms as infringing on academic freedom by interfering with academic discussion. Boycotters and others who engage in more confrontational means of engaging a conflict are often asked, "Why did you not try discussion?" This can be seen in the case of the recent AUT boycotts against Israeli universities, where one of the boycotted, Bar Ilan University, wondered why the AUT did not enter into discussion with Bar Ilan prior to calling the boycott.[3] Such ethical controversy, as discussed in chapter

[3] Yosef Yeshurun, letter to Brenda M Gourley, May 22, 2005.

1, can overshadow the purpose of the boycott and may interfere with the successful use of the boycott as a result.

The boycotted must, in some meaningful way, be dependant on the boycotters in order for a boycott to work. During a boycott, boycotters withdraw support from the boycotted in order to get the boycotted to take some action that the boycotted desire. This cannot occur if there is no relationship of dependence on the boycotters. In some cases, this reliance is obvious. For instance, a university may depend on funding or information from the boycotters. In other cases, this relationship is less apparent. Sometimes, the boycotted simply depend on the boycotters to remain silent, to be unobtrusive observers. The boycotted need the boycotters to be latent allies that do not disturb the status quo and do not challenge their behaviour. Boycotters may have complied with this unspoken norm, but can apply a great deal of incentive for the boycotted to change their behaviour by threatening to or in reality withdrawing consent by breaking the silence. If the boycott is called, the boycotted are then dependent on the boycotters if the boycotted want to end the interference they are experiencing; only the boycotters can stop the burden they are placing on the boycotted.

Ethical issues, such as those discussed in chapter 1, can interfere with the use of boycotts in a number of ways. The three primary ways that ethics can affect a boycott are: when the controversy over the academic boycott overshadows the issue that one is attempting to address with the boycott; potential supporters or participants avoid involvement in the boycott because of the ethical issues involved; and a third-party intervenes in the academic boycott because they believe that it is in someway unethical.

Academic boycotts are contentious; sometimes the controversy of the call for an academic boycott becomes the heated topic of discussion, leaving the issue that it was suppose to rise in the dust. In situations such as these, even though the controversy of academic boycotting has been effective in getting public attention, it can overshadow its own purpose, thus rendering itself ineffective. This is not unlike political violence when the war or violence becomes the focus of attention as opposed to the original reason for engaging in the violence. In an era of sensationalized news coverage, the drama of war and violence is simply more entertaining and rating conducive than reflection and analysis on the root causes of the violence. In the realm of academic boycotting, this phenomenon can be seen in the current academic boycotts called against Israeli academics. There have been numerous outcries against the academic boycotts in various academic journals, including *The Scientist* and *Nature*, in the media, including *The Guardian, The Times Higher Education Supplement* and *Ha'aretz*, and on numerous websites.[4] While this controversy has caused a storm of media debate, the plight of the Palestinians – the reason for the boycotts – is overshadowed by the academic boycott itself.

Even if the ethical controversy does not reach the point of overshadowing the issue at hand, it is possible for the ethics of academic boycotts to cause people to shy away from becoming involved in boycott, resulting in reduced involvement. This may be because potential supporters for addressing the issue at hand find, for many different reasons, the academic boycott ethically problematic. As a result, they refuse to participate. Such non-

[4] For example, see Ron Evans, "Against the boycott of Israeli scientific institutions" at http://euclid.ucsd.edu/~revans/boycott.html or Bonnie Lipton, "The Cost of Boycott" at www.jewishjournal.com/home/print.php?id=9126.

involvement may simply be due to a desire to not have their name associated with controversy. It is possible that being associated with a controversial issue could result in personal or professional ramifications; an academic may not want to take those risks. For instance, a letter to the editor of *The Scientist*, hints at boycotting those who are part of the academic boycott against Israel. Jack Cohen suggests that "If someone were asked to review a paper by a boycott organizer Stephen [sic] Rose, they might refuse to do so… So the boycotters should be aware, such actions are likely to boomerang."[5] Steven and Hilary Rose, both involved in the initiation of an academic boycott against Israel, discuss the consequences of signing their letter to boycott. "Many of the signatories of our letter are receiving torrents of hate e-mail, especially if they are Jewish, being accused of everything from anti-semitism to support for terrorism."[6]

While ethical controversy can discourage potential supporters from becoming involved, it can also cause outside parties that are otherwise external to become involved to the detriment of the academic boycott. These outside parties intervene because they believe that academic boycotting is in some way unethical or the reason for which the academic boycott is being implemented is unjust. Such involvement can directly sabotage the boycott or can intensify the above-mentioned controversy that can overshadow the reason for the boycott or discourage people from becoming involved in the boycott. There have been numerous examples of this in the current academic boycotts against Israel. One more formal attempt at intervening in the boycotts was reported on by Helena

[5] Jack Cohen, letter to the editor, 11.
[6] Steven Rose and Hilary Rose, letter to the editor, *Nature*, 221.

Flusfeder in *The Times Higher Education Supplement*, "Israeli academics are to set up a forum to fight the international academic boycott of Israeli institutions."[7] Academic boycotts are more vulnerable to this type of intervention than other types of less public forms of non-violent action.

There is no way to calculate when an academic boycott will be "ethically acceptable enough" to benefit from the public attention controversy brings while not having the uproar overshadow the purpose of the boycott, prevent supporters from fleeing, or keep potential opponents from obstructing the boycott. The factors at play are multifaceted and complex. Though boycotters have used a variety of approaches to reduce the likelihood of ethical issues causing interference with a boycott, it is not a science. Ethical controversy still has the ability to derail a boycott even if boycotters take precautions, such as carefully selecting criteria to reduce harm or dodge moral landmines or getting the support of the affected to lend legitimacy to the campaign. Despite the most valiant attempts to be transparent and educate the public about the potential gains of an academic boycott, there is no guarantee that the ethical controversy of the boycott will be reduced. The most that boycotters can do is take every precaution they can while implementing the boycott and, if the method still proves to be too problematic or the issue to controversial to address publicly without an eruption, consider alternate forms of non-violent action.

There are three distinct distances from the source of the offensive behaviour at which a boycott can occur: primary; secondary; and tertiary. There is little written about such degrees of boycotting in academic boycotting,

[7] Helena Flusfeder, "Israelis unite to fight boycott."

but Gene Sharp[8] and Harry W. Laidler[9] address them in the context of economic boycotting. The boycott can be called directly against the group, person, organisation, or government whose behaviour the boycotters wish to challenge. This is a primary boycott. An example of a primary academic boycott would be the boycott of the Technical University of British Columbia (TechBC) in Canada in the late 1990s.[10] In this case, the boycotters – lecturers associations and their members – directly boycotted TechBC to pressure TechBC into negotiating a change in the internal governing structure TechBC. The lecturers' associations were objecting to the policies and structure of TechBC, the very party whom they were directly targeting. There was no intermediary or boycotting of a third party. Though the provincial government was informed of the boycott, they were neither targeted by the boycott nor otherwise directly involved in the boycott. These factors make this a clear-cut case of primary academic boycotting.

Boycotts can also be removed by one degree. They can be called against people who support the group, person, organisation, or government whose behaviour the boycotters wish to challenge. This is done in hopes that the boycotted will, as a result of their frustration with or problems resulting from the boycott against them, take action to influence that person or group committing the objectionable action to change their behaviour. This is a called a secondary boycott. Secondary boycotting can also be seen as directing a boycott at one of the pillars of a building in hopes that the removal of that one pillar will cause the building to shake. Secondary boycotts are more complex

[8] Gene Sharp, *The Politics of Nonviolent Action: The Method of Nonviolent Action,* 220-221.
[9] Harry W. Laidler, *Boycotts and the Labor Struggle*, 64-65.
[10] This case will be discussed in detail later in chapter 7.

than primary boycotts. There is theoretically two ways that secondary boycotts can be manifested in academia. Firstly, a secondary boycott could be exclusively in academia; a boycott of one sector of academia could be used to pressure a second sector of academia into changing their behaviour or policies. There are no known unambiguous cases of this occurring in academia. However, there have been cases that are partially primary, partially secondary cases of boycotting that are exclusively internal to academia. An example of such a hybrid primary/secondary boycott would be the boycotts that were called against universities accepting funding from the tobacco industry starting in the late 1990s in the U.K. Though it may have only been one department in a university that was accepting money from the tobacco industry, an organisation such as the Cancer Research Campaign would boycott the entire university. The part of the boycott that involved boycotting the department committing the perceived offence would be a primary boycott, while the boycotting of the remainder of the university, with the hopes that they would pressure the offending department, would be a secondary boycott.

The second type of secondary boycotting in academia is more prevalent. It is when academia is boycotted to challenge behaviour or policies outside of academia. This most often occurs when academia is seen as supporting a government that is perceived to be acting in an unjust way. The lines around this type of boycotting are unclear. If academia were understood as a part of the government, the examples presented here would technically be primary boycotts. However, academia is usually considered either an independent entity or at the very least, even if it is somehow interconnected with the government, academia is in one way or another separate or distinct from the other policies or

actions of a government. One example of using a secondary academic boycott to make change external to academia occurred in 1992 in China when several scientists that were to attend a conference boycotted the conference by refusing to attend. The change that these scientists wanted was not in academia, although the boycott was of academic conferences, including the International Congress of Entomology. The boycotters wanted to protest the repressive policies of the Chinese government. One boycotter states, "The Chinese government had crushed student protests in T[iananmen] Square. I believe that attending the ICE [International Congress of Entomology] would show political and financial support to the government."[11]

The most remote boycott is a tertiary boycott. It is an uncommon, distance form of boycotting. It is when the boycotters boycott a party who supports a second who supports the person or people who are committing the objectionable behaviour. It resembles removing the foundation stone that supports a pillar that holds up a building to shake a building. It is a less effective, more convoluted means of action then either primary or secondary boycotting. Jeff Leeuwenburg, by means of a letter in the *Library Association Record,* called such a boycott in July 1986.[12] Leeuwenburg was concerned that information on weapons research, which was transferred to South African embassies, universities etc. by librarians, supported South African weapons research and consequently, their arms industry; the South African arms industry, in turn, contributed the South Africa government's ability to suppress

[11] Marjorie A. Hoy, personal communication with the author (underlining in original text), January 2005.

[12] This case is complex and contains many grey areas. Depending on whether or not one distinguished academia from weapons research, weapons research from the arms industry, the arms industry from South African military/police, and/or South African arms use from state policy, it is possible to see this case as anywhere from a primary boycott to a four-times removed boycott.

people. As a result, Leeuwenburg suggested that librarians restrict information resources given to South Africa, emphasising information on the subject of weapons research. In his plea to his colleagues to boycott, Leeuwenburg stated:

> You may be in favour of a free flow of information, but what if the direct consequence[13] is facilitating death in the townships of South Africa or its neighbouring countries? The rapid growth of SA's arms industry depends to a significant extent on use of international research literature. Librarians have a real chance of restricting access to this material.[14]

This case shows how confusing and removed tertiary boycotts can become. It is difficult to know if it would even be possible for the withholding of information by librarians to weapons researcher would have any impact at all on South African state repression. This is one reason why it is preferable to call a boycott that is as directly connected to the objectionable behaviour as possible.

There are a number of reasons why primary boycotts are more likely to be effective than secondary or tertiary boycotts. Less direct boycotts (particularly tertiary boycotts) involve more variables and people, in particular people who are increasingly less responsible for the offensive behaviour. While they tend to be more time and resource demanding than primary boycotts, they are also inclined to lose their strength and message the more they are removed from the boycott. All of these factors combine usually make secondary and, even more so, tertiary boycotts less effective and ethically more problematic; they also make primary boycotts an attractive option.

---

[13] Although Leeuwenburg describes the consequences of providing arms information as "direct" to the oppression in townships, the consequence are most likely more accurately described as secondary or tertiary as the information itself was not causing the harm, but rather the information was used to construct arms that were then used to oppress.

[14] Jeff Leeuwenburg, letter to the editor, 328.

While any boycott is a demanding undertaking, implementing a secondary or tertiary boycott is a massive enterprise. Generally, they take time; the further removed the offenders are from the boycott, generally, the longer it takes for any effect to "trickle down" to them. Furthermore, they tend to be more resource and time intensive than primary boycotts as they involve more people, factors, uncertainty and risk. For instance, it takes resources to educate people about why the boycotters are boycotting one party if it's another party who is liable for the offence. It also takes more foresight, research and planning to strategise and work out a complex plan for action when there are many variables involved. The potentially shorter timeframe and reduction in required resources makes primary boycotting more feasible for many boycotters.

While reflecting on consumer boycotts, Harry W. Laidler writes, "Tertiary boycotts do exist, but they generally become weaker in proportion as they become more remote".[15] This is also true of academic boycotts. Absolutely all the pressure placed on the boycotted is not necessarily transferred to the next level, that is, to the offender in a secondary boycott or to the intermediate party and then the offender in a tertiary boycott. Most often, some of the force is either absorbed by the boycotted or otherwise lost. Sometimes, the boycotted cannot apply the same amount of pressure or the removal of the boycotted's support from the offender (or intermediate party and, in return the offender) does not have the same effect as the boycotter removing support from the boycotted. In this way, primary boycotts are superior in that the full force of the boycott is leaned directly against the

[15] Harry W. Laidler, *Boycotts and the Labor Struggle,* 164.

offender. Boycotters must consider this weakening of strength when strategising about secondary and tertiary boycotts.

The more direct the boycott, usually the greater the presence of clarity about what behaviour the boycott is challenging and who is responsible for changing that behaviour. When a boycott is primary, the boycotted is the offender; the offender is the one that the boycotter wants to force to take action. During the boycott, boycotters can directly pass the message about what action the boycotted is to take on to the boycotter. Though boycotts will always be blunt instruments, a primary boycott is as unmistakable as they can be. Secondary and tertiary boycotts make the waters murky and what clarity is present in primary boycotts is lost. It is difficult to successfully convey the message that a boycott of one party is to result in a change in another party's behaviour; it is even more challenge to make it happen.

When parties consider possible actions, they examine the potential effects of each action and whether it will lead to immediate, intermediate, and long-term outcomes that will enable them to achieve their ultimate goal. There are many factors that can influence the outcome of primary boycotts; secondary and tertiary boycotts introduce more human variables not found in primary boycotts that make predicting possible outcomes even more challenging.

Human behaviour can be difficult to predict. We can be impulsive, creative, intelligent, random, and illogical. We can also be stubborn, resilient, calculating and resourceful. The boycotted may find a way around the pressure or respond in some unforeseen way, either rational or otherwise. Secondary boycotts are filled with risk. The boycotted may or may not respond to the boycott in the way that the boycotters had hoped. Boycotters can be very

cautious and methodical about how they implement the boycott, but boycotters have no control over the kind of pressure that the boycotted may put on the second party, the committers of the offence. No matter how dedicated the boycotters are to non-violence, they have no assurance that the boycotted will not be violent towards the offenders. If the pressure applied to the boycotted is transferred as desired by the boycotters onto the offenders, there is no guarantee how the offenders will respond. A tertiary boycott only compounds these problems to the point that predicting a successful strategy is almost impossible. Strategising is not only problematic as a result of increased human variables, but also increased logistical obstacles. Direct boycotts generally have less potential for strategic error or failure due to human variables.

Along with more human variables affecting strategy, there are more logistical barriers that have the potential to interfere with the successful use of secondary and tertiary boycotts. It is simply a case of the more pieces at work in the system, the increased likelihood of one of them malfunctioning; secondary and tertiary boycotts have more opportunities for systemic or logistical failure than a primary boycott does. As boycotters do not have direct of control over how pressure is applied to each of the parties in the strategy during a secondary boycott and, even more so, during a tertiary boycott, they have less opportunity to prevent logistical problems. Factors beyond the boycotters' control, such as political events, weather, or the economy, can interfere at any time and with any party in a boycott; with an increase of parties and time during secondary and tertiary boycotts, there can be an increase in logistical problems of this sort. Thus, direct boycotts are less susceptible to logistical impediment.

Choosing the more direct boycott decreases the potential of harm to non-offending parties that is present in secondary and tertiary boycotts, thus reducing the likelihood of ethical concerns. In a primary boycott, pressure, in the form of a boycott, is only placed on the boycotted, who is also the one responsible for the offensive behaviour. In primary boycotts, it is possible for external, third parties to be harmed by the effects of the boycott. With secondary and tertiary boycotts, pressure is placed on parties who are not responsible for making the critical change in behaviour. A boycott is more ethically problematic when it burdening parties who are "innocent" of the offending deeds, even if they are beneficiaries of it in some way. The forcing of more people may also mean the potential increase of external, third party harm as more people may be exposed to one aspect or another of the boycott. Too much ethical controversy, as discussed earlier, can impede a boycott in a variety of ways. Though some commotion can be good for gaining media attention, the particular pointed ethical criticism of placing pressure on "innocent" parties that accompanies secondary and tertiary boycotts, the type that primary boycotts are not subject to, is not conducive to positive media attention, but rather is more likely to result in detrimental attacks. For instance, opponents of boycotts have argued that it is not justifiable to cause detriment to academia if it is a country's military or government that is committing the offence. Attacks such as these can be vicious and difficult to address.

Despite all of these factors, in some cases, it is simply impossible to implement a boycott, or some other form of non-violent action, at a primary level. For instance, international academics could not directly target the Chinese government after the Tiananmen Square violence repression of

students; they could however boycott a conference that was in some ways connected to the Chinese government although not officially part of the Chinese government. In these instances, it may be necessary to attempt a secondary or tertiary academic boycott. For the reasons presented above, they should be reserved as absolute last resort. Boycotters embarking upon a secondary academic boycott should be prepared for a substantial undertaking, requiring more time, resources and planning than a primary boycott. Boycotters attempting a tertiary academic boycott should hope for good luck and recognize that a tertiary boycott, with so many variables and complications, is not much more than a desperate shot in the dark.

In order to have an effective boycott, it is important to ensure the party who is boycotted is able – not necessarily willing, but able – to affect the desired change. The pressure of academic boycott may be able to confront and remove a lack of willingness to act, but it can ordinarily do very little to change the ability of a boycotter to take action. If the boycotter is unable to comply with the request, it is unlikely that the process of boycotting will change their ability and as a result, the boycott will be rendered impotent. It is simply unproductive to boycott someone who cannot affect the change that is required for the boycott to be removed. Such a boycott could also be considered unethical and/or violent as it pressures a party that is not able to take the action required to escape the coercion. Boycotters are able to make informed decisions about whether or not a demand can be feasibly met by the boycotted through careful research and consideration, but may find themselves changing their demands during the boycott if, as a result of monitoring and evaluation of the boycott, they find that the boycotted are unable to satisfy the demand.

Not only is information key to determining whether or not a boycotter will be able to satisfy the demands of the boycotters, information is necessary for almost all aspects of successfully developing and implementing an academic boycott. Some areas of essential information are discussed later the research segment of the steps for implementing academic boycotts section at the end of this chapter.

Gene Sharp provides extensive analysis of the information needed to successfully struggle non-violently in the appendices of his book *Waging Nonviolent Struggle: 20th Century Practice and 21st Century Potential.* The six main areas that Sharp investigates in detail are: the general conflict situation; the issues at stake and the objectives of both parties to the conflict; the opponent group; the non-violent struggle group and dependency balances. Sharp writes, "On the basis of the information and the understanding produced by such an examination, the nonviolent struggle group will be better equipped to prepare wise strategies to guide the conduct of the conflict."[16]

In addition, it is particularly important to seek the opinions of those who will be affected but are not the target of the boycott. They may have insights about the potential impact of a boycott that others may not; their input may be critical in determining whether or not a boycott should be implemented in light of potential harm.

In addition to providing information, those who are affected, but not boycotted, can lend legitimacy to a boycott. In fact, along with respected and recognised community and international organisations, the affected may be essential for giving the boycott more legitimacy and gaining public support for

[16] Gene Sharp, *Waging Nonviolent Struggle*, 528.

the boycott. What David Cortright writes about international sanctions, can also be applied to academic boycotts, "When credible civil society groups and human rights organizations in the targeted country support international sanctions, the moral legitimacy and likely political effectiveness of those measures are enhanced."[17] An example of this occurring with boycotts would be the support given by the ANC to the boycotts of South Africa during apartheid.[18]

Diverse, committed allies who are equipped with a variety of skills, connections and perspectives are indispensable to having an effective boycott. Having the right allies and supporters not only lends legitimacy to the campaign, but also can help with information gathering, implementation, partnership or coalition building, publicity, political action, problem solving, in addition to the actual act of boycotting. Therefore, it is important that the right players are at the table. It is necessary that they be committed to a possibly long campaign, as academic boycotts can potentially linger for a very long time, although more people can be added if needed at any point during the process.

Despite having the right allies and support, there are countless situational factors that can impact an academic boycott, including: resources; information; other actions occurring simultaneously; political events; natural disasters; media coverage; ideologies; the economy; religious, cultural or social factors; systemic limitations or structural influence; academic norms; and conventions around conflict. Certain factors cannot be foreseen or prevented; a number of them are beyond the control of the boycotters and cannot been

[17] David Cortright and George A Lopez, *The Sanctions Decade*, 21.
[18] A complete discussion of the academic boycotts against South Africa can be found in chapter 6.

changed even as they affect the boycott. In such situations, boycotters can only act within their means to maximize on the potential (or reduce the harm) of a given situation.

On the contrary, several factors can be anticipated, which can either lead to the decision not to boycott or be planned for during the preparation for and implementation of an academic boycott. There are various ways that such factors can be discovered in advance. For instance, boycotts do not affect all cultures the same nor do all cultures affect boycotts in the same way; in some cultures, for example, interdependence is culturally important and isolating someone is considered far harsher than in a culture that values independence. If boycotters familiarize themselves with the culture in which they are working, they will be better able to proceed in an appropriate and ethical manner according to the norms of a culture. A second example could be how boycotters can extensively investigate how the system that surrounds the boycott works in order to better predict who and what they will be affecting with the boycott; they could solicit information from as many reliable and diverse sources as possible in order to ensure that they are making well-informed decisions about the boycott.

The careful selection of criteria for an academic boycott can limit the burden of some situational, ethical, strategic, and logistical factors. Boycotts can be limited to exclude or widened to include various aspects of academia. Some theorists and practitioners of boycotts suggest that boycotts can be either comprehensive or selective in their target. In a consumer boycott, a selective boycott may mean only boycotting certain products, limiting the boycott to specified days, or limiting the boycott to a particular region. Comprehensive

boycotts are broader and all encompassing, such as all products from the boycotted company. With academic boycotting, unlike with consumer boycotting, it is often difficult to make such clear distinctions.

Some academics believe that boycotts that are more discriminating and limiting in their boundaries are in fact more powerful than boycotts with broader scopes. For instance, William Cobbett writes, "Those proposing a selective boycott argue that if effectively and representatively administered, its impact is potentially more powerful than a total boycott."[19] Others criticise broad-stroke approaches to boycotts and suggest that only people, institutions, or organisations that practice apartheid or support oppression or occupation should be boycotted and that those who speak out for justice should be supported.

On the other hand, boycotts that are more selective in whom they boycott are in return criticised as requiring "thought policing". Michael Davis provides a concrete example of how the questions of implementation and "thought policing" might play out in an academic boycott. Davis asks of the academic boycott Primoratz called for in Serbia, "We must, for example, consider whether the boycott should require that each interlibrary loan request from the University of Belgrade include a statement of the patron's position on Greater Serbia."[20]

In South Africa, a more selective, pointed form of boycotting was implemented. F.W. Lancaster and Lorraine Haricombe write about some of the criticisms of selective boycotting that were discovered in the South Africa case.

---

[19] William Cobbett, "The Tactics of Academic Boycott," 39.
[20] Michael Davis, "Academic Boycotts."

"This approach was also severely criticized both because of the practical problems of implementation and because it implicitly endorsed the idea that political views are valid determinants of who should attend scholarly meetings, whose work should be published, and so on."[21] Others challenge this view; they believe that there are ways of contending with these concerns. Neville Alexander, for one, explains:

> All anti-apartheid academics and intellectual activists should band together in academic staff associations explicitly opposed to the regime and committed to the eradication of apartheid. The associations would be mandated, as appropriate, to invite foreign scholars to South African universities or to prevent them from coming. The boycott should not be a suicidal weapon cutting off all communication between the progressive academic community in the rest of the world and ourselves living in South Africa.[22]

Others advocate for more comprehensive, all-inclusive boycotts in order to avoid such concerns.

One could argue that the creation of two such discrete categories is too simplistic and of limited use. Sometimes, callers of boycotts challenge the dichotomy of such labels a devise a boycott that falls into the grey area between these two categories. Igor Primoratz in his call for an academic boycott of Serbia said, "While this boycott should be as comprehensive and thorough as possible in terms of what it covers, it should also be selective in terms of whom it covers." Primoratz believed that academics that had publicly condemned and protested Serbia's action should be exempt from the boycott and that this group was such "a tiny and conspicuous minority" that it would easy to distinguish them from their colleagues.[23]

However, the underlying notion that these theorists and practitioners offer may be of use if the over-simplified categories of selective vs.

---

[21] F.W. Lancaster and Lorraine Haricombe, "The Academic Boycott of South Africa."
[22] Neville Alexander, "Academic Boycotts: Some Reflections on the South African Case."
[23] Igor Primoratz, "Boycott of Serbian Academics."

comprehensive are disregarded. At the heart of their argument, they are suggesting that it is important that the boundaries of who and what is included (and excluded) in an academic boycott are carefully selected and defined. Despite all of this debate about the selectiveness of decisive factors, there are a few vital questions that instead should be considered. Who is able to make the necessary changes? How can they be boycotted while excluding, to the best of the boycotters' ability, those who cannot act and are superfluous? How should those who can affect the required change be boycotted in a way that will produce the desired results by meeting all of the other criteria for an effective boycott? What manifestations of academic boycotts will be utilised?

Unlike some other forms of non-violent action, boycotts do not depend on elements of surprise or secrecy in order to be successful. Gandhi believed that truth could never damage a just cause.[24] This is apparent in the case of boycotting; boycotts are more successful if expectations are clearly communicated. A high level of transparency appears to help to decrease the possibility of manipulation and coercion because both the boycotters and the boycotted are clear about expectations of what must happen for the boycott to end. Transparency also lets others know about the expectations of the boycott so that both parties can be held accountable for their behaviour. Gene Sharp also suggests that secrecy can contribute to fear and paranoia within the movement while openness and transparency lends itself to larger mass movements and psychological liberation. Sharp explains, "In the struggle to attain freedom, it is necessary to behave like free people."[25] Transparency also

[24] Ellen W. Gorsevski, "Nonviolent Theory on Communication," 452.
[25] Gene Sharp, *Waging Nonviolent Struggle,* 369.

serves to publicise the campaign. This can beneficial for gathering support; conversely, it can also be effective at drawing criticism. In situations that are vulnerable to the negative effects of ethical controversy, a less transparent method may be more appropriate than the often-public approach of boycotting.

As explained in chapter 4, academic boycotts can only be used to achieve discussion. However, the discussion that is achieved via academic boycotting can be used to realize other goals, such as a change in procedure, a new law or policy, or government reform. It should be noted that a successful boycott does not guarantee the success of the subsequent discussion. The discussion that follows a boycott must be carefully planned and executed in its own right in order to achieve the intended goals.

The desired result of an academic boycott is discussion, which involves at least a basic level of trust, confidence, communication, interconnectedness, and understanding. The process of academic boycotting must not alienate the boycotted to the point that such an encounter post-boycott is rendered impossible. John Burton writes about the term 'alienation' saying, "*Alienate* usually has the meaning to become hostile, to become unfriendly, to turn away. *Alienation* is the end result of processes or relationships that alienate... It refers to the condition in which individuals experience a sense of exclusion from society..."[26] There are a number of ways that boycotters can reduce alienation during an academic boycott. They can always be careful to attack the behaviour, not the person.[27] Boycotters can be consistently honest and respectful of the boycotted. Gandhi always insisted on being open to discussion

[26] John Burton, *Conflict Resolution: Its language and processes*, 15 (italics in original text).
[27] Roger Fisher, William Ury, and Bruce Patton, *Getting to Yes*, 17-39.

before, during, and after a non-violent action[28]; academic boycotters can follow his lead and do the same. Boycotters can also clearly indicate that their desire is to end the boycott as soon as possible and to return support to the boycotted.

In addition, the boycotting group must remain functional for the duration of the boycott. This can be difficult as a boycott can be a lengthy and challenging process. A boycott can fail if the boycotters begin to struggle against each other or divide into factions that have distinct objectives or goals. Boycotters need to find a way to deal with their own intra-group conflict in a constructive manner so that they can continue to work towards their goal. In some cases, this may mean strong leadership, although there have been cases of large non-violent movements that did not have clear consistent leaders.[29] Part of reducing intra-group fighting is maintaining morale. Gene Sharp suggests four ways to maintain morale: maintaining rapport and solidarity; generating incentives to carry on the struggle; reducing grounds for capitulation; and restraints or sanctions.[30] Boycotting groups may benefit from looking to theory on group dynamics and intra-group conflict before implementing a boycott in order to take measures – such as establishing a group decision making process, discussing potential stumbling blocks, or creating some group conduct guidelines – to reduce the likelihood of group destroying problems from occurring and prepare for conflict that is common in groups.

---

[28] Judith M. Brown, "Gandhi, Mohandas Karamchand," 197.
[29] Gene Sharp, *Waging Nonviolent Struggle*, 346.
[30] Gene Sharp, *Waging Nonviolent Struggle,* 388-389.

Steps in Implementing an Academic Boycott

Whether being implemented at the primary, secondary or tertiary level, academic boycotts should not be called on a whim because of possible ineffectiveness resulting from poor implementation. There are a number of steps that boycotters should take when initiating an academic boycott. Many of these steps seem blatantly obvious, but it is these small points that are often missed and impact the success of a boycott, academic or otherwise. It is possible to successfully implement them in an order different to the one presented here.

1. Research

A time of individual consciousness raising or research about the situation at hand should occur before any action is considered. Boycotters should consider the history and socio-political context of the situation, examining such factors as the various perspectives of the players involved, pertinent cultural or social issues, past attempts at intervention, and significant political events. Boycotters should also reflect on the position from which they are working. There are advantages and disadvantages to every location; understanding these is valuable for maximising gain and reducing risk. Though the time, energy, and resource consuming prospect of researching is often quickly passed over for the more rewarding feeling of taking immediate action, the better-informed boycotters are about the situation that they are dealing with, the better equipped they are to address it in a constructive manner. In the long run, competent research may end up saving more time and resources. On the importance of research Adam Curle writes, "If one gets involved with delicate and complex issues without understanding the specifics (however good one

may be on the theory) one's ignorance will quickly become apparent; it is then unlikely that one will get very far."[31] Missing critical details, especially ones that could have easily been found out in advance, has been the Achilles' heel of many non-violent actions and has led to their collapse.

2. Community or group consciousness raising and involvement

Once potential initiators of a boycott have informed themselves about the situation, they need to begin raising the consciousness of others in order to get more supporters involved. Boycotts require the informed involvement of many; a call for a boycott is useless if few carry it out. Parties will not rush to join an academic boycott if they are not knowledgeable about the problem. They need to not only be aware of the issues, but also have to be convinced that the problem is worthy of making an effort and taking risks to challenge it. This part of implementation is about educating, empowering, and involving potential supports. Theorists have different terms for this stage. George Lakey would consider this *cultural preparation.*[32] Adam Curle writes a great deal about the importance of increasing awareness the weaker party in a conflict in his book *Making Peace*. Curle simply identifies this as "education", but in the broadest sense of the word: "Among communities of 'ignorant slaves'... no change will occur, no move away from passive unpeacefulness, until there is an increase in the level of awareness of the fundamental conflict of interest."[33] By raising the consciousness of potential participants about the concern at hand early in the process, they will be more likely to become actively involved if a boycott is

[31] Adam Curle, *Making Peace*, 173.
[32] Adam Curle, *Making Peace*, 206.
[33] Adam Curle, *Making Peace,* 175-6.

later called. This stage is not for educating those who may be potentially boycotted; that is a later stage.

3. Envisioning goals

After ensuring that boycotters are well informed and have fully researched all the necessary aspects of the situation at hand, they should consider the goals that they want to achieve. "Clear", achievable, and assessable goals are important. As obvious as these points appear, surprisingly, the majority of academic boycotts fail to achieve two of these features, let alone all three.

Clear means that the goal has been carefully defined and articulated so that the boycotters, the boycotted, and any other interested parties (such as the media or the general public) can understand why the boycott is being called and what the boycotters hope to achieve at the end of the action. The goal is not vague or abstract. Rather, it is unambiguous and comprehensible.

Achievable goals are realistic, proportional to the size, strength, ability, and resources of the action-taking group, appropriate for the method of action, and attainable. For instance, it is unlikely that an academic boycott alone can topple an entire regime, if many other pillars such as the military, other countries, religious ideology, the media etc. support the regime. Nevertheless, if an academic boycott is part of a comprehensive strategy to isolate a regime on a number of fronts, such as with an economic boycott, a weapons embargo, withdrawal of diplomatic relations etc, an academic boycott may encourage discussion, the outcomes of which can contribute to the goal of toppling the regime. As well, boycotts are blunt instruments; if the goal of the boycott is to convey a complex message, the goal is not realistic. However, if the goal is get

the other party to enter into discussion where the complex message can be communicated, it is a more sensible goal.

Thirdly, the goal must be assessable. This means that the goal is measurable or it is clear when the goal has been achieved. This is necessary so that all involved parties know exactly if and/or when the goal has been achieved; it clarifies if and/or when the boycott should be ended. For example, the goal may be that a specific law will be officially removed from the books; the president of this company will meet with the boycotters and hear their complaint, or *x* number of mainstream British newspaper articles will be written about their concern. Some practitioners of non-violence have found creative, but very valuable ways of measuring the success of their goal.

4. Outcomes

Non-violent practitioners need to start at the end, that is, with the ultimate goal, and then work backwards, determining what needs to happen in order to achieve that end. They must then establish immediate, intermediate and long-term outcomes that will lead to the goal. In the same manner as the goal, these three types of outcomes should be clear, achievable, and assessable. Most academic boycotts do not identify any such outcomes, but suggesting them enables the boycotters to complete valuable ongoing evaluation of the boycott. The outcomes serve as guiding signposts that allow the boycotters to determine whether they are on course to achieving their goal and, in response to their findings, to act accordingly. Often such outcomes are incorporated into a flowchart, allowing actions to be filled in between each outcome, thus ensuring that all outcomes and eventually the goal is achievable.

5. Strategising about types of actions to achieve goals

In their book *Social Movements: An Introduction*, Donatella Della Porta and Mario Diani explain how forms of non-violent action are imported from other times and places and applied to current situations. Practitioners of non-violence must learn from other situations and determine how those actions might work in their own context:

> It should be added that socialization in protest tactics is not a matter of blind reflex but a critical learning process. Thus, not all forms of action carry over from one period to the next, one social group to another, or from one country to another. It is, above all, those considered as successful, or particularly well adapted to a movement's context or culture which are most easily imported.[34]

Boycotters, with the aid of a flowchart or some other method for strategic planning, need to determine what actions to take to achieve immediate outcomes, intermediate outcomes, long-term outcomes, and finally, the goal. Classical strategic thinker Carl von Clausewitz believed that there are many ways to succeed in war[35]; there may also be many approaches to achieve one's goal using non-violent action. It is important not to get fixated on one method of action. For instance, even if boycotts have been used successfully in other situations, non-violent activists must ask themselves if a boycott is the best method available for achieving their outcomes and goal after a careful consideration of the other methods available and the consequences of each.

A flow chart can help to ensure that the most appropriate actions are taken in the most advantageous order. As a form of non-violent confrontation, academic boycotts should not be the first action taken. Mohandas Gandhi was adamant that non-violent confrontation was always a last resort for both moral reasons and the fact that, as Judith Brown phrases Gandhi's understanding,

---

[34] Donatella Della Porta and Mario Diani, *Social Movements*, 186.
[35] Robert J. Burrowes, *The Strategy of Nonviolent Defense*, 20.

"non-violence in practice was highly problematic".[36] As discussed in chapter 1, even for a type of non-violent non-cooperation, academic boycotts are very blunt and coercive tools. They can also be time consuming, risky, and ethically questionable and resource intensive, particularly human resource intensive. Usually, academic boycotts occur after all other types of standard academic discussion fail. One should carefully consider when to move from discussion to academic boycotting. This is part of the careful strategising that is required.

Often people using non-violent actions do not invest adequate time or effort into strategising. They fail to think creatively, yet tactically about their options and double-check their plan for possible weaknesses. Men have spent millennia strategising about war; violent attacks are well thought out and carefully planned. That same amount of energy and attention needs to go into non-violent strategising if the goal is to be achieved.

6. Logistical planning

Not only do wars involve careful strategising, but also they are meticulously executed as a result of planning tactics thoroughly and implementing them methodically, right down to the most minuscule detail. Non-violent actions should be logistically prepared for with the same vigilance.

Boycotters have to be sure that they have the means to implement a boycott. This may entail human, physical, time or financial resources. They need to work through the logistical details of implementation that are required for a boycott to achieve its goal and ensure that they can take care of the particulars. The cliché "the devil is in the details" is especially true for an

[36] Judith Brown, "Gandhi, Mohandas Karamchand," 198.

academic boycott. Minor oversights in logistical planning can lead to failure for a boycott. For example, inadequate media relations can lead to the demise of a boycott that is dependant on public support or a disaster could be caused if information is leaked too soon or to the wrong people.

Boycotters should consider how they are going to deal with the aftermath of a boycott as part of their planning for an academic boycott. Functional discussion cannot occur if too large a void has been created between the boycotted and the boycotter, if the boycotted has been too alienated. Steps need to be taken during the boycott to ensure that the boycotted know that the boycotters intend to normalise relations and resume discussion after the boycott has ended. Boycotters must consider how they will deal with the strain that has been placed on the relationship and prepare for how the dynamics between the boycotted and boycotter will have changed when support is reinstated.

7. Calling the boycott

Part of logistical planning is making certain that the boycott is called properly. An academic boycott is essentially the withdrawal of support to place pressure on some part of academia to take some type of action. Boycotters should be cautious to ensure that they are putting pressure on the boycotted, but not threatening them in a possibly violent manner. Dean G. Pruitt and Sung Hee Kim outline what they see as the difference between coercion and threatening.

> Threats are "if-then" assertions by Party in the following form: "If you don't conform to my wishes, I will punish you." By contrast, coercive commitments take the following form: "I have started doing something that punishes you and will continue doing it until you conform to my wishes.[37]

[37] Dean G. Pruitt and Sung Hee Kim, *Social Conflict: Escalation, Stalemate, and Settlement,* 75.

Violent threats are not only contrary to principle of non-violence, but are also prohibitive when attempting to create an environment that is conducive to constructive discussion.

There are many ways to withdraw support. Sometimes publishing a group letter in a newspaper accomplishes this. Other times, boycotters issue a press release. Though the format was different in each case, the following is an outline of common elements that are found in many academic boycotts. These shared elements are similar to the factors that Susan M. Brooks[38] outlines as necessary in order to have an effective consumer boycott. These steps may sound obvious, but they are often neglected in calls for academic boycotts. For instance, in the case of South African boycotts during apartheid, it was seldom clear what precise actions the boycotters wished the boycotted to take. There were often broad calls to end apartheid, but the specific actions that individual boycotted persons were to take were seldom articulated. Nor was it articulated at what point the academic boycott would be lifted.[39]

When the boycotted do not know exactly what they should do to have a boycott lifted or when the boycotted are not able to take actions that will result in the lifting of the boycott, the non-violent boycott begins to become punitive and could potentially become violent. In addition, in circumstances where the boycotted cannot make the desired changes in their behaviour, the boycott is

[38] Susan M. Brooks, "How to Organize a Killer Boycott." This article carefully outlines the important steps and elements that are necessary for a successful consumer boycott. All too often in many of the major calls for boycotts, some of these steps or elements are overlooked and the boycott is rendered impotent. Ironically, this article was written for school-aged girls.

[39] See Linda Vergnani, "2 South African Groups Vote Not to Call for Renewal of Academic Boycott" for one example of the indecision of when to lift academic boycotts.

rendered ineffective. A call for an academic boycott should include the elements outlined in figure 7.1.

Where as ...	• Name the specific organisations or institutions being boycotted • List the behaviour(s) that they are doing that the boycotters find offensive (possibly include evidence of the behaviours) • State why the boycotters find these behaviours offensive
Therefore, *[the boycotters' name, institution, or organisation]* **will call an academic boycott against** *[the organisations or institutions being boycotted]* **by...**	• List the support that the boycotters will be withdrawing or the actions that the boycotters will be asking people to take as part of the boycott
until such times as *[the organisations/institutions being boycotted]* **take the following actions...**	• Clearly explain what specific actions the boycotters want them to take. (Ensure that the academics/institutions being boycotted can make the changes the boycotters are asking for.) • These actions must be clear, achievable and assessable.
When the above actions are taken by *[the organisations or institutions being boycotted], [the boycotters' name, institution, or organisation],* **will publicly call an end the academic boycott and return their support to** *[name the organisations or institutions being boycotted]* **by ...**	• List clear and assessable indicators that the desired actions have been adequately fulfilled. • List the actions the boycotters will take to return the support that had been withdrawn.

Figure 7.1

There has been much confusion and dispute about when boycotts should be ended; this uncertainty is compounded during secondary and tertiary boycotts. This means that, especially in secondary and tertiary boycotts, boycotters must take great care when identifying when they will lift the boycott. Boycotters must ensure that they are specific when preparing this section of the call for the boycott. Will the boycott be halted as soon as parties enter into discussion or when an amenable agreement is met? What if the boycotters act and then renege? Will the boycott be re-implemented? If so, how and when? In secondary and tertiary boycotts, will the boycott be ended when the boycotted acts accordingly or when the offender acts accordingly? If the boycotted act as desired, but the offenders do not follow suit, what will happen? It is verges on violence to continue to pressure the boycotted if they cannot do anything else to compel the offenders to act. These details may seem tedious, but the disagreement between the African National Congress and the Union of Democratic University Staff Associations in South Africa and the South African Students Congress in 1992 about whether or not to renew calls for academic boycotts of South Africa show the public conflict that can result if such details are not worked out in advance by boycotters.[40]

In addition to these required elements, there are a number of other clauses the boycotters may want to add to academic boycott statement. They may want to include information about why they think the boycotters' requests are feasible and can be done by those the boycotters are boycotting. For example, in January 2000, when NATFHE called for a boycott of the University of Derby, they showed that they believed their request was

[40] Linda Vergnani, "2 South African Groups vote not to call for Renewal of Academic Boycotts."

reasonable by explaining that the outstanding money they were requesting would cost the university £120,000 out of an annual budget of £45 million.[41] The boycotters may wish to include a statement about the boycotters' willingness to enter into discussion[42], the boycotters' desire to end the boycott as quickly as possible so as to minimize the potential negative effects of the boycott, or the boycotters' wish to return to positive relations with those boycotted after the boycott ends.

Boycotters may want to show that the boycotters have seriously considered the repercussions of calling the boycott by stating some of the concerns that they have considered when deciding to call the boycott. For example, a 2002 Australian call for an academic boycott of Israel acknowledges, "The boycott we propose will inevitably also adversely affect those who don't deserve it, and we regret that this has to happen."[43] If there is a potential to cause undesirable ill effects to academia, such as retarding medical research, the boycotters may wish to add a clause that states the actions the boycotters are taking or will take to minimize such harm or that the boycott will be ended if such harm is found to be occurring.

8. Collective withdrawal of support

At this point, support is withdrawn as per the call for the boycott. This is done collectively. It involves individuals, groups, unions, or institutions following through with the actions they indicated in the call for the boycott. This could possibly include sending letters to indicate that boycotters will not

[41] NATFHE, press release, January 25, 2000.
[42] In the Sheffield Hallam University boycott, the NATFHE, press release, February 2, 2001 included reference to a date for a meeting to discuss the concerns at hand.
[43] John Docker, Ghassan Hage et al., "Call for Australian Boycott of Research and Cultural Links with Israel," appendix II in John Docker "Settler Colonialism as Genocide."

participate in a conference or collaboration, declining invitations for honorary degrees, refusing requests for information or funding etc. These actions may or may not be public. While some are relatively private interactions, sometimes an action can become a public controversy. One example of this occurred in 2002, when Mona Baker removed two Israeli professors from the editorial board of translations journals as part of an academic boycott against Israel.[44] It can be difficult to know exactly what actions boycotters are taking when they are not broadcasted in the news. Boycotters may want to consider setting up some type of system to collect or register information about what actions boycotters are taking. This information may be useful for on-going monitoring and evaluation of the boycott.

9. Continuing the boycott

Academic boycotts are a slow and lengthy process. Steps must be taken to ensure that the boycott continues after the initial call if the boycotted do not change their behaviour immediately. A portion of this work begins before the boycott is even called. Organisers need to ensure during the planning stages of the boycott that supporters are committed to remain engaged throughout a possibly long-lasting boycott. At some stage in the boycott, boycotters may need to find new supporters, as some participants may not be able to continue to give their support all the way through. Boycotters need to develop ways to keep supporters and the public interested and aware that the boycott is continuing after the initial commotion around the calling of the boycott. Sometimes ongoing debate or an eruption of ethical controversy about a particular action within the boycott will ease the boycotters' workload in this

[44] Debate on Mona Baker's actions appeared in 2002 and 2003 in many newspapers including *The Times Higher Education Supplement*, *The Guardian,* and *Ha'aretz.*

respect. If boycotters are not so fortunate, they may take actions such as having regular press releases, meetings with supporters, letters to the editor, articles in journals or association newsletters, and contact with the boycotted. They may organise consciousness-raising events or speaking engagements to increase awareness and interest in the boycott. Many boycotts slowly burn out or drop off behind the horizon without achieving their goal simply because the momentum cannot be maintained.

10. Ongoing Monitoring and Evaluation

Another aspect of maintaining a boycott is conducting ongoing monitoring of the boycott and regular evaluation to ensure that they boycott is on track for reaching its goal as a result of achieving the immediate, intermediate and long-term outcomes that had been carefully established before the boycott began. Monitoring and evaluation can be either formal or informal as long as it provides boycotters with useful feedback about how the boycott is going. This monitoring and evaluation allows for earlier detection of problems so that they can be addressed immediately before the boycotted is impaired to the point of failure. For example, in the boycott against the Technical University of British Columbia, the boycotters determined mid-way through their boycott that their goal was not achievable and modified their goal to be negotiation about their concerns. They were able to realize this more realistic goal. Monitoring and evaluation can provide positive reinforcement that, even if results are not blatantly apparent, the boycott is on target for reaching the goal and that the boycotters should continue with their efforts. It can also assist boycotters in knowing when the boycott should be ended, either for reasons of success or failure.

11. Ending the boycott

An academic boycott usually ends for one of three reasons; a boycott can end by fading out because of a lack of momentum or it can be ended by the boycotters either because the goal has been reached or because the boycott is failing to meet its objectives or goal and a different approach is needed. Though there are no known cases of it, an academic boycott could theoretically be ended because it is causing too much harm. It is possible that it has occurred, but the boycotters quietly let it slip off the radar screen instead of dealing with it publicly. If boycotters are adhering to Gandhi's principles of Satyagraha, such as truth, non-violence, and openness to discussion, when they end a boycott because of harm or potential harm, they should tell the boycotted and any other involved parties, possibly including the public via the media, why they are ending the boycott.

A boycott should end if offensive behaviour ends as per the ultimatum in the boycott call. If the boycott is not ended as promised, the boycott begins to tread on the threshold of violence. The announcement to end the boycott should be done publicly if it was called publicly so that all involved, either directly or indirectly, know the status of the situation. Boycotters usually announce that they are resuming support at the same time that they declare the end of the boycott. This can be either a general blanket statement or it can be detailed, indicating exactly what support will be resumed.

12. Resume Support

After the end of the boycott is announced, the boycotters should resume the interactions with or support of the boycotted that was withheld during the boycott. Continuing to withhold support after the boycott has been declared

over is on the edge of violent behaviour. This normalising of relations after a boycott can be difficult as the power balance in the relationship may have been challenged or the relationship may have been strained or changed in some other way. It is only after support has been returned that the boycott is in fact ended.

* * *

An academic boycott has the potential to be effective if it is ethically acceptable enough to prevent ethical controversy from interfering with the boycott; primary (or secondary/tertiary with adequate time, foresight, resources, strength, and clarity); satisfactorily transparent; and all the steps of implementation realized. Sufficient allies and support, suitable situational factors, and well-defined applicable criteria must also be in place. The boycotting group needs to remain functional throughout the process. Academic boycotting must be a fitting method for the situation and the goals must be attainable and measurable. Finally, because an outcome or the final goal is discussion, the boycotters must not have alienated other parties to the point that they will be unwilling to enter into discussions.

With such stringent criteria, it seems unlikely that an effective boycott is achievable. Despite these odds, boycotters have achieved their outcomes and goals by means of academic boycotting and have proven that it is indeed possible. The boycott of TechBC in chapter 7 is one such example. Nevertheless, cases such as those involving Israeli academic boycotts presented in chapter 8, demonstrate how difficult it is to meet all of these criteria. With the case of Israel, the ethical dimension is particularly problematic.

Academic Boycotts against South Africa

Chapter 6

This first case study is an examination of international academic boycotts called against South African academia during the former government of South Africa's policies of apartheid from the 1950s to the early 1990s. The academic boycotts of South Africa are among the most discussed and researched. There have been primarily two areas on which this discussion and research has focused. The first is the ethics of academic boycotting, particularly in the South African context. The second is the effects of academic boycotting on scholarship in academia. Lorraine J. Haricombe and F.W. Lancaster have compiled their research on this aspect in the book *Out in the Cold: Academic Boycotts and the Isolation of South Africa.* Despite research and discussion into these areas, there has been little research about the mechanisms and strategy of the academic boycotts against South Africa. In addition, there has been little said about how these academic boycotts – as some of earliest, notorious examples – have exposed concerns that would resurface in later boycotts and, in some instances, set a precedent.

This case study will look at the historical significance, including the contribution they made to creating *academic boycotting* as a distinct method of action by popularising the term "academic boycott" and displaying the range of manifestations that can be included under the umbrella of *academic boycotting.* The academic boycotts against South Africa also surfaced a great deal of controversy and debate that would continue to emerge with academic boycotts

since. This case study will examine some of these ethical and pragmatic concerns. Finally, this case study inspects their strategy, or lack there of, and their implementation. The problems that the boycotters of South Africa experienced are echoed in subsequent academic boycotts, particularly those that emulated these boycotts, such as the ones called against Israel (as discussed in chapter 8). The lessons learned from the struggles and successes of boycotts against South Africa can also be found in chapter 5, an examination of the criteria required for and the implementation of successful academic boycotts.

This case is historically important as it is the first large scale series of academic boycotts, used in conjunction with other actions as part of a larger political strategy, in which a diverse collaboration of boycotters boycotted multiple parties. The previously obscure label "academic boycott" was used frequently during this case in a range of contexts including personal correspondence, academic journals and newspapers, thus helping to popularise the phrase and establish a popular definition of 'academic boycott'.

The diversity of approaches used demonstrates a large range of possible manifestations of academic boycotts. These academic boycotts were plagued with debate about the ethical implications of academic boycotting. For the first time, academics wrote extensively about the specific ethical controversies that surround academic boycotting. The ethical debates presented in this case are classic because since then similar debates have erupted anew each time another academic boycott has been called. This case reveals the challenges of strategizing and implementing a boycott of this scale. The final debate about this case surrounds its success. While some scholars are adamant that these academic boycotts contributed a great deal to the ending of apartheid in South

Africa, there is little evidence to support their claim; sceptics point to other factors as the precipitating cause of the downfall of apartheid.

The call for academic boycotts in South Africa came in the context of a complex political situation involving policies of apartheid at all levels, including education. An examination of the social and political history is beyond the scope of this thesis, but can be found in a number of sources.[45] Academic boycotts were first considered in the 1950s. Yngve Nordkvelle writes, "The issue of an academic boycott was first dealt with by the conference on academic freedom arranged by 'The committee on Science and Freedom' in London in 1957, and the influential philosopher A. J. Ayer suggested some ideas on a comprehensive boycott."[46]

Academics boycotts were not the only type of sanction that South Africa was to face as nations and individuals from around the world attempted to pressure the government into ending their policies of apartheid. There were economic sanctions, including trade sanctions[47] and divestment, which, like academic boycotts, were much debated in terms of both ethics and success.[48] Governments engaged in various political sanctions,[49] and arms embargoes.[50] There were tourism, travel, and cultural boycotts that included sports, music,

---

[45] For a summary of the broader political history of South Africa and specifically the implications on education, see Voyi Vuyisile, Xola Mtshona and Trevor Abrahams, "South Africa," 125-149; Freda Troup, *Forbidden Pastures: Education Under Apartheid*; and Mary Benson, *The African Patriots*, 209-211.

[46] Yngve Nordkvelle, "The Academic Boycott of South Africa Debate," 253.

[47] Janice Love, "The Potential Impact of Economic Sanctions against South Africa."

[48] Charles M. Becker, "Economic Sanctions against South Africa;" William H. Shaw, "Boycotting South Africa;" Gary Clyde Hufbauer, Jeffrey J. Schott and Kimberly Ann Elliot, *Economic Sanctions Reconsidered: History and Current Policy;* and Margaret P. Doxey, "International Sanctions: A Framework for Analysis with Special Reference to the UN and Southern Africa."

[49] Lorraine J. Haricombe and F.W. Lancaster, *Out in the Cold*, 8-10.

[50] Lorraine J. Haricombe and F.W. Lancaster, *Out in the Cold*, 8.

and entertainment.[51] In 1968, the UN requested "all States to discourage the flow of immigrants, particularly skilled and technical personnel, to South Africa".[52]

The goal of all of these actions, including academic boycotting, was to end apartheid. Lorraine J. Haricombe and F.W. Lancaster explain the general reasoning behind academic boycotts of South Africa.

> The South African academic boycott arose from the desire of the disadvantaged people to change the political system of discrimination in South Africa. Its purpose was to isolate academics in South Africa associated with universities that supported the racist policy of the former South African government.[53]

In a letter to the editor of the *New England Journal of Medicine* in 1987, Yosuf Veriava contributes his understanding of academic boycotting. "Academic boycott is not primarily a punitive measure but a coercive strategy designed to persuade academics of influence and status to refrain from the practices of apartheid and to strive actively to secure an end to apartheid in the academic sphere."[54]

The basis of academic boycotting was the perceived connection between South African academia, and the South African government and its policies. The connections include the government's control of academia and academia's maintenance or support of the regime, even if only as a latent ally because of silence and inaction in the face of apartheid. In a 1990 report by the World University Service, Voyi Vuyisile, Xola Mtshona and Trevor Abrahams explain the former:

---

[51] Lorraine J. Haricombe and F.W. Lancaster, *Out in the Cold*, 5-14 and UN General Assembly, "Resolutions Adopted on the Reports of the Special Political Committee," Resolution 2396, section 12, 20.
[52] UN General Assembly, "Resolutions Adopted on the Reports of the Special Political Committee," Resolution 2396, section 11, 20.
[53] Lorraine J. Haricombe and F.W. Lancanster, *Out in the Cold*, 30.
[54] Yosuf Veriava, letter to the editor, 1161.

> By definition, apartheid education in South Africa is controlled. Full institutional autonomy and academic freedom cannot exist. This is evident not only in the allocation of funds, but also in the repression and violence on the campuses. Staff composition and other controls reveal how the principles of academic freedom are violated.[55]

Concerning the latter connection, there is much debate about to what degree academia in South Africa was responsible for the perpetuation of apartheid. Though supporters of the boycotts outlined some connections, questions about the evidence remained. This debate contributed to the ethical controversy of the academic boycotts of South Africa. Yngve Nordkvelle, while examining the involvement of science with government, contends, "the academicians, as a group, are a part of the State apparatus"[56] and may contribute to the continuance of a government's policies, including apartheid.

> The unwillingness of the international scientific community to impose an effective boycott has mainly been due to the concern of the liberal academicians and the liberal English-speaking universities in South Africa.
> Unfortunately, very few scholars have investigated what SA [South African] universities and science have contributed to the continuing oppression and exploitation of the minority."[57]

Nordkvelle maintains that an academic boycott is necessary if the whole scientific community is to analyse the societal contract between science in South Africa and apartheid society, and thus challenge a paradigm of racism and apartheid.

Others contend that, although some parts of academia may contribute to apartheid, other parts of academia are central to resisting apartheid. This conflict is at the heart of much debate about the complexity and multi-faceted challenges of academic boycotts. In a book published in 1987 entitled *The Sanctions Handbook*, Joseph Hanlon and Roger Omond explain:

---

[55] Voyi Vuyisile, Xola Mtshona and Trevor Abrahams, "South Africa" 140.
[56] Yngve Nordkvelle, "The Academic Boycott of South Africa Debate," 271.
[57] Yngve Nordkvelle, "The Academic Boycott of South Africa Debate," 254.

> The academic boycott of South African universities has proceeded in fits and starts since the 1950s when the government legislated to segregate higher education. The issue is one of the more complex of all the arguments about contact with South Africa, for the mainly white English-speaking universities there are regarded generally as intellectual, and sometimes physical, centres of opposition to apartheid.[58]

Graeme C. Moodie contends that the relationship between South African academics and state is complex and must not be over simplified. In reference to the experience of South African universities during the period of 1948-1990 Moodie writes:

> Contrary to once popular impression, however, it was not a period of constant all-embracing struggle between, as it were in the blue corner, an increasingly despotic government that was antagonistic to academic freedom, university autonomy, and the whole western liberal concept of a university and, in the red corner, a beleaguered minority of liberal "open" universities gallantly fighting racial discrimination in alliance, later, with the newer "Black" institutions... Though there is truth in such a characterisation, it is also a serious over-simplification of a much less tidy and coherent pattern of events.[59]

In 1994 article entitled "The State and the Liberal Universities in South Africa: 1948-1990," Moodie explains the complex and dynamic relationships between the various types of universities and the state. These relationships were influenced by the universities' historical position, the degree to which they were controlled by the state, and how they did (or did not) oppose various policies of the state.

The boycotts in South Africa were given more legitimacy by the fact that some South African groups, such as the African National Congress and some academics, supported the boycotts:

> Faculty members at certain South African universities, supported by the pro-sanctions policies of the United Nations, the African National Congress, and other boycott advocacy groups, urged the use of an academic boycott as a means to reverse the inequalities between the predominately white universities and the predominately black universities.[60]

---

[58] Joseph Hanlon and Roger Omond, *The Sanctions Handbook*, 118.
[59] Graeme C. Moodie, "The State and the Liberal University in South Africa: 1948-1990," 1.
[60] Lorraine J. Haricombe and F.W. Lancaster, *Out in the Cold*, 30-31.

This support was particularly helpful in countering claims that the boycotts would hurt those they were designed to help and thus should not be implemented.

However in practice, the ANC was known to turn a blind eye to breaches of the boycott as it suited them by, for example, attending conferences that were also attended by South African academics. Conor Cruise O'Brien writes:

> The ANC had called for an international boycott of the South African universities – regardless of their own internal practices – for a long as the government of South Africa failed to repeal its apartheid laws. Up to this time [1986] the international boycott had not been rigorously enforced and foreign scholars coming to South African universities to teach had in general not been interfered with.[61]

Academic boycotts in South Africa continued at low levels through the 1960s with a few noteworthy cases. In 1965, a group of 496 academics from 34 universities in Britain declared a boycott against South African universities that discriminated based on race.[62] The text of their boycott read:

> We, the (undersigned) professors and lecturers in British universities in consultation with the Anti-Apartheid Movement:
> 1. Protest against the bans imposed on Professors Simons and Roux;
> 2. Protest against the practice of racial discrimination and its extension to higher education;
> 3. Pledge that we shall not apply for or accept academic posts in South African universities which practise racial discrimination.[63]

In 1968, the United Nations General Assembly endorsed a cultural boycott as part of its resolution 2396 regarding the policies of apartheid of the Government of South Africa: "*Requests* all States and organizations to suspend cultural,

---

[61] Conor Cruise O'Brien, *Memoir: My Life and Themes*, 392.

[62] Jack Simons and Eddie Roux were two well-known progressive academics that had banning orders issued against them. (*Academic Boycott of South Africa: Declaration by British Academics 1965*).

[63] *Academic Boycott of South Africa: Declaration by British Academics.*

educational, sporting and other exchanges with the racist regime and with organizations or institutions in South Africa which practise *apartheid*."[64]

While academic boycotts were low profile during the 1970s, an abundance of manifestations of boycotts, from a variety of boycotters occurred throughout the 1980s. Lorraine J. Haricombe and F.W. Lancaster write about two factors that lead to the increased momentum of academic boycotts in the 1980s. "First was the volatility of the political climate in South Africa. Second was the success of the African National Congress in gaining strong support for sanctions against all types of collaboration with South Africa."[65]

Many manifestations of academic boycotting appeared during the 1980s. A broad range of people supported and/or participated in academic boycotting. Despite widespread support, there were some active critics of academic boycotting. Some of these critics faced dire consequences for speaking against the boycott. There were also instances when proponents of the academic boycotts did not adhere strictly to non-violence. For instance, Conor Cruise O'Brien, then Deputy Chancellor of Trinity College – Dublin, visited the Universities of Cape Town and Witwatersrand in October 1986 in open defiance of the academic boycotts South Africa.[66] Though O'Brien has breached the academic boycott of South Africa before, this occasion was significant as O'Brien publicly declared that his was breaking the boycott in an article for the London *Times* that he wrote before leaving for South Africa. In his autobiography, Memoir: My Life and Themes, O'Brien writes:

---

[64] UN General Assembly, "Resolutions Adopted on the Reports of the Special Political Committee," Resolution 2396, section 12, 20.
[65] Lorraine J. Haricombe and F.W. Lancaster, *Out in the Cold*, 31-32.
[66] William Cobbett, "The Tactics of Academic Boycott," 37 and Joseph Hanlon and Roger Omond, *The Sanctions Handbook*, 119.

> While the debate over the decision to disinvite the [South African] scholars was at its height I wrote a piece about the matter for *The Times* in support of the protest against the disinvitation and against the "academic boycott" in particular. In the course of the article I indicated that I was about to go to South Africa to teach thereby breaking the "academic boycott" which I believed to be altogether wrong, and a breach of the basic principle of the international solidarity of scholars and teachers. This announcement turned out to be quite imprudent, but I cannot say that I regret the imprudence.[67]

Though the first three weeks of O'Brien's visit and lecturing went without incident, the fourth week proved to be different.[68] On October 7, O'Brien was to deliver a lecture for the Jewish Students Association. Trouble erupted as protesters broke down the door to the lecture hall. Donald Harman Akenson writes in his biography of O'Brien, "It was a very messy scene. Dr. Stuart Saunders, vice-chancellor, was in the chair, and he declared the meeting over. Conor, convoyed by some of the Jewish students, managed to get out the door."[69]

The next day, at O'Brien's regularly scheduled class, O'Brien faced even more resistance. Akenson explains:

> Conor had a regular class scheduled for the next morning, and he was resolved to teach it. This time twelve campus security men controlled the entrance. Only class members were let in and when the number of protestors grew to about 150, the security men barricaded the door with two tables. Outside the door, they linked arms and tried to keep the demonstrators out. There was a general fracas, and one demonstrator used his belt buckle to slash at a security man. The protestors broke in and Conor, protected by some of the seventy-odd students in his class, fought his way out, through students who were trying to punch him.[70]

By the early 1990s, academic boycotters of South Africa began to announce ends to their boycotts. However, some organisations, governments and institutions ended their boycotts before others; confusion and conflict erupted as a result.

The withdrawal of support from South African academia during apartheid nearly perfectly meets the definition of *academic boycotting* as outlined in

---

[67] Conor Cruise O'Brien, *Memoir: My Life and Themes*, 393.
[68] Conor Cruise O'Brien, *Memoir: My Life and Themes*, 393-4.
[69] Donald Harman Akenson, *Conor: A Biography of Conor Cruise O'Brien*, 479.
[70] Donald Harman Akenson, *Conor: A Biography of Conor Cruise O'Brien*, 479.

chapter 1. These actions were an act of non-cooperation in which academics, libraries, students and others involved in academia refused to cooperate with the South African government and its policies of apartheid by withdrawing support from South African academia, which, according to the boycotters, supported apartheid in various ways. The academic boycotts were clearly called because of policies of apartheid.

The one criterion that is debatable is the notion of 'non-violent.' As will be discussed as an ethical consideration in this case study, critics of academic boycotting in South Africa often expressed concern about the harm that could result from boycotting in academia. Some of these critics would disagree with calling the academic boycotts 'non-violent' as a result. However, boycotters, along with many theorists of non-violence would categorise the boycotts called against South African academia as 'non-violent action.'

As per the other requirements of boycotting, the academic boycotts against South Africa were done as a collective action, in concert with many others as are any form of boycotting. The academic boycotts were called publicly and discussed openly, including in academic journals; thus, these boycotts met the criterion of transparency. The boycotts also continued until the end of apartheid, therefore also meeting the condition that most boycotts are planned to last until the offensive behaviour is changed. Academics resumed support of and involvement with South African academics after the end of apartheid, albeit at different times.

Though the academic boycotts against South Africa were called by a range of individuals, institutions and organisations, all of the actions directly affected the main purposes of South African academia, thus distinguishing

academic boycotts from other types of boycotts and sanctions. The academic boycotts interfered with such areas of academia as the exchange of knowledge, teaching, collaborations, and research. All of these characteristics make the actions that occurred against South African academia fall clearly under that category of academic boycotting.

This case shows a variety of possible manifestations of academic boycotting. In a call for an academic boycott, it is rare to have so many manifestations used at once. Usually an academic boycott focuses on a few manifestations, such as refusal to attend a conference or to collaborate. In addition, it is atypical to have so many types of boycotters engaging in academic boycotting focused on the same goal. Often academic boycotters are a group of academics that have something in common, such as membership in a particular group or organisation. The following discussion of some of the manifestations of academic boycotting that appeared in South Africa show that professors, journal editors, countries, libraries, students, academic organisations, companies, and conference organisers all were boycotters in this case. This case demonstrates the diversity of boycotters that are possible during academic boycotting.

One type of boycotters was editorial personnel. Journal editors and editorial boards refused to accept manuscripts from South Africa. There was a broad range of journals that implemented this type of academic boycott. John Maddox provides some examples in the article "Science in Apartheid." Maddox provides an exhibit of a letter from the Linnean Society of London,

which just reads, "I am not now accepting manuscripts from South Africa."[71] In the same article, Maddox also cites examples from the Norwegian journal *Holarctic Ecology* and the ornithology journal *Ornis Scandinavica.*[72]

Nation states became academic boycotters when some countries withheld or limited visas to South African academics travelling to their countries for conferences or collaborations or by prohibiting South African academics from using academic facilities in their country. Phillip Tobias explains:

> Some institutions may debar persons from South Africa from visiting their laboratories or departments. In the Netherlands, for instance, the government has advised all universities in the country that they are "to minimize contact with South Africa and South African scholars". In terms of this, for example, a doctoral student was denied access to a particular university department, although permission had previously been given for him to visit and learn some new procedures in the field of biochemistry.[73]

An example of a visa refusal is exhibited in the book, *Out in the Cold.* In this case, it was a letter dated March 27, 1987 from the Consulate General of Finland rejecting an application from a South African for a visa to attend an international conference. The letter simply reads, "We regret to inform you, that your application for a Finnish visa has not been accepted by the Finnish authorities."[74] In 1987, the editor of the journal *Nature*, John Maddox wrote:

> South Africans have found that it has become more difficult to attend conferences overseas. Some of the problems are administrative. Japan, for example, has become virtually out of bounds, issuing visas to South Africans travelling for business purposes, but not to tourists; conferences appear in the eyes of consulates to fall vaguely in between. Both Canada and Australia now require that South Africans seeking a visa should present themselves in person at their consulate in London (or in Harare, the capital of Zimbabwe, in the case of Australia). Applicants are advised to allow three days, at the least adding to the length of any journey.[75]

---

[71] John Maddox, "Science in Apartheid," 273.
[72] John Maddox, "Science in Apartheid," 273.
[73] Phillip Tobias, "The Academic Profession and Contemporary Politics," 576.
[74] Lorraine J. Haricombe and F.W. Lancaster, *Out in the Cold*, 42.
[75] John Maddox, "Science in Apartheid," 272.

The boycott included refusal to supply or limiting supply of journals or books to South Africa by various companies.[76] Several examples are included in an article entitled "Anatomy of a Book Boycott" that appeared in the journal *American Libraries*:

> The Dutch Book and Reading Centre declined to sell its materials to South Africa, some Scandinavian academic libraries terminated journal exchanges with South Africa, and publishers in several countries (including Denmark, India, and Australia) refused to send journals to South African subscribers.[77]

Some academic boycotts involving publishers caused more problems and controversy than others. F.W. Lancaster and Lorraine J. Haricombe write, "Perhaps the most significant element in the overall publications boycott was the 1986 action by University Microfilms International (UMI) to suspend the supply of dissertations to South Africa."[78]

Individual international students were discouraged from studying in South Africa out of fear of potential harm to their careers later, or of their degrees not being recognised as part of the boycott. In a 1986 article in *New Scientist*, Steve Connor explains the perspective of Professor Brian Allanson, president of the Zoological Society of Southern Africa:

> Allanson says that he has one doctoral student who has been told by his professor in Italy, where the student normally lives, that it would be unwise to complete his doctorate in South Africa. Allanson says that the student was told there would be no guarantee that his degree would be recognised."[79]

South African academics were excluded from conferences. One of the most notoriously, the 11th annual World Archaeological Congress[80] in Southampton in 1986, is documented extensively in Peter Ucko's book *Academic Freedom and Apartheid: The Story of the World Archaeological*

---

[76] John Maddox, "Science in Apartheid," 272 and F.W. Lancaster and Lorraine J. Haricombe. "Anatomy of a Book Boycott," 685-689.
[77] F.W. Lancaster and Lorraine J. Haricombe, "Anatomy of a Book Boycott," third section.
[78] F.W. Lancaster and Lorraine J. Haricombe, "Anatomy of a Book Boycott," fourth section.
[79] Steve Connor, "Science and Sanctions," 20.
[80] Peter Ucko, *Academic Freedom and Apartheid* and Steve Connor, "Science and Sanctions," 20.

Congress. South African academics were excluded from meetings as well. For instance, the Royal Australian College of Physicians (RACP) boycotted the College of Medicine of South Africa (CMSA) during its 1988 meeting.[81]

Many international scholars refused to travel to South Africa or were discouraged or forbidden by their universities or nations. India, for instance, "refused to allow their nationals to use that country's passport to visit South Africa to attend a conference."[82] Phillip Tobias explains that other external parties also pushed for this manifestation of academic boycotting:

> Where no institutional pressure is applied, in many places student bodies or outside anti-apartheid organisations have brought pressure to bear on individuals not to visit South Africa. In some cases, there has been a threat of "action" against an academic who has defied such pressure, on his [or her] return to his [or her] home institution.[83]

Despite being a widespread manifestation of the boycott, there were renowned examples of breaches of this aspect of the boycott, such as the public defiance of the boycott by Conor Cruise O'Brien discussed above. In a similar vein, some individuals and/or institutions, such as Trinity College – Dublin[84], refused to collaborate with South African academics.

There were also library boycotts. For example, in *Library Association Record,* Jeff Leeuwenburg writes:

> Several options are open to those concerned: to quietly mislay requests; to privately inform requesters that specific items will not be provided; to work for institutional policies on screened loans or no loans to South Africa; to introduce the topic into academic boycott plans; and to work at political levels for national policies for national or state libraries.[85]

The academic boycotting that occurred against academia in South Africa during apartheid is extraordinary in that it demonstrates an exceptionally

---

[81] Solomon R. Benatar, "Academic Boycott – Through the Looking Glass," 501.
[82] Phillip Tobias, "The Academic Profession and Contemporary Politics," 577.
[83] Phillip Tobias, "The Academic Profession and Contemporary Politics," 577.
[84] See footnote in chapter 1 for a discussion about the references to the Trinity College – Dublin academic boycott.
[85] Jeff Leeuwenburg, letter to the editor, 328.

broad range of boycotters and manifestations that has yet to be matched. It shows that extremely diverse boycotters can participate in different ways in the academic boycotting of a particular party. However, the participation of so many boycotters in such diverse positions does not occur without extensive conflict and controversy.

Academic boycotts are ethically controversial; academic boycotts in South Africa were no exception. As the first large scale, multi-faceted, international academic boycott, the academic boycotts against South Africa were the premier opportunity for broad public discussion about the ethics of academic boycotting. These same discussions about ethics – often with reoccurring lines of argument – would appear again in one form or another in many of the academic boycotts that have been called since. Each time the discussion is often similar despite the presence of the unique details of each individual boycott, with supporters and critics of the boycotts usually appearing to be oblivious to the fact that they are attempting to reinvent the wheel as they sort out their arguments. This case can shed a great deal of light on ethical controversies that have surfaced in academic boycotts that occurred since this boycott.

There was very little discussion about whether ending apartheid was ethical in the context of discussion about the ethics of academic boycotting in South Africa, making discussion of the ethics of the purpose the least intense ethical controversy. Discussion about the ethics of the purpose of various boycotts has appeared in several boycotts since the boycotts of South Africa. As with the academic boycotts of South Africa, the ethical controversy around

this is factor is seldom as frequent or as heated as the other ethical considerations.

As with subsequent academic boycotts, one of the impassioned discussions about ethics was about whether academic boycotting infringes on academic freedom and norms of academic discussion. In a 1995 article, Neville Alexander writes:

> The liberals opposed the academic boycott completely, arguing both that it transgressed the principles of academic freedom and university autonomy and that it would shut off essential communication between South African scholars and their international counterparts. South Africa would suffer a catastrophic drop in academic standards and an erosion of its economic and technological capacity.[86]

Critics also argued that academic freedom in South African universities was already being severely infringed upon by apartheid and the government. [87]

> The lack of academic freedom in South Africa was evident in the control of the State over what was taught in schools, the stringent censorship system, and the lack of freedom of expression. Thus, academic freedom was seen as a poor justification for insulating the academic community from the effects of sanctions.[88]

One of the more extensive discussions of ethics during this academic boycotting centred on the potential of unintended – and in particular long-term – impairment of academia in South Africa and secondary harm to South African society as a result. There were concerns about the retarding of research and academic institutions in South Africa that "would cause long-term damage to academic institutions, to education, and to post-apartheid society."[89] This fear of damage to academia resulted in a number of organisations and individuals renouncing academic boycotts. For instance, the American Physical Society (APS), out of concern about the potential of unintended harm to physics in South Africa that could be caused by an academic boycott, "adopted a

---

[86] Neville Alexander, "Academic Boycotts," section 3.
[87] Voyi Vuyisile, Xola Mtshona and Trevor Abrahams, "South Africa" and Freda Troup, *Forbidden Pastures*.
[88] Lorraine J. Haricombe and F. W. Lancaster, *Out in the Cold*, 35.
[89] Hoosen Mahomed Coovadia, "Sanctions and the Struggle for Health in South Africa," 1506.

statement encouraging APS members to cooperate and collaborate with scientists in South Africa"[90] instead of boycotting.

The academic boycotts of South Africa resulted in extensive discussion about the potential harm versus the potential good of academic boycotting. This harm included negative ramifications in terms of education students received. Soloman Benatar explains the challenge of balancing possible negative results with prospective gain by saying:

> proponents of academic boycott in such a context justify their stand as appropriate political strategies which, by contributing to the isolation of South Africa, could facilitate the removal of an unjust regime and lead to greater academic freedoms in the future. Crucial to this notion has been the time anticipated for such change to occur. The time frame has already been so long that many individuals and organisations, including the African National Congress, are openly expressing concern for the now obvious adverse effects on a whole generation of schoolchildren...[91]

Ethical controversy erupted in particular over the issues of damage to society resulting from impairment of certain fields of study. This debate was particularly fervent in the field of medicine with a flurry of articles and letters to the editor appearing in medical journals including *The New England Journal of Medicine*.

There was debate about whether or not academia should be exempt from sanctions as opponents claimed that academic boycotts contravened academia's removed position from society and politics. However, many disagreed. "Boycott proponents argued that academics should not be treated as an elite detached from the political and social environment in which it functions, especially since some of the South African universities seemed to be tools of the Nationalist government."[92]

---

[90] *Physics Today,* "APS Issues Statement on Helping South African Physicists," 73.
[91] Soloman Benatar, "Academic Freedom in South Africa," 1578.
[92] F.W. Lancaster and Lorraine Haricombe, "The Academic Boycott of South Africa," paragraph 4.

In the context of academic boycotts in South Africa, Maurice McGregor writes, "Boycott is a clumsy weapon and it would be more welcome if it could be less indiscriminate."[93] Schemes of selective boycotting were suggested as alternatives to comprehensive boycotting. Selective boycotting was to allow those South African academics that challenged apartheid to be exempt from the academic boycotts of South Africa. This would help address concerns that academic boycotts could potentially isolate the very progressive academics that are speaking out against apartheid. Mike Morris writes, "Progressive academics cannot be asked to ally themselves with the forces opposing apartheid, while internationally they are attacked as upholders of apartheid."[94] This suggestion led to many debates about who was a staunch enough fighter against apartheid to be supported rather than boycotted. Soloman Benatar suggests that this is an unworkable approach because of, in addition to the challenge of implementation, the difficulty determining criteria of who to include and exclude.[95] Should the criterion for exclusion from boycotting be membership in a certain anti-apartheid organisation(s) or professional bodies (such as NAMBA)?[96] Should only select universities and their staff be exempt? If a good record of opposition to racism[97] is an adequate criterion, what should constitute a "good record? Should only those who work directly for the government or a government organisation be boycotted?

[93] Maurice McGregor, letter to the editor, December 26, 1985.
[94] Mike Morris, "The Academic Boycott: Choose Sides and Organise," 35.
[95] Solomon R. Benatar, "An Alternative to Academic Boycott," 506.
[96] Phillip V. Tobias, "The Academic Profession and Contemporary Politics," 577.
[97] Phillip V. Tobias, "The Academic Profession and Contemporary Politics," 577.

One of the other key debates surrounds the issue of who should have the authority to decide who is boycotted and who is excluded from the boycott. Phillip V. Tobias presents this struggle of selective boycotting:

> The question of who is a fit and competent person or body to decide on the issue is still very much at issue: the scholarly bodies would insist on being judged by fellow-scholars; the boycott-supporting bodies appear to maintain that their own political attitude gives them the right to adjudge the issue.[98]

William Cobbett expresses a similar concern:

> It is vital that organisations within South Africa have a central role in the vetting of local academics, allowing for informed decisions to be taken. By accepting organisational vetting, the debate shifts away from the dangerous ground of individuals being vetted by self-appointed committees. What is then important is which organisations can and should be involved in the vetting process.[99]

The National Medical and Dental Association (NAMDA) suggested guidelines for *selective support*. According to Hoosen Mahomed Coovadia, an MD from the University of Natal in South Africa explains the term *select support* in an article about NAMDA: "Because we had no resources to monitor an academic boycott, we decided that we would offer "selective support." This simply meant we would endorse those academic exchanges that accorded with the aims and principles of the democratic movement."[100] Solomon Benatar, an academic in medicine in South Africa, writes, "If selective support means freedom of choice in targeting one's support of colleagues in South Africa, and is not a euphemism for selective boycott (requiring coercion for its implementation), this is certainly a more justifiable alternative to total boycott or uncritical support."[101]

Though some advocates of selective boycotting believed it would infringe less on academic freedom than a comprehensive boycott, others were

---

[98] Phillip V. Tobias, "The Academic Profession and Contemporary Politics," 578.
[99] William Cobbett, "The Tactics of Academic Boycott," 40.
[100] Hoosen Mahomed Coovadia, "Sanctions and the Struggle for Health in South Africa," 1506.
[101] Solomon R. Benatar, "An Alternative to Academic Boycott," 505.

not convinced. Phillip Tobias writes, "by accepting a selective boycott, one is in fact accepting that political criteria, personal or institutional, are a valid basis for deciding who may attend a scholarly meeting, and who may be permitted to make visits or to receive academic visitors."[102]

This case demonstrates many of the challenges of strategising about and implementing a large, multi-partied academic boycott, the theory of which will be discussed further in chapter 5. Firstly, it shows for how *long* an academic boycott can continue. Academic boycotts were first suggested in the 1950s and continued at varying intensities and forms up until the early 90s. This case serves as a reminder to potential boycotters about the potential time investment involved in academic boycotting. A campaign that last up to 35 years is a lengthy undertaking.

The complexity of a boycott consisting of multiple boycotters with different understandings and approaches was also revealed in this case. The goal of ending apartheid on all levels was unambiguous, however, how the tactics and strategise utilised were to achieve this end was unclear at many points in this case. This lack of clarity about strategy may have added to the ethical controversy about the harm the academic boycott could cause. Opponents may have been unclear about how boycotters envisioned the strategy for the boycotts that would result in the gains surpassing the potential harm. In 1987 in the *New England Journal of Medicine*, Maurice McGregor writes:

> The objectives of boycott are variable and often very poorly understood. The usual intention is to modify behavior… limited-objective boycotts were common some years ago, they are no longer relevant in South Africa, where the object of all boycott activities is now a general one – that is, "to end apartheid".[103]

[102] Phillip V. Tobias, "The Academic Profession and Contemporary Politics," 578.
[103] Maurice McGregor, "Apartheid and the Academic Boycott of South Africa", April 1987.

Though the occasional instance was cited, boycotters seldom clearly articulated the connection between the actions – or inaction – of the boycotted South African academics and the continuation of apartheid. Often it was difficult to determine exactly what actions the boycotters wanted the boycotted to take in order to end apartheid. Concerns about this lack of strategic and tactical awareness surfaced during the boycotts. In the context of criticism about the implementation of academic boycotts targeting South African science, in 1987 Ralph Crawford writes, "boycotters should be be [sic] clear in their own minds, and in advance, of the conditions in which they would relent. They also owe it not merely to those affected but to their own objectives to declare what they are hoping to accomplish."[104] In the 1986 article "Boycotting South Africa," William H. Shaw outlines some of the flaws in strategy around academic boycotting in South Africa, including symbolic academic boycotts that were not fully understood:

> I have affirmed that both nation-states and individuals have obligations to fight apartheid and have argued that boycotts and other measures must be chosen with care, after examining carefully the goals we wish to accomplish and the rival strategies for realising them. I have also maintained that certain proposed boycotts are ill-considered and that they are not likely to be justified on symbolic grounds alone.[105]

Boycotters did not identify immediate, intermediate and long-term outcomes that would indicate that the academic boycotts were in fact contributing to the goal of ending apartheid. Such confusion around goals was compounded by the fact that some boycotters were focused on primary boycotting, that is to say South African academics pushing for change in their own academic institutions, while other boycotters were focused on secondary boycotting in which South

[104] John Maddox, "Science in Apartheid," 269.
[105] William H. Shaw, "Boycotting South Africa," 71.

African academics were expected to push for change in their government's policies.

Sanctions theory teaches that such clarity of strategy and tactics is required. In the context of South Africa, Ralph Crawford writes, "An essential requirement for effective declarations of sanctions should clearly state the reason, nature, exceptions, and expected duration of the sanction, while fully delineating specific actions expected for rescinding the sanctions."[106] Had the academic boycotters set out clear, measurable, identifiable outcomes, with unmistakable expressed steps to achieve each, there would be less conflict over the success of academic boycotts in South Africa. Without such measures, success is impossible to prove or disprove. Was the purpose to surface the problem of apartheid, that is, either bring it into the public eye of the international community or to the attention of academic community in South Africa? Was it to bring attention to the role South African academic institutions played in supporting the apartheid government? Was the goal to increase awareness and discussion about apartheid through a symbolic gesture, causing feelings of isolation, or inconvenience? Was the goal to actually impede scholarly advancement that would contribute to the former South African government that supported apartheid policies? Was one of the goals to end apartheid in academic institutions?

Current advocates of an academic boycott against Israel cite the academic boycotts of South Africa as successful. Hilary Rose and Steven Rose write in a letter to *Nature*, "the peaceful boycott by the world's academic and

[106] Ralph Crawshaw, "Academic Sanctions," 1503.

cultural communities was instrumental in ending apartheid in South Africa."[107] Others remain more pessimistic about such achievements. Lorraine J. Haricombe and F.W. Lancaster write, "In general, however, the results indicate that the academic boycott had very limited success in the sense that, while many scholars were affected to some extent, actual impact on their research was slight."[108] In a letter published in *Nature*, George Fink contends that two political events, rather than academic boycotts were instrumental in ending apartheid in South Africa:

> First, the United States Congress, on 29 September 1986, overrode President Reagan's veto and imposed strict economic sanctions on South Africa. Second, F.W. de Klerk was elected president of South Africa on 14 September 1989. Two months later (16 November 1989), de Klerk announced the scrapping of the Separate Amenities Act, then, on 11 February 1990, freed Nelson Mandela from prison. The rest is historical detail.[109]

Graeme C. Moodie writes, "The [academic] boycott was not effective against *apartheid* sympathisers and the politically indifferent, but as well as helping to simplify the work of government censors and others anxious to combat liberal ideas it undoubtedly reduced the number of qualified overseas applicants for academic posts in the sixties and for a considerable time after." [110]

Without clear objectives, complete with accompanying indicators of accomplishment, it is difficult to definitively determine the success of the academic boycotts against South Africa. At a minimum, the academic boycotts were at least a contributing factor in consciousness-raising discussion for academics, both international and in South Africa, about the impact of and inter-relationship between apartheid and academia in South Africa as

---

[107] Steven Rose and Hilary Rose, letter to the editor, *Nature*, 221.
[108] Lorraine J. Haricombe and F. W. Lancaster, *Out in the Cold*, 111.
[109] George Fink, letter to the editor, 690.
[110] Graeme C. Moodie, "The State and the Liberal Universities in South Africa: 1948-1990," 15.

demonstrated by the volume of newspaper and journal articles about the academic boycotts and the surrounding issues. The degree to which this increased consciousness lead to discussion that impacted behaviour or policy is open to speculation and requires further extensive investigation, which is beyond the scope of this thesis.

Some argue that the particularities of the academic context were not given due consideration when implementing academic boycotts in South Africa; there was not enough reflection on the ethical implications or norms of academia. A 1987 article from the science journal *Nature* reads, "So far, too little attention has been paid to the complexities of the intellectual trade, which are much greater even than those of rugby football, too little calculation has been made of what a boycott in science would achieve and almost no thought has been given to the circumstances in which a boycott once imposed would then be lifted."[111]

The final conflict over the academic boycotts in South Africa surfaced when some boycotters announced they were ending their academic boycott. During the implementation and execution of the academic boycotts, there had been inadequate reflection and discussion about precisely when and how the boycotts were to be concluded. The result was that different groups of boycotters ended their boycotts at different times.[112] Planning for ending the boycotts during implementation of the boycotts may have reduced this public conflict.

---

[111] *Nature*, "Boycott Someone and Feel Virtuous," 259.
[112] Linda Vergnani, "2 South African Groups vote not to call for Renewal of Academic Boycott, but Students seek Selective Action."

As the first large-scale movement that meets the definition of *academic boycotting* involving multiple parties and a significant goal, it is understandable that implementation was problematic and that ethical problems that had not previously been debated would surface. This case demonstrates the importance of clear, measurable, expressed outcomes and goals if boycotters are to know whether or not their boycott is successful. However, as seen in subsequent academic boycotts, despite emulating these academic boycotts of South Africa, boycotters have not learned the importance of articulating achievable outcomes or goals. Consideration of the ethical concerns that surfaced in this case prepares potential boycotters and theorists of boycotts for the types of ethical concerns that may transpire in other boycott scenarios, thus reducing the likelihood of ethics interfering in the successful execution of an academic boycott.

The academic boycotts of South Africa are historically significant as they helped to define and popularise academic boycotting. The academic boycotts against South Africa were the first large-scale, multi-boycotter example of academic boycotting that adheres to criteria outlined in chapter 1. These boycotts also prompted the first of many debates about the ethical controversies of academic boycotting, covering topics that continue to surface in current academic boycotts. Some of the key ethical concerns included ethical concerns about the purpose of the boycotts, possible harm to society or academia, the selective versus comprehensive debate, and the breaching of the norms of academic freedom and discussion.

The academic boycotts in South Africa are an excellent example of stage 9, the continuing of the boycott, from the steps found in chapter 5. The

boycotters in this case were able to sustain the boycott for decades while many boycotters in other scenarios struggle to continue their boycotters for days or months.

During apartheid in South Africa, discussion was difficult due to a lack of awareness and a power imbalance. In this one way, the situation was suited to academic boycotting. In the case of South Africa, the boycotters were able to engage and mobilize many people and institutions, including many high profile people. They were able to garnish a great deal of publicity and discussion in newspapers, journals and organisations' newsletters and thus increase awareness about apartheid and academia in South Africa. This consciousness-raising resulted in a vast amount of discussion on the issues in journals, newspapers, and newsletters. Such discussion and increase in awareness can theoretically be a power force in pushing an otherwise unwilling party to engage. Yet, it is unclear if that discussion was the type of discussion that could lead to the desired changes. For instance, one could argue that the boycotts moved English language universities in South Africa to engage in discussion, which in turn led to change in the universities' policies and practices of apartheid or one could argue that the boycotts simply surfaced the conflict without making any further contribution to substantial change. While the boycotters were able to mobilize large numbers of people and gather a great deal of support, they were only able to partial achieve some of the critical elements for successfully implementing an academic boycott. In particular, their strategy with accompanying activities and outcomes were not clear and ethical debate often overshadowed the concern at hand. Without such elements, success is difficult to determine.

The challenges of strategising and implementing faced in the academic boycotts of South Africa can serve as a valuable lesson to modern boycotters. Wise strategising and careful execution of an academic boycott is paramount for success; current boycotters need not repeat the errors of the historically significant academic boycotts after which they model their new boycotts.

Academic Boycott against the Technical University of British Columbia

Chapter 7

The most brilliant practitioners of non-violence are able to accomplish a number of tasks that, if done effectively, demand a wide range of skills. While Martin Luther King Jr. and Gandhi provided distant examples and taught the author this conceptually, it was a group of mothers and grandmothers, enraged about the access that children have to violent video games, who made these examples and theories tangible. This ad hoc group of women, with the cleverness and gentle firmness of Gandhi, have been able to achieve remarkable aspirations by envisioning great goals, articulating them in clear and measurable ways, and developing a multi-faceted, creative strategy to achieve these goals. They then devised tactics, including coalition building activities, public education campaigns, government lobbying, and publicity events, that were compatible not only with their strategy, but also their abilities and resources. During and after each aspect of their tactics, they carefully evaluated their progress and made necessary changes to their future plans.

This same series of actions is what distinguishes the most remarkable, successful academic boycotts from the rest. While diverse grassroots groups, with far less access to formal knowledge and resources, have been able to achieve this magical combination, the majority of academic boycotts are unable to. There is no apparent reason for this; perhaps grassroots practitioners simply have more experience and skills in organising projects, events, and action than

academics[113] do. The little known case of an academic boycott of the Technical University of British Columbia is one of the extraordinary cases in which the boycotters were able to set understandable assessable goals and devise a corresponding strategy. To accompany this strategy, they implemented manageable tactics. When this strategy and tactics did not initially work, the boycotters' goals were not lost. As the boycotters were astute organisers, like the women discussed above, they had ensured that they were monitoring their progress and were making changes to their strategy and tactics as necessary.

Thus, this case is included as an example of one of the best planned and executed – though not without struggle – academic boycotts examined in this thesis. This case demonstrates how, if implemented with the utmost insight and careful attention to detail, academic boycotting can create the conditions required for fruitful discussion. (Extensive detail about the steps taken is included to show how exact this implementation must be. Of particular note are the extensive attempts at discussion prior to engaging in non-cooperation.) However, consistent with the theory presented in this thesis, the boycott was unable to achieve directly anything other than discussion. In many ways, the boycotters in this case were innovative and did not stumble over many of the pitfalls that are common in many other boycotts. Some of this originality is a result of *not* having a concrete example to guide them or, for that matter, lead them astray. Despite some communication problems, this case serves as a solid model for other academic boycotts.

[113] As discussed in chapter 1, academics make up a large portion of academic boycotters.

In 1997, two faculty associations in Canada, the Confederation of University Faculty Association of British Columbia (CUFA/BC)[114] and the Canadian Association of University Teachers (CAUT)[115] boycotted the Technical University of British Columbia. Thanks to extensive information archived by the CUFA/BC on their website, a multitude of media reports, and details provided by Robert Clift that filled in any remaining gaps, this case demonstrates how an academic boycott can be used when discussion fails to move towards a more functional discussion by giving the other party a reason to engage in discussion. This case reveals the challenges of establishing realistic goals; the boycotters modified their original goal mid-way through the boycott. While this example of academic boycotting includes some problems and setbacks, it reflects more of the criteria for a successful academic boycott – as outlined in chapter 5 – than any other documented case of academic boycotting. Though some, in particular the boycotted, may disagree, most evidence suggests that this boycott was successful in meeting all of its goals to an extent that was satisfactory to the boycotters.

The controversy surrounding the Technical University of British Columbia started on June 9, 1997 when the provincial government of British Columbia[116] sought to establish a new technical university by introducing *Bill*

---

[114] The *Confederation of University Faculty Associations of British Columbia (CUFA/BC)* is an association that represents 3500 university professors, professional librarians, and other academic staff at the University of British Columbia, Simon Fraser University, University of Victoria, and University of Northern British Columbia in the province of British Columbia in Canada.
[115] *Canadian Association of University Teachers (CAUT)* is an association that represents 25,000 university professors, professional librarians and other academic staff at universities across Canada.
[116] *Government of British Columbia* is a provincial government in Canada. Canada is divided into 10 provincial and 3 territorial regions. Each of these regions is responsible for the education of their own population. The province of British Columbia is located in the south/west of Canada.

30 – 1997, Technical University of British Columbia Act into legislature.

According to *Bill 30*:

> The purposes of the university are
> (a) to offer certificate, diploma and degree programs at the undergraduate and graduate levels in the applied, technological and related professional fields that contribute to the economic development of British Columbia,
> (b) to conduct applied research and development,
> (c) to provide continuing education that responds to the needs of the applied, technological and related professional fields,
> (d) to collaborate and cooperate with other post-secondary institutions, business and labour respecting education and applied research and development, and
> (e) to create strong links with business and labour and develop programs that are relevant to, and at the forefront of, industrial and professional initiative.[117]

Two faculty associations, the Confederation of University Faculty Association of British Columbia (CUFA/BC) and the Canadian Association of University Teachers (CAUT) were concerned about the proposed structure of this university; there was no senate or tenure system to protect academic freedom. They were also concerned about the board of governors, who were to be largely appointed from industry and labour groups instead of being populated by professors. [118] In the estimation of the associations, the board of governors would have "extraordinary powers" [119] to determine research and institutional policies of the university, possibly leading to corporate interference, "programs of questionable quality and credibility"[120] and negative affects on academic freedom. Section 8 of *Bill 30* discusses the powers and duties of the board:

> (1) Subject to this Act, the board has the duties and may exercise the powers of the board of governors or senate of a university under the *University Act* except those powers and duties given to the president by this Act.
> (2) The board must
> (a) approve strategic program and research directions and policies, including instructional program and research priorities, program objectives and desirable

[117] Legislative Assembly of British Columbia, Bill 30 – 1997 Technical University of British Columbia Act, section 2.
[118] Patrick Dare, "Professors Boycott new B.C. University."
[119] CUFA/BC, "Background on the TechBC Campaign."
[120] CUFA/BC, "Background on the TechBC Campaign."

> learning outcomes, for the university in accordance with the mandate of the university,
> (b) determine whether to establish, change or discontinue programs or program areas of the university, and
> (c) at the request of the minister, provide the minister with reports and any other information that the minister considers necessary to carry out the minister's responsibilities respecting the university.[121]

However, Honourable Paul Ramsey spoke positively about the proposed structure of TechBC when introducing the bill:

> The act provides for a corporate governance model to enable the university to respond quickly to changing industry and community needs. It includes a board of governors, a president, who is chief executive officer of the university, and a university council. The board of governors and the president will have the duties and powers of the board of governors and the senate under the University Act. The president will consult with the university council on specified academic matters. The act also establishes program advisory committees for each program area, which will make recommendations to the head of the program area.[122]

The associations wanted the structure of the university to be amended to include measures that would protect academic freedom. Initially, they hoped to achieve this by amending Bill 30 before it passed through the legislature. A letter dated June 11, 1996 from Bruce More, president of CUFA/BC and Bill Bruneau, President of CAUT, to the Honourable Paul Ramsey, Minister of Education, Skills and Training reads:

> We understand that the technical university act has been completed and is ready for introduction into the legislature. Though we have not seen the final version of the act, we believe the fundamental flaws in the earlier drafts remain, and thus we ask that it not be introduced without some amendments...
> It is our experience and view that the senates serve as an important forum for institutional policy-making, and provide a structure through which faculty and students can "buy into" policy rather than having it imposed by administrative fiat. Thus, it is through senates and other means of collegial governance that academic freedom – the freedom to teach, to research, and to comment – are preserved. It is this type of co-operative decision-making and the attendant academic freedom which foster the creativity and innovation that the technical university, and indeed all our universities, need to be successful in the 21st century. Senates are, therefore, a key element in any system of accountability which wishes to ensure quality.
> We request a meeting with you prior to the introduction of this legislation, to expand on these points and outline specific amendments enabling fair and balanced educational governance.[123]

---

[121] Legislative Assembly of British Columbia, "Bill 30 – 1997 Technical University of British Columbia Act," section 8, (italics in original text).
[122] Legislative Assembly of British Columbia, "Excerpt from Official Report of Debates of the Legislative Assembly", June 9, 1997.
[123] Bruce More and Bill Bruneau, letter to Paul Ramsey, June 11, 1996.

The CUFA/BC and the CAUT had expressed concerns about this new university in the two years before the introduction of this bill in June 1997. The following outline of correspondence is not intended to be a comprehensive historical account, but rather to demonstrate the multiple attempts made by the associations to discuss concerns they had with members of the provincial government and interim planning committee before the Bill was introduced.[124] Clift, executive direct of the CUFA/BC, had spoken with Ron Dickson, Chair of the Interim Planning Council of the Technical University,[125] in September 1995 and had followed up the discussion with a letter and a report about university governance and accountability in November 1995. The letter reads: "I had indicated that we would like the opportunity to meet with you, and possibly your Council, at some point in the near future to discuss a range of issues, particularly governance. As our schedules have now cleared up to a large extent, we would be happy to meet with you at anytime (and place) suitable to you."[126]

Members of CUFA/BC had met with the Assistant Deputy Minister of the Post-Secondary Education Division in January 1996 and followed the meeting up with a letter in February 1996, in which Bruce E. More writes, "our major concern is the lack of senate or equivalent body in the governance

[124] For more information and detail about communications prior to and after the introduction of the Bill to the legislature, see the extensive documentation the CUFA/BC has made available on their website at www.cufa.bc.ca.

[125] The *Interim Governing Board of the Technical University of British Columbia* (sometimes referred to as *Technical University Interim Planning Council*) is a committee, chaired by Ron Dickson, that was in charge of developing a proposal for a new technical university in British Columbia.

[126] Robert Cliff, letter to Ron Dickson, November 23, 1995.

structure of the institution."[127] More encourages further communication and interaction in the closing of this letter:

> In conclusion, I hope government will see fit to incorporate some of our recommendations into the proposed legislation before presenting it to the Legislature. I would certainly be happy to answer any questions, or expand on any of these points if they are unclear. Once again, I thank you for the opportunity to comment and look forward to seeing the revised draft of the legislation.[128]

Shell Harvey responded in a letter on April 1996: "You will be interested to know that the draft proposal for establishing the Technical University of British Columbia, is in its final stages and the Ministry is proposing that it proceed in the Spring 1996 Legislative session. When it is introduced, the Bill establishing the Technical University will become public and open to discussion and debate. If you like, you may forward your comments for consideration at that time."[129]

In June 1996, the CAUT and the CUFA/BC sent a joint letter to the Minister of Education, Skills and Training of the government of B.C.[130] expressing concern about the legislation concerning the technical university and requesting a meeting.[131] In April 1997, CUFA/BC expressed the associations' concerns again during a meeting with the Minister of Education, Skills and Training and in a letter following the meeting. Lee Keener, President of the CUFA/BC writes:

> We understand that there is considerable pressure to introduce legislation for the Technical University, should the cabinet decide the project will proceed. We appreciate this and suggest that if government is currently disinclined to include an academic senate or equivalent body in the legislation, that enabling legislation be introduced instead. This would then give the requisite time for all the parties interested in this matter to be brought together to air their differences and see if

---

[127] Bruce E. More, letter to Shell Harvey, February 15, 1996.
[128] Bruce E. More, letter to Shell Harvey, February 15, 1996.
[129] Shell Harvey, letter to Bruce E. More, April 18, 1996.
[130] The *Ministry of Skills, Training and Labour* is a division of the provincial government of British Columbia that, among other duties, would be responsible for post-secondary education in the province.
[131] Bruce More and Bill Bruneau, letter to Paul Ramsey, June 11, 1996.

> consensus could be reached. If consensus could be reached, then government can proceed secure in the knowledge that content experts are making the academic decisions, and that the government is supporting the freedom to teach, the freedom to conduct research, and the freedom to comment on public matters; which is as it should be in our public universities.[132]

This is a well-documented, textbook-worthy example of established channels and norms of discussion failing despite many attempts at engagement. There is little else that the associations could have done that would have fallen within the norms of academia and government lobbying. The associations carefully documented their multiple failed attempts at having their concerns heard before decided to move forward into a confrontational boycott. Robert Clift, Executive Director of the CUFA/BC is quoted in a CUFA/BC press release: "This boycott is essential. For two years, the government of British Columbia and the governors of TechBC have proven themselves unwilling to engage in substantive discussion on how to run this institution."[133] The university and province were not open to amending the legislation, placing a member of the associations onto the interim committee, or changing the governance structure of the university. As a result of a lack of a substantial problem with, dependence on, or relationship with CUFA/BC or CAUT, the provincial government and the university had no reason to engage with the associations prior to the boycott. Once the possibility of an academic boycott emerged, the associations were presenting a problem that begged for TechBC and/or the province to take the associations seriously.

The series of faxes, letters, and information packages sent and meetings held over the course of 18 months was extensive. Nevertheless, the associations found that the government and the Interim Governing Board of the

[132] Lee Keener, letter to Paul Ramsey, April 10, 1997.
[133] Robert Clift, quoted in CUFA/BC Media Release, December 1, 1997.

Technical University did not heed their message. Bill 30 was introduced to legislature on June 9, 1997 without amendments that would satisfy the concerns of the associations; The CAUT responded with a resolution on the Bill on June 19, 1997, which read:

> THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED
> That the Executive Committee of the Canadian Association of University Teachers, acting under policy set by its governing Council, take the following actions, should the Government of British Columbia pass into law Bill 30, the Technical University of British Columbia Act, but without provisions for an academic senate and provisions of appropriate safeguards for academic freedom in teaching and research:
>
> 1. recommend to its members in faculty associations across Canada, and to faculty members elsewhere in the world, that they not take academic or administrative appointments at the Technical University of British Columbia until such time as its governance arrangements include the provision of an academic Senate or its equivalent, and as its legislative basis removes threats to academic freedom for those holding academic appointments in that institution;
> 2. recommend to colleagues in other countries, particularly those holding appointments in institutions of higher education within the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, that they not take academic or administration appointments at the Technical University of British Columbia, nor participate in collaborative research projects nor attend meetings on the campus of the Technical University of British Columbia;
> 3. advise academic, professional, and learned societies in this country and abroad of our action, and invite the co-operation and support of the Canadian Federation of Students, the Canadian Labour Congress and its affiliates, the Canadian School Boards Association, the Canadian Teachers' Federation, colleague organizations in the Coalition for Post-Secondary Education and the Canadian Consortium for Research, the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada, and other concerned organizations;
> 4. advise accrediting agencies and authorities, particularly in Canada and the United States, of our action;
> 5. inform our sister associations in the International Conference of University Teachers' Organizations--in Europe, the Americas, Australasia, and Africa--of our actions, and seek their active support; and
> 6. begin a campaign of systematic publicity and communication to ensure that British Columbians and Canadians are aware of the threat to the public interest represented by the creation of the Technical University of British Columbia in its present form.[134]

The Chair of the Technical University Interim Planning Council, Ron Dickson, found out (via a third-party) about CAUT resolution on July 2, 1997 before the resolution before the association made it public. In a letter to the CAUT, Dickson writes, "Let me begin by expressing my disappointment that

[134] CAUT, "Resolution on Bill 30 – 1997 Technical University of British Columbia Act."

we have not had an opportunity for dialogue prior to the CAUT adopting a public attitude hostile to this institution."[135] Dickson closes the letter showing that he is keen to meet with the associations:

> Because we are of course concerned about opposition from your internationally respected organization, we would like to know what stage your deliberations have reached. Has the resolution which has just come to our attention been passed by the CAUT membership and become official policy of your organization? Have you already implemented measures to attempt to thwart our hiring of academic staff? Or does the resolution represent proposed policy which is still under discussion and review? While we hope the latter suggestion is the more accurate description of the current stance of your organization, it is important that we know precisely where we stand. Our hope is that our two organizations may yet develop a cordial and cooperative working relationship.
> Please advise us if you wish to meet with us and share concerns and perspectives. We will do our best to accommodate your availability for such discussions. [136]

This confusion about the status of the boycott demonstrates a breakdown in communication, which will be discussed further in the context of effective boycott implementation. A letter sent on July 3, 1997 by Robert Clift (of the CUFA/BC) to Paul Ramsey, Minister of Education, Skills and Training[137] helps to clarify the confusion:

> the members of CUFA/BC and the CAUT Executive Committee have authorized severe sanctions should Bill 30 pass third reading as is. In this event, CUFA/BC and CAUT will advise academics across Canada and worldwide that TUBC [Technical University of British Columbia] does not meet international standards for academic governance and academic freedom, and that, accordingly, they should not accept academic or administrative appointments at TUBC, nor should they engage in cooperative instructional or research projects.[138]

William Bruneau from the CAUT also attempted to clarify the confusion about the boycott in a letter sent to Ron Dickson on July 4, 1997:

> To begin, let me assure you that the Canadian Association of University Teachers [CAUT] has not yet made public its strong disapproval of Bill 30, "Technical University of British Columbia Act." The resolution of the CAUT Executive, as finally approved, contained a clause limiting our action unless and until the Government of British Columbia actually passes Bill 30. If Bill 30 were appropriately amended, we would not have to take action of the sort outlined in our resolution of June 19."[139]

---

[135] Ron Dickson, letter to William A. Bruneau, July 2, 1997.
[136] Ron Dickson, letter to William A. Bruneau, July 2, 1997.
[137] The letter was carbon copied to a number of people including Ron Dickson, chair of the Interim Governing Board of TechBC.
[138] Robert Clift, letter to Paul Ramsey, July 3, 1997.
[139] William Bruneau, letter to Ron Dickson, July 4, 1997.

Paul Ramsey, Minister of Education, Skills and Training, responded to Robert Clift, from the CUFA/BC, on July 8 by saying, "I am concerned and disappointed by the content of your letter [of July 3] and the actions which you are apparently advocating. I had hoped for, and expected, a more forward-thinking response."[140]

Bill 30 received its second reading on July 24. On July 28, the CAUT and CUFA/BC issued a media release, which read in part:

> The national organization representing Canadian university academic staff, and their provincial counterpart in British Columbia, today formally announced plans to launch an international boycott of the Technical University of British Columbia (TUBC), should the provincial government adopt Bill 30, the legislation establishing the institution, in its current form.
> "This institution simply isn't a university," Bill Bruneau, president of the Canadian Association of University Teachers (CAUT), said. "The legislation violates two basic characteristics of a university: first, that professors and students should have the major voice in decisions about academic programs, and second, that professors should not be artificially constrained in their decisions as to which research projects to pursue."
> If Bill 30 is not amended to correct these defects, CAUT and the Confederation of University Faculty Associations of British Columbia (CUFA/BC) plan to launch an international boycott of the institution, urging potential professors and administrators not to take positions at the new institution, nor to participate in joint research projects with the institution. The organizations also intend to notify British Columbians that their interests are not being served by this institution.[141]

The Bill received its third reading July 28 and Royal Assent July 30, 1997,[142] and thus in response, a boycott was call.

By the end of July 1997, the news of an academic boycott of TechBC appeared in numerous newspapers.[143] The plethora of media articles throughout August and September demonstrated that the boycott was building in momentum.[144] This press attention ranged from school newspapers[145] to

---

[140] Paul Ramsey, letter to Robert Clift, July 8, 1997.
[141] CUFA/BC, press release, July 28, 1997.
[142] CUFA/BC, "Background to the TechBC Campaign."
[143] Kim Bolan, "B.C.'s New Technical University is Target of Worldwide Boycott"; *Vancouver Sun*, "Be Open to New U"; Sheila Reynolds, "Tech B.C. to be Blackballed"; *Surrey/North Delta News*, "Boycott Bad News for City's Image; Kelly Sinoski, "Proposed Tech B.C. Facing Boycott"; and Jim Beatty, "Victoria Pushes ahead with Plans for Technical University."
[144] Erin McKay, "Technical University Questioned"; Kim Bolan, "Academic Freedom at Risk in New School, Boycott Ad Claims"; Jennifer Lewington, "Teachers Oppose B.C. Tech"; Sheila Reynolds, "Cloverdale Still on U List, says President'; B. A. Kamath, letter to the editor; Bill

large publications such as Maclean's magazine.[146] The boycotters rallied support for their boycott by "placing an ad in the *Vancouver Sun* employment section advising potential applicants [to TechBC] of the boycott, and going to university Senates across the country to ask them to support the boycott."[147]

The boycott continued throughout the autumn of 1997.[148] A CUFA/BC press release reads, "Representatives of more than 70 Canadian university faculty organizations gathered in Ottawa on November 22 to give formal approval to a plan to boycott the controversial Technical University of British Columbia (TechBC)."[149] The American Association of University Professors (AAUP), while not joining the boycott, did write a letter to the B.C. government expressing their concerns about academic freedom and decision-making at TechBC:

> The American Association of University Professors, comprised of 45,000 professors in the United States, views this proposal with alarm, and urges you to reconsider. This new university has an exciting potential to take its place among major universities specializing in the sciences, and to command the respect of the scientific community. We urge you to consult with Canadian university faculty, through the good offices of the Canadian Association of University Teachers and the Confederation of University Faculty Associations of British Columbia, in completing and implementing the design of this new institution.[150]

In December 1997 and January 1998, a number of newspaper articles suggested that the boycott of TechBC was having little or no effect on hiring.[151] An article by Barry Came appearing in Maclean's reads:

> For the record, neither the B.C. government nor the administration expresses much worry over the growing boycott. "We've had no trouble hiring some top-rate people,"

Bruneau, "TechBC Sells Academic Freedom by Degrees"; Craig Saunders, "Breaking the Rules"; Philip Fine, "Union Calls for World Boycott"; and Patrick Dare, "Professors Boycott New B.C. University."

[145] Craig Saunders, "Harsh Opposition Over New B.C. University Grows."

[146] *Maclean's*, "An 'innovation' Under Fire."

[147] Robert Clift, personal communication with the author, March 28, 2005.

[148] Carole Pearson, "B.C. Government Continues to Defend Controversial New University."

[149] CUFA/BC, media release, December 1, 1997.

[150] Mary Burgan, letter to Paul Ramsey and Ron Dickson, October 17, 1997.

[151] Janis Foster, "Boycott? What Boycott?" and Janis Foster, "U Faculty Group Predicts Boycott Impact."

> says Education Minister Ramsey. Significantly, he points to Tech B.C. president Bernard Sheehan, formerly associate vice-president of computing and communications at the University of British Columbia, and vice-president Tom Calvert, formerly vice-president of research at Simon Fraser University. "The criticism is extremely premature," argues Sheehan. "We've only hired 15 staff, and the board of governors has only had one meeting."[152]

This could suggest that the boycott was not flourishing; yet, the boycotters were meeting their intermediate outcomes. The numerous newspaper articles were increasing public awareness. The board of TechBC wanted to enter into discussion; the associations had caught the attention of TechBC and had given them a reason to engage in discussion.[153] Robert Clift (CUFA/BC), is quoted saying, "if they're [TechBC administration] not worried about the boycott why are they meeting with us to have discussion to try and end the boycott? If their position is so solid, they'd simply try to ignore us and they're not."[154] Though a declaration that the boycott was successful may be challenged by TechBC, the associations were able engage the university and to have all of their main concerns addressed in the final agreement,[155] in addition to meeting a series of intermediate outcomes. Robert Clift explains the intermediate outcomes the associations achieved:

> There were a number of intermediate outcomes along the way:
> - We caused the people in Surrey to question whether or not they were getting a "real" university as they had been promised by the government.
> - We caused a good number of Canadian university senates to be wary of any relationships with TechBC
> - We achieved international media and academic attention.
> - We caused a number of potential faculty members to raise questions about academic freedom and governance at the institution
> - We hampered TechBC's fundraising efforts[156]

---

[152] Barry Came, "The Tenure Trap."

[153] As soon as Ron Dickson, chair of the Interim Governing Board of TechBC, found out about the potential of a boycott, he wrote to CAUT to say, "We would very much appreciate an opportunity to meet with you and discuss the concerns you have raised." (Ron Dickson, letter to William Bruneau, July 2, 1997).

[154] Robert Clift, quoted in Janis Foster, "U Faculty Group Predicts Boycott Impact."

[155] TechBC / CAUT / CUFA/BC Agreement.

[156] Robert Clift, personal communication with the author, March 28, 2005.

The boycott was suspended and subsequently lifted when an agreement was reached among the parties.[157] Tony Sheppard, President of CUFA/BC, explains in the press release announcing the end of the boycott:

> Under this agreement, the TechBC Board of Governors will implement policies that guarantee the academic freedom of academic staff and students, that put academic decision making into the hands of academic staff and students, and that guarantee the institution will hire academic staff into, what are for all practical purposes, tenured positions."[158]

Robert Clift stated that the associations and the university reached a final agreement, "that created a quasi-senate, that guaranteed academic freedom, and that provided tenured faculty positions in the future."[159] The agreement includes sections on the academic planning board, academic freedom, human resource policy, a statement on cooperation, and appointments to the University Council and the Program Advisory Committees. In terms of academic freedom, the agreement resolves, "The Board declares the attached *Statement on Academic Freedom* an internal canon of the University," which reads in full:

> It is affirmed that the fulfillment of the mandate of the Technical University of British Columbia is dependent upon its academic community having the protection of academic freedom. The common good of society depends upon the search for knowledge, its free exposition and application. Academic freedom is essential to these purposes in the teaching/learning, research, and service functions of the University. In fulfilling their responsibilities, members of the academic community at the Technical University of British Columbia shall not be hindered or impeded in any way by the University or by any organization within the University from exercising their legal rights as citizens, nor shall they suffer any penalties because of the exercise of their rights. Members of the academic community are entitled, regardless of prescribed doctrine, to freedom in carrying out research and in publishing the results thereof, freedom of teaching and of discussion, freedom to criticize the University and any organization within the University, and freedom from institutional censorship. Academic freedom carries with it the duty to use that freedom in a manner consistent with the scholarly obligation to base research and teaching on an honest search for knowledge. Moreover, academic freedom carries with it a corresponding obligation to use this freedom responsibly, with due concern for the rights of others, for the duties appropriate to the University appointment and for the purposes of the University. Academic freedom does not confer legal immunity either inside or outside the University, nor does it prevent collective self-governance and peer evaluation as

---

[157] TechBC / CAUT / CUFA/BC Agreement.
[158] Tony Sheppard, quoted in CUFA/BC, media release, March 20, 1998.
[159] Robert Clift, personal communication with the author, March 28, 2005.

> conducted or approved by academic, research or professional bodies whether within or outside the University.[160]

The section on human resource policy dealt with a number of concerns, including the lack of tenure or its equivalent. The agreement reads in part:

> TechBC will be guided in establishing its relationships with its employees by provincial and Canadian law and custom as well as current practice in Canadian universities, particularly in the applied fields and professions. Consequently, over the next decade faculty and others engaged in academic areas and certain academic support areas will be hired, some on continuing appointments, some on term appointments, some seconded from other organizations, some under other contractual arrangements, and some associated with the University without compensation as part of their own or their firm's public service contribution.[161]

In a letter from the university to the associations dated March 16, 1998, the concept of "continuing appointments" is clarified:

> We can say that continuing appointments are contracts of an indefinite period. An academic employee would be able to terminate such a contract by resigning, or by retiring.
> The University would be able to terminate a continuing appointment for one of the following reasons:
> - for just cause, which shall include but not be limited to misconduct or persistent neglect of duties,
> - due to the inability of the employee to perform duties for medical or other reasons of a like nature,
> - due to discontinuance of a department or program of instruction,
> - due to financial exigency,
> - due to the employee having reached retirement age.
>
> We will develop employment policies with respect to continuing appointments within this familiar framework.[162]

A few elements of governance were addressed in the final agreement. One of the main concerns of the associations was covered in the final clause of the agreement:

> Under section 13(3) of the Act, the Board shall normally appoint to the Program Advisory Committees teaching staff members and students of the University who have been elected by the teaching staff members and students, respectively, from the appropriate University program area.
> During the initial phases of the university (5 years) it will not be possible to appoint only elected students and teaching staff members (or for that matter to appoint internal teaching staff and student members). Therefore the Board reserves the right to interpret these resolutions in the spirit of collegial governance.[163]

---

[160] TechBC / CAUT / CUFA/BC Agreement.
[161] TechBC / CAUT / CUFA/BC Agreement (underlining in original text).
[162] Bernie Sheehan and Ron Dickson, letter to Robert Clift et al., March 16, 1998.
[163] TechBC / CAUT / CUFA/BC Agreement (underlining in original text).

The text of the final agreement demonstrates that the associations were able to have all their interests met, albeit to varying degrees.

This suggests that in this case, the actual reduction in applications was not as critical as pressure arise from the poor public relations and potential harm to the university's credibility that could be caused by a boycott. Bernie Sheehan, president of TechBC, indicated that boycott had not really affected hiring, but that the university entered into discussion, as they wanted to be part of the international academic community.[164] In addition to the pressure of the boycott, some of the by-products of the boycott, such as increased public awareness and pressure or external letters raising similar concerns from other agencies or union, may have also contributed to the willingness of the university to engage in discussion.

A number of factors in this boycott may have contributed to this success. The primary nature of this boycott – the university that the association had concerns about was the boycotted – may have increased the likelihood of achieving the boycotters goals. One critical factor was the ability of the boycotted to meet the interests of the boycotted; had the boycotted not had the power or ability to make the requested amendments, the boycotted would have likely failed.

The boycotters had modified their goals, while maintaining core principles, to make the goals more feasible. The original concerns of the boycotted were academic freedom, including involvement in governance of the university instead of corporate dominance in governance and a lack of a tenure system. Originally, the associations had envisioned these interests being met by

[164] Craig Saunders, "Boycott Lifted on New BC University."

a change in legislation that would result in a senate and tenure system at TechBC. Ongoing monitoring of the boycott revealed that the first goals were not going to be met. Robert Clift suggests that perhaps it was too late for the province to back down without losing face.[165] Academic boycotts are blunt tools; it is likely that the associations' interests were too complex to be immediately met by the coarse, coercive ways of an academic boycott. The boycotters instead used the coercive power of academic boycott to push for discussion, a method of engagement that is far more appropriate for dealing with intricacies and complexities of the associations' interests in relation to the interests of the province and TechBC. Robert Clift explains:

> Our initial aim was to get the government to amend the TechBC legislation to provide for a proper senate. Our hope was that the publicity and the academic consequences would embarrass the government, hurt them politically, and/or make it more difficult for the institution to get set up and then establish itself as academically respectable. As the boycott progressed, it became apparent to us that the government was unlikely to change the legislation (in part because it would look like they were backing down), but it was clear that the TechBC administration and Board of Governors were keen to achieve some sort of understanding that would result in a the boycott being rescinded. So, our goals later changed to focus on achieving a negotiated settlement.[166]

Had the boycotters had clung to their original unrealistic goals, they would have been less likely to have their interests met as well as they did.

The implementation of this boycott is noteworthy. As neither union had called an academic boycott before and there was no conventions about how to do so, the associations found themselves free to create their own policies and procedures.

> So, why did we use a boycott? We needed some way to draw public attention to matters that the public really didn't know much about and thus didn't really care about – academic freedom and academic governance. The obvious answer was to create some sort of conflict that would draw their attention to what we were doing, then giving us the opportunity to explain the issues to them.
> We had considered using CAUT's "censure" procedure but that process required some sort of violation to happen before it could be invoked and it was a lengthly process to

[165] Robert Clift, personal communication with the author, March 28, 2005.
[166] Robert Clift, personal communication with the author, March 28, 2005.

> have censure imposed. What we needed was some sort of attention that was done in anticipation of something bad happening so that we could avert it. After discussing the matter with CAUT, we came up with this idea of a boycott. Neither we nor CAUT had ever done such a thing before, and since there were no established policies about how one does this sort of thing, we were free to make them up as we went along.[167]

Yet, despite having no guidelines, they were able to meet all of the criteria suggested in chapter 5 well enough to achieve what can be described as a successful boycott, that is a boycott in which the goals of the boycotters are met to the satisfaction of the boycotters.

There are a number of reasons for the success of the boycott. Firstly, this boycott appears to be well thought out. The associations were well informed about the legislative process of creating a new university. They fully exhausted their options by writing letters, sending an information package[168], and meeting with the government before seeking out methods of action that were more confrontational. The associations' previous experience with unsuccessful attempts to address concerns they had had with the new Royal Roads University informed their decision to take action quickly when discussion was proving ineffective.[169]

The boycotters had considered other options,[170] such as one of the union's "censure" procedure, but found that it would not be applicable in this case. They knew that they needed to have an engaged, educated public if they were to successfully pressure the government/university into changing the governance or policies of the university. The associations were attempting to surface a latent conflict using confrontation. Once the conflict was surfaced

---

[167] Robert Clift, personal communication with the author, March 28, 2005.
[168] Robert Clift, letter to Ron Dickson, November 23, 1995.
[169] Robert Clift, personal communication with the author, March 28, 2005.
[170] Robert Clift, personal communication with the author, March 28, 2005.

and a chance for discussion was established, the associations utilized the opportunity to enter into fruitful negotiations.

CUFA/BC and CAUT worked together; unlike some multi-partied boycotting teams, they were able to maintain a unified front and functional intra-group dynamics. The associations found other allies to assist them when necessary. For instance, the American Association of University Professors wrote a letter to the government and the Interim Governing Board of TechBC to pressure them to change the governance of the university. The unions took advantage of this letter and used it as an opportunity for more media exposure. The associations continually made good use of media, in terms of both strategically placed advertisements and regular press releases, to increase public awareness and to put pressure on the government and TechBC throughout the preparation and implementation of the boycott. In addition to publicity about the details of this specific campaign and boycott, much of this media work included a public education component about the importance of academic freedom and appropriate academic institutional governance.

With one notable exception, the associations were transparent and forthright with the boycotted and the public; they communicated their concerns directly and clearly to both the government and TechBC. The associations took measures to ensure transparency that most boycotters do not. They documented all the information about the boycott, including media releases, correspondence, media coverage, legislations, their resolution, and a letter of support, on the CUFA/BC website in an attempt to demonstrate that they acted in a "reasonable

manner."[171] The one breakdown in communication occurred when Ron Dickson, chair of the Interim Governing Board of TechBC, found out via a third party about the CAUT resolution to boycott TechBC if the legislation were to be passed without the desired amendments before he had been informed directly by the boycotters and/or before the boycott had been publicly announced. This caused confusion and conflict, and appears to have strained relations. The CUFA/BC and CAUT both sent letters[172] immediately afterwards to address the confusion. Though this error in communication and the general confrontational nature of boycotting could have caused irremediable alienation, the associations, and TechBC were able to create an ongoing working relationship as stated in their agreement:

> The Board commits itself to maintaining open communications among CAUT, CUFA/BC and TechBC on matters of mutual interest such as collegial governance, academic freedom, policies regarding appointments, and legislative issues relevant to universities, and to meet from time to time at the request of any parties for discussions or for cooperative efforts.[173]

With the exception of the above-mentioned problem with leaked information, the ultimatum itself, as presented in the CAUT resolution on Bill 30, was clear about why a boycott was being considered, who would boycott whom, under what conditions the boycott would proceed, and how the boycott would be manifested. These points are reiterated in subsequent letters to the boycotted. The associations carefully explained that they wanted a system of governance and policies that protected academic freedom built into the development of TechBC. Throughout the preparation for and implementation of the boycott, the associations are unambiguous about their demands, though

---

[171] Robert Clift, personal communication with the author, March 28, 2005.
[172] William Bruneau, letter to Ron Dickson, July 4, 1997 and Robert Clift, letter to Paul Ramsey, July 3, 1997.
[173] TechBC / CAUT / CUFA/BC Agreement.

they modified these demands to the changing situation. In a letter from CAUT to the Interim Governing Board of TechBC, William Bruneau explains that, "in this current round, the CAUT is not opposed to TechBC itself. Our quarrel is with the Government of British Columbia, its legislation, and its funding arrangements."[174] A press release from July 28, 1997, the associations publicly declare that they will shift from lobbying the government to boycotting TechBC if their desired amendments are not made to the legislation.[175]

The boycotters, boycotted, and the public were clear about exactly when the academic boycott was ended as a result of an unambiguous agreement,[176] and a timely press release on behalf of the unions.[177] However, this clarity is only one of a number of factors that reduced the ethical debate about this boycott.

This academic boycott was not as ethically controversial as most other boycotts. Often academic boycotts are questioned in terms of the harm done versus the good achieved.[178] In this case, the university was only in its infancy, and thus there was little impact on students or academic staff. Robert Clift, from CUFA/BC explains, "We had the luxury of boycotting an institution that consisted only of administrators and administrative staff. Nobody lost their jobs as the result of what we did and the faculty and students ended up with a better institution in my view."[179] It is interesting to note that CUFA/BC decided not to boycott another university in British Columbia, Royal Roads University: "One of the primary considerations that affected our decision not to

[174] William Bruneau, letter to Ron Dickson, July 4, 1997.
[175] CUFA/BC, media release, July 28, 1997.
[176] TechBC / CAUT / CUFA/BC Agreement.
[177] CUFA/BC, media release, March 20, 1998.
[178] See the case study of South Africa (chapter 6) for a discussion on this theme.
[179] Robert Clift, personal communication with the author, March 28, 2005.

boycott Royal Roads is that there were faculty members and students at the institution who would have been negatively affected by a boycott."[180]

Unlike most other cases of academic boycotting, these boycotters did not receive the flurry of criticism about academic boycotts inhibiting academic freedom. This was likely due to the combination of a few factors. Firstly, the boycott was in defence of academic freedom and academic norms of governance. Secondly, there were no students or academic participating in the university yet, thus the boycott was not obstructing the academic freedom of individual people. Thirdly, those who would be most likely to be concerned with the breach of academic freedom – university teachers and academic associations – were in fact the ones calling and participating in the boycott.

This boycott also appears to be less ethically controversial because it was a primary boycott that was directly dealing with a concern about the institution that was being boycotted. Unlike instances of secondary boycotting, resulting from a connection between academia and politics or a government, there were no contentions about the separation of academia from politics or society. The connections between the action and the goal were apparent and direct; they were difficult to question or dispute.

This case demonstrates that academic boycotting can have a role to play in moving from failed discussion to an agreement that meets the boycotters concerns. It also shows the limitations of academic boycotting to directly achieve a goal other than discussion. The academic boycott of the Technical University of British Columbia is an example of a successful primary boycott of

[180] Robert Clift, personal communication with the author, March 28, 2005.

one university by multiple parties. After several failed attempts at having their concerns heard, CAUT and CUFA/BC were able to use an academic boycott to coerce the board of TechBC into discussions. These discussions resulted in an agreement in which the associations' main concerns were addressed to a satisfactory level and thus, the associations lifted their academic boycott and resumed normalised relations with TechBC.

Though the criteria for the successful use of an academic boycott are extensive and situations in which they are appropriate are limited, this case demonstrates that academic boycotts can be an effective method to move a conflict from an impasse resulting from failed discussion to functional discussion. The obstacles faced by the boycotters when they initially attempted to achieve overly complex goals using an academic boycott reveals the limited functionality of academic boycotts when discussion would be a more appropriate means of dealing with complicated or detail oriented goals. The case, however, establishes the useful role academic boycotts can play creating the conditions – such as increasing public awareness and the other party's willingness to engage – that would make discussion possible in such situations.

Compared to many other situations in which academic boycotts occur, the TechBC case was uncomplicated. The context of this case, for instance, stands in sharp contrast to the circumstances of the case of Israel, found in chapter 8. The political situation, historical baggage, and ethical controversy surrounding the academic boycotts of Israel are far more extensive, complex, and multi-faceted than in the boycott of TechBC. Thus, attempting to execute an academic boycott in the context of Israel is far more difficult than with this case. As discussed in chapter 8, the success of the academic boycotts against

Israel is debatable, as is the success of most academic boycotts that occur in multi-faceted situations. It may be that the relatively straightforward situational factors involved in the TechBC case allow for a more definite assertion of success than in other more contextually complex academic boycotts. It may also be that academic boycotts are better suited to less complicated environmental conditions. Possibly, situational factors did not play such a vital role. Perhaps in addition, the boycotters in other cases simply did not have the skills or resources to strategise about or implement an academic boycott as well as the boycotters in the TechBC case did.

In addition to providing insights into academic boycotting theory, this case study is a helpful example for practitioners engaging in any type of non-violent action. Like the work of Gandhi and the women organising around violent video games, this action was part of a well-planned, well-executed strategy, complete with clear, articulated, achievable short- and long-term outcomes or goals. This combination of level of clarity and insight, both in terms of strategy and implementation, is seldom found in non-violent action; usually, non-violent actions are stronger either in vision or in the details of carrying out tactics. This case also exhibits how boycotters can ensure that all of the criteria for the successful implementation of an academic boycott can be incorporated into their campaign.

Academic Boycotts Against Israel

Chapter 8

The most notorious and heated academic boycotts in the first part of the 21st century have been academic boycotts of Israeli academia. This case study, which focuses on the 2005 Association of University Teachers (AUT) academic boycotts, will examine the strategic, ethical, and logistical complications that can occur in and affect the success of a complicated, impassioned academic boycott. As the events of the AUT boycotts only unfolded throughout the spring and summer of 2005, this case study is compiled from current material and analysed in terms of the mechanisms of boycotting and implications for non-violence theory. A range of aspects are examined, including the ethical controversy and backlash that can occur when all options for discussion are not exhausted before escalating to academic boycotting is demonstrated. All the criteria and steps for the successful implementation of an academic boycott, as outlined in chapter 5, are not met in this case. While the AUT boycotts may have made some gains, this chapter will discuss how the lack of clear, measurable goals makes it impossible to declare these boycotts a success. This chapter also has implications for broader non-violence theory as it confirms the importance of carefully selecting an appropriate method of action based on the context, establishing and presenting a well planned strategy for achieving goals, and clearly indicating how immediate actions will contribute to the final goals.

Though the boycotts of Israel had been occurring irregularly since the founding of Israel, broad multi-faceted international boycotts intensified shortly after the start of the new millennium. The boycotts occur because of what the

boycotters perceive as unjust actions by the Israeli government against Palestinians in the West Bank and the Gaza Strip.[1] By 2002, manifestations included arms boycotts, academic boycotts, cultural boycotts, economic boycotts (including divesting), sports boycotts, and tourism boycotts.[2] Secondary boycotts of those who support Israel also began.[3] One organisation that promotes the various types of boycotts against Israel, Boycott Israel Campaign, explains its understanding of the boycotts on its website.

> The boycott of Israeli products and companies supporting the zionist entity is about ordinary people around the world using their right to choose what they buy in order to help bring about an end to oppression in Palestine. Its (sic) a peaceful means of putting international pressure on the racist state of Israel and follows in the footsteps of the successful boycott against South African racist apartheid.[4]

There are numerous examples of such boycotting including a divestment campaign at Princeton University in the United States.[5] Under the heading "Why Divest?" supporters of divestment write:

> We believe that the human rights of Palestinians must be respected. Further, as members of the Princeton University community, we believe that Princeton University ought to use its influence – political and financial – to encourage the United States government and the government of Israel to respect these human rights. As a tool to make this happen, Princeton University should immediately divest from Israel and only reconsider investing again when:
>
> - Israel is in compliance with United Nations Resolution 242 which calls for "Withdrawal of Israeli armed forces from territories occupied in the recent [1967] conflict,"
> - Israel is in compliance with the United Nations Committee Against Torture 2001 Report which recommends that Israel's use of legal torture must be ended,
> - In compliance with the Fourth Geneva Convention ("The occupying power shall not deport or transfer parts of its own civilian population into territories it occupies," (Article 49, paragraph 6)), Israel ceases building settlements in the Occupied Territories,

---

[1] As the United Nations Security Council, in resolutions such as 484, 465, and 478, refers to Israel occupying Arab territories since 1967, the West Bank and the Gaza Strip are often referred to as "Occupied Territories." To confuse matters, Israel withdrew from the Gaza Strip in September 2005, *after* the academic boycotts discussed in this thesis were called and relevant referenced articles were written.

[2] http://www.inminds.co.uk/boycott-news.html has one of the most comprehensive lists of goods, services and cultural aspects that are part of the boycotts.

[3] http://www.inminds.co.uk/boycott-news.html also has a list of companies that support Israel that are part of the secondary boycott.

[4] Boycott Israel Campaign, "Boycott Israel Frequently Asked Questions," question 1.

[5] As divestment by a university does not affect the primary purposes of academia, it is not considered a form academic boycotting.

- Israel acknowledges the applicability of United Nations Resolution 194 with respect to the rights of refugees.[6]

There have been boycotts suggested for and called in a number of types of sports ranging from soccer[7] to table tennis. For instance, Nabeel Al-Magahwi refused to play an Israeli at the table tennis World Championships in 2003.[8] The Network of Palestinian Art Centres called for a cultural boycott of Israel, which reads in part:

> We call on members of the international community of artists, academics and performers to show their moral disapproval for Israeli violation of the laws of war and the Geneva Convention by not coming to perform, attend conferences, or give lectures. Israel can no longer claim to be an enlightened state when its armies rampage across the land of a colonized and occupied people. To pretend that business as usual is possible while Israel is still actively involved in terrible aggression and destruction is to give it support where only condemnation is warranted.[9]

In August 2002, a Tate Britain exhibition was boycotted because of an exhibition by an Israeli artist.[10] The Boycott Israel Campaign urged people to write letters to Tate Britain and provided the following "Sample Letter."

> I am appalled to see you hosting an exhibition by an Israeli artist (Ori Gersht – Afterglow) at a time when Palestinian artists have no freedom, their artistic talent being crushed under the brutal occupation.
> It is totally unethical to carry on 'business as usual' with Israel when the war crimes and human rights abuses of their illegal military occupation are stains upon the conscience of humanity.
> Please don't collaborate with apartheid! Observe a cultural boycott until Israel ends the occupation and its racist state terrorism. It happened with South Africa and it will happen with Israel: justice demands a boycott.[11]

All types of boycotting in the context of the Israeli/Palestinian conflict have been controversial. Organisations and people calling for and participating in the boycotts have faced disapproval and criticism, including threats.[12]

---

[6] Students for Progressive Education and Action, "Why Divest?"
[7] *BBC*, "Israeli Match Sparks Protest" and Chris McAuley, "Clash over Israel Game."
[8] Saleh Fareed, "Table Tennis Player becomes Celebrity after Refusing to Face Israeli."
[9] Network of Palestinian Art Centers, letter to the international community of artists, intellectuals and academics.
[10] Helen Jacobus, "Israel Boycott Targets Tate Exhibit."
[11] Boycott Israel Campaign, "Cultural Boycott of Israel," Tate Britain section.
[12] Felicity Arbuthnot, "Call to Boycott Israeli Goods Faces Threats."

Almost all actions taken in a politically charged context, such as in Israel and the occupied territories, are controversial; boycotts are not exempt. In addition, academic boycotting has two other factors that make it even more contentious than other forms of boycotting. Firstly, academic boycotting is contentious as a method as there are the assertions that boycotting is a method of action that is incompatible with the values and norms of academia, especially academic freedom.[13] Secondly is a history of anti-Semitism in academia, particularly in Nazi Germany. In his book, *Hilter's Willing Executioners*, Daniel Jonah Goldhagen writes:

> The universities were still more swept along by the antisemitic wave that engulfed them and German society... The hostility to Jews, by both students and professors, and the many accompanying discriminatory acts were alarmingly described by the Prussian Minister of Science, Art, and Popular Education in 1920 as a "massive swelling of antisemitic tendencies at our universities"... All of this was to grow only worse ten years later, when many of these same organizations would wholeheartedly accept the leadership of Nazi students, and the National Socialist German Student League would win the allegiance of the majority of students in Germany and Austria. Professors, themselves anything but immune to the prevailing cultural models about Jews, rarely criticized the racist antisemitism that was the widespread norm on campuses.[14]

Some critics compare the current academic boycotts against Israel to the isolation and exclusion of Jews in Nazi Germany.[15]

Lisa Taraki, an organiser of the Palestinian boycott call, explains why Israeli academia is being boycotted along with other aspects of Israeli society:

> There is nothing unique per se in the academy. The goal is to make Israel as a state censurable, isolatable, and to indeed isolate it as a state that practices racism, and which oppresses another people. Of course having said that, I want to note that singling out the Israeli academy is important in itself, because that is where the Israeli narrative is fashioned, refined, expanded. In general academics have been and continue to be very involved in developing the racist discourse (take the "demographic threat" as an example; demographers have been very valuable in providing data and analyses for the right wing's demographic policy, which is racist in its very conception.) So the role of academics and intellectuals in general is important, and putting them on the spot also make them vulnerable among – and hopefully

[13] See chapter 1 for a discussion of academic freedom.
[14] Daniel Jonah Goldhagen, *Hitler's Willing Executioners*, 83.
[15] For instance, see Jack Cohen, letter to the editor, 11.

> accountable to – their international colleagues. If that makes them more inclined to question their state's policies, than it is all to the better.[16]

The focus of this case study is a set of academic boycotts called by the Association of University Teachers in April 2005. These academic boycotts, however, are not the first to be called against academia in Israel. They are the most recent in a series of international academic boycotts called since 2002 in objection to the actions of the Israel state with regards to Palestinians and what boycotters see as silent support or lack of protest by Israeli academics to their state's actions.

The most prominent call for an academic boycott against Israel occurred on April 6, 2002, when a letter calling for an academic boycott of Israel appeared in *The Guardian* newspaper. It was signed by some 125 academics from around the world, including a few Israeli academics.

> Despite widespread international condemnation for its policy of violent repression against the Palestinian people in the occupied territories, the Israeli government appears impervious to moral appeals from world leaders (Fear of wider conflict as army pushes on, April 5). The major potential source of effective criticism, the US, seems reluctant to act. However, there are many ways of exerting pressure from within Europe.
> Odd though it may appear, many national and European cultural and research institutions, including especially those funded from the EU and the European Science Foundation, regard Israel as a European state for the purposes of awarding grants and contracts. Would it not therefore be timely if a both national and European level a moratorium was called upon any further such support unless and until Israel abides with UN resolutions and opens serious peace negotiations with the Palestinians along the lines proposed in many peace plans, including most recently that sponsored by the Saudis and the Arab League.[17]

The demand that Israel adhere to UN resolutions is a broad request considering that there have been many resolutions that pertain to Israel and the Palestinians over a long period of time and about various aspects, including resolutions 194 (1948), 242 (1967), 252 (1968), 446 (1979), 465 (1980), 471 (1980), 605 (1987), 607 (1988), 636 (1989), 694 (1991), 726 (1992), 799 (1992), 904

---

[16] Lisa Taraki, personal communication with the author, November 6, 2005.
[17] Patrick Bateson et al., letter to the editor.

(1994), 1322 (2000), 1405 (2002), 1435 (2002).[18] Supporters of boycotts believe that pressure from outside the UN is critical for making Israel adhere to UN resolutions, as the UN is not able to enforce Chapter Six resolutions:

> The UN distinguishes between two sorts of Security Council resolution. Those passed under Chapter Six deal with the peaceful resolution of disputes and entitle the council to make non-binding recommendations. Those under Chapter Seven give the council board powers to take action, including warlike action, to deal with "threats to the peace, breaches of the peace, or acts of aggression." Such resolutions, binding on all UN members, were rare during the cold war. But they were used against Iraq after its invasion of Kuwait. None of the resolutions relating to the Israeli-Arab conflict comes under Chapter Seven. By imposing sanctions – including military ones – against Iraq but not against Israel, the UN is merely acting in accordance with its own rules.[19]

This boycott caused a raging storm of controversy. Articles about the legitimacy, ethics, and individual actions within the boycott appeared in mainstream newspapers, such as *The Guardian* (U.K.), *Ha'aretz, The Independent* (U.K.), and *the Jerusalem Post*; articles in *The Chronicle of Higher Education* and *The Times Higher Education Supplement*; throughout academic journals including *Nature, European Molecular Biology Organization Reports, The Scientist, New Scientist*, and *Notices of the American Mathematical Society*; by academic newsletters; and on numerous websites and discussion boards. Many of the debates that surfaced during the academic boycotts of South Africa were revived.

Controversy was greatest when boycotters took actions against individual Israeli academics. For instance, controversy erupted when Mona Baker dismissed two Israeli academics from the editorial boards of journals that she edits.[20]

---

[18] These resolutions are summarised well in the *Economist*, "Iraq, Israel, and the UN: Double Standards."

[19] *Economist*, "Iraq, Israel, and the UN: Double Standard."

[20] Caroline Davis, "Baker defends Actions and Denies Anti-Semitism"; Michael Cohen, "Academic Freedom in Britain Petition"; Sara Leibovich-Dar, "Scholars under Siege"; and Polly Curtis, "Academic's Death adds Fuel to Israeli Boycott Campaign."

Though the letter suggested a desire to have Israel enter into serious peace talks and abide with UN resolutions, Steven Rose, one of the initiators of the boycott, is quoted by Catherine Zandonella as saying, "I never assumed the boycott, as such, would actually change the policies of the Israeli government."[21] Zandonella goes on to quote Rose further, "We wanted to make a protest and raise the issue, and in that sense the effect has been quite dramatic, far more than what we anticipated."[22] Though Israeli academic Ilan Pappe would like to see one democratic secular state and Palestinian right of return, he believes that academic boycotting should not be used for those purposes. Instead, in the context of the Israeli occupation of the West Bank and the Gaza Strip, Pappe writes, "The overall objective is to change a policy not the identity of the state… The device of external pressure should be employed to change a policy of destruction, expulsion and death." In *the Guardian* article "Academic Boycott of Israel gathers Momentum," Hilary Rose, another initiator of the boycott, is quoted expressing her hope that the boycott will revive conversations about what is happening to the Palestinian academic system.

Many boycotters view the academic boycotts of Israel as one part of a larger movement to change the Israeli government's policies and actions concerning Palestinians. In the article "Why Academic Boycott – A Reply to an Israeli Comrade," Tanya Reinhart, professor of Linguistics at Tel Aviv University, compares the current political situation in Israel to South Africa during apartheid. Reinhart writes, "Given that the US backs Sharon, no UN resolution has any force… The only way left to exert pressure on Israel to stop

[21] Steven Rose, quoted in Catherine Zandonella, "Mixing Science and Politics."
[22] Steven Rose, quoted in Catherine Zandonella, "Mixing Science and Politics."

is through the protest of people around the world, including the use of the most painful means of boycott."[23]

Though many subsequent academic boycotts of Israel were based on the same premise as this earlier boycott from April 2002, it is different to boycotts such as the 2005 AUT boycott in a number of particular ways. This 2002 boycott was an expressly European call, in which only one manifestation of boycotting was suggested. Support from national and European cultural and research institutions was highlighted and other specific manifestations, such as refusal to collaborate on projects or the exclusion of Israeli academics from conferences, were not included.

While the April 2005 AUT boycott was called against two specific Israeli institutions, this letter was a broad call against all of Israel. Unlike some boycotts, such as the July 2004 boycott called by the Palestinian Campaign for the Academic and Cultural Boycott of Israel that explicitly excluded those individuals who speak out about the policy of Israel, this letter was unclear as to who was to be included and excluded. Though one of the signatories, Steven Rose, later wrote that their call makes, "clear that we exclude from boycott, and actively support, those brave Israelis who work with the Palestinians to oppose Israel's apartheid-like policies."[24] The debate of who to include and exclude in an academic boycott is reminiscent of similar debates that occurred during the academic boycotts of South African academia during apartheid.[25]

---

[23] Tanya Reinhart, "Why Academic Boycott – A Reply to an Israeli Comrade."
[24] Steven Rose, letter to the editor, *New Scientist,* 26.
[25] See chapter 6 for discussion of the academic boycotts of South Africa.

John Docker and Ghassan Hage, a Jewish Australian and an Arab Australian, called for an academic boycott of Israel after hearing that the above boycott appeared in *The Guardian*. The call for the boycott reads in part:

> In the face of our government's unwillingness or inability to act, civil society must step in to exert pressure against the continuation of the savagely anachronistic act of colonisation. In a globalised world, our passivity as citizens of a world in the face of such inhumanity will stain all of us.
> Academics and intellectuals as always can play an instrumental role in fostering the growth of such a non-violent movement within civil society. It is in this spirit that we call for a boycott of research and cultural links with Israel. We urge our colleagues not to attend conferences in Israel; to pressure our universities to suspend any existing exchange or linkage arrangements; and to refuse to distribute scholarship and academic position information. We note that while some academics and intellectuals in Israel oppose the government and some also are involved in cooperative Israeli/Palestinian research projects, the vast majority have either supported the current Israeli Army onslaught on the Palestinians, or failed to voice any significant protest against it. The boycott we propose will inevitably also adversely affect those who don't deserve it, and we regret that this has to happen.[26]

In a paper given in London on December 5, 2004, John Docker indicated that their call was largely symbolic. "But symbolic protests – as the great Gandhi knew well – can be powerful, perhaps in changing in quiet and invisible ways the climate of opinion around an issue."[27]

Paris University VI, Pierre-et-Marie-Curie, also called for the suspension of Israel participation in the EU Framework Programme for research.[28] The university's board passed the call for the boycott on December 16, 2002. The university faced a great deal of pressure to revoke the boycott, but, as noted by Tanya Reinhart, "Paris VI did sustain the pressure. In the board meeting on Monday January 27, 2003, the previous resolution was reconfirmed with an overwhelming majority."[29] Reinhart also notes, "A similar resolution was

---

[26] John Docker, Ghassan Hage et al., "Call for Australian Boycott of Research and Cultural Links with Israel", appendix II in John Docker, "Settler Colonialism as Genocide.
[27] John Docker, "Settler Colonialism as Genocide," 2.
[28] Tanya Reinhart, "Why the World should Boycott Israeli Academic Institutions"; Declan Butler, "Paris University blasted over Israel Motion"; and Jane Marshalland and David Jobbins, "Unesco Head Rejects Israel Boycott amid Paris Storm."
[29] Tanya Reinhart, "Why the World should Boycott Israeli Academic Institutions."

subsequently approved by two other French universities in Grenoble and in Montpellier."[30]

Shortly after the academic boycott originated in the U.K. in 2002, the NATFHE lecturers union also issued a petition[31] that, according to Holger Breithaupt, "asked universities and colleges in the UK to review their use of Israeli products in catering, their collaboration in student exchanges and their seminar invitations to Israeli academics."[32]

After a series of less formal Palestinian calls for academic boycotts, the Palestinian Campaign for the Academic and Cultural Boycott of Israel issued a statement on July 7, 2004. The call included an introductory letter from the Palestinian Campaign for the Academic and Cultural Boycott of Israel, which explains that the boycott is in response to the failure of other forms of international intervention in the face of military occupation and colonization of the West Bank and the Gaza Strip. The letter acknowledges that "boycott is not popular yet when the target is Israel" and explains that Palestinians cannot wait until public opinion changes. The letter ends by saying,

> Boycott is clearly among the clearest and least violent tactics in resisting occupation and injustice at an international level. We hope that you can endorse it and find the best, most nuanced and effective means of advocating and implementing it. This would be a highly appreciated and practical contribution to supporting Palestinian academic freedom and, indeed, to resisting injustice and fostering genuine peace in our troubled region.[33]

The boycotters explain part of the reasons for a specifically Palestinian call for an academic boycott in a series of statements leading up to the call: "Recognizing that the growing international boycott movement against Israel

---

[30] Tanya Reinhart, "Why the World should Boycott Israeli Academic Institutions."
[31] Owen Bowcott, "Academics in War of Words over Calls to Boycott Israel."
[32] Holger Breithaupt, "Science and War," 596.
[33] Palestinian Campaign for the Academic and Cultural Boycott of Israel, letter to fellow academics, intellectuals and activists.

has expressed the need for a Palestinian frame of reference outlining guiding principles."[34] The text of the actual call following the pre-amble reads:

> *We, Palestinian academics and intellectuals, call upon our colleagues in the international community to comprehensively and consistently boycott all Israeli academic and cultural institutions as a contribution to the struggle to end Israel's occupation, colonization and system of apartheid, by applying the following:*
>
> 1. Refrain from participation in any form of academic and cultural cooperation, collaboration or joint projects with Israeli institutions;
> 2. Advocate a comprehensive boycott of Israeli institutions at the national and international levels, including suspension of all forms of funding and subsidies to these institutions;
> 3. Promote divestment and disinvestments from Israel by international academic institutions;
> 4. Exclude from the above actions against Israeli institutions any conscientious Israeli academics and intellectuals opposed to their states' colonial and racist policies;
> 5. Work toward the condemnation of Israeli policies by pressing for resolutions to be adopted by academic, professional and cultural associations and organizations;
> 6. Support Palestinian academic and cultural institutions directly without requiring them to partner with Israeli counterparts as an explicit or implicit condition for such support.[35]

Omar Barghouti, one of the organisers of the Palestinian boycott, discusses the goals and successes of the boycott thus far:

> We are realistic. We do not think that the world will suddenly experience a conscience awakening and isolate the Israeli academic establishment. The intermediate goal of the boycott campaign right now is to show that Israel is boycottable, just like South Africa was. One main indicator of the progress of the struggle to reach that goal is the actual spread of boycott initiatives (including divestment) in various countries. Another is the decrease of the number of international academics and cultural figures taking part in conferences/festivals in Israel or supporting joint research with Israeli academic institutions. A third indicator of the boycott's effectiveness is the degree of panic in official Israel as a result of the various initiatives taken so far.[36]

This boycott re-surfaced as part of the AUT boycotts in April 2005. It was this boycott that was presented in a motion to be circulated to local branches of the AUT for information and discussion.

The Association of University Teachers (AUT) issued the most recent major call for an academic boycott of Israel in April 2005. This AUT boycott is not

---

[34] Palestinian Campaign for the Academic and Cultural Boycott of Israel, "Palestinian Academics Call for International Academic Boycott of Israel."
[35] Palestinian Campaign for the Academic and Cultural Boycott of Israel, "Palestinian Academics Call for International Academic Boycott of Israel," (italics in original text).
[36] Omar Barghouti, personal communication with the author, November 6, 2005 (underlining in original text).

only part of a succession of academic boycotts against Israel, but is also rooted in a series of attempts by the AUT to deal with the situation in Israel, including a rejection of academic boycotting in May 2003[37] and a policy about Israel and Palestine.[38] Before the motion for a boycott was even brought to the floor of the AUT council meeting in April 2005, controversy had erupted. Articles appeared in many newspapers including *The Independent*, *The Guardian*, *Jewish Chronicle* and *Ha'aretz*.[39] Debate about the boycott has continued since, despite the retraction of the boycott call in May 2005. There is little agreement about this boycott; even the details of the major events of the boycott are contentious. Polly Curtis and Matthew Taylor write:

> How the boycott became official AUT policy at the Eastbourne conference will become the stuff of legend... But like all good legends, some of the detail has already been lost. And like all legends concerning the sensitive and polarised world of Israeli-Palestinian politics, the debate about whether to boycott the universities is now shrouded in a thick cloud of claim and counter-claim.[40]

There are a few facts that have not been disputed. The motions for the boycotts were presented and subsequently passed at the AUT council meeting, which was held from April 20-22, 2005 in Eastbourne, UK. The motions for the boycotts were dealt with on April 22, the final day of the meeting. The media reported that there were approximately 200 members of AUT in attendance at the meeting.

There were five motions that pertain to the area of academic boycotting. The executive submitted one:

> Council welcomes the recent ceasefire between Israel and Palestine as a valuable respite in the damage caused to higher education and the working lives of higher education personnel in Palestine. Council reaffirms its support for colleagues in

[37] Phil Baty, "Lecturers Reject Call to Boycott Israelis."
[38] AUT, "Israel and Palestine."
[39] Sue Blackwell includes links to many of these pre-boycott articles on her website at http://www.sue.be/pal/academic/AUT.html.
[40] Polly Curtis and Matthew Taylor, "Second Opinion."

> Palestinian institutions working in these difficult and sometimes dangerous conditions, and urges LAs [local associations] to further develop the twinning programme bringing together their institution with those in Palestine. Council asks the executive to continue to develop its links with the Palestinian Federation of Unions of University Professors and Employees with the view to providing further support.[41]

Originally, there was a second paragraph, but it was amended by Birmingham University. The second paragraph read:

> Council also recognises that the peaceful resolution of the problems facing the Middle East will not be brought about by the erection of barriers, but by open dialogue. Council therefore calls on the executive to establish contact with the Israeli Higher Education Union representatives.[42]

The motion was carried as amended.

John Klier, professor of Jewish History at University College London[43], summarises his feeling about the motions in a response to the boycott he wrote in *The Chronicle of Higher Education.*

> These motions came up at the end of the last day. Clearly hoping to finesse them, the executive committee submitted a bland resolution welcoming the recent Israeli-Palestinian cease-fire and calling for cooperation among British, Palestinian, and Israeli academic unions. With time running out, the debate was a shambles, and there was no chance for specific changes to be discussed. Under those conditions, the boycott passed.[44]

A different motion dealt with a Palestinian call for a boycott of Israel. The motion, moved by Open University and seconded by Birmingham University, reads:

> ***Open and Birmingham*** Council notes:
>
> 1. That nearly sixty of the most prominent academic, cultural and professional associations and trade unions in the Occupied West Bank and Gaza, including the Federation of Unions of Palestinian Universities' Professors and Employees and the umbrella organization of Palestinian Non Governmental Associations (NGOs) in the occupied West Bank (PNGO), and thus highly representative of the views of major sectors in Palestinian civil society, have now called for an academic and cultural boycott of Israeli institutions.
> 2. That AUT is affiliated to Friends of Bir Zeit University and Trade Union Friends of Palestine.
> 3. That the full text of the Palestinian Call can be found on the following websites: http://right2edu.birzeit.edu/news/article178 http://www.bricup.org.uk
> 4. That the wording of this call is as follows:
> 'In the spirit of international solidarity, moral consistency and resistance to injustice

[41] AUT 2005 Council resolutions (pertaining to Israel) as emailed to the author by the organisation Engage.
[42] AUT 2005 Council resolutions (pertaining to Israel) as emailed to the author by the organisation Engage.
[43] Institutional affiliations are provided only for the purpose of identification.
[44] John D. Klier, "A British Union Reverses a Boycott: 3 Responses," third response.

and oppression, we, Palestinian academics and intellectuals, call upon our colleagues in the international community to comprehensively and consistently boycott all Israeli academic and cultural institutions as a contribution to the struggle to end Israel's occupation, colonization and system of apartheid, by applying the following:

i. Refrain from participation in any form of academic and cultural cooperation, collaboration or joint projects with Israeli institutions;
ii. Advocate a comprehensive boycott of Israeli institutions at the national and international levels, including suspension of all forms of funding and subsidies to these institutions;
iii. Promote divestment and disinvestment from Israel by international academic institutions;
iv. Exclude from the above actions against Israeli institutions any conscientious Israeli academics and intellectuals opposed to their state's colonial and racist policies;
v. Work toward the condemnation of Israeli policies by pressing for resolutions to be adopted by academic, professional and cultural associations and organizations;
vi. Support Palestinian academic and cultural institutions directly without requiring them to partner with Israeli counterparts as an explicit or implicit condition for such support.'

Council resolves to circulate the full text of the Palestinian call to all LAs for information and discussion.[45] This motion was carried, without amendments.

A third motion, which was with regards to the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, was referred to the executive committee for further examination. It read:

Birmingham Council notes:

1. That on Sunday, November 21 2004 at 7:15AM, bulldozers and armed security guards hired by Hebrew University Properties, Ltd. arrived at the home of the Al-Helou family in Jerusalem to announce that their land would be confiscated for the expansion of the university.
2. That the Al-Helou family is among seven Palestinian families whose houses are trapped among the university dormitory buildings.
3. That the families have lived in this area, called Ard Al-Samar, since 1948 when they were forced out of the Jerusalem village of Lifta with the establishment of the state of Israel.
4. That after the Israeli occupation of East Jerusalem began in 1967, these families' land has been confiscated repeatedly by the university to build student dorms, so that the families are now confined in small pockets of land surrounded by the fences.

Council resolves:

i. To call on all AUT members to boycott the Hebrew University of Jerusalem until it calls a halt to all attempts to confiscate land from Palestinian families, and reaches an acceptable settlement with the families' lawyers regarding restoration or compensation in the case of land already confiscated.

[45] AUT 2005 Council resolutions (pertaining to Israel) as emailed to the author by the organisation Engage.

ii. That the boycott should take the form described in the Palestinian call for academic boycott of Israeli institutions.[46]

There have been many critics of the content of this motion. The organisation The Academic Friends of Israel contends:

> The basis for boycotting the Hebrew University is that it has confiscated land from El-Halou family. This is entirely false, and in fact the reverse was true. The El-Halou family, who own land adjacent to that owned by the Hebrew University, had also illegally taken possession of the Hebrew University property. Repeated court proceedings found in favour of the Hebrew University, and the matter was eventually settled by negotiations between both parties. The land that does belong to the El-Halou family has never been under threat, nor are they "trapped" amongst Hebrew University buildings."[47]

A fourth motion focuses on Haifa University and the case involving senior lecturer Ilan Pappe and his support of Teddy Katz, a Masters student[48] who had done controversial research on killings committed by the pre-state army of Israel in Tantura. The case of Teddy Katz' research is a complex and highly debated matter unto itself,[49] as is the treatment of Pappe by Haifa University. This motion was one of three – two of which were carried – that involved boycotts against individual Israel universities for actions taken by the universities that were seen as part of the injustices experienced by Palestinians and/or supportive of Israel's continued occupation of the West Bank and Gaza. The motion read:

> ***Birmingham*** Council notes:
>
> 1. That on May 15, 2002 Dr. Ilan Pappe, senior lecturer in Political Science at Haifa University, was sent a letter notifying him that he faced trial and possible dismissal from his position. The charge was that he had violated 'the duties of an academic member of staff', that he had 'slandered departments and members in the humanities faculty, damaged their professional reputation and endangered the possible promotion of some of them.'
> 2. That these accusations related to Dr. Pappe's efforts to defend a 55 year old graduate student, Teddy Katz, whose Master's thesis was under attack by an Israeli veteran's organization because it documented a massacre of 200 unarmed civilians by the Haganah (the pre-state army of Israel) at a village called Tantura, near Haifa.

---

[46] AUT 2005 Council resolutions (pertaining to Israel) as emailed to the author by the organisation Engage.
[47] Academic Friends of Israel, "Addressing the Points Raised in the AUT Council Motions," point a.
[48] Pappe was not Katz' advisor.
[49] Many documents that pertain to this case can be found at www.ee.bgu.ac.il/~censor/katz-directory/.

3. That the recriminations are still continuing and Dr. Pappe's job is still being threatened.

Council resolves:

i. To call on all AUT members to boycott Haifa University until it commits itself to upholding academic freedom, and in particular ceases its victimisation of academic staff and students who seek to research and discuss the history of the founding of the state of Israel.
ii. That the boycott should take the form described in the Palestinian call for academic boycott of Israeli institutions.[50]

The University of Haifa was displeased with the boycott and responded with a statement, which read in part, "The University of Haifa is saddened and not a little outraged by the utterly unjust and unjustifiable decision of the AUT and by its attempt to erect barriers and obstruct the flow of ideas within the international academic community."[51] The University of Haifa disputed the facts presented in the call for the boycott:

> In actual fact, during the past few years, Dr. Pappe has transgressed all common ethical standards of academic life. Yet, despite his conduct, the University of Haifa has demonstrated extraordinary tolerance. One of his colleagues did indeed lodge a complaint with the internal faculty disciplinary committee. The complaint focused on Dr. Pappe's unethical behaviour towards his peers and his efforts to disbar them from international forums for daring to contradict his views. **However, Dr. Pappe was never summoned by the disciplinary committee as the committee's chairperson decided not to pursue the complaint. Moreover, and contrary to Dr. Pappe's claim, the university made no attempt to expel him.**[52]

In response, Yuval Yonai, lecturer in the Department of Sociology and Anthropology at Haifa University, wrote a letter to the Rector and staff of Haifa University in response to the above statement made by Haifa University in April 2005. Yonai addresses, in particular the sentence, "Dr. Pappe has transgressed all common ethical standards of academic life."

> Dr. Pappe, may I remind you, has not forged historical data, has not plagiarized researches of others, has not sexually harassed students or colleagues and never pillaged university property. He is embroiled in a long and bitter argument with the university powers that be, but is conducting it openly and honestly. He also supports the boycott of Israeli universities for political reasons. We do not like it, and many find this as blameworthy in

[50] AUT 2005 Council resolutions (pertaining to Israel) as emailed to the author by the organisation Engage.
[51] University of Haifa, "The University of Haifa Response to the AUT Decision."
[52] University of Haifa, "The University of Haifa Response to the AUT Decision" (bolding in original text).

itself. There is no call to slide into ridiculous allegations of abuse of "all common ethical standard of academic life," which only presents the university as ludicrous.[53]

Yonai also has contentions with the statement, "Yet, despite his [Pappe's] conduct, the University of Haifa had demonstrated extraordinary tolerance." Yonai writes:

> You must choose – either Dr. Pappe has violated the regulations, in which case his guilt should be proved in the suitable forums, or he has acted within the proscribed limits in which case no tolerance is necessary. Your declaration proclaims Dr. Pappe's guilt without due judicial process that would allow him the right to reply and with no decision by an authorized independent judicial body.[54]

The fifth motion, like the above motion, was directed at an individual university. This motion focused on the connections Bar Ilan University has (or debatably had) with the College of Judea and Samaria, located in an Israeli settlement in the West Bank. This motion was carried.

> ***Birmingham*** Council notes:
>
> 1. That Bar Ilan University supervises degree programmes at the College of Judea and Samaria in the illegal settlement of Ariel, near Nablus, in the occupied West Bank.
> 2. That it is thus directly involved with the occupation of Palestinian territories contrary to United Nations resolutions.
>
> Council resolves:
>
> i. To call on all AUT members to boycott Bar-Ilan University until it severs all academic links with the College of Judea and Samaria and with any other college located in an illegal settlement in the Occupied Territories.
> ii. That the boycott should take the form described in the Palestinian call for academic boycott of Israeli institutions.[55]

Like the boycott of the University of Haifa, this boycott was contentious. The International Advisory Board for Academic Freedom (IAB), formed by Bar Ilan University, published an open letter on May 22, 2005 as an advertisement in *UK Times*, *Telegraph*, and *the Guardian*.[56] The letter, addressed to members of the

---

[53] Yuval Yonai, letter to Rector and Staff of Haifa University.
[54] Yuval Yonai, letter to Rector and Staff of Haifa University.
[55] AUT 2005 Council resolutions (pertaining to Israel) as emailed to the author by the organisation Engage.
[56] These dates and papers locations for the advertisements are according to the Bar Ilan website.

Association of University Teachers, other university members, and the public under the heading "Come now, and let us reason together; or why an academic boycott is wrong," reads:

> We call on all AUT members and people of goodwill to join with us in working to rescind the opportunistic decision initiated by a small extremist group of AUT members to impose a boycott on Israeli universities, their staff and students.
> Scholarship and research, the open and free exchange of ideas are the foundation of civilization. Without them there can be no true advancement of human knowledge. They require, Israeli law demands, and Israeli universities provide an environment which totally rejects any discrimination based on race, sex, ethnic affiliation, religion, political belief and sexual or other mores.
> Whatever your opinion of the situation in the Middle East, it is only by reasoning together that truth can be discovered, facts verified and opinions exchanged. The AUT boycott can in no way be justified by a false analogy with the illegitimate and undemocratic regimes based on an ethos of discrimination. Those who do so are trying to use past tragedies to advance present prejudices.
> Sixty years ago the people of Britain triumphed over a foe that started his campaign of hate and extermination by boycotting people because of their race, religion and political opinions.
> We have all learned too much, and at too great a cost, to let such a process repeat itself. Come now, and let us reason together."[57]

Akin to the contentions with the boycott of the University of Haifa, the facts presented in the boycott of Bar Ilan University also came under scrutiny. Stephen Howe writes:

> From the mid-1990s, small numbers of "Judea & Samaria" students took degree courses validated by Bar-Ilan: thus involving the university, as pro-boycott campaigners argue, in direct collaboration with Israel's occupation of the land where the college operates. The Bar-Ilan authorities have responded that their agreement with the Ariel college is being phased out and is set to end in 2005 anyway.[58]

On May 1, 2005, the facts of the case were changed. The College of Judea and Samaria was granted full university status. David Hirsh shares his perspective:

> Ariel Sharon has intervened into the British debate around proposals for an academic and cultural boycott of Israel. **At his cabinet meeting on Sunday 1st May** he pushed through proposals to upgrade the **'College of Judea and Samaria'** to full university status. The AUT's decision to boycott Bar-Ilan University was based on its connections to that college, which is situated in the West Bank settlement of Ariel.
> Sharon has thereby chosen to undermine one of the mainstream arguments against boycotting universities, which is that academia should be kept separate from politics.
> Interior Minister Ophir Pines-Paz (Labor) spoke at the cabinet meeting against bringing

[57] International Advisory Board for Academic Freedom, open letter to members of the Association of University Teachers (AUT), other university members and the public.
[58] Stephen Howe, "Boycotting Israel," 2

> politics into higher education unnecessarily. But Likud, Sharon's right wing party, pushed its position through with a majority of 13 votes to 7."[59]

Opponents of the AUT boycott, such as the group Zionism on the Web, were quick to respond, arguing:

> The case against the Bar Ilan University was that it authorises course units at the college at Ariel, an Israeli settlement in the West Bank. Paradoxically, the case has become irrelevant: Since the AUT decision, the Israeli government has granted Ariel college full university status, and the links with Bar Ilan are being discontinued. There is thus no case left against Bar Ilan.[60]

The AUT said very little after the passing of the resolutions. On April 22, it released the following statement about the boycotts:

> AUT Council today decided to boycott Haifa University and the Bar-Ilan University. The executive committee will issue guidance to AUT members on these decisions.
> Council delegates also referred a call to boycott the Hebrew University of Jerusalem and the executive committee will investigate the background to this and will report in due course.
> Council delegates also agreed to circulate to all local associations a statement from Palestinian organisations calling for an academic boycott of Israeli institutions.[61]

Others had plenty to say about the boycotts. There were a range of responses to the boycotts, some supportive, others sympathetic, and yet others extremely hostile. The president of the Hebrew University in Jerusalem, Menachem Magidor and the president of Al-Quds University,[62] Sari Nusseibeh, signed a joint statement in London calling for academic cooperation. The statement read: [63]

> Cognizant of the moral leadership universities should provide especially in already turbulent political contexts, we, the President of Al-Quds University and the President of the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, have agreed to insist on continuing to work together in the pursuit of knowledge, for the benefit of our peoples and the promotion of peace and justice in the Middle East.
> Our position is based upon the belief that it is through cooperation based on mutual respect, rather than through boycotts or discrimination, that our common goals can be achieved. Bridging political gulfs - rather than widening them further apart -

---

[59] David Hirsh, "Ariel Sharon asks the Boycotters to Dance around Ariel College" (bolding in original text).
[60] Zionism on the Web, "The Argument Against the Boycott," section 2.2.
[61] AUT, "Israeli Universities – Statement by AUT General Secretary Sally Hunt."
[62] Palestinian/Arab university located in Jerusalem.
[63] Hebrew University of Jerusalem President Prof. Menachem Magidor and Al-Quds University President Prof. Sari Nusseibeh signed a joint statement in London calling for academic cooperation on May 19, 2005.

> between nations and individuals thus becomes an educational duty as well as a functional necessity, requiring exchange and dialogue rather than confrontation and antagonism. Our disaffection with, and condemnation of acts of academic boycotts and discrimination against scholars and institutions, is predicated on the principles of academic freedom, human rights, and equality between nations and among individuals.
> We therefore call upon academics here and worldwide to act in support of our mission, as one which might allow for ending our shared tragedy rather than prolonging it.[64]

A newly formed group, Engage, opposed the boycotts. Their website is filled with information condemning them. The Engage website also explains the origins of their group and its purpose:

> ***Engage*** was set up in response to the **Association of University Teacher's decision** to take steps towards an academic and cultural boycott of Israel.
> ***Engage*** opposes Israel's occupation of the West Bank and Gaza. We are in favour of the foundation of a Palestinian state alongside the state of Israel. We believe that Israel is not an illegitimate state. We are for reconciliation between Israeli Jews and Palestinians.
> *Engage* wants to debate, inform and organise around three themes:
>
> - ***Engage* opposes the idea of an academic or cultural boycott of Israel...**
> - ***Engage* aims to encourage, facilitate and publicise positive links between Israeli, Palestinian, British and global academia. Engage is for closer engagement, not boycotts...**
> - ***Engage* stands up against antisemitism in our universities, in our unions and in our students unions.**[65]

The Academic Friends of Israel also denounced the boycotts writing, "This call, based on false information, imposes discriminatory boycott and vetting of political opinions, and is a backwards step in the current climate of positive moves being made in the region."[66]

Six AUT members who were displeased with the AUT resolutions sought legal advice. In a letter on May 19, 2005 to the AUT, the six AUT members' solicitor, Mishcon de Reya, call the AUT boycott invalid and outside the objects of the AUT. Mishcon de Reya writes:

> Our clients' (sic) require the AUT to acknowledge the resolutions' invalidity, confirm that no implementation instruction will be issued, and provide the appropriate assurances in relation to the expenditure of AUT funds.

---

[64] Sari Nusseibeh and Menachem Magidor, joint statement, May 19, 2005.
[65] Engage, "The Original 'About Engage' Page, Written to Oppose the Academic Boycott," (bolding and italics in original text.)
[66] Academic Friends of Israel, Press Release, April 21, 2005.

> The resolutions are a threat to the AUT's integrity, as well as the cause of academic freedom. Our clients are prepared to take the steps necessary to ensure that the threat does not become a reality.[67]

With regard to boycotts, the AUT policy reads, "The AUT imposes or considers imposing an academic boycott on a university or college[68] when we conclude that the actions of the institution pose a fundamental threat to the interests of members."[69]

Some groups and individuals were supportive of the calls. Some Israeli academics, such as Tanya Reinhart[70] and Ilan Pappe,[71] stepped forward to support the AUT boycotts. A group of 29 council members, delegates and observers at the AUT Council in 2005 wrote an open letter to Jon Pike[72] with points that support the boycott.[73] The organisation BRICUP was sympathetic. BRICUP, though a still a relatively new group, was established in response to the above discussed call for an academic boycott of Israel made by Palestinians rather than the more recent AUT boycotts.

> BRICUP is an organisation of UK based academics, set up in response to the Palestinian Call for Academic Boycott. Its twin missions are:
> - to support Palestinian universities, staff and students, and
> - to oppose the continued illegal Israeli occupation of Palestinian lands with its concomitant breaches of international conventions of human rights, its refusal to accept UN resolutions or rulings of the International Court, and its persistent suppression of Palestinian academic freedom.[74]

BRICUP summarises its aims on its website.

> In support of this [Palestinian] call for a boycott, BRICUP will:
> - Continue to put pressure on the EU and the UK government for the exclusion of Israel from the European Research Area.

---

[67] Mishcon de Reya, letter to Sally Hunt, May 19, 2005.
[68] In the past, the AUT has called for boycotts of universities that are being less than agreeable during labour disputes with little or no fanfare.
[69] AUT, "Boycotts/Greylisting."
[70] Tanya Reinhart, "Why Us? On the Academic Boycott."
[71] Ilan Pappe, "Public Enemy for the Week," 18.
[72] Jon Pike was involved in calling for the special Council meeting on May 26, 2005.
[73] Shereen Benjamin et al. "An Open Letter to Jon Pike from 29 Council Members, Delegates and Observers at AUT Council 2005."
[74] BRICUP, "Statement of Aims."

- Develop a policy which encourages individual academics to break their professional links with Israel by such actions as:
    1. Refusing research collaborations with Israeli institutions or to referee papers or grant applications issuing from such institutions
    2. Refusing to attend academic conferences in Israel
    3. Supporting Israeli academic colleagues working with Palestinian colleagues in their demand for self-determination and academic freedom
- Work within our trades unions and professional organisations in support of such actions
- Explore forms of support to Palestinian academic colleagues.[75]

Members of the AUT also took exception to the boycott and insisted on holding a special Council meeting to debate the issue further.[76] On May 26, 2005, a special Council meeting was called. The AUT writes, "As set out in the calling notice, LA/7629, the business of this special council meeting is to have a full debate on proposals to boycott Israeli universities."[77] According to an article in *The Times Higher Education Supplement*, the AUT's national executive committee recommended that members rescind the boycotts[78] at the meeting that would be held, "behind closed doors despite great public and press interest."[79]

The boycotts were overturned at the meeting. A statement issued by the AUT after rescinding the boycott reveals that the AUT had decided to take another fundamentally different approach: "AUT council has decided to base its policy on providing practical solidarity to Palestinian and Israeli trade unionists and academics, by agreeing [upon] a motion committing the union to having a full review of international policy."[80] The rector of Bar Ilan responded to the news of the end of the boycott against the universities with a statement that read in part:

> Bar-Ilan University welcomes the British Association of University Teachers (AUT) vote to rescind its boycott of universities in Israel, including Bar-Ilan. I see this decision as a model of how democratic organizations can overcome anti-democratic manipulation by listening to their members, and reviewing and repealing mistaken decisions.

---

[75] BRICUP, "Statement of Aims."
[76] AUT, "Israeli Boycott Revoked – AUT Statement."
[77] AUT, "Motions Submitted to the Meeting of Special Council to be Held on 26 May 2005," section 1.
[78] Phil Baty, "Boycott Pulls in Natfhe."
[79] Phil Baty, "Boycott Pulls in Natfhe."
[80] AUT, "Israeli Boycott Revoked – AUT Statement."

> The AUT's vote is a triumph for democracy and academic freedom worldwide, and a victory for the universal principle of academic freedom.[81]

Following the withdrawal of the AUT boycotts, two motions in the vein of the AUT boycotts were presented to NATFHE, another lecturers union in the U.K. The motions, as Phil Baty explains, never made it to the conference floor:

> At Natfhe's conference this week, two motions calling for boycotts were declared out of order by the union's steering committee and were therefore not put to a conference vote. The committee ruled them out of order because they referred to the AUT's original boycott policy, which had already been overturned by the time of Natfhe's conference, and also because it felt that such serious policy-changing issues should not come in the form of emergency motions but only after full debate at local Natfhe branches.[82]

Strategic, Ethical, and Logistical Concerns with the AUT Boycotts

Application of the theory presented in this thesis suggests that there are three main factors that could have inhibited the success of the AUT boycotts. To begin with, there were strategic problems. Secondly, as mentioned above, the ethical controversy took centre stage in the media discussion of the boycotts. Thus, the boycotts did not meet the criteria of adequate ethical acceptance. Thirdly, there were concerns with implementation and many of the criteria required for a successful boycott, as presented in chapter 5, were not met.

Boycott supporter Ilan Pappe writes that the "threat of a boycott is effective, but it can also affect other positive voices and forces. If it is exercised with tactical wisdom and human sensitivity, it has a chance of helping bring an end to the callous Israeli occupation, next month entering its 38th year."[83] There are many who would question the level of "tactical wisdom and human sensitivity" involved in the AUT call for boycotts. There have been a number of strategic objections made to the AUT boycotts. The groups of critics are strange bedfellows. This includes those who support the objectives of the boycotts, but disagree with the

---

[81] Yosef Yeshurun, A Message from the Rector, May 26, 2005.
[82] Phil Baty, "Unions deal blow to Israel Boycott."
[83] Ilan Pappe, "Public Enemy for a Week."

method as well as those who adamantly disagree with the objectives, regardless of the method. Those not in favour of boycotting Israel are quick to point out errors in the strategy.

As argued throughout this thesis, the only purpose that academic boycotting can achieve is discussion. It is too blunt a tool to achieve any other goal directly. As previously discussed, supporters of the AUT boycotts hope to achieve numerous objectives. Though some of their goals involved discussion, many of their goals were not discussion based (such as changing policies) and the AUT presented these goals with no mention of first achieving the functional discussion that would be required to achieve them.

Despite investing a great deal of energy and resources into boycotting, supporters of the AUT boycotts did not demonstrate an in-depth, comprehensive analysis of the cause and effects of boycotting. They stated goals without indicating precisely how they saw a boycott contributing to those goals.

> The practical reason that prevented me from supporting this type of boycott is the lack of its ability to ease the suffering and exploitation of the Palestinians, not to mention putting an end to the occupation. The opposite may even be the case. Universities – some more and some less – are among the few places left in Israel where individuals are allowed to think freely and raise new ideas, sometimes daring ones. Even if the ideas do not become consensus, they may crystalize slowly as one of the alternatives that Israel should choose in order to become a properly-run democratic state.[84]

It may be apparent enough why the AUT is boycotting the separate universities, but this explicit explanation is particularly important when boycotts have secondary implicit implications, such as ending an occupation. David Aaronovitch highlights this weakness in the logic of this boycott campaign's strategy. "So, according to the disclosed agenda, somehow or other, the boycott will make Israeli academics

[84] Baruch Kimmerling, "A Boycott All the Way."

think again about their support for the system, thus strengthening the forces of progress and justice… But will it?"[85]

Some critics argue that the results of the boycotting will be opposite to the desired effects. Baruch Kimmerling, from the Department of Sociology and Anthropology at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, sees the academic boycotts of Israel as strategically flawed to the point that they will backfire, or have a rebound effect:

> The consequences of a successful boycott would have a boomerang effect by cementing the complete dependence of Israeli academic institutions on an increasingly capricious government. Since Limor Livnat's appointment as Minister of Education, the Israeli academy has become the target of "reconstruction" and "re-education" campaign. This policy was in no way accidental. In Israel today, mass media are generally chauvinistic and unwilling to challenge the Sharon Government. The Israeli academy remains almost the last bastion of free thought and free speech.[86]

Eva Garrard, lecturer at the Centre for Professional Ethics, Keele University, UK, is also concerned about the boycotts backfiring:

> The effect on Israeli academics selected for boycott is unlikely to be what the proposers of the motion are presumably aiming at. Israeli academics are on the whole further to the left, and more critical of their current government, than the general population. Those who have not spoken in public against Israel's presence in Gaza and the West Bank will often have quite complex reasons for this, and being singled out for adverse treatment by foreign academics is not likely to increase their hostility to their own government, but rather the reverse.[87]

Kimmerling also believes that the boycotts will not apply sufficient pressure, considering all of the other far more powerful factors that have not produced change.

> Israelis are well aware of the painful consequences of occupation: heavy taxes, poor services, the highest burden of military spending per capita in the world, job losses and the decline in other economic indicators, not to mention the loss of thousands of lives. All these have not moved Israelis towards opposition to the occupation. Do academics think having papers rejected for publication by, say, *The British Journal of Gerontology* will?[88]

---

[85] David Aaronovitch, "Why Israel will always be Vilified."
[86] Baruch Kimmerling, "Boycott Will Do Nothing to Change Israeli Policy."
[87] Eve Garrard, letter to AUT colleagues at Keele University.
[88] Baruch Kimmerling, "Boycott Will Do Nothing to Change Israeli Policy."

Others believe that the boycotters are targeting the wrong party. Alan Carling and numerous other signatories of a letter to *The Guardian* newspaper write, "The campaign for the academic boycott treats all academics as though they were responsible for government policy – which they are not." [89]

There are questions about whether this is strategically the right time to be attempting sanctions, such as boycotting. Noam Chomsky expresses his concerns in a post on his official weblog on Znet in May of 2004:

> ...sanctions against South Africa did not become a really significant issue with a major impact until after years of education and organization had aroused enormous opposition to Apartheid... When South Africa set up homelands ("Bantustans") 40 years ago, it received virtually no support, only worldwide condemnation, even from its supporters (US and Britain in particular). When Israel does the same, it is largely protected from criticism, so much so that public opinion in the US on these matters – which is highly critical – is effectively suppressed and unknown, and within the media (including liberal media) and political arena there is essentially nothing. That tells us that there is a long way to go in education and organizing before it makes any sense to raise the issues of sanctions. In the current real-world circumstances, a call for sanctions, even if it were justified, would be greatly welcomed by the right wing extremists and hard-liners, because they could easily convert it into another "proof" that everyone wants to kill the Jews so we must rise to the support of embattled Israel to prevent another Holocaust.[90]

Colman Altman, professor in Physics at Technion in Haifa, Israel, suggests that the AUT boycott may divide supporters of Palestinians by targeting:

> Israeli academics as individuals, leading to a world-wide split in the progressive academic community. It was, and remains, our duty to explain the harm caused by politically ill-judged resolutions, in order that in the (inevitable) next round these mistakes will not be repeated. We could not have supported the resolution as it stood, but should have abstained from joining the Zionist campaign against the boycott.[91]

Mishcon de Reya, lawyers for six AUT members who disagreed with the boycotts, believes that the AUT is not the forum for changing the policies of Israel: "The legal position is clear. The pursuit of a policy of boycott is outside the scope of the AUT's objectives. The resolutions are void. In technical legal language, they are ultra vires the AUT."[92]

---

[89] Alan Carling et al., letter to the editor, April 19, 2005.
[90] Noam Chomsky, "South Africa Style Sanctions Against Israel."
[91] Colman Altman, "The Academic Boycott: Post-Mortem?" section 4.
[92] Mishcon de Reya, letter to Sally Hunt, May 19, 2005.

However, some boycotters feel the boycotts were successful, and thus their strategy worked. Sue Blackwell, one of the key advocates of the AUT boycotts, explains gains she sees that resulted from the AUT boycotts, "For example, a lot more people now understand that the College of Judea and Samaria is built on an illegal settlement in violation of international law. Before AUT Council few people had even heard of this college."[93]

As discussed above, the AUT boycotts have caused an outbreak of debate about the ethicality of academic boycotting. The various areas of ethical controversies have been heavily debated, at times, appearing to overshadow discussion about the reasons for boycotting. Gargi Bhattacharya warned about this in an article appearing in *The Guardian* in 2002:

> My opinion is that the purpose of any proposed boycott is to draw attention to what is being done to the Palestinian people, quite knowingly, by the State of Israel. If the issue of boycott becomes more interesting than the suffering and struggle of Palestinians, then it is time to think of a new campaign strategy.[94]

Even Ilan Pappe, a strong supporter of academic boycotting of Israel and the central character of the Haifa boycott, comments on how debate has focused on approach of the AUT boycotts instead of the issues behind the boycotts:

> The Association of University Teachers' decision to reconsider its motions on the academic boycott of Israel seems to confuse procedure and principle. I am not a trade union activist, neither am I a British citizen, but I understand there may – or may not – have been procedural, and even tactical, errors in the way the decision was taken. Either way, these issues cannot be the focus of the debate over sanctions and boycott. Judging by the amount of time spent – especially by the opponents of the new AUT policy – on debating procedural matters and tactics, there is a risk of the wider public losing sight of the main issue, namely the need to apply external pressure on Israel as the best means of ending the worst occupation in recent history.[95]

There are a series of areas that are part of this ethical debate. In addition, as discussed above, there was heated debate about the details of the individual cases involved in the boycotts.

---

[93] Sue Blackwell, personal communication, October 19, 2005.
[94] Gargi Bhattacharya, "Time for a Rethink."
[95] Ilan Pappe, "Back the Boycott."

Reminiscent of previous academic boycotts, the AUT boycotts are accused of obstructing the academic freedom of the boycotted. John Klier writes:

> Some of my colleagues opposed the [AUT] boycott because they thought the specific charges against the Israeli universities were spurious. Others, like myself and my colleagues at University College London, opposed it because we believed it ran counter to the basic values of academe, the free and open exchange of ideas and opinions.[96]

Adam Logan, from the University of Liverpool, Department of Mathematics, expressed similar sentiments; Logan believes that boycotting is a step backwards for academia:

> [T]he resolution seeks to deny Israeli scholars their right to communicate the findings of their research, and seeks to deny British scholars the right to collaborate with the scholars of their choice. Great progress has been made in recent decades to promote internationalization of scholarship, as well as in encouraging people of nations without scholarly traditions to found their own and to participate in others'; it is wrong for the AUT to seek to reverse this trend. That Israeli scholars who denounce the policies of their government may be exempted from the boycott does not in any way ameliorate it; instead, by holding scholarship hostage to politics, it degrades both.[97]

Others argue that academic freedom is not the issue. In a speech given at the May 26, 2005 AUT special Council meeting, Steven Rose cited examples of academic boycotts that the AUT has called, including ones against Nottingham, London Metropolitan University and Fijian universities, that were supported by other academic unions and did not result in charges of defamation.[98] Using the same examples cited by Steven Rose, D.D. Guttenplan, writer for *The Nation* and author of *The Holocaust on Trial*, argues:

> The AUT has previously passed motions boycotting two British universities over pay and conditions; Fiji was also the target of an AUT boycott following the coup on the island in 2000. None of these were remotely controversial. Nor did most of the voices raised against the AUT boycott protest the campaign of systemic intimidation in American universities waged by such pro-Israel groups as Campus Watch. And in a political landscape dominated by military checkpoints, tank incursions, land seizures, house demolitions and targeted assassinations, and where many Palestinian students now find themselves walled off, literally, from their own universities, it seems obscene to repeat platitudes about "the freest possible… movement of scholars and ideas."[99]

---

[96] John D. Klier, "A British Union Reverses a Boycott: 3 Responses," third response.
[97] Adam Logan, "Statement on the AUT Boycott of Israeli Universities."
[98] Steven Rose, speech given to the AUT Special Council.
[99] D.D. Guttenplan, "After the Boycott… What?" 24.

Steven Rose, also at the AUT special Council meeting, expresses the often argued point that if academics, particularly Israeli academics, were genuinely concerned about academic freedom, that they would speak out against the limitations placed on Palestinian academics and students:

> I urge you to see for yourselves the day to day restrictions on our fellow Palestinian academics, who cannot receive academic journals, whose access to research equipment is restricted and who often are even blocked from going to give their scheduled lectures by an all-powerful Israeli soldier at a check point.
> And when did you hear the Israeli academic community – any university vice-chancellor, any senate, any collective – protest? I'll tell you – never. The Israeli academic community, so careful of its own academic freedom, is silent, complicit.[100]

Opponents of academic boycotts against Israel often ask, "Why is Israel the only country to be facing academic boycotts?" Gerald M. Steinberg writes: "If those who pressed this discriminatory and unjustified campaign were actually concerned about academic issues, and – first and foremost – academic freedom, they would have started with the cases in which the threats are most serious – such as in Syria, Egypt, or China."[101] In a letter to AUT colleagues at Keele University, Eve Garrard expresses similar sentiments:

> To propose to punish the lesser offences of Israel, while ignoring the greater offences of other countries, is at least prima facie discriminatory. I'm sure you would think that any proposal to punish the lesser offences of, say, black criminals in this country more than the greater offences of white criminals would amount to serious discrimination, particularly given the long history of discrimination against blacks. The case of Israel is analogous to this example. Unless some significant justification can be provided for this selective hostility, I do not think you, or the AUT in general, should get involved in such discriminatory behaviour.[102]

Some argue that isolating out Israel is anti-Semitic. David Hirsh, from the Department of Sociology at the University of London, writes:

> Why does AUT pick on Israel? Why does AUT not boycott Russian, Chinese, Sudanese, Saudi Arabian, North Korean, US, British academia? The only legitimate way of explaining the focus on Israel would be to claim that Israeli academia is the least free in the world, that the Israeli state is killing more people than any other state, that it is denying more human rights than any other state. Given that none of these claims is remotely true,

---

[100] Steven Rose, speech given to the AUT Special Council.
[101] Gerald M. Steinberg, "Academic Freedom and the AUT Boycott Campaign: Examining the Lessons," 7.
[102] Eve Garrard, letter to AUT colleagues at Keele University.

> Engage believes that the choice to boycott Israeli Jews rather than anyone else in the world is effectively antisemitic, as the only academics boycotted because of the bad actions of their state are Jewish ones. This is true even if those arguing for a boycott do not feel that they are antisemities, do not feel a hatred of Jews, or do not intend to be antisemitic. This is even true if some of those proposing the boycott are themselves Jewish.[103]

Steven Rose, a Jewish supporter of the boycotts disputes these claims:

> Not to boycott is to equate the oppressor with the oppressed. Please listen very carefully to my next words. In the 1930s, Jewish academics in Germany were being expelled from their universities and fleeing the country. Of course, many German academics – decent ordinary people – may have disapproved. But they were silent. And British academics continued to deal 'normally' with them as if what was happening was something not to be spoken about in polite society. Do you not see the parallels? You – we – have no right to remain silent, to treat Israel as if it were a normal state. Those who argue for it are guilty of what they charge the boycotters with – an Israeli exceptionalism.[104]

Some, such as D.D. Guttenplan, suggest that the history of boycotting being associated with anti-Semitism is reason enough to demand careful consideration before boycotting Israel:

> Even Jews who don't immediately think of the Nazi boycott of Jewish businesses might recall the Arab boycott against Israel – a boycott that long predated the 1967 war, and whose echo in the current campaign made many suspect that the ultimate object was not just the end of the occupation but the liquidation of the "Zionist entity." Palestinians are under no obligation to defer to Jewish sensitivities, but anyone interested in creating a broad, effective campaign to end the occupation ought to at least pause before picking up the boycott weapon.[105]

In addition, there have been accusations that the passing of the motions on the eve a Jewish holy day was anti-Semitic as it excluded Jews from participating. Shereen Benjamin et al. respond to this accusation in an open letter to Jon Pike.

> Some members have complained that observant Jews were prevented from contributing to the debate by its timing close to the Jewish Sabbath and Passover. For the record it was Sue Blackwell, a supporter of the boycott, who brought up the issue of the Sabbath at the first meeting of Council Agenda Committee on 17th March, but after discussion CAC felt the best that could be done was to ensure that the debate would be concluded by Friday lunchtime. Only one would-be delegate had contacted AUT prior to this CAC meeting saying that she would not be able to attend council because of its proximity to Passover, and this appears to have been a problem with Council as a whole and not just the Friday.[106]

There has been extensive deliberation about the use of the comparison of academic boycotts of South Africa to the academic boycotts of Israel. For instance,

---

[103] David Hirsh, "How do I Argue Against the Boycott? Questions and Answers," question 4.
[104] Steven Rose, speech given to the AUT Special Council.
[105] D.D. Guttenplan, "After the Boycott... What?" 24.
[106] Shereen Benjamin et al. "An Open Letter to Jon Pike from 29 Council Members, Delegates and Observers at AUT Council 2005," point 3.

the two initiators of the Palestinian Campaign for the Academic and Cultural Boycott of Israel write:

> The statements against the proposed academic boycott of Israeli universities miss the clear analogy between Israel's apartheid system and South Africa's. Nobel Peace Prize winner Archbishop Desmond Tutu has recently drawn similarities between the two, calling for boycotts against Israel. In South Africa's case, the UN established a regime of sanctions that eventually ended apartheid. Academics, athletes, artists and business people were all subject to boycott then, and British academics and intellectuals played a distinguished role in those campaigns.[107]

The first dilemma is whether the comparison is accurate. In the article, "Stand Up and Be Counted," Haim Bresheeth, from the Department of Cultural Studies at the University of East London, writes:

> Much energy is spent unnecessarily, comparing the Apartheid regime in South Africa, and the State of Israel, in order to equate the two, and make a ***boycott*** acceptable. In my view there is no need for this comparison as, apart from some superficial features, such as the start date of both political ventures, they are very different, as pointed out clearly by the late Edward Said. Israel is different – definitely no better, maybe somewhat worse than Apartheid. One regime was based on exploitation of labour forces of the indigenous population, the other their expulsion.[108]

In a similar vein David Newman, founder of the Department of Politics and Government at Ben-Gurion University in Israel, writes:

> But I do not recall South African universities employing black academics or enabling black students to register at their institutions – unlike the 10 percent (and growing) Israeli students who are from the Arab-Palestinian sector of society.
> Nor do I recall that, at the time of the academic boycott against South African universities, that South African government was engaged in a process of political dialogue aimed at bringing an end to apartheid. The collapse of the unjust political system in South Africa had nothing to do with the various cultural and educational boycotts. Political rapprochement came about as the political leaders realised that the unjust system could not continue for ever, just as Israeli governments of the past decade (right- and left-wing alike) have come to realise that Israel cannot continue to survive as a Jewish state if it does not end the occupation of the West Bank and the Gaza Strip.[109]

D.D. Guttenplan disagrees with the use of the comparison:

> *The AUT is not the ANC.* The South African academic boycott began as a simple pledge not to accept or apply for posts at universities that practiced racial discrimination. The wider ANC boycott came only after a massive campaign of nonviolent civil disobedience had been brutally suppressed by South African authorities; the ANC's armed struggle against apartheid never deliberately targeted civilians. By comparing themselves to the

---

[107] Omar Barghouti and Lisa Taraki, letter to the editor.
[108] Haim Bresheeth, "Stand Up and Be Counted," 1 (bolding and italics in original text).
[109] David Newman, "Degrees of Dishonour," 20.

> ANC, the AUT and their Palestinian allies are trading on moral credit they have not earned.[110]

Others believe that the academic boycott was not a significant factor in the fall of apartheid in South Africa. Baruch Kimmerling writes:

> Those who approve of a boycott bring as an example the academic boycott of South Africa, which they say contributed greatly to the fall of apartheid. In fact, the academic boycott of South Africa proves the opposite. It resulted in the departure from that country of many of its progressive elements, the weakening of internal opposition to the regime, and perhaps even to the prolonging of its demise.
> What did bring down the racist regime in South Africa was the general boycott – economic, political, military and cultural – a boycott of which the academic component was minuscule, and not a separate element.[111]

The value of strictly institutional boycotting versus the value of including individuals when boycotting is one of the debates that surfaced most prominently for the first time not long after the May 2002 European call appeared in *The Guardian* when Mona Baker was in the centre of a scandal for removing two Israelis from the boards of journals she edits. Colman Altman explains how the Palestinian appeal for a boycott that AUT was to circulate as per the resolution it passed, in fact calls for the boycotting of individuals, a highly contentious point in academic boycotting.

> In their letter to the Guardian (20.4.05), Omar Barghouti and Lisa Taraki on behalf of the Palestinian [Bir Zeit] Campaign for the Academic and Cultural Boycott of Israel, write, "The Palestinian call for boycott targets Israeli academic institutions, not individuals." However, in their original appeal, 7 July 2004, which the British AUT decided to circulate officially as part of their resolution, the Palestinians call to:
> 1. Refrain from participation in any form of academic and cultural cooperation, collaboration or joint projects with Israeli institutions;
> 2. Advocate a comprehensive boycott of Israeli institutions… including suspension of all forms of funding and subsidies to these institutions;
> 3. Promote divestment from Israel by international academic institutions;
> 4. Exclude from the above actions… any conscientious Israeli academics and intellectuals opposed to their state's colonial and racist policies;
>
> In other words the proposed boycott does in fact apply to individuals, excluding only the good guys.[112]

---

[110] D.D. Guttenplan, "After the Boycott… What?" 24 (italics in original text).
[111] Baruch Kimmerling, "A Boycott all the Way."
[112] Colman Altman, "The Academic Boycott: Post-Mortem?" section 2 (square brackets in original text).

Instead of "boycotting", some have suggested "grey listing" instead. Malcolm Povey explains the concept of *grey listing*, " 'Grey listing' is a boycott tactic long used by the AUT in which institutional relations are suspended whilst contacts between individual academics may continue."[113]

Mona Baker suggests the following four guiding principles to ensure that an academic boycott undermines the institutions of the state rather than individuals.

a. First, the boycott does not target Israelis as individuals. This means that Israelis who work for non-Israeli institutions are not subject to the boycott.
b. Secondly, the other side of the same coin: the boycott does not distinguish between Jews, Christians or Muslims working for Israeli academic institutions. This means that EVERYONE who works for an Israeli institution, irrespective of their nationality, religion or ethnic origin, and that also includes the few Palestinians working for Israeli institutions, are all subject to the boycott.
c. Thirdly, where it is possible to make a distinction between institutions and individuals – in other words, where helping or working with an individual is possible without directly supporting the institution that employs them or giving them visibility and legitimacy – it is important to help and work with individuals in Israel. This may be possible on an informal basis, outside any official forum. Or it may, for instance, involve a publisher selling books to individuals in Israel while refusing to sell to Israeli institutions, a practice currently adopted by St. Jerome Publishing.
d. And finally, it is important to continue to work with everyone, including individuals affiliated to Israeli academic institutions, in any context or project designed specifically to challenge the occupation. This is a very different proposition from exempting individuals as a reward for their own courage and integrity. It has to do with the content and purpose of the activity in which they are involved at any given time rather than merely their stand on the Occupation. Working with a colleague like Ilan Pappe in the context of this Conference is a good example.[114]

There have been concerns expressed that the AUT boycotts may cause problems for Jewish academics and students in the UK. Eve Garrard explains:

> The effect on Jews in this country [United Kingdom] of this discriminatory measure will be to increase the alarm and distress currently being felt about the rise of anti-Semitism throughout Europe, including the UK. Jewish academics who are Zionists (i.e. who support the existence of the State of Israel) will feel particularly threatened by their own trade union displaying partial and discriminatory behaviour towards Jewish nationalism…[115]

There has also been heated debate about the value of isolating out specific cases to boycott versus issuing a general boycott. The AUT boycotts are among the most specific academic boycotts issued against Israel. D.D. Guttenplan writes, "By

---

[113] Malcolm Povey, "AUT Boycott Debate that has Put Palestine Back on the Map."
[114] Mona Baker, "On the Distinction between Institutions and Individuals," 4.
[115] Eve Garrard, letter to AUT colleagues at Keele University.

singling out Haifa and Bar-Ilan universities, proponents of a boycott ended up arguing specific cases rather than general principles."[116] Such specific academic boycotts are radically different from broader calls for boycotts and sanctions, such as this one, issued July 9, 2005. In this instance, the demands cast a broader net:

> **We, representatives of Palestinian civil society, call upon international civil society organizations and people of conscience all over the world to impose broad boycotts and implement divestment initiatives against Israel similar to those applied to South Africa in the apartheid era. We appeal to you to pressure your respective states to impose embargoes and sanctions against Israel. We also invite conscientious Israelis to support this Call, for the sake of justice and genuine peace.**
> These non-violent punitive measures should be maintained until Israel meets its obligation to recognize the Palestinian people's inalienable right to self-determination and fully complies with the precepts of international law by:
> 1. Ending its occupation and colonization of all Arab lands and dismantling the Wall;
> 2. Recognizing the fundamental rights of the Arab-Palestinian citizens of Israel to full equality; and
> 3. Respecting, protecting and promoting the rights of Palestinian refugees to return to their homes and properties as stipulated in UN resolution 194."[117]

A debate as old as the academic boycotts of South Africa,[118] the selective versus comprehensive question resurfaced during the recent AUT boycotts. David Hirsh explains the problem of excluding some Israel academics from the boycotts if they support the goals of the boycott:

> The latest proposal [the Palestinian Campaign for the Academic and Boycott of Israel call] contains a clause which is intended to get round this problem by excluding from the boycott "conscientious Israeli academics and intellectuals opposed to their state's colonial and racist policies". This would mean that Israeli academics would first have to affirm their "anti-Zionist" credentials before being allowed to function as members of the global academic community.
> But there is no agreed definition of the word 'Zionism'. Some people define it as a form of racism. Others understand it as a Jewish national liberation movement. Other consider themselves Zionists if they support the right of Israel to exist free from threat of invasion.[119]

Ironically, the point of ending the occupation is seldom discussed, nor is Israel's treatment of Palestinians – even Palestinian academics and students – in the context of discussion about the AUT boycotts. Malcolm Povey writes, "Although

---

[116] D.D. Guttenplan, "After the Boycott... What?" 9.
[117] Palestinian Civil Society, "Palestinian Civil Society Calls for Boycott, Divestment and Sanctions against Israel" (bolding in original text.)
[118] See chapter 5 for an examination of selective boycotting.
[119] David Hirsh, "How do I Argue Against the Boycott? Questions and Answers," question 9.

media coverage in Europe and the US was hostile to the boycott, the presumption behind the original vote, that Israel oppresses the Palestinians, went more or less unchallenged."[120] It is paradoxical that the issue at the heart of the boycott, Israel's actions toward the Palestinians, a topic that is often said to be heated and controversial, is the least contentious, least discussed point of the academic boycotts. Considering what a political hot spot the Middle East is, this may be an indicator of how controversial academic boycotting is as a method and how intoxicating the ethical controversy around academic boycotts can be. In this case, the ethical controversy considered above may well have initially drawn media attention to the boycotts, but appears to have then captured attention away from the reasons for the boycotts.

There were a number of problems with the implementation of the AUT boycott, some of which became part of the central criticisms of the boycotts. The AUT missed a number of required steps, as outlined in chapter 5. As mentioned above, there was a lack of clear, measurable articulated immediate, intermediate, and long-term outcomes and final goals. The AUT did not openly outline the actions they wish the boycotted to take. There were also a series of other clarifying details missing, such as who the boycott included or excluded, whether the boycott could be directed at isolated individuals as well as institutions, and precisely when the boycott would end. Some of such details were missing from the resolutions, the calls for the boycotts. Public debate around the AUT implementation of their boycotts centred around two points: opportunities for discussion that were missed and concerns about the way the resolutions were passed.

---

[120] Malcolm Povey, "AUT Boycott Debate that has Put Palestine Back on the Map."

The AUT failed to exhaust all – or by some claims, even try any – options for discussion before calling the boycotts. Yosef Yeshurun, rector of Bar-Ilan University, writes:

> We at Bar-Ilan were particularly distressed by the AUT's lack of intellectual honesty. The AUT failed to approach us prior to their meeting and inform us of their intention to propose a motion designed to boycott our university; they contemptuously refused to allow a representative of Bar-Ilan (or, apparently, anyone else) to speak against this motion; they flatly used "facts" which were based on false premises and incorrect information and ignored requests to check the validity of their claims.[121]

In its response to the AUT boycotts, the University of Haifa writes:

> In lieu of evidence to support the singling out of Israeli academia, the authors of this campaign have chosen to adopt a three-year old urban legend.
> We are astounded by the fact that the AUT never requested our response prior to adopting their resolution, and did not allow our position to be presented by members of the AUT who are familiar with the facts. The case against Israeli academia, in general, and the University of Haifa in particular, is devoid of empirical evidence and violates the principle of due process. Driven by a prior and prejudicial assumption of guilt, the AUT has refused to confuse itself with facts.[122]

In an article appearing in *The Times Higher Education Supplement* in early May 2005, Stephen Howe relates a personal story about how Howe sees the AUT boycott as an ill-informed decision, based on inadequate information.

> The night before the Association of University Teachers voted to boycott Haifa and Bar-Ilan universities, I had dinner with two close friends. Both teach at Haifa, both, as it happens, are Arab – one Palestinian and one Druze – and both were centrally involved in the events that are the stated justification for the boycott. Yet no one from either side of the AUT's debate has sought their opinion. In fact, until I showed them, neither had even seen the text of the two resolutions. The boycott's proposers – and their critics – have relied on a narrow and partisan range of informants, especially about happenings at Haifa.[123]

As suggested earlier, there were also many concerns about the way the resolution was passed. The Academic Friends of Israel share similar concerns as the University of Haifa:

> The AFI [Academic Friends of Israel] is dismayed that the AUT has used repeated manoeuvres to prevent an opposing voice being heard: During the debate, once the motions for boycott had been proposed, the AUT president, Angela Rogers, who was chairing the meeting, refused to allow any opposing speeches or further debate, but moved straight to a vote. Even prior to the debate, the AUT adopted procedures that made it very difficult for a pro-Israel voice to be heard. The debate was held on the eve of the Jewish festival of Passover and the Sabbath, which would be the equivalent of holding a debate on

---

[121] Yosef Yeshurun, letter to Brenda M Gourley.
[122] University of Haifa, "The University of Haifa Response to the AUT Decision."
[123] Stephen Howe, " 'I do not feel I know for sure what happened, either at Tantura or at Haifa…' "

> Christmas Eve for the general community. Consequently, it proved very difficult for Jewish members of the AUT to participate. The executive committee of the AUT refused requests to reschedule the debate to an earlier day in the 3-day meeting. The AFI and others also repeatedly requested that outside speakers be given an opportunity to make the case against boycott, but again the AUT rejected this.[124]

Adam Logan expresses his reasons for rejecting the AUT boycott in a statement he posted on the web. Among other reasons, Logan states his concerns with the process that the AUT used to pass the resolution:

> [T]he resolution was adopted at a meeting on the eve of the Jewish holiday of Passover – which, intentionally or not, can only have diminished the number of people willing to speak against it. More seriously, it was adopted in a rushed debate in which the time allotted to its opponents to speak was severely limited.[125]

Shereen Benjamin et al. respond to these accusations in an open letter to Jon Pike, one of the AUT members involved in calling the special council meeting:

> We very much regret that there was not a full debate on the topic. This, however, was not the movers' doing but was the ruling of the President who was in the chair. With hindsight, less time should have been allocated for debate on less controversial issues, such as the NATFHE merger, over the previous two days. By Friday morning we were running out of time, and if a full debate had taken place on the issue, other important motions would have fallen off the agenda. The President had a very difficult job to do and while we have our criticisms of her chairing, we believe she acted in good faith. There was certainly no conspiracy to rush the motions through since the Executive did not support most of them![126]

As examined in chapter 5, implementation is critical; there are certain criteria that must be met for a success to occur. Implementation concerns, such as those mentioned above, can greatly affect the success of an academic boycott. Had the criteria for the successful implementation of an academic boycott from chapter 5 been better satisfied, it is likely that the boycotts would have been better able to meet its goals.

Success of the Boycott?

---

[124] Academic Friends of Israel, Press Release, April 21, 2005.
[125] Adam Logan, "Statement on the AUT boycott of Israeli universities."
[126] Shereen Benjamin et al. "An Open Letter to Jon Pike from 29 Council Members, Delegates and Observers at AUT Council 2005," point 2.

While the AUT academic boycotts of Israeli academia broke new ground in the spring of 2005 by insolating individual Israeli academic institutions for particular actions or policies, it was not a simple undertaking. Problems were encountered with ethical controversy, implementation, and strategy. The success or even the outcomes of the boycotts are as disputed as every other aspect of this case. Supporters of the boycott say that the boycott was a success – or more successful than they had imagined.

Boycott initiator Sue Blackwell appears optimistic about the results of the boycott:

> We have forced Israeli academics to examine their consciences. The publicity has been huge. I believe that the boycott campaign will now spread to other unions and resurface in the AUT, until the occupation is ended and Palestinian students and teachers can enjoy the same academic freedoms as their Israeli and British counterparts.[127]

However, it is nearly impossible to fully analyse the success of the AUT boycott, because, like South Africa[128], there were no means of evaluation built into the strategy and implementation of the boycott. The first problem with establishing the success of the boycott is the lack of clear, articulated, measurable goals. As discussed in chapter 5, academic boycotting is not based on the element of surprise; transparency leads to an effective boycott. Those directly and indirectly need to know what is happening, why and what role they play or can play in the situation. A lack of clear, articulated, measurable goals is both a strategic problem as well as a problem in implementation. It can also exacerbate ethical controversy. Clear, articulated, measurable goals may have reduced confusion, speculation and controversy by specifically stating what the boycotters hoped to achieve and how would expect to see it happen. It is vital to state these goals openly as public opinion is important with academic boycotts that are so controversial and debated

---

[127] Sue Blackwell, "Academic Boycott – A Legitimate Form of Peaceful Protest."

[128] See the case study of South Africa (chapter 6) for a complete discussion about the problems with measuring the effects of the academic boycott.

in the media, especially when one of the purposes, as stated by some of the supporters of the boycotts, is to increase awareness about the occupation.

With the AUT boycotts, different parties involved in the boycott state different purposes for the boycott. According to Ben Lynfield in the *Christian Science Monitor*, Ilan Pappe, an Israeli supporter of the boycott, "sees the boycott as a key step toward pressuring Israel to end its occupation of the West Bank and Gaza Strip."[129] Tanya Reinhart suggests that the boycott was called "to signal to the Israeli Academy that it is being watched. But the Israeli Academy still has the option of removing itself from the cycle of passive support of the occupation."[130] Rita Giacaman writes, "The aim of the boycott of Israeli academic institutions has little to do with bridging the gap between individual Israelis and Palestinians and more to do with bridging the gap of justice for the Palestinians."[131] Sue Blackwell, one of the initiators of the boycotts is quoted as saying that the boycotts were to "show solidarity with the Palestinian people and to draw attention to the way Israeli universities were complicit in the occupation."[132] Mona Baker, one of the more notorious supporters of boycotting Israel, writes:

> One of the most important aims of any form of boycott, as I understand it, is to undermine the institutions that allow a pariah state to function and claim membership of the international community. Israeli academic and research institutions are a major source of prestige, legitimacy and income for Israel. Israel publishes more scientific articles per capita than any other country in the world. Every time a member of an Israeli academic institution publishes an article or speaks at an international conference, unless they start with a disclaimer to dissociate themselves from their government, they automatically confer legitimacy on what the boycott movement regards as a pariah state.[133]

Some supporters of the AUT boycotts expressed that they were pleased with the publicity resulting from the boycotts including Sue Blackwell and Ilan Pappe.

---

[129] Ben Lynfield, "British Boycott riles Israeli Academics."
[130] Tanya Reinhart, "Why Us? On the Academic Boycott."
[131] Rita Giacaman, letter to the editor.
[132] Sue Blackwell, quoted in Yaakov Lappin and Talya Halkin, "Israel Fumes at UK Academics' Boycott."
[133] Mona Baker, "On the Distinction between Institutions and Individuals," 2.

Polly Curtis and Matthew Taylor quote Sue Blackwell in a *Guardian* article that appeared just before the AUT special Council meeting in May. "We've done better than we've ever expected. We've had an international debate and prompted a lot of soul searching in Israeli academia."[134] Pappe discusses the way that the AUT boycotts brought attention to the Israeli occupation in an article entitled, "Public Enemy for a Week."

> In hindsight, its most positive aspect was the AUT decision – and the repercussions it produced in Britain, the United States and Israel – brought the Israeli occupation of Palestine to the front pages of the broadsheets in London, Washington and New York. It was a rare appearance: in the last five years, the leading western dailies, except for *The Guardian* in London, too often conveyed the commonly held Israeli view that the occupation does not exist anymore… If the above assessment of the AUT boycott is correct, and it did indeed allow a central – be it even for a short time – place for the story of the occupation on the global stage, then strategically, it was a very positive act. It would have been, undoubtedly better, if the AUT decision would have been comprehensive, and part of an overall effective campaign of sanctions and pressures…[135]

As discussed above, when the ethically controversial nature of academic boycotts is used to get the boycott into the news, often the ethical controversy becomes the focus of the media's attention. Details about the reasons for the boycott or the root problems can be overshadowed by the debate over the contentious nature of the action. When this occurs, such academic boycotts are only useful for the initial cursory surfacing of a completely hidden conflict. Though possibly underreported on, the decades old Israeli occupation can hardly be considered a "completely hidden conflict." Academic boycotts are only able to let a broader audience know that "something" is wrong, that a conflict is present.

---

[134] Sue Blackwell, quoted in Polly Curtis and Matthew Taylor, "Second Opinion."
[135] Ilan Pappe, "Public Enemy for a Week."

The Faculty for Israeli-Palestinian Peace reminds activists that the debate surrounding academic boycott of Israel should not distract from other forms of action that can contribute to the overall goals of ending occupation and protecting the rights of Palestinians:

> We do not oppose an academic boycott in principle, but feel it demands strategic evaluation: will it achieve its desired goals or might it hinder some attempts to build support for fundamental Palestinian rights? Not surprisingly, there are differing responses. We must not allow these differences to divert us from other activities that the vast majority of those who seek to end the occupation support.[136]

However, in many ways, this overshadowing of the reasons for boycotting has happened with the case of the AUT boycotts. In articles about the boycotts, often the reasons for the boycotts are summarised in a couple of sentences and the remainder of the article is discussion about the ethical controversies surrounding academic boycotting as a tactic and its impact on the academic freedom of the boycotted. This can be seen in academic journals, such as *Science*[137] and *Nature,*[138] as well as in mainstream news, such as *BBC News,*[139] *The Jerusalem Post,*[140] and *The Times Higher Education Supplement.*[141] Polly Curtis and Matthew Taylor quote Lynne Segal, of the Faculty for Israeli-Palestinian Peace International, "This debate has concentrated on the academic freedom of Israelis, but we should focus on what is happening every day to Palestinian academics and students who are routinely prevented from carrying out their studies."[142]

It is difficult to even get a clear picture of what the motions contained from media reports. The summaries of the motions the media and journals presented were so short and the discussion about the motions and the reasons for their

---

[136] Faculty for Israeli-Palestinian Peace, "Response from 'Faculty for Israeli-Palestinian Peace'."
[137] Mason Inman, "Boycott of Israeli Universities Overturned."
[138] *Nature*, "Boycott of Israeli Universities Sparks Academic Backlash."
[139] *BBC*, "Academics Back Israeli Boycotts."
[140] Yaakov Lappin and Talya Halkin, "Israel Fumes at UK Academics' Boycott."
[141] Phil Baty, "Boycott Pulls in Natfhe."
[142] Lynne Segal, quoted in Polly Curtis and Matthew Taylor, "Second Opinion."

existence was so limited that even after reading ten or fifteen articles, the author of this thesis was surprised by the full content of the motions when she read the original motions. Most academics or members of the public would be unlikely to read that many articles or to seek out the original motions, and thus would be left with only a superficial notion that there is some conflict about academic freedom in the Middle East, but with few details and limited understanding.

There is no denying that the AUT boycotts caused a media storm and made their way into many popular newspapers. However, the discussion about the ethical controversies of the tactic of academic boycotting appears to have outweighed discussion about the occupation and the struggles faced by Palestinians, in particular Palestinian academics and students. With the discussion remaining at such a superficial level in the media and on the internet, one wonders how much it could have caused Israelis and in particular, Israeli academics, to reconsider their positions and actions with regards to the occupation.

With impediments such as ethical controversy overshadowing the purpose of the boycotts, some definite and other potential strategic flaws, and serious concerns about the implementation, one cannot help but wonder if there is not another tactic that would be more effective at or appropriate for achieving the boycotters goals in this situation than the AUT boycotts. The previous attempts at academic boycotting against Israel that have resulted in rigorous ethical debates may also indicate that the combination of situational factors make academic boycotts poorly suited for this context. What other methods of action are possible that would lead to more in-depth discussion of the root problems at hand? What other actions might be more effective at affecting change?

Academics have presented a number of suggestions for alternative methods of action that may achieve some of the goals or meet some of the concerns of the boycotters. With academic boycotting, the actual isolation – and the problems inflicted with it – is seldom the motivating force behind the boycotted taking action. For example, in the case of the Technical University of British Columbia, the boycott did not affect hiring to any great degree, but still the boycott pushed the boycotted towards negotiation. Increasing public awareness may create accountability and place pressure on a group to act. Increased awareness by Israelis may cause conversion, increase their sense of responsibility or empower them to act. It could be possible to increase awareness using other forms of non-violent protest and persuasion by writing articles, holding or speaking at conferences, issuing public statements, or writing personal letters about aspects of the root problems.

Noam Chomsky suggests that academics in the West have other ways to oppose atrocities, particularly to those to which their own states are contributing.[143] International academics could lobby their governments to change their own unjust policies with regards to the Middle East or to put pressure on the Israeli government to change their policies. Academics could work towards creating opportunities for action for Israeli academics and British academics to speak out to the British government or Israeli government and suggest policy changes. Baruch Kimmerling suggests fortifying relationships for the purpose of empowerment:

> I am calling on the British and international community to strengthen its connections with both the Israeli and the Palestinian academic communities to empower them. Both peoples need a strong academic realm as a part of their civil societies to promote the elements that

[143] Philip Fine, "Chomsky Attacks Boycott of Israel."

> are able to initiate major social and political changes in the region and inside their own regimes.[144]

According to David Newman and Benjamin Pogrund, director of the Center for Social Concerns at Yakar in Jerusalem, the AUT:

> should be investing time and effort in promoting more, rather than less, Israeli-Palestinian cooperative projects in the fields of health, education and technological advancement. It should be inviting Israeli and Palestinian scholars to take part in joint research projects; it should be hosting joint forums of political and social dialogue; and, most important, it should be using its research expertise to contribute to the furtherance of peace and conciliation between the two peoples.[145]

Rita Giacaman disagrees, "Joint academic Palestinian-Israeli projects initiated by outsiders lead peace nowhere… Our experience has indicated that the only tangible and positive impact of such collaboration is the enhancement of the Israeli academy's reputation and legitimacy, without restoring justice to Palestinians."[146] The Faculty for Israeli-Palestinian Peace International Organisation is also caution with such proposals:

> In particular, we believe British academics should think carefully before developing research links and exchanges with Israelis: ascertaining whether they are part of the military machine or work to sustain the occupation; whether they are prepared to address and criticise infringements of Palestinian rights and willing/able to work with Palestinians.[147]

Lisa Taraki issues cautions about funding collaboration projects between Palestinians and Israelis:

> [I]t should be said that conditioning support to Palestinian researchers by requiring partnering with Israelis is nothing but a crude example of the politicization of research, no matter how noble the intentions of those sponsoring such projects may be. Luring fund-starved Palestinian academics in such a manner can be seen as a form of political blackmail, again regardless of the intentions of the sponsors. We believe that if international funding institutions are sincere about their intention of developing the scientific and research capacity of Palestinian institutions and scholars, they should offer direct assistance and not politicize their support.[148]

Faculty for Israeli-Palestinian Peace presents a substantial list of alternative suggestions in a response it wrote just prior to the AUT's April conference:

---

[144] Baruch Kimmerling, "Boycott Will Do Nothing to Change Israeli Policy."
[145] David Newman and Benjamin Pogrund, "A Boycott will only strengthen the Israeli Right."
[146] Rita Giacaman, letter to the editor.
[147] Faculty for Israeli-Palestinian Peace, "Response from 'Faculty for Israeli-Palestinian Peace'."
[148] Lisa Taraki, "The Palestinian Campaign for the Academic and Cultural Boycott of Israel," 2.

> We need to develop a substantial programme of assistance for Palestinian institutions of higher education among international academics, involving staff and student exchanges, sharing of research and research materials etc.
> We need professional associations of academics, in Israel and internationally, to take a stand against the occupation and to issue guidelines regarding the use of academic connections to promote the end of Israeli occupation. We hope such interventions will activate academia in Israel and elsewhere in whatever academic fields to promote awareness of and resistance to Israeli infringements of human and civil rights.
> We must condemn academic activities in Israel and elsewhere which clearly support the occupation (for example, the disgraceful establishment of the College Judea and Samaria in the West Bank as a part of the machinery of Israeli occupation; or the confiscation of land in East Jerusalem to extend the Hebrew University's student dorms).
> We call on international academics visiting Israeli institutions of higher education, and Israeli academics visiting foreign institutions, to make clear their objection to the continued Israeli occupation. The situation in Israel-Palestine in not normal. Israeli academia has to account for its role in the situation and by and large it is not a particularly heroic one.[149]

In a *Guardian* article from 2002, Gargi Bhattacharya suggested some distinct, practical ideas for concerned academics.

> So for all my colleagues who wish to hold on to the values of academic freedom and their belief in the power of dialogue and exchange, I am suggesting a change of emphasis.
> - If you have colleagues or acquaintances in Israeli universities, ask them what they are doing to protect Palestinian access to education. If you meet Israeli academics at professional gatherings, ask them about the situation of Palestinian colleagues
> - If you belong to professional associations or other disciplinary networks, raise the issue of Palestinian access to education and pass a resolution deploring the current shutdown of Palestinian academic life
> - If you are holding a conference, editing a journal or collection, engaging in any kind of academic networking activity – actively seek participation and contributions from Palestinian academics. Make space to explain why this participation is so important now
> - Build links with Palestinian academics and universities. Find ways to provide some day-to-day support. If you can, visit and see for yourself.[150]

In instances – such as with the problematic circumstances faced by the AUT boycotters – when the criteria required for a successful academic boycott are difficult to achieve, non-cooperation (such as boycotting) may *not* be the ultimate solution when discussion fails in academia. The above cited academics are suggesting that there may be other choices for action instead of or to be used in conjunction with academic boycotting, including under-researched, under-considered methods of creation non-violence, such as described in chapter 3.3. When a situation presents barriers that prohibit academic boycotting, such

---

[149] Faculty for Israeli-Palestinian Peace, "Response from 'Faculty for Israeli-Palestinian Peace'."
[150] Gargi Bhattacharya, "Time for a Rethink."

alternatives or accompanying actions deserve careful examination and consideration.

This is not to say conclusively that some other type of action would be more effective than academic boycotting. The context in which the AUT boycotts occurred is very complex. It is impossible, for instance, to know whether any other type of non-violent action could have caused the media stir and the accompanying broad (but not in-depth) consciousness-raising that the academic boycotts created. However, there are other forms of action that would be less ethically controversial, cause less backlash (including criticism from supporters of ending the occupation) and may be better at achieving a deeper level of consciousness-raising. It is also possible that academic boycotting may have been a good option for surfacing the conflict to a broader audience, but it could have been done in close conjunction with other actions that could have moved discussion forward. Regardless of whether academic boycotting was the best possible choice, this case study of Israel should reinforce for non-violence practitioners the importance of careful evaluation and selection the method of action. Too often practitioners end up selecting a method of action because it is convenient, has worked in another situation, or it seems most dramatic or sensational. Though academic boycotting and many other forms of non-violence may have these characteristics, it does not mean that they are appropriate for every situation, strategy, or goal.

When a situation is as complex as the one in the Occupied Palestinian Territories/Israel, it is difficult for practitioners of non-violent action to determine an effective strategy. There are many factors to consider and countless unknown variables. These complexities increase the need for informed, well thought-out strategising and wise implementation, including the full execution of each of the

criteria and steps listed in chapter 5. The AUT boycotters missed a number of these criteria and steps. Practitioners must fully understand the limitations and implications of any of method of action they choose. For instance, as presented in this thesis academic boycotts are only useful for creating an environment compatible with discussion. This case also shows what a large influence ethics can have on academic boycotts and how academic boycotts are weakened when excessive ethical controversy interferes with them. It is unclear whether the AUT boycotters fully appreciated these limitations in their strategy.

The AUT boycotters were not as clear as many successful practitioners of non-violence about how their tactic (academic boycotting) fit into their strategy. Gandhi and Martin Luther King Jr. were two great teachers of this. They both set out, for the benefit of supporters and opponents, articulated plans about their final goals and how the immediate actions fit into the larger plan. There was no doubt about what they were hoping to achieve and how they intended to achieve it. This aspect of planning has been overlooked in most academic boycotts, including the AUT ones; the TechBC boycotters, as presented in chapter 7, are one notable exception to this. In return, cases – such as the AUT boycotts – can inform non-violence theorists about the importance of such planned and presented strategies by demonstrating the effect of their absence, including increased confusion, ethical controversy, and uncertainty about the success of the action.

Conclusion

Discussion is a useful first response to conflict, as it is generally more socially acceptable, less risky, and less resource intensive than more coercive reactions. It is also better for transferring complex messages, receiving feedback, and maintaining and building relationships. However, there are times when discussion is inhibited or prevented and other options must be sought if a conflict is to be addressed. In contexts, such as academia, where discussion is a central principle and deep-rooted norm, it is challenging to find viable alternatives to failed discussion. In the cases of South Africa, Tech BC and Israel, academic boycotters believed that boycotted had become a more viable option than continuing to engage in discussion. Due to the risk associated with breaking norms, as well as the nuanced nature of most conflict found in academia, it is vital to exhaust options for discussion in academia before taking further action. In the case of Tech BC, the boycotters made numerous well-documented attempts at discussion before resorting to boycotting. Some opponents of the boycotts against Israel believed that the boycotters had not exhausted all options for discussion before boycotting. This contributed to the ethical outcry about the boycotts.

Academic boycotts are one of many options for action when discussion fails. Academic boycotts are powerful, but blunt tools that are ineffective at directly addressing multi-faceted situations; though academic boycotts can contribute to complex goals, they can only do so by creating the conditions necessary for discussion, which, in turn can be used to contend with the details and various aspects of a conflict. Academic boycotts can move a conflict from an impasse caused by failed discussion increasing factors, such as awareness or reasons to engage, which are required in order for discussion to be fruitful. This

makes boycotts particularly suited to surfacing types of latent conflict that are often insufficiently addressed in academia. Consequently, while academic boycotts alone cannot realise complex goals directly, the resulting discussion may be able to achieve such goals. In the cases of Tech BC and South Africa, the boycotters were able to increase awareness about their concerns and, though debatably in the case of South Africa, increase the boycotted's reasons to engage in discussion. Due to the outcry over ethical concerns that overshadowed reports, the boycotts in Israel were limited in their ability to raise in-depth awareness about the boycotters concerns.

The limitations and potential of academic boycotts are poorly understood. Throughout their history, boycotters have attempted to use them for goals that are too complex and in situations that are not suitable for academic boycotting. The most concrete example of this is found in the Tech BC case, where the boycotters had to adjust their goal of direct policy change in exchange for the more realistic goal of engaging in fruitful discussion, which in turn could potential achieve their goal of policy change. Wise strategising and careful planning around the implementation of academic boycotts are critical. Academic boycotts are only able to create these conditions required for discussion if a number of criteria are met. These factors include exhausting all options for discussion; dependence of the boycotted on the boycotters; adequate ethical acceptance; sufficient directness; essential information; favourable situational factors; carefully selected criteria; and transparency. Academic boycotting must be a suitable method for the outcomes and goals stipulated in the boycotters' strategy. The boycotted must be able to make the changes requested and the boycotting group must remain functional throughout the boycott. The boycott cannot alienate the boycotted, as the goal is functional discussion. In addition, there are 12 steps that need to be taken to

successfully implement the boycott. In the case of TechBC, all of the criteria and steps were adequately met, while in the cases of South Africa and Israel, the boycotters struggled to adequately meet these criteria. As a result, it is difficult to determine to what degree the Israel and South African boycotts were successful.

Achieving these criteria may mean modifying unrealistic outcomes and goals or changing a situation so that it is more hospitable and appropriate for boycotting. As mentioned above, the boycotters in the case of Tech BC modified their strategy accordingly. When the criteria cannot be met, boycotters should seek alternative actions instead wasting resources and risking potential harm while attempting an ill-fated academic boycott. Unfortunately, other options for dealing with conflict in academia are even more under-researched than academic boycotting. [1]

The first overlooked area is other methods of discussion that are less traditional in academia. These include: street speaking; teach-ins; leaflets or pamphlets; letters of opposition or support; public statements; articles in newsletters, newspapers, or journals; letters to the editor; declarations by organisations; letter writing campaign by academics to offending academics; informal gathers; distributing information; lobbying; written petitions to universities or academics to change their behaviour; and personal conversations, emails, or letters petitioning for transformation.

An area seldom ventured into in academia is non-violent protest and persuasion that is not discussion based. Methods of persuasion and protest that are not based on discussion break the academic norm of discussion, but not norms

[1] Gene Sharp, *The Politics of Nonviolent Action: The Methods of Nonviolent Action*, explores some of the examples mentioned here.

surrounding conversion and academic freedom. Protest, though often ineffective at balancing power in situations of great power discrepancy, can often raise awareness. Possibilities are abundant, including parades, marches, vigils, wearing symbols, picketing, mock elections, radical cheerleading, prayer, banners, silence, turning ones back, musical performances, delivering symbolic objects, media stunts, and art displays.

There are other types of non-cooperation that may be better alternatives after discussion and non-discussion based forms of non-violence fail. These may include resigning, strikes, walk-outs, whistleblowing, refusal to work overtime or participate in extra-curricular activities, refusal of public support, and speeches or writing encouraging resistance.

The largest untapped collection of alternatives is of the under-researched creation non-violence variety. The vast range of possibilities in this category suggests that "creative" non-violence may be a more accurate description. Some of these methods are more proventative (as in John Burton's provention), while others are responses to already existing problems. This category includes, but is certainly not limited to: starting a new fund for projects that address the problem; developing opportunities for academics to participate in challenging the injustice; presenting awards to those academics who speak out about the problem or against the injustice; conducting research into the problem; setting up a body to monitor and report on the concern; planning a conference or meeting where the problem can be discussed in-depth; nurturing new collaborations or relationships; proposing proactive policies; holding diversity and conflict resolution skill-building training; implement a standing conciliation or mediation programme; and developing resources and guidelines for dealing with labour disputes.

Academic boycotts have a purpose, albeit limited and with many stipulations; they have the potential to be useful for creating fertile ground for meaningful discussion after all other options for discussion have failed, and that is all. If the conditions are not right or if the direct aim of the boycott is something other than discussion, it is time to explore these other options, as it is futile to embark on an academic boycott that is doomed to fail. Like all types of non-violent action, strategy and effective implementation are required for success.

The analysis developed in this thesis is not of exclusive use to boycotters and theorists of academic boycotting. It contributes to a better understanding of both academic boycotting theory and broader non-violent action theory. Non-violence theory has many gaps that academic boycotting theory may shed some light on. All forms of non-violent action may not exactly reflect all the findings about academic boycotting. However, since academic boycotting shares so much with other forms of non-violent action, particularly actions that deal with more involved, less spontaneous forms of action, it is reasonable to expect that other forms of non-violent action will benefit from the analysis gleaned from academic boycotting. For the purpose of illustrating how this theory might look when applied to other forms of non-violent action, the case of the women working to reduce young children's access to violent video games, as first presented in chapter 7, will be used as an example.

The 59 academic boycotts examined in this thesis convey the importance of developing and articulating clear goals. Concise, assessable final goals allow for evaluation of the action. Often boycotters – along with many other types of practitioners of non-violent action – believe that vague, general goals are sufficient. However, final goals must be measurable or assessable. They must also be realistic

and achievable. One example of such a goal in the framework of academic boycotting is the CAUT and CUFA/BC goal of ensuring that TechBC university had measures to ensure that the board of governors cannot interfere with the academic freedoms of academics. In the context of regulating violent video games, one of the women's final goals was to change the provincial laws so that children cannot purchase violent/sexually explicit video games, in a manner similar to the laws governing violent/sexually explicit movies. In both cases, it is apparent whether the goal has been achieved; the goals are not obscure or vague. As strategy and tactics should be flexible and may change often, the final goals are usually the most fixed, permanent aspect of an action. These goals are not changed on a whim.

Once final goals are established, academic boycotting teaches that taking action without having an adequate strategy is a sure way of failing. Strategy is a continually changing and developing outline of immediate, mid-term, and long-term outcomes with corresponding actions to achieve each outcome. Though it may seem backward or counter-intuitive, strategy is often made by first examining what will need to be in place in the long-term so that the final goals can be achieved, and then determining what will have to happen in the mid-term to create those conditions. Only after the mid-term outcomes are determined, are immediate actions investigated. While practices of outlining outcomes and goals is a key component of programme and project planning in such areas as social service organisations, community development programmes, and health improvement projects, these insights have not been transferred to the planning of non-violent actions. Militaries also set out well-planned outcomes and goals.

Strategy can be planned as a set of multi-layered flow charts. Each flow chart represents one aspect of strategy, such as public education, resource development, situational research, or ally building. All the flow charts connect together with the same final goals at the bottom of each, as each aspect contributes, each in its own way, to the final goals. Every flow chart has immediate actions at the top of the page with clear, measurable, achievable immediate outcomes listed for each. For example, in the case of academic boycotting, an immediate action may be meeting with a particular key politician by the end of the month or creating a planning committee of at least 5 members before the semester ends. In the case involving the violent video games, the women set out short-term goals such as having media coverage on certain television news reports, radio stations, and the two local newspapers; getting *x* number of signatures on a particular petition at an event; and printing and distributing *x* number of informational brochures. Mid-term and longer term outcomes are similar, but are set to be achieved weeks, months, or years later. The long-term the outcome, the lower it appears on the flow chart.

The immediate and mid-term outcomes in non-violent actions serve as Inukshuks do for Inuit people, trail markers that ensure the action is on course for success. Precise, assessable outcomes are required for many reasons, including on-going assessment that allows for making changes to tactics or strategy as necessary, to ensure that the action or boycotted is not having negative unintended consequences, and to reassure and encourage participants when an action is indeed on track.

After outcomes have been determined, corresponding actions must be planned to achieve each outcome. As academic boycotting must not be selected as

a method without careful consideration of the alternatives, neither should any other method of action be selected carelessly. When choosing actions, situational factors, possible ethical interference, and the resources and abilities of the practitioners must be considered. The military is far cleverer than non-violence practitioners when it comes to determining the correct tactic and tools for a given scenario. For instance, submachine guns are best suited to close range combat or particular formations are more secure to move in when dealing with certain scenarios. Non-violence theory has yet to determine the limitations and strengths of each method of action. Theorists need to examine each type of action and categorise the type of situation it is best situated for and what it can potentially achieve. This thesis has done this for academic boycotting: academic boycotts should only be used to create the conditions for discussion after all other attempts at discussion have failed in academia and are only viable if the criteria listed in chapter 5 are met. Establishing parameters, such as these, for each type of action would give practitioners helpful guidelines for selecting actions.

Like academic boycotting theory, all non-violence theory is useless if it cannot be implemented successfully. Each action or step taken must have its own detailed plan for carrying it out. With the current lack of theoretical guidance, this can be challenging. There needs to be more theoretical consideration about implementation, as non-violent theory has yet to establish the advantages and drawbacks to various approaches to implementation or to develop schemes for implementation that can be applied broadly. Much non-violent action suffers from disorganisation, arbitrary decisions, lack of preparation, and inability to change when an approach is not working. The "but we've always done it this way..." excuse needs to be laid to rest. Implementation must be considered step-by-step,

planned down to the smallest detail. Plans must be flexible, as they will likely change, but there needs to be an initial plan to work from. Successful implementation is about careful planning, attention to detail, adequate information and resources, methodical execution, and flexibility or adaptability when necessary.

While some types of action have been investigated more fully than others, various aspects of the execution of non-violence have been overlooked for most methods of action. For example, what is the most advantageous order for action in a given scenario? What level of transparency is the best for various types of actions? What type of skill sets in a planning committee are most advantageous for planning an action? Is there an optimal number of participants for each type of action? How broad and how in-depth should public consciousness-raising be for an action? Whilst chapter 5 provides a framework by suggesting one approach to implementing boycotts in academia, there may be other equally effective ways of executing academic boycotts and whereas this approach may work for some other kinds of action, there may be other more efficient or effective means of action.

Having measurable or assessable short-, mid-, and long-term outcomes mean that effective on-going evaluation is possible and may be very simple and straightforward. For instance, has there been media coverage in the newspapers designated in the plan? Did the meeting occur? How many signatures are on the petitions? What percentage of the brochures was actually distributed? Other times, evaluation can be more complex, involving casual or formal surveys, interviews, or the gathering of extensive data. Regardless of how assessment is done, it is to the same ends. Practitioners are able to see how their action is progressing. Is the strategy on track? Is a change of approach needed? What is or is not working? Should the plan continue as written? Have their been any surprises? Have

situational factors changed? What has been learned? If change is necessary, so is flexibility and adaptability. Practitioners will need to adapt or create a new plan that reflects what they have learned. An example of this can be found in chapter 7, when the boycotters of TechBC found that lobbying the government was not achieving their goals. Similarly, the women entered back into discussion with the appropriate government department after finding that, even though the laws has been changed to make it illegal, a local store was still willing to sell a violent video game to a 12-year-old.

Non-violent action, including academic boycotting, requires inter-play between wise, well-informed strategy and careful, clever implementation. Both strategy and implementation require critical thinking skills, resources, situational awareness, and understanding of the mechanisms of methods of non-violent action. It is only when both strategy and appropriate actions are engaged effectively that non-violence can achieve its potential.

Appendix

The Academic Boycotts Examined

The following is a list of 59 boycotts included for analysis in this thesis. The same boycotts were used to calculate the figures in chapter 1. Footnotes indicate some articles, news reports, books, papers, and letters that are relevant to each case. In the instances of the scientific boycotts of China, the Australian boycott of Israel, the TechBC boycott, the AUT boycott of Israeli universities, the Elsevier journal boycott, and the Serbian boycott (1990s), information received directly from the callers of the boycotts filled in gaps in published facts.

Only cases that met all of the criteria required to be an academic boycott as indicated in chapter 1 were included. In addition, only academic boycotts that had adequate information were incorporated. Required details included information about the boycotter and boycotted, reason for the boycott, manifestations of the boycott or information that denoted that the boycott was of an academic nature, approximate date of boycott, and an indication that the boycott was actually called. Boycotts that were threatened, but not called were excluded. Boycotts called by multiple boycotters, but for the same purpose were investigated as one boycott.

- Academics and students boycott of National Security Education Program (U.S.) (1994)[2]
- Academics and writers boycott of City University of New York because of Cornel West participating at a conference (2002)[3]
- Action on Smoking and Health (U.K) boycott of Nottingham University (U.K.) (2001)[4]

---

[2] Paul Desruisseaux, "Federal Fellowship Program Enters Second Year."
[3] Piper Fogg, "Neoconservatives Plan Boycott of Conference where Cornel West will Speak" and Eric Alterman "Who's Afraid of Cornel West?"

- African National Congress (South Africa) – joined by many others – call for boycotts of South African Universities (late 1950s to early 1990s)[5]

- AIDS activists call upon private donors to boycott the University of Toronto (Canada) because of mismanagement of funds for AIDS Clearinghouse (1991)[6]

- Asian Pacific Americans in Higher Education and Association for Asian American Scientists (U.S.) boycott of U.S. Federal Laboratories (2000)[7]

- Association of University Staff and Association of University Teachers (U.K.) boycott of universities in Fiji (2000)[8]

- Association of University Staff and Association of University Teachers (U.K.) boycott of Nottingham University (U.K.) over pay and grading offer (2005)[9]

- Association of University Teachers (AUT) (U.K.) boycott of Oxford Union (U.K.) because of an invitation to David Irving to speak. (2001)[10]

- Association of University Teachers (U.K.) boycott of Bar-Ilan University and Haifa University (2005)[11]

- Association of University Teachers (U.K.) boycott of member universities over salary dispute (1999)[12]

- Association of University Teachers (U.K.) boycott of Universitas 21 (international) (2002)[13]

---

[4] *BBC*, "Call to Boycott Tobacco University" and *BBC*, "Student's Snub over 'tobacco money'."
[5] See the case study of South Africa (chapter 2) for references.
[6] *Chronicle of Higher Education*, "Canada Cancels Support for AIDS Clearinghouse."
[7] Joel Hardi, "U.S. National Labs Face Boycott by Asian Scientists"; Joel Hardi, "Asian-American Scholars Call for Job-Application Boycott of National Labs"; and *New York Times*, "Asian-American Scholars Urge Scientists to Boycott U.S. Labs."
[8] AUT, "AUT Lifts Academic Boycott of Fiji" and AUT, "Fiji Academic Boycott."
[9] AUT, "New Year Hope as Nottingham Boycott Ends"; AUT, "Academic Boycott of Nottingham Suspended"; and AUT, "Negotiations at Nottingham."
[10] AUT, "Threat of International Boycott for Oxford Union" and David Triesman, letter to Amy Harland, "Open Letter to Oxford Union."
[11] See the case study of Israel (chapter 9) for references.
[12] David Walker, "British Academics Endorse Protest over Salaries."

- Association of University Teachers (U.K.) boycott of University of Hull because of Edgar Page being removed from his position (1989)[14]

- Batya Weinbaum (U.S.) boycott of National Women's Studies Association over childcare at a conference (2001)[15]

- Can Assoc. of U Teachers and CUFA/BC boycott of Technical University of British Columbia (Canada) (1997)[16]

- Cancer Research Campaign (U.K.) boycott of U.K. universities that accept tobacco money (1997)[17]

- CONADU (national faculty union in Argentina) boycott of exams (1990)[18]

- Conference participants boycott of AIDS conference in San Francisco (1990)[19]

- Council of Irish Federation of University Teachers boycott of Hibernia College (Ireland) (2004)[20]

- ETUCE and NATFHE (U.K.) boycott of University of North London (1999)[21]

- European Association of Universities boycott of University of Mitrovica (2004)[22]

---

[13] Michael Arnone, "International Consortium Readies Ambitious Distance-Education Effort" and Polly Curtis, "AUT Considers Boycotting Global Alliance."
[14] David Walker, "Dismissal of a Tenured Faculty Member for Financial Reasons is upheld in Britain."
[15] Robin Wilson, "Parents say Women's Studies Association Provides Inadequate Child Care" and Batya Weinbaum, "NWSA Childcare Organizing."
[16] See the case study of the Technical University of British Columbia (chapter 7) for references.
[17] *Chronicle of Higher Education*, "Cancer Charity to Withhold Grants from Universities that take Tobacco Money" and *BBC*, "University Tobacco Boycott Looms."
[18] Cristina Bonasegna, "Union Drops Exam Boycott but Still Seeks Big Raises" and Cristina Bonasegna, "Faculty Protest in Argentina Forces Suspends Exams."
[19] *Chronicle of Higher Education*, "Boycott Seems to Fail at AIDS Conference."
[20] Irish Federation of University Teachers, news release, April 23, 2004; Irish Federation of University Teachers, "Motions Passed at Council Meeting 2 (2003/2004);" and Irish Federation of University Teachers, "Hibernia College."
[21] Alain Mouchoux letter to all ETUCE affiliates in Higher Education and Research, "Academic Boycott of University of North London, UK;" Harriet Swain, "New Deal Enrages Natfhe;" and The Times Higher Education Supplement, "University of North London Talks."

- Faculty members boycott of Plymouth State College because of an invitation to Lamar Alexander to speak at commencement (1995)[23]

- Felipe Aguero's (Chile) supporters boycott of Emilio Meneses (Chile/U.S.) (2001)[24]

- Gay Alumni boycott of Carnegie Mellon University until university provides "domestic partner" benefits (1996)[25]

- Giorgio Agamben's boycott of New York University because of U.S. border measures (2004)[26]

- Headmasters' and Headmistresses Conference & Girls' Schools Association (U.K.) boycott of the University of Bristol (U.K.) (2003)[27]

- Hilary and Steven Rose et al. (U.K) boycott of Israeli universities (2002)[28]

- Igor Primoratz (Israel) call for a boycott of Serbian academics (1995)[29]

- Independent Student Association (Poland) boycott of Polish universities (1989)[30]

- International scientists boycott of AIDS conference in Durban (South Africa). (1998-1999)[31]

---

[22] Burton Bollag, "Europeans Boycott Ethnic Serbian U"; European University Association, "EUA Calls for Boycott of the University of Kosovska Mitrovica"; Gillian Sandford, "Serb Students Hit in a Row Over Rector"; and *The Times Higher Education Supplement*, "Call for Serbian Boycott."
[23] *Chronicle of Higher Education*, "Lamar Alexander to Speak at a New Hampshire Commencement."
[24] Michael Easterbrook, "Slander Case Dismissed in Chile" and Michael Easterbrook, "Justice, Memory, and a Professor's Accusation."
[25] *Chronicle of Higher Education*, "Gay Alumni Push for Donor Boycott of Carnegie Mellon U."
[26] Giorgio Agamben, "No to Bio-Political Tattooing" and Aisha Labi, "Italian Scholar Cancels Visit to NYU to Protest U.S. Security Measures."
[27] Sarah Cassidy, "Independent Schools Launch Boycott of Bristol University"; Rebecca Smithers, "Private Schools Boycott Bristol over Selection"; and *Chronicle of Higher Education*, "British Prep Schools Urge Boycott of U. of Bristol."
[28] See the case study of Israel (chapter 9) for references.
[29] Igor Primoratz, "Boycott of Serbian Academics."
[30] Burton Bollage, "Students Boycott Military Classes at Polish Universities." Currents members of the Independent Student Association knew of this boycott, but did not know any more details than Bollage provides and did not know of any further documentation about the boycott. (Personal communication with the author, Świnoujście, Poland, July 22, 2005).

- Jesse Jackson called for students to boycott classes of Lino A. Graglia at the University of Texas (1997)[32]

- John Docker and Ghassan Hage (Australia) boycott of Israeli universities (2002)[33]

- Kansas Citizens for Science boycott of State Board of Education evolution hearings (2005)[34]

- Keith Yamamoto and Peter Walter (U.S.) boycott of Elsevier journals (2003)[35]

- Kikuyu (Kenya) boycott of mission schools (Kenya) (1929)[36]

- Luc Devroye (Canada) boycott of the Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers in response to their boycott papers from Iran, Libya, Sudan and Cuba (2004)[37]

- Middle East Studies Assoc. of North America boycott of U.S. language training program (2002)[38]

- NATFHE (U.K.) boycott of London Metropolitan University (2004)[39]

---

[31] Michael Cherry, "US Scientists may boycott AIDS Congress" and Mark A. Wainberg, "Say no to Boycott of AIDS Conference."
Patricia Reaney, "Experts Urged Not to Boycott AIDS Conference"; Steve Connor, "Boycott Threat to AIDS Forum"; and Linda Vergnani, "South African Scientists fear Boycott of AIDS Conference over President's Comments."

[32] Katharine S. Mangan, "Professor's Comments on Affirmative Action Inflame a Campus."

[33] Manfred Gerstenfeld, "The Academic Boycott against Israel and How to Fight it" and John Docker, "Settler Colonialism as Genocide: Implications for a Strategy of Solidarity with the Palestinians."

[34] Randy Scholfield, "Scientists right to Boycott Evolution Hearings."

[35] Faith McLellan, "Publishers face Backlash over Rising Subscription Costs"; Andrea Foster, "Scientists at the U. of California at San Francisco Call for a Boycott of 6 Biology Journals"; Jeffrey R. Young, "Boycott over lack of Access to Journals is a Bust"; Frank Gannon, "Boycott!"; and Peg Brickley, "Science Rules: Fight about Fees Unites Foes."

[36] Theodore Natsoulas, "The Kenyan Government and the Kikuyu Independent Schools."

[37] Luc Devroye, "Boycott the IEEE;" Geoff Brumfiel, "Publishers Split over Response to US Trade Embargo Ruling;" John Dudley Miller, "Publishers Steamed by US Ban;" and Lila Guterman, "Embargo Imbroglio."

[38] Anne Maria Borrego, "Scholars Revive Boycott of U.S. Grants to Promote Language Training" and National Security Education Program, "General Information."

[39] Phil Baty, "London Met Exam Marks to go out without External Validation"; BBC, "Lecturers Strike over Contracts"; Greg Barnett, letter to NATFHE members at London Metropolitan

- NATFHE (U.K.) boycott of Newcastle College over pay dispute (2005)[40]
- NATFHE (U.K.) boycott of Sheffield Hallam University (U.K) (2001-2002)[41]
- NATFHE (U.K.) boycott of the University of Derby (U.K.) (2000)[42]
- Nepal Teachers' Association, Nepal National Teachers' Organisation, Nepal Teachers Forum and Nepal Revolutionary Teachers Association boycott of exams (2004)[43]
- Paris University 6 boycott of Israeli universities (2002)[44]
- Peter B. Lewis (U.S.) boycott of Case Western Reserve University (ended 2003)[45]
- Physicists boycott of the 21st International Conference on the Physics of Semiconductors (China) (1992)[46]
- Punjab and Chandigarh College Teachers Union (India) boycott of exams (1999)[47]
- Radcliffe Alumnae boycott of Harvard because of low number of women tenured faculty at Harvard (started in 1995)[48]
- Staff and students of Emory University (U.S.) boycott of Mary Robinson (Ireland) (2004)[49]

University; Polly Curtis, "London Met Staff Locks Horns Over Contracts;" and Andy Pike letter to HE Branch Circular."

[40] Guy Basnett, "Lecturers Vote to Boycott College."

[41] NATFHE, "Sheffield Hallam University Focus of National Boycott"; NATFHE, "Academic Boycott"; and NATFHE, "Lecturers' Union Celebrates Progress in Sheffield Hallam University Dispute."

[42] NATFHE, "Union Calls for a National Academic Boycott of the University of Derby"; ETUCE, "Academic Boycott of the University of Derby Lifted"; and NATFHE, "Don't Deal with Derby!"

[43] *Indo-Asian News Service*, "Nepal's Insurgency-hit Teachers Threaten Exam Boycott."

[44] Jane Marshalland and David Jobbins, "Unesco Head Rejects Israel Boycott amid Paris Storm" and Declan Butler, "Paris Univesity Blasted over Israel Motion."

[45] Lila Guterman, "Cleveland Philanthropist Ends Gift Boycott."

[46] Franklin Hoke, "U.S. Scientists Wary of Traveling to China."

[47] *Indian Express*, "Teachers Threaten to Boycott Exam Duty."

[48] *Chronicle of Higher Education*, "Boycott by Radcliffe Alumnae Denies Harvard $500,000 in Gifts."

- Staff and students of McGill University (Canada) boycott of Mary Robinson (Ireland) (2004)[50]

- Students' organisations & anti-racism group (Canada) boycott of J. Phillipe Rushton (1990)[51]

- Teachers boycott Hopkinsville High School (U.S.) graduation ceremonies because of students passing with failing grades (1998)[52]

- U.S. entomologists boycott of the 19th International Congress of Entomology (China) (1992)[53]

- U.S. Treasury Department boycott of Cuba from the early 1960s until present[54]

- U.S. Treasury Department boycott of Iran[55]

- U.S. Treasury Department boycott of Iraq[56]

- U.S. Treasury Department boycott of Libya[57]

- U.S. Treasury Department boycott of Sudan[58]

- United Nations boycott of Yugoslavia (ended 1994)[59]

---

[49] Deaglán de Bréadún, "Robinson 'very hurt' by Anti-Semitism Allegations" and Fiona Tyrrell "Ex-president Carter defends Robinson."
[50] Gil Troy, "Degree of Dishonour at McGill."
[51] Mark Gerson, "Boycott of Course Sought at Western Ontario."
[52] Education Week, "Ky. Teachers Protest Graduation."
[53] Franklin Hoke, "U.S. Scientists Wary of Traveling to China" and John R. Anderson et al., "International Congress of Entomology."
[54] Lorraine J. Haricombe and F. W. Lancaster, *Out in the Cold*; Bob Ubell, "Cuba's Great Leap"; Lila Guterman, "Embargo Imbroglio"; John Dudley Miller, "Publishers Steamed by US Ban"; David Newsom. "Boycotts May Boomerang on US" and *Foreign Policy*, "Editing the Enemy."
[55] Lila Guterman, "Embargo Imbroglio"; John Dudley Miller, "Publishers Steamed by US Ban"; David Newsom, "Boycotts May Boomerang on US" and *Foreign Policy*, "Editing the Enemy."
[56] Lila Guterman, "Embargo Imbroglio" and John Dudley Miller, "Publishers Steamed by US Ban."
[57] Lila Guterman, "Embargo Imbroglio"; John Dudley Miller, "Publishers Steamed by US Ban"; W.M. Duh, "WMD Intel Commission on Libya" and David Newsom, "Boycotts May Boomerang on US."
[58] Lila Guterman, "Embargo Imbroglio" and John Dudley Miller, "Publishers Steamed by US Ban."
[59] Dusko Doder, "Scholars in Yugoslavia Seek to Renew Overseas Contacts."

- Yale University student boycott of the part of commencement involving Hillary Clinton (2001)[60]

[60] William F. Buckley, "Hillary at Yale?" and Louise Story, "Petition Planned to Protest Clinton's Speech."

Bibliography

Aaronovitch, David. "Why Israel will Always be Vilified." *The Observer*, April 24, 2005. http://www.observer.co.uk.

Academic Boycott of South Africa: Declaration by British Academics, 1965. ANC website. www.anc.org.za/ancdocs/history/boycotts/academic65.html.

Academic Friends of Israel. "Addressing the Points Raised in the AUT Council Motions." Academic Friends of Israel website. n.d. (Accessed August 29, 2005) www.academics-for-israel.org/aut_points.htm.

Academic Friends of Israel. "The AUT is Following a Dangerous Path." Press Release. April 21, 2005. www.academics-for-israel.org/press_042005.htm.

Academics for Justice. "The Boycott of Israeli Academic and Research Institutions: Frequently Asked Questions." Academic for Justice website. n.d. (Accessed July 18, 2004) http://www.academicsforjustice.org/CallforBoycott_FAQ.htm.

Ackerman, Peter and Christopher Kruegler. *Strategic Nonviolent Conflict*. Westport, Connecticut, USA: Praeger, 1994.

Ackerman, Peter and Jack Puvall. *A Force More Powerful: A Century of Nonviolent Conflict.* New York, USA: Palgrave, 2000.

Adams, Bouddih and Effa Tambenkongho. "UB Students Boycott Lectures." *The Post* (Buea), June 11, 2005. http://allafrica.com/stories/printable/200506130080.html.

African National Congress. "Position Paper on the Cultural and Academic Boycott." Adapted by the National Executive Committee of the African National Congress, Lusaka. ANC website, May 1989. www.anc.org.za/ancdocs/pr/1989/pr0500.html.

Agamben, Giorgio. "No to Bio-Political Tattooing." *Le Monde*, January 10, 2004. http://www.freuchen.no/Bilder/texts/Giorgio%20Agamben.htm.

Akenson, Donald Harman. *Conor: A Biography of Conor Cruise O'Brien.* USA: Cornell University Press, 1994.

Alexander, Neville. "Academic Boycotts: Some Reflections on the South African Case" *Perspectives on the Professions* 15, no. 1 (Fall 1995). http://www.iit.edu/departments/csep/perspective/pers15_1fall95_3.html.

Alterman, Eric. "Who's Afraid of Cornel West?" *The Nation*, July 15, 2002. www.thenation.com/doc.mhtml?I=20020715&s=alterman.

Alterman, Eric. "Who's Afraid of Cornel West?" *The Nation,* July 15, 2002 www.thenation.com/doc.mhtml?I=20020715&s=alterman.

Altman, Colman. "The Academic Boycott: Post-mortem?" Posting on *alef* listserve. June 4, 2005. http://list.haifa.ac.il/pipermail/alef/2005-June/004000.html.

Anderson, John R., John T. Doyen, Marjorie A. Hoy, Carlton Koehler, Rudolph L. Pipa, Lloyd A. Andres, Michael I. Haverty, James B. Hoy, Nancy F. Knop, Paul R. Ehrlich, Matthew Greenstone, Fredrick W. Plapp, Jr. and Ye Shuping. "International Congress of Entomology." *Science* 250, no. 4979 (1990):360.

Anveshi Collective, Hyderabad. "India: Reworking Gender Relations, Redefining Politics." In *Women, Violence and Nonviolent Change*, edited by Aruna Gnanadason, Musimbi Kanyoro and Lucia Ann McSpadden, 91-5. Geneva: WCC, 1996.

Apressyan, Ruben G. "Violent Speech" *Peace Review* 10, no. 4 (1998):587-591.

Arbuthnot, Felicity. "Call to Boycott Israeli Goods Faces Threats." *The Herald* (Harare), May 21, 2002. (Reprinted on the Boycott Israel Campaign website) www.inminds.co.uk/boycott-news-0093.html.

Arendt, Hannah. *On Violence*. London: Harcourt Brace and Company, 1970.

Arnone, Michael. "International Consortium Readies Ambitious Distance-Education Effort." *Chronicle of Higher Education*. June 28, 2002. http://chronicle.com/.

Astin, Alexander W., Helen S. Astin, Alan E. Bayer and Ann S. Bisconti, *The Power of Protest: A National Study of Student and Faculty Disruptions with Implications for the Future*. London: Jossey-Bass, 1975.

Atack, Iain. "Civil Society, Nonviolence and the Consent Theory of Power." Paper presented at *A World for All? The Ethics of Global Civil Society* Conference. September 4-7, 2005. University of Edinburgh.

Aung San Suu Kyi. *Freedom From Fear and Other Writings*. London: Penguin Books, 1991.

AUT. "Academic Boycott of Nottingham Suspended" AUT News. December 7, 2004 www.aut.org.uk/index.cfm?articleie=1043.

AUT. "AUT Lifts Academic Boycott of Fiji." AUT News. December 12, 2000. http://www.aut.org.uk/index.cfm?articleid=377.

AUT. "Fiji Academic Boycott." AUT News. September 26, 2000. http://www.aut.org.uk/index.cfm?articleid=396.

AUT. "Negotiations at Nottingham" Campaigning section of AUT website. (Accessed June 22, 2005) www.aut.org.uk/index.cfm?articleid=879.

AUT. "Boycott/Greylisting." *AUT Policies*. n.d. (Accessed June 22, 2005) http://www.aut.org.uk/index.cfm?articleid=102.

AUT. "Israel and Palestine." *AUT Policies*. n.d. (Accessed June 29, 2004)http://www.aut.org.uk/index.cfm?articleid=122.

AUT. "Israel Universities – Further Statement to Members." *AUT News*, April 25, 2005. http://www.aut.org.uk/index.cfm?articleid=1204.

AUT. "Israel Universities – Statement by AUT General Secretary Sally Hunt." *AUT News*, April 22, 2005. http://www.aut.org.uk/index.cfm?articleid=1201.

AUT. "Israeli Boycott Revoked – AUT Statement." *AUT News*, May 26, 2005. http://www.aut.org.uk/index.cfm?articleid=1235.

AUT. "Motions Submitted to the Meeting of Special Council to be Held on 26 May 2005." Sent to Local Association Secretaries and Council Members. May 2005. www.biu.ac.il/rector/academic_freedom/files/ASSOCIATION%20OF%20UNIVERSITY%20TEACHERS.doc.

AUT. "New Year Hope as Nottingham Boycott Ends." AUT News. January 10, 2005. www.aut.org.uk/index.cfm?articleid=1061.

AUT. "Threat of International Boycott for Oxford Union." AUT News. May 4, 2001. www.aut.org.uk/index.cfm?articleid=356.

Awad, Mubarak E. "Nonviolent Resistance: A Strategy for the Occupied Territories." In *Nonviolence in Theory and Practice*. Robert Holmes, 361-72. Belmont, California, USA: Wadsworth Publishing, 1990.

Baker, Mona. "On the Distinction between Institutions and Individuals." Paper presented at *Resisting Israeli Apartheid: Strategies and Principles, An International Conference on Palestine*, SOAS, London, December 5, 2004. www.bricup.org.uk/downloads/Mona%20Baker%20paper.doc.

Barghouti, Omar and Lisa Taraki. Letter to the editor. *The Guardian*, April 20, 2005.

Barlow, John B. Letter to the editor. *The New England Journal of Medicine* 317, no. 18 (1987):1161.

Barnet, Ronald. "Limits to Academic Freedom: Imposed-Upon or Self Imposed?" In *Academic Freedom and Responsibility*, edited by Malcolm Tight, 88-103. Milton Keyes, UK: Open University Press, 1988.

Barnett, Greg. Letter to NATFHE members at London Metropolitan University. August 2, 2004. http://www.natfhe.org.uk/says/lonmetun.html.

Bartos, Otomar J. and Paul Wehr. *Using Conflict Theory*. U.K.: Cambridge Press, 2002.

Basnett, Guy. "Lecturers vote to Boycott College." *The Journal* (icteesside website), May 30, 2005. http://icteesside.icnetwork.co.uk/thejournal/news/tm_objectid=15572167&method=full&siteid=50081&headline=lecturers-vote-to-boycott-college-name_page.html.

Bateson, Patrick et al. Letter to the Editor. *The Guardian*, April 6, 2002. http://www.guardian.co.uk/print/0,3858,4762240-103552,00.html.

Baty, Phil. "AUT May Boycott New RAE." *The Times Higher Education Supplement*, May 3, 2002. www.thes.co.uk.

Baty, Phil. "Boycott Pulls in Natfhe." *The Times Higher Education Supplement*, May 27, 2005. www.thes.co.uk.

Baty, Phil. "Lecturers Reject Call to Boycott Israelis." *The Times Higher Education Supplement*, March 15, 2004. http://www.thes.co.uk/.

Baty, Phil. "London Met Exam Marks to go out without External Validation." *The Times Higher Education Supplement*, August 6, 2004. www.thes.co.uk.

Baty, Phil. "Students Unions Reject Academic Boycott of Israel." *The Times Higher Education Supplement,* December 20, 2002. http://www.thes.co.uk/search/story.aspx?story_id=88954.

Baty, Phil. "Union Deal Blow to Israel Boycott." *The Times Higher Education Supplement*, June 3, 2005. www.thes.co.uk.

BBC. "Academics Back Israeli Boycotts." *BBC News*, April 22, 2005. http://news.bbc.co.uk/go/pr/fr/-/2/hi/uk_news/education/4472169.stm.

BBC. "Call to Boycott Tobacco University." *BBC News Online: Education*, March 15, 2001. http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/low/education/1223396.stm.

BBC. "Israeli Match Sparks Protest." *BBC News*, August 16, 2002. (Reprinted on the Boycott Israel Campaign website) www.inminds.co.uk/boycott-news-0336.html.

BBC. "Lecturers Strike over Contract." *BBC News Online*, June 6, 2004. http://news.bbc.co.uk/go/pr/fr/-/2/hi/uk_news/england/london/3831113.stm.

BBC. "Professor Resigns in Tobacco Protest." *BBC News Online,* May 17, 2001. http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/low/education/1336853.stm.

BBC. "Student's Snub over 'tobacco money'." *BBC News Online,* December 14, 2000. http://news.bbc.co.uk/l/low/education/1069261.stm.

BBC. "University Tobacco Boycott Looms." *BBC News Online: Education*, December 14, 1998. http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/education/235099.stm.

Beatty, Jim. "Victoria Pushes Ahead with Plans for Technical University." *Vancouver Sun*, July 30, 1997. http://www.cufa.bc.ca/tubc/Article-July_30.html.

Becker, Bernard H. *Disturbed Ireland: Being the Letters Written During the Winter of 1880-81.* London: MacMillan and Co. 1881.

Becker, Charles M. "Economic Sanctions Against South Africa." *World Politics* 39, no. 2 (January 1987):147-173.

Beckett, Andy. "Sacking of Israeli Scholars." *The Guardian*, December 12, 2002.

Begley, Sharon with George Raine. "Resisting the SDI Temptress." *The Scientist* 1, no. 1 (1986):26. www.the-scientist.com.

Bell, Nancy. "Alternative Theories of Power." In *Encyclopedia of Violence Peace and Conflict Vol 3*, edited by Lester Kurtz, 99-105. London: Academic Press, 1999.

Benatar, Soloman. "Academic Boycott – Through the Looking Glass (Letter from Cape Town)." *Journal of the American Medical Association* 266, no. 4 (1991):501 and 504.

Benatar, Soloman. "Academic Freedom in South Africa." *The Lancet* 335 (June 1990):1576-8.

Benatar, Soloman. "An Alternative to Academic Boycott." *Nature* 343 (February 1990):505-6.

Benjamin, Shereen et al. An open letter to Jon Pike from 29 Council members, delegates and observers at AUT Council 2005. n.d. (Accessed August 29, 2005) www.sue.be/pal/academic/Open_letter.html.

Bennett, Brad. "Iraq Uprising, 1948." In *Protest, Power, and Change: An Encyclopedia of Nonviolent Action from ACT-UP to Women's Suffrage*, edited by Roger S. Powers and William B. Volgele, 266-7. London: Garland Publishing, 1997.

Benson, Mary. *The African Patriots*. London: Faber and Faber, 1963.

Bercovitch, Jacob. "Mediation and Negotiation Techniques." In *Encyclopedia of Violence Peace and Conflict Vol 2*, edited by Lester Kurtz, 403-12. London: Academic Press, 1999.

Bernard H. Becker. *Disturbed Ireland: Being the Letters Written During the Winter of 1880-81*. London: MacMillan and Co., 1881.

Bhattacharya, Gargi. "Time for a Rethink. *The Guardian*, August 8, 2005. (Reprinted on buzzle.com) http://www.buzzle.com/editorials/8-6-2002-23917.asp?viewPage=1.

Bin Sayeed, Omer. *Organizational Commitment and Conflict: Studies in Health Organizational Processes*. London: Sage, 2001.

Blackwell, Sue. "Academic Boycott- A Legitimate Form of Peaceful Protest." *The Muslim News*, June 24, 2004. www.sue.be/pal/academic/Muslim_News.pdf.

Blakemore, Colin, Richard Dawkins, Denis Noble and Michael Yudkin. "Is a Scientific Boycott Ever Justified?" *Nature* 421 (January 2003):314. www.nature.com/nature.

Blume, Stuart S. *Toward a Political Sociology of Science.* London: Collier Macmillan, 1974.

Blumenstyk, Goldie. "Guest Editor and Authors Boycott an Elsevier Journal over its Rejection of Disputed Articles." *Chronicle of Higher Education.* June 21, 2004. http://chronicle.com/.

Boëtie, Etienne de la. "The Discourse of Voluntary Servitude." *Anarchy* 6, no. 5 (May 1966):137-152.

Bolan, Kim. "Academic Freedom at Risk in New School, Boycott Ad Claims." *Vancouver Sun*, August 15, 1997. http://www.cufa.bc.ca/tubc/Article-August_15.html.

Bolan, Kim. "American Professors want Change at Technical School." *Vancouver Sun*, October 29, 1997. http://www.cufa.bc.ca/tubc/Article-October_29.html.

Bolan, Kim. "B.C.'s New Technical University is Target of Worldwide Boycott." *Vancouver Sun*, July 26, 1997. http://www.cufa.bc.ca/tubc/Article-July_26.html.

Bollag, Burton. "European University Group Scuttles Ties with Serb Institution in Kosovo." *The Chronicle of Higher Education.* October 19, 2004. http://chronicle.com/.

Bollag, Burton. "Europeans Boycott Ethnic Serbian U." *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, October 29, 2004. http://chronicle.com/.

Bollag, Burton. "Students Boycott Military Classes at Polish Universities." *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, October 25, 1989. http://chronicle.com/.

Bonasegna, Cristina. "Faculty Protest in Argentina Forces Suspends Exams." *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, September 19, 1990. http://chronicle.com/.

Bonasegna, Cristina. "Union Drops Exam Boycott but Still Seeks Big Raises" *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. October 17, 1990. http://chronicle.com/.

Bondurant, Joan V. *Conquest of Violence: The Gandhian Philosophy of Conflict*. Los Angeles, USA: University of Calfornia Press, 1965.

Bonn, M.J. "How Sanctions Failed." *Foreign Affairs* 15, no.2 (1937):350-361.

Boren, Mark Edelman. *Student Resistance: A History of the Unruly Subject*. London: Routledge, 2001.

Borrego, Anne Marie. "Scholars Revive Boycott of U.S. Grants to Promote Language Training." *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, August 16, 2002. http://chronicle.com/.

Boulding, Kenneth E. *Three Faces of Power*. London: Sage Publications, 1989.

Boulle, Laurence and Miryana Nesic. *Mediation: Principle Process Practice*. Dublin: Butterworths, 2001.

Bowcott, Owen. "Academics in War of Words over Calls to Boycott Israel." *The Guardian*, May 27, 2002. (Reprinted on the Boycott Israel website) http://www.inminds.co.uk/boycott-news-0115.html.

Boycott Israel Campaign. "Cultural Boycott of Israel." Boycott Israel Campaign website, Tate Britain section. n.d. (Accessed December 11, 2003) www.inminds.co.uk/cultural-boycott-of-israel.html.

Boycott Israel Campaign. "Frequently Asked Questions." Boycott Israel Campaign website. n.d. (Accessed December 14, 2005) www.inminds.co.uk/boycott-faq.html.

Boycott, Arthur Charles. *Boycott: The Life Behind the Word.* Great Britain: Carbonel Press, 1997.

Bréadún, Deaglán de. "Robinson 'very hurt' by Anti-Semitism Allegations." *Irish Times*, April 15, 2004. www.ireland.com/newspaper/front/2004/0415/pf4159743548HM1MARY.html.

Breithaupt, Holger. "Science and War." *EMBO Reports* 3, no. 7(2002):596-8.

Bresheeth, Haim. "Stand Up and Be Counted." Paper presented at *Resisting Israeli Apartheid: Strategies and Principles, An International Conference on Palestine*, SOAS, London, December 5, 2004. www.bricup.org.uk/downloads/Haim%20Bresheeth%20paper.doc.

Brickley, Peg. "Science Rules: Fight about Fees Unites Foes" *The Scientist* 18, no. 4 (2004):49. http://www.the-scientist.com/yr2004/mar/prof4_040301.html.

BRICUP. "Statement of Aims." BRICUP website. n.d. (Accessed August 25, 2005) www.bricup.org.uk/home/statementofaims.html.

Britton, Carolyn. "Supporting Women in Research." In *Women, Research and Careers*, edited by Sue Hatt, Julie Kent and Carolyn Britton. London: MacMillan, 1999.

Broda, Engelbert. "The Dilemma of Scientists in the Nuclear Age." In *Scientists: The Arms Race and Disarmament*, edited by Joseph Rotblat, 71-99. London: Taylor and Francis, 1982.

Brooks, Susan M. "How to Organize a Killer Boycott." *The Boycott Quarterly* (Winter 1997), 17-19.

Brower, Vicki. "Public library of science shifts gears." *European Molecular Biology Organization Reports* 2 no. 11 (2001):972-3.

Brown Judith M. "Gandhi, Mohandas Karamchand." In *Protest, Power, and Change: An Encyclopedia of Nonviolent Action from ACT-UP to Women's*

Suffrage, edited by Roger S. Powers and William B. Volgele, 195-202. London: Garland Publishing, 1997.

Brumfiel, Geoff. "Publishers Split over Response to US Trade Embargo Ruling." *Nature* 427 (February 19, 2004):633. www.nature.com.

Bruneau, William. "Tech BC Sells Academic Freedom by Degrees." *CAUT Bulletin*, September 1997. http://www.cufa.bc.ca/tubc/Editorial-September.html.

Bruneau, William. Letter to Ron Dickson. July 4, 1997. http://www.cufa.bc.ca/tubc/Dickson-July_4.html.

Bruyn, Severyn T. "Social Theory of Nonviolent Action: A Framework for Research in Creative Conflict." In *Nonviolent Action and Social Change*, edited by Severyn T. Bruyn and Paula M. Rayman, 16-63. New York: Irvington, 1979.

Buch, Victoria. "Israeli Concern about Palestinian Suffering." *Nature* 418 (August 2002):479.

Buckley, William F. Jr. "Hillary at Yale? The Invitation to Mrs. Clinton is Not a Casus Belli." *National Review Online*, March 29, 2001. www.nationalreview.com/buckley/buckleyprint033001.html.

Burgan, Mary. Letter to Paul Ramsey and Ron Dickson. October 17, 1997. http://www.cufa.bc.ca/tubc/AAUP-October_17.html.

Burrowes, Robert J. *The Strategy of Nonviolent Defense: A Gandhian Approach*. Albany, New York, USA: State University of New York Press, 1996.

Burton, John. *Conflict and Communication: The Use of Controlled Communication in International Relations*. London: Macmillan, 1969.

Burton, John. *Conflict Resolution: Its Language and Processes*. London: Scarecrow, 1996.

Burton, John. *Conflict: Resolution and Provention.* London: MacMillian Press Ltd, 1990.

Butler, Avril and Mel Landells. "Taking Offence: Research as Resistance to Sexual Harassment in Academia." In *Feminist Academics: Creative Agents for Change*, edited by Louise Morley and Val Walsh, 156-168. London: Taylor and Francis, 1995.

Butler, Declan. "Paris University Blasted over Israel Motion." *Nature* 421 (January 2003):200.

Butler, Declan. "Science Collaboration Stymied by Relentless Middle East Conflict." *Nature* 417(May 2002):209-10. www.nature.com.

Caldecott, Leonie. "At the Foot of the Mountain: The Shibokusa women of Kita Fuji." In *Keeping the Peace: A Women's Peace Handbook*, edited by Lynne Jones. London: Women's Press, 1983.

Came, Barry. "The Tenure Trap." *Maclean's*, December 22, 1997. www.cufa.bc.ca/tubc/Article-December_22.html.

Carling, Alan et al. Letter to the Editor. *The Guardian*, April 19, 2005. www.guardian.co.uk/letters/story/0,3604,1463079,00.html.

Carson, Claybourne. "Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee." In *Protest, Power, and Change: An Encyclopedia of Nonviolent Action from ACT-UP to Women's Suffrage*, edited by Roger S. Powers and William B. Volgele, 517-9. London: Garland Publishing, 1997.

Carter, April. *Direct Action.* London: Peace News, 1983.

Cassidy, Sarah. "Independent Schools Launch Boycott of Bristol University." *The (London) Independent*, March 5, 2003. http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_qn4158/is_20030305/ai_n12679444/.

CAUT. "Resolution on Bill 30 – 1997 Technical University of British Columbia Act." Approved by the Executive Committee, Canadian Association of

University Teachers. June 19, 1997. http://cufabc.harbour.sfu.ca/tubc/CAUT-Resolution-June_19.html.

CAUT. "Restriction Lifted from New University." CAUT Bulletin Online 48, no. 4 (April 1998). http://www.caut.ca/english/bulletin/98_apr/lead.htm.

Chaiken, Shelley L., Deborah H. Gruenfeld and Charles M. Judd. "Persuasion in Negotiations and Conflict Situations." In *The Handbook of Conflict Resolution: Theory and Practice*, edited by Morton Deutsch and Peter T. Coleman. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 2000.

Cherry, Michael. "US Scientists may boycott AIDS Congress." *Nature* 396 (December 1998):504.

Chomsky, Noam. "South African Style Sanctions Against Israel?" Turning the Tide weblog, May 31, 2004. http://blog.zmag.org/ttt/archives/000492.html.

Chronicle of Higher Education. "Boycott by Radcliffe Alumnae Denies Harvard $500,000 in Gifts." February 28, 1997. http://chronicle.com/.

Chronicle of Higher Education. "Boycott Seems to Fail at AIDS Conference." July 5, 1990. http://chronicle.com/.

Chronicle of Higher Education. "British Prep Schools Urge Boycott of U. of Bristol." April 3, 2003. http://chronicle.com/.

Chronicle of Higher Education. "Canada Cancels Support for AIDS Clearinghouse." May 1, 1991. http://chronicle.com/.

Chronicle of Higher Education. "Cancer Charity to Withhold Grants from Universities that take Tobacco Money." October 24, 1997. http://chronicle.com/che-data/articles.dir/art-44.dir/issue-09.dir/09a06302.htm.

Chronicle of Higher Education. "European Scholars Call for an Academic Boycott of Israel." April 26, 2002. http://chronicle.com/weekly/v48/i33/33a04502.htm.

Chronicle of Higher Education. "Gay Alumni Push for Donor Boycott of Carnegie Mellon U." January 26, 1996. http://chronicle.com/.

Chronicle of Higher Education. "Lamar Alexander to Speak at a New Hampshire Commencement." March 31, 1995. http://chronicle.com/prm/che-data/articles.dir/articles-41.dir/issue-29.dir/29a02303.htm.

Church of the Province of Southern Africa. *Bishopscourt Update*. Item No. 252. July 11, 1990. www.cpsa.org.za/oldarc/252.html.

CIEA. "CIEA Asks for Independent Reviewer for Technical University." Media Release. July 28, 1997. http://wwww.cufa.bc.ca/tubc/CIEA-Media-July_28.html.

Clift, Robert. Letter to Paul Ramsey. July 21, 1997. http://www.cufa.bc.ca/tubc/Ramsey-July_21.html.

Clift, Robert. Letter to Paul Ramsey. July 3, 1997. http://www.cufa.bc.ca/tubc/Ramsey-July_3.html.

Clift, Robert. Letter to Ron Dickson. November 23, 1995. http://www.cufa.bc.ca/tubc/Dickson-November_23.html.

Cloke, Kenneth and Joan Goldsmith. *Resolving Conflicts at Work: A Complete Guide for Everyone on the Job.* San Francisco, USA: Jossey-Bass, 2000.

Cobbett, William. "The Tactics of Academic Boycott." *Work in Progress* 45 (November/December 1986):37-41.

Cohen, Jack. Letter to the Editor. *The Scientist* 17, no. 15 (2003):11. www.the-scientist.com/yr2003/jul/letters2_030728.html.

Cohen, Michael. "Academic Freedom in Britain Petition." Petition to Professor John Garside, Vice-Chancellor, University of Manchester Institute of Science and Technology U.K. n.d. (Accessed December 15, 2003) www.petitiononline.com/umist02/.

Cohen, Stanley. *States of Denial: Knowing about Atrocities and Suffering.* Cambridge: Polity Press, 2001.

Cohen-Joppa, Felice. "Vanunu's Release Date Nears." *Peace Magazine* 20, no.1 (January-March 2004):9.

Cohn, John R. Letter to the Editor. *Nature* 435 (June 2005):736. www.nature.com.

Coleman, Peter T. "Power and Conflict." In *The Handbook of Conflict Resolution: Theory and Practice*, edited by Morton Deutsch and Peter T. Coleman. San Francisco, USA: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 2000.

Conneely, Sinéad. *Family Mediation in Ireland.* England: Dartmouth Publishing, 2002.

Connor, Steve. "Boycott Threat to AIDS Forum." *The (London) Independent*, April 2, 2000. www.findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_qn4158/is_20000402/ai_n14297230/

Connor, Steve. "Science and Sanctions." *New Scientist* 111(August 1986):19.

Coovadia, Hoosen Mahomed. "Sanctions and the Struggle for Health in South Africa." *American Journal of Public Health* 89, no. 10 (October 1999):1505-8.

Corin, Chris. "Fighting Back or Biting Back? Lesbians in Higher Education." In *Changing the Subject: Women in Higher Education*, edited by Sue Davies, Cathy Lubelska and Jocey Quinn, 58-74. London: Taylor and Francis, 1994.

Cortright, David and George A. Lopez. *The Sanctions Decade: Assessing UN Strategies in the 1990s.* London: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 2000.

Crawshaw, Ralph. "Academic Sanctions: Targeting South African Science." *Journal of the American Medical Association* 262, no. 11 (1989):1499-1503.

Cronin, Blaise. *The Scholar's Courtesy: The Role of Acknowledgement in the Primary Communication Process*. London: Taylor Graham, 1995.

CUFA/BC. "Background on the TechBC Campaign." CUFA/BC website. Last Updated January 6, 1999. http://www.cufa.bc.ca/tubc/Background.html.

CUFA/BC. "Canadian Professors Formally Approve International Boycott of Technical University." Media Release. December 1, 1997. http://www.cufa.bc.ca/tubc/Media-December_1.html.

CUFA/BC. "Professors Across Canada Deplore Technical University Legislation." Media Release. October 16, 1997. http://www.cufa.bc.ca/tubc/Media-October_16.html.

CUFA/BC. "U.S. University Professors Call TechBC Legislation a "Grave Error." Media Release. October 27, 1997. http://www.cufa.bc.ca/tubc/Media-October_27.html.

CUFA/BC. "University Professors Announce Plans to Boycott New Technical University." Media Release. July 28, 1997. http://www.cufa.bc.ca/tubc/Media-July_28.html.

CUFA/BC. "University Professors Lift Boycott of Technical University." Media Release. March 20, 1998. http://www.cufa.bc.ca/tubc/Media-March_20.html.

Curle, Adam. *Making Peace.* London: Tavistock Publications. 1971.

Curtis, Polly. "Academic Boycott of Israel Gathers Momentum." *The Guardian*, March 25, 2004. http://education.guardian.co.uk/higher/worldwide/story/0,9959,1177094,00.html.

Curtis, Polly. "Academic's Death Adds Fuel to Israeli Boycott Campaign." *The Guardian*, July 6, 2004. (reprinted on Academics for Justice website) http://www.academicsforjustice.org/pMachine/more.php?id=1700_0_1_0_M.

Curtis, Polly. "Academics Appeal for West Bank Education Rights." *The Guardian*, July 30, 2002. www.EducationGuardian.co.uk.

Curtis, Polly. "AUT Considers Boycotting Global Alliance." *The Guardian Unlimited*, April 25, 2002. http://education.guardian.co.uk.

Curtis, Polly. "London Met Staff Lock Horns Over Contracts." *The Guardian Unlimited*, August 27, 2004. http://education.guardian.co.uk/.

Curtis, Polly. "Second Opinion." *The Guardian*, May 24, 2005. http://education.guardian.co.uk.

Dare, Patrick. "Professors Boycott New B.C. University: Institution Denies Academic Freedom, Critics Charge." *Ottawa Citizen*, September 17, 1997. http://cufabc.harbour.sfu.ca/tubc/Article-September_17.html.

Davidson, Lawrence. "Why We Should Boycott Israeli Academics." Response to Juan Cole. Boycott Israel Campaign website, July 26, 2002. http://www.inminds.co.uk/boycott-news-0248.html.

Davis, Caroline. "Baker Defends Action and Denies Anti-Semitism." *The Times Higher Education Supplement*, March 15, 2004. http://www.thes.co.uk/search/story.aspx?story_id=89594.

Davis, Michael. "Academic Boycotts." *Perspectives on the Professions* 15, no. 1 (Fall 1995). http://www.iit.edu/departments/cspe/perspective/persp3.html.

Davis, Nicholas E. Letter to the Editor. *The New England Journal of Medicine* 317, no. 18 (October 1987):1161-2.

De Dreu, Carsten K. W. "Productive Conflict: The Importance of Conflict Management and Conflict Issue." In *Using Conflict in Organizations*, edited by Carsten De Dreu and Evert Van De Vliert, 9-22. London: SAGE, 1997.

De Dreu, Carsten K. W. and Nanne K. De Vries. "Minority Dissent in Organizations." In *Using Conflict in Organizations*, edited by Carsten De Dreu and Evert Van De Vliert, 72-86. London: SAGE, 1997.

Della Porta, Donatella and Mario Diani. *Social Movements: An Introduction.* Oxford, UK: Blackwell Publishers, 1999.

Desmond, Marc. "Boycotts by Academics" Letters to the Editor. *Chronicle of Higher Education.* April 21, 2000. http://chronicle.com/

Desruisseaux, Paul. "Federal Fellowship Program Enters Second Year" *Chronicle of Higher Education.* September 28, 1994. http://chronicle.com/

Devroye, Luc. "Boycott the IEEE." n.d. (Accessed December 14, 2005) http://www-cgrl.cs.mcgill.ca/~luc/boycottieee.html.

Dickson, Ron. Letter to William A. Bruneau. July 2, 1997. http://www.cufa.bc.ca/tubc/Dickson-July_2.html.

Docker, John and Ghassan Hage et al. "Call for Australian Boycott of Research and Cultural Links with Israel." Appendix II in John Docker "Settler Colonialism as Genocide: Implications for a Strategy of Solidarity with the Palestinians." Paper presented at *Resisting Israeli Apartheid: Strategies and Principles, An International Conference on Palestine*, SOAS, London, December 5, 2004.

Docker, John. "Settler Colonialism as Genocide: Implications for a Strategy of Solidarity with the Palestinians." Paper presented at *Resisting Israeli Apartheid: Strategies and Principles, An International Conference on Palestine*, SOAS, London, December 5, 2004.

Doder, Dusko. "Scholars in Yugoslavia Seek to Renew Overseas Contacts." *Chronicle of Higher Education.* November 9, 1994. http://chronicle.com/.

Donnellon, Anne and Deborah M. Kolb. "Constructive for Whom? The Fate of Diversity Disputes in Organizations." In *Using Conflict in Organizations*, edited by Carsten De Dreu and Evert Van De Vliert, 161-176.

Doucet, Ian. *Resource Pack for Conflict Resolution.* London: International Alert, 1996.

Doxey, Margaret P. "International Sanctions: A Framework for Analysis with Special Reference to the UN and Southern Africa." *International Organization* 26 (1972):527-550.

Doxey, Margaret. *International Sanctions in Contemporary Perspective*. London: MacMillan Press, 1987.

Duh, W.M. "WMD Intel Commission on Libya." *Armchair Generalist* website. April 7, 2005. http://armchairgeneralist.typepad.com/my_weblog/2005/04/wmd_intel_commi_2.html.

Dunn, David J. *From Power Politics to Conflict Resolution: The Work of John W. Burton.* New York, New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2004.

Easterbrook, Michael. "Justice, Memory, and a Professor's Accusation." *Chronicle of Higher Education.* August 17, 2001, http://chronicle.com/.

Easterbrook, Michael. "Slander Case Dismissed in Chile." *Chronicle of Higher Education*, January 1, 2003. www.ebscohost.com.

Economist. "Iraq, Israel, and the UN: Double Standards." 365, no. 8294 (2002):22. www.ebscohost.com.

Education Week. "Ky. Teachers Protest Graduation." 17, no. 38 (1998).

Eisler, Riane. *The Chalice and the Blade*: Our History, Our Future. San Francisco, USA: Harper and Row, 1988.

Ellinor, Linda and Glenna Gerard. *Dialogue: Rediscover the Transforming Power of Conversation.* New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1998.

Engage. "The Original 'About Engage' Page, Written to Oppose the Academic Boycott." Posted April 23, 2005. http://liberoblog.com/about-engage/.

Etingof, Pavel et al. Letter to those who signed the PJPO boycott letter. April 30, 2002. http://www.pjpo.org/letter_opposition.html.

ETUCE. "Academic Boycott of the University of Derby Lifted." ETUCE Newsletter. May 5, 2000. http://www.ei-ie.org/etuce/english/eetucenews01.html#boycott5.

European University Association. "EUA Calls for Boycott of the University of Kosovska Mitrovica." October 15, 2004. www.eua.be/eua/jsp/en/client/item_view.jsp?type_id=1&item_id=1749.

Evans, Ron. "Against the Boycott of Israeli Scientific Institutions." December 2002 (updated March 24, 2004). http://euclid.ucsd.edu/~revans/boycott.html.

Faculty for Israeli-Palestinian Peace. "Response from 'Faculty for Israeli-Palestinian Peace'." http://www.dlandmj.pwp.blueyonder.co.uk/segal.html.

Fang, Li. "China." In *Protest, Power, and Change: An Encyclopedia of Nonviolent Action from ACT-UP to Women's Suffrage*, edited by Roger S. Powers and William B. Volgele, 73-81. London: Garland Publishing, 1997.

Fareed, Saleh. "Table Tennis Player becomes Celebrity after Refusing to Face Israeli." *Arab News*, June 28, 2003. (Reprinted on the Boycott Israel Campaign website) www.inminds.co.uk/boycott-news-0418.html.

Fellman, Gordon. *Rambo and the Dalai Lama: The Compulsion to Win and Its Threat to Human Survival.* Albany, USA: State University of New York Press, 1998.

Fernando, Laksiri, Nigel Hartley, Manfred Nowak and Theresa Swinehart. *Academic Freedom 1990: A Human Rights Report*. Geneva: World University Service, 1990.

Fine, Philip. "Chomsky Attacks Boycott of Israel." *The Times Higher Education Supplement*, March 15, 2004. http://www.thes.co.uk/.

Fine, Philip. "Union Calls for World Boycott." *The Times Higher Education Supplement*, September 5, 1997. http://www.cufa.bc.ca/tubc/Article-September_5.html.

Fink, George. Letter to the Editor. *Nature* 417(June 2002):690.

Fisher, Roger, William Ury and Bruce Patton. *Getting to Yes: Negotiating an Agreement without Giving in.* Second Edition. Toronto: Penguin Books, 1991.

Fisher, Simon, Dekha Ibrahim Abdi, Jawed Ludin, Richard Smith, Steve Williams, and Sue Williams. *Working with Conflict: Skills and Strategies for Action.* London: Zed Books, 2000.

Fisler Damrosch, Lori. "The Civilian Impact of Economic Sanctions." In *Enforcing Restraint: Collective Intervention in Internal Conflicts*, edited by Lori Fisler Damrosch, 274-315. New York, USA: Council on Foreign Relations Press, 1993.

Flufeder, Helena. "Israelis Unite to Fight Boycott." *The Times Higher Education Supplement*, March 15, 2004. http://www.thes.co.uk/search/story.aspx?story_id=2007953.

Fogg, Piper. "Neoconservatives Plan Boycott of Conference where Cornel West will Speak." *Chronicle of Higher Education*, July 5, 2002.

Folger, Joseph P, Marshall Scott Poole, and Randall K Stutman. *Working through Conflict: Strategies for Relationships, Group, and Organizations.* 3rd ed. Harlow, England: Addison-Wesley Educational Publishers, 1997.

Follett, Mary Parker. "Power." In *Dynamic Administration: The Collected Papers of Mary Parker Follett*, edited by Elliot M. Fox and L. Urwick, 66-87. London: Pitman, 1973.

Foreign Policy. "Editing the Enemy." (January/February 2005). www.foreignpolicy.com/story/cms.php?story_id2742.

Foster, Andrea L. "Scientists at the U. of California at San Francisco Call for a Boycott of 6 Biology Journals." *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, October 31, 2003. http://chronicle.com/weekly/v50/i10/10a03403.htm.

Foster, Janis. "Boycott? What Boycott? Technical University Reports Few Problems Recruiting Staff." *Langley Times*, January 14, 1998. http://www.cufa.bc.ca/tubc/Article-January_14.html.

Foster, Janis. "U Faculty Group Predicts Boycott Impact." *Langley Times*, January 17, 1998. http://www.cufa.bc.ca/tubc/Article-January_17.html.

Francis, Diana. *People, Peace and Power: Conflict Transformation in Action.* London: Pluto Press, 2002.

Friedlander, Henry. *The Origin of Nazi Genocide: From Euthanasia to the Final Solution*. North Carolina, USA: University of North Carolina, 1997.

Friedman, Monroe. *Consumer Boycotts: Effecting Change through the Marketplace and the Media.* London: Routledge, 1999.

Gaard, Greta. "Anti-lesbian Intellectual Harassment in the Academy." In *Antifeminism in Academy*, edited by VèVè Clark, Shirley Nelson Garner, Margaret Higonnet, and Ketu H. Katrak, 115-140. London, Routledge, 1996.

Galtung, Johan. "Cultural Violence." In *Violence and Its Alternatives: An Interdisciplinary Reader*, edited by Manfred B. Steger and Nancy S. Lind, 39-53. London: Macmillan, 1999.

Galtung, Johan. *Peace by Peaceful Means: Peace and Conflict, Development and Civilization*. London: Sage Publications, 1996.

Gandhi, Mahatma. *All Men Are Brothers: Autobiographical Reflections*. New York, USA: Continuum, 1980.

Gandhi, Mahatma. *An Autobiography (or The Story of My Experiments with Truth)*. Great Britain: Penguin Books, 1982.

Gandhi, Mahatma. *Non-violent Resistance*. New York, USA: Schocken Books, 1961.

Gannon, Frank. "Boycott!" Editorial. *European Molecular Biology Organization Reports* 2, no. 3 (2001): 163.

Garner, Richard. "Teachers' Union Lifts Threat to Boycott National Test." *The Independent*, December 17, 2003. www.proquest.com.

Garrard, Eve. Letter to AUT Colleagues at Keele University. April 10, 2005. http://normblog.typepad.com/normblog/2005/04/the_proposed_au.html.

Georgakopoulos, Alexia. "The Role of Silence and Avoidance in Interpersonal Conflict." *Peace and Conflict Studies* 11, no. 2 (2004):85-95.

Gerson, Mark. "Boycott of Course Sought at Western Ontario." *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, March 21, 1990. http://chronicle.com/.

Gerstenfeld, Manfred. "The Academic Boycott Against Israel and How to Fight It." *Post-Holocaust and Anti-Semitism*, September 1, 2003. http://www.jcpa.org/phas/phas-12.htm.

Giacaman, Rita. Letter to the Editor. *New Scientist* 184 (November 2004):26. http://weblinks2.epnet.com/.

Giles, Jim. "Across the Great Divide." *Nature* 425 (October 2003):444-9. www.nature.com.

Giles, Jim. "Palestinian Unease Sparks Fresh Calls for Israeli Boycott." *Nature* 434 (April 2005):813. www.nature.com/nature.

Gillian Sandford. "Serb Students Hit in a Row Over Rector." *The Times Higher Education Supplement,* January 7, 2005. www.thes.co.uk/search/story.aspx?story_id=2018676&window_type=print.

Gnanadason, Aruna, Musimbi Kanyoro, and Lucia Ann McSpadden, eds. *Women, Violence and Nonviolent Change*. Geneva, Switzerland: WCC Publications, 1996.

Gnanadason, Aruna, Musimbi Kanyoro, and Lucia Ann McSpadden. "Introduction." In *Women, Violence* and *Nonviolent Change*, edited by Aruna Gnanadason, Musimbi Kanyoro, and Lucia Ann McSpadden, vii-xi. Geneva, Switzerland: WCC Publications, 1996.

Goldhagen, Daniel Jonah. *Hitler's Willing Executioners: Ordinary Germans and the Holocaust*. New York, USA: Vintage Books, 1997.

Gor, Haggith. "Education for War in Israel: Preparing Children to Accept War as a Natural Factor of Life." In *Education as Enforcement: The Militarization and Corporatization of Schools*, edited by Kenneth J. Saltman and David A. Gabbard, 177-86. London: Routledger Falmer, 2003.

Gorsevski, Ellen W. "Nonviolent Theory on Communication: The Implications for Theorizing a Nonviolent Rhetoric." *Peace and Change*, 24, no. 4 (1999) 445-75.

Granke, Lynn. "Canada: After the Massacre." In *Women, Violence and Nonviolent Change*, edited by Aruna Gnanadason, Musimbi Kanyoro and Lucia Ann McSpadden, 81-87. Geneva: WCC Publications, 1996.

Gray, Breda. "Women in Higher Education: 'What are we doing to ourselves?'" In *Changing the Subject: Women in Higher Education*, edited by Sue Davies, Cathy Lubelska, and Jocey Quinn, 75-88. London: Taylor and Francis, 1994.

Gregg, Richard B. *The Power of Nonviolence, Second Edition*. London: James Clark and Co. 1960.

Guardian. "Isolated Arguments: Contact with Israel is the Better Way." July 9, 2002. www.EducationGuardian.co.uk.

Guardian. "Sacking of Israeli Scholars," December 13, 2002. (Reprinted on the History News Network website). http://www.hnn.us/comments/5671.html.

Guardian. "Scientists Criticise Academic Boycott." December 17, 2002. (Reprinted on buzzle.com) http://www.buzzle.com/editorials/text12-17-2002-32386.asp.

Guterman, Lila. "Cleveland Philanthropist End Gift Boycott." *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, November 21, 2003. http://chronicle.com/cgi2-bin/printable.cgi?article=http://chronicle.com/free/v50/i08/08a01701.htm.

Guterman, Lila. "Embargo Imbroglio." *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, October 17, 2003. http://chronicle.com/.

Guttenplan, D. D. "After the Boycott... What?" *The Nation*, June 20, 2005. www.thenation.com/doc/20050620/guttenplan.

Habermas, Jürgen. *Toward a Rational Society*. London: Heinemann Educational Books, 1971

Hage, Ghassan, John Docker et al. "Call for Australian Boycott of Research and Cultural Links with Israel." April 5, 2002. Appendix II in John Docker. "Settler Colonialism as Genocide: Implications for a Strategy of Solidarity with the Palestinians." Paper presented at *Resisting Israeli Apartheid: Strategies and Principles, An International Conference on Palestine*, SOAS, London, December 5, 2004.

Hanlon, Joseph, and Roger Omond. *The Sanctions Handbook: For or Against?* Middlesex, England: Penguin Books, 1987.

Hardi, Joel. "Asian-American Scholars call for Job-Application Boycott of National Labs." *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, June 9, 2000. http://chronicle.com/prm/weekly/v46/i40/40a02801.htm.

Hardi, Joel. "U.S. National Labs Face Boycott by Asian Scientists. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, June 16, 2000. http://chronicle.com/prm/weekly/v46/i41/41a03004.htm.

Haricombe, Lorraine J. and F.W. Lancaster. *Out in the Cold: Academic Boycotts and the Isolation of South Africa.* Arlington, Va, USA: Information Resource Press, 1995.

Harvey, Shell. Letter to Bruce E. More. April 18, 1996. http://www.cufa.bc.ca/tubc/Harvey-April_18.html.

Hawkesworth, Mary. "The Politics of Knowledge: Sexual Harassment and Academic Freedom Reconsidered." In *Academic Freedom and Responsibility*, edited by Malcolm Tight, 17-30. Milton Keynes, UK: Open University Press, 1988.

Heibert, Adam. "Negotiating Compromise in Divided Societies: Lessons from South Africa for Israel/Palestine." The Leon and Thea Koerner Foundation Lecture in the Liberal Arts, SFU Harbour Centre, Vancouver, October 23, 2003.

Henry, Millsom. "Ivory Towers and Ebony Women: The Experience for Black Women in Higher Education." In *Changing the Subject: Women in Higher Education*, edited by Sue Davis, Cathy Lubelska and Jocey Quinn, 42-57. London: Taylor and Francis, 1994.

Hirsh, David. "Ariel Sharon asks the Boycotters to Dance around Ariel College." Engage website, May 5, 2005. http://liberoblog.com/ariel-sharon-asks-the-boycotters-to-dance-around-ariel-college/.

Hirsh, David. "How do I Argue Against the Boycott? Questions and Answers." Engage website, June 20, 2005. http://liberoblog.com/how-do-i-argue-against-the-boycott-questions-and-answers/.

Hoch, Paul. *Academic Freedom in Action.* London: Sheed and Ward, 1970

Hoke, Franklin. "U.S. Scientists Wary of Traveling to China." *The Scientist* 6 no. 15 (1992):1.

Hollan, Douglas. "Conflict Avoidance and Resolution Among the Toraja of South Sulawesi, Indonesia." In *Cultural Variation in Conflict Resolution:*

Alternatives to Violence, edited by Douglas P. Fry and Kaj Björkqvist, 59-68. Mahwah, NJ, USA: Lawerence Erlbaum Associates, 1997.

Howe, Stephen. " 'I do not feel I know for sure what happened, either at Tantura or at Haifa...' " *The Times Higher Education Supplement*, May 6, 2005. www.thes.co.uk.

Howe, Stephen. "Boycotting Israel: The Uses of History." *Open Democracy*, April 25, 2005. www.openDemocracy.net.

Hufbauer, Gary Clyde, Jeffrey J. Schott and Kimberly Ann Elliot. *Economic Sanctions Reconsidered: History and Current Policy.* 2nd ed. Washington, D.C., USA: Institute for International Economics, 1990.

India Express. "Teachers Threaten to Boycott Exam Duty." India Express website. Express News Service, March 6, 1999. www.expressindia.com/ie/daily/19990306/ige06115p.html

Indo-Asian News Service. "Nepal's Insurgency-hit Teachers Threaten Exam Boycott" Yahoo News. January 21, 2004. http://in.news.yahoo.com/040121/43/2b16q.html.

Inman, Mason. "Boycott of Israeli Universities Overturned." *Science* 308 (June 2005):1397. www.sciencemag.org.

International Advisory Board for Academic Freedom. Open Letter to Members of the Association of University Teachers (AUT), Other University Members and the Public. May 22, 2005. www.biu.ac.il/rector/academic_freedom/files/IAB%20Advert%20final.pdf.

Irish Federation of University Teachers. "Hibernia College." In *IFUT 2004* (section 4):12. www.ifut.ie/ifut2004.pdf.

Irish Federation of University Teachers. "Motions Passed at Council Meeting 2 (2003/2004)." October 18, 2003. http://www.ifut.ie/Hibernia_motion_oct03.pdf.

Irish Federation of University Teachers. News Release. April 23, 2004. www.ifut.ie/Hibernia-4-04.pdf#search='hibernia%20college%20IFUT'.

Isenhart, Myra Warren and Michael Spangle. *Collaborative Approaches to Resolving Conflict.* London: Sage Publications, 2000.

Jack, Homer A. "Introduction." In *The Gandhi Reader: A Sourcebook of His Life and Writings*, by Mahatma Gandhi, edited by Homer A. Jack, v-ix. New York, USA: Grove Press, 1956.

Jacobus, Helen. "Israel Boycott Targets Tate Exhibit." Jewish Chronicle, August 9, 2002. (Reprinted on the Boycott Israel Campaign website) www.inminds.co.uk/boycott-news-0317.html.

Johnson, David W., Roger T. Johnson and Dean Tjosvold. "Constructive Controversy: The Value of Intellectual Opposition." In *The Handbook of Conflict Resolution: Theory and Practice*, edited by Morton Deutsch and Peter T. Coleman, 65-85. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2000.

Jones, Lynne, ed. *Keeping the Peace: A Women's Peace Handbook.* London: Women's Press, 1983.

Juergensmeyer, Mark. *Gandhi's Way: A Handbook of Conflict Resolution.* London: University of California Press, 1984.

Kamath, B.A. Letter to the Editor. *Vancouver Sun*, August 21, 1997. http://www.cufa.bc.ca/tubc/Letter-August_21.html.

Karachi News. "FUUAST Teachers to Boycott Academic Activities Today." June 15, 2005. www.jang.com.pk/thenews/jun2005-daily/15-06-2005/metro/k9.htm.

Kee, Robert. *The Green Flag: A History of Irish Nationalism.* London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1972.

Keener, Lee. Letter to Paul Ramsey. April 10, 1997. http://www.cufa.bc.ca/tubc/Ramsey-April_10.html.

Kennedy, Donald. "When Science and Politics Don't Mix." *Science* 296 (June 2002):1765. www.sciencemag.org.

Kent, Julie and Anna Palmer. "The Research Context." In *Women, Research and Careers*, edited by Sue Hatt, Julie Kent, and Carolyn Britton, 11-31. London: MacMillan, 1999.

Kidron, Peretz, ed. *Refusenik!* London: Zed Books, 2004.

Kimmerling, Baruch. "A Boycott All the Way." *Ha'aretz*, May 18, 2005. www.haaretz.com.

Kimmerling, Baruch. "Boycott Will do Nothing to Change Israeli Policy." *The Times Higher Education Supplement*, August 29, 2005. www.thes.co.uk.

King, Coretta Scott. *My Life with Martin Luther King, Jr.* London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1970.

King, Martin Luther Jr. *Stride Toward Freedom: The Montgomery Story.* New York, USA: Harper and Row, 1958.

Kingsbury, Steven J. "What is Solution-Focused Therapy?" *Harvard Medical Health Letter* 13 (April 1997):8. www.ebscohost.com.

Kirk, Russell. *Academic Freedom: An Essay in Definition.* Chicago, USA: Henry Regnery, 1955.

Klier, John D. "A British Union Reverses a Boycott: 3 Responses." Third Response. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, June 17, 2005. www.ebscohost.com.

Kogut, John B. "Say No to a 'Dumb, Dangerous' Program." *The Scientist* 1, no. 7 (1987):11. www.the-scientist.com.

Kra, Irwin. Letter to the Editor. *Notice of the AMS* 49 (November 2002):1222.

Kriesberg, Louis. *Constructive Conflicts: From Escalation to Resolution.* 2nd ed. Oxford: Rowman and Littlefield, 2003.

Labi, Aisha. "Italian Scholar Cancels Visit to NYC to Protest U.S. Security Measures." *Chronicle of Higher Education*, February 6, 2004. http://chronicle.com/weekly/v50/i22/22a03402.htm.

Laidler, Harry W. *Boycotts and the Labor Struggle: Economic and Legal Aspects.* New York, USA: John Lane Company, 1913.

Lakey, George. "Sociological Mechanisms of Nonviolence: How It Works." In *Nonviolent Action and Social Change*, edited by Severyn T. Bruyn and Paula M. Rayman, 64-72. New York: Irvington Publishers, 1979.

Lancaster, F.W. and Lorraine J. Haricombe. "Anatomy of a Book Boycott." *American Libraries* 26, no. 7 (1995):685. www.ebscohost.com.

Lancaster, F.W. and Lorraine J. Haricombe. "The Academic Boycott of South Africa: Symbolic Gestures or Effective Agent of Change." *Perspectives on the Professions* 15 no.1 (Fall 1995). http://www.iit.edu/departments/csep/perspective/pers15_1fall95_2.html.

Lappin, Yaakov and Talya Halkin. "Israel Fumes at UK Academics' Boycott." *Jerusalem Post* – Online Edition, April 22, 2005. www.jpost.com.

Lazaroff, Tovah. "European Academics Call for Cultural Boycott." *The Internet Jerusalem Post*, April 12, 2002. http://cgis.jpost.com/.

Lederach, John Paul. *Building Peace: Sustainable Reconcilitation in Divided Societies.* Washington, D.C., USA: United States Institutes of Peace Press, 1997.

Leeuwenburg, Jeff. Letter to the Editor. *Library Association Record* 88 no. 7 (1986):328.

Legislative Assembly of British Columbia. "Bill 30 – 1997 Technical University of British Columbia Act." http://www.cufa.bc.ca/tubc/gov30-3.htm.

Legislative Assembly of British Columbia. "Excerpt from Official Report of Debates of the Legislative Assembly." June 9, 1997. www.cufa.bc.ca/tubc/h0724am.htm.

Leibovich-Dar, Sara. "Scholars Under Siege." *Ha'aretz*, November 20, 2003. (Reprinted on Academics for Justice website) http://www.academicsforjustice.org/pMachine/more.php?id=P1681_0_1_0_C.

Lewington, Jennifer. "Teachers Oppose B.C. Tech." *The Learning Beat*, August 18, 1997. http://cufabc.harbour.sfu.ca/tubc/Article-August_18.html.

Lipton, Bonnie. "The Cost of Boycott." *The Jewish Journal of Greater Los Angeles*. n.d. (Accessed November 4, 2003) www.jewishjournal.com/home/print.php?id=9126.

Logan, Adam. "Statement on the AUT Boycott of Israeli Universities." April 23, 2005. www.liv.ac.uk/~adam1/math/statement.html.

Love, Janice. "The Potential Impact of Economic Sanctions Against South Africa." In *Choices in World Politics: Sovereignty and Interdependence*, edited by Bruce Russett, Harvey Starr, and Richard Stoll, 94-112. New York, USA: W. H. Freeman and Company, 1989.

Lulofs, Roxane S. and Dudley D. Cahn. *Conflict: From Theory to Action.* 2nd ed. London: Allyn and Bacon, 2000.

Lynfield, Ben. "British Boycott Riles Israeli Academics." *Christian Science Monitor*, May 12, 2005. http://weblinks2.epnet.com.proxy1.lib.umanitoba.ca/ (accessed July 7, 2005).

Lyons, F.S.L. *Charles Stewart Parnell*. London: Harper Collins, 1978.

Lyons, F.S.L. *Ireland Since the Famine*. United Kingdom: Fontana, 1990.

Maclean's. "An 'Innovation' Under Fire." August 11, 1997. http://www.cufa.bc.ca/tubc/Article-August_11.html.

Maddox, John. "Science in Apartheid." *Nature*, 327 (May 1987):269-276.

Mandell, Brian S. "Conflict Resolution." In *Protest, Power, and Change: An Encyclopedia of Nonviolent Action from ACT-UP to Women's Suffrage*, edited by Roger S. Powers and William B. Volgele, 112-4. London: Garland Publishing, 1997.

Mangan, Katharine S. "Professor's Comments on Affirmative Action Inflame a Campus." *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, September 26, 1997. http://chronicle.com/prm/che-data/articles.dir/art-44.dir/issue-05.dir/05a03301.htm.

Marlow, Joyce. *Captain Boycott and the Irish*. London: Andre Deutsch, 1973.

Marshall, Eliot. "Two Israeli Universities Targeted for Boycott." *Science* 308 (April 2005):613. www.sciencemag.org.

Marshalland, Jane and David Jobbins. "Unesco Head Rejects Israel Boycott Amid Paris Storm." *The Times Higher Education Supplement*, March 15, 2004. http://www.thes.co.uk/search/story.aspx?story_id=89294.

Martin, Brian and Wendy Varney. "Nonviolence and Communication." *Journal of Peace Research* 40, no. 2 (2003):213-32.

Martin, Brian. "Whistleblowing and Nonviolence." *Peace and Change* 23, no. 1 (1999):15-28.

Masters, Judith, Richard Rayner, and Neil Caithness. "How can Scientists help to End Apartheid?" *New Scientist* 111 (September 1986):61.

Mayer, Bernard. *The Dynamics of Conflict Resolution: Practitioner's Guide*. San Francisco, USA: Jossey-Bass, 2000.

McAllister, Pam, ed. *Reweaving the Web of Life: Feminism and Nonviolence*. Philadelphia, PA, USA: New Society Publishers, 1982.

McAllister, Pam. Introduction to "Nonviolence and Women: The Pioneers," by Margaret Bacon. In *Reweaving the Web of Life: Feminism and Nonviolence*, edited by Pam McAllister, 78. Philadelphia, PA, USA: New Society Publishers, 1982.

McAllister, Pam. "You Can't Kill the Spirit: Women and Nonviolent Action." In *Nonviolent Social Movements: A Geographical Perspective*, edited by Stephen Zunes, Lester R. Kurtz and Sarah Beth Asher, 18-36. Oxford, UK: Blackwell.

McAuley, Chris. "Clash over Israel Game." *The Glaswegian*, August 9, 2002. www.inminds.co.uk/boycott-news-0311.html.

McAuley, Lucy and Lisa Looney. "Women and Education in Ireland: Focus on Engineering." In *Women and Education in Ireland,* Vol 2, edited by Bríd Connolly and Anne Bridget Ryan, 89-107. Maynooth, Co. Kildare, Ireland: MACE, 1999.

McCarthy, Ronald M. and Gene Sharp. *Nonviolent Action: A Research Guide*. London: Garland Publishing, 1997.

McConnon, Shay and Margaret McConnon. *Resolving Conflict: Establish Trusting and Productive Relationships in the Workplace*. Oxford, UK: Communicators, 2002.

McGregor, Maurice. "Apartheid and the Academic Boycott of South Africa." *The New England Journal of Medicine* 316, no. 16 (April 1987):1022-3.

McGregor, Maurice. Letter to the Editor. *The New England Journal of Medicine* 313 (December 26, 1985):1666.

McKay, Erin. "Technical University Questioned." *Langley Advance*, August 1, 1997. http://www.cufa.bc.ca/tubc/Article-August_1.html.

McKinley, Michael. "The Co-option of the University and the Privileging of Annihilation." *International Relations* 18, no. 2 (2004):151-172.

McLellan, Faith. "Publishers face Backlash over Rising Subscription Costs." *The Lancet* 363 (2004): 44-5. www.thelancet.com.

McLeod, Donald. "Natfhe Calls for Boycott of Israel." *The Guardian*, April 16, 2002. http://education.guardian.co.uk/higher/news/story/0,,685332,00.html.

Meikle, James. "Professor Quits over Tobacco Firm's £3.8m gift to University." *The Guardian*, May 18, 2001. http://societyguardian.co.uk.

Merton, Robert K. *Social Theory and Social Structure*. New York, USA: The Free Press, 1968,

Mertus, Julie. "The Kitchen Cabinet." In *Frontline Feminisms: Women, War and Resistance*, edited by Marguerite R. Waller and Jennifer Rycenge, 209-211, London: Garland Publishing, 2000.

Miller, John Dudley. "Publishers Steamed by US Ban." *The Scientist: Daily News*, March 2, 2004. www.the-scientist.com/news/20040302/04/printerfriendly.

Miller, William Robert. *Nonviolence: A Christian Interpretation*. New York, USA: Schocken Books, 1972.

Mishcon de Reya. Letter to Sally Hunt. May 19, 2005. http://boycottnews.haifa.ac.il/html/html_eng/19.5.pdf.

Moodie, G. C. (1994). The state and the liberal universities in South Africa: 1948–1990. *Higher Education* 27(1):1–40.

Moore, Christopher. *The Mediation Process: Practical Strategies for Resolving Conflict.* 3 ed. San Francisco, USA: Jossey-Bass, 2003.

More, Bruce and Bill Bruneau. Letter to Paul Ramsey. June 11, 1996. http://www.cufa.bc.ca/tubc/Ramsey-June_11.html.

More, Bruce E. Letter to Shell Harvey. February 15, 1996. http://www.cufa.bc.ca/tubc/Harvey-February_15.html.

Morgan, Gareth. *Images of Organization*. 2nd ed. London: Sage Publication, 1997.

Morris, Mike. "The Academic Boycott: Choose Sides and Organise." *Work in Progress* 46 (February 1987):34-6. http://disa.nu.ac.za/.

Mouchoux, Alain. Letter to all ETUCE affiliates in Higher Education and Research re: Academic boycott of University of North London, U.K. February 15, 1999.

Nash, Paul. *Authority and Freedom in Education: An Introduction to the Philosophy of Education.* London: John Wiley and Sons, 1966.

NATFHE. "Academic Boycott." Newsletter of the NATFHE Sheffield Hallam University Co-ordinating Committee. October 2002.

NATFHE. "Don't Deal with Derby." *Higher Education News*. NATFHE. No. 2, February 4, 2000.

NATFHE. "Lecturers' Union Celebrates Progress in Sheffield Hallam University Dispute." Press Release. February 27, 2001. www.natfhe.org.uk/says/rels2001/2001pr19.shtml.

NATFHE. "Sheffield Hallam University Focus of National Academic Boycott." February 2, 2001. www.natfhe.org.uk.

NATFHE. "Union Calls for a National Academic Boycott of the University of Derby." Press Release. January 25, 2000. www.natfhe.org.uk.

National Security Education Program. "General Information." National Security Education Program website. n.d. (Accessed December 13, 2005) www.iie.org/programs/nsep/generalinfo.htm.

Natsoulas, Theodore. "The Kenyan Government and the Kikuyu Independent Schools." *Historian* 60, no. 2 (Winter 98):289. www.ebscohost.com.

Nature. "Boycott of Israeli Universities Sparks Academic Backlash," 434 (April 2005):1060. www.nature.com/nature.

Nature. "Boycott Someone and Feel Virtuous." 327 (May 1987):259. www.nature.com.

Nature. "Collaboration *in Extremis.*" 417 (May 2002):207. www.nature.com.

Nature. "Cuba's Great Leap." Commentary. 302 (1983):745-8.

Nature. "Don't Boycott Israel's Scientists." 417 (May 2002):1. www.nature.com.

Neufeldt, Reina et al. *Peacebuilding: A Caritas Training Manual*. Vatican City: Caritas Internationals, 2002.

New York Times. "Asian-American Scholars Urge Scientists to Boycott U.S. Labs." May 31, 2000. http://www.asianam.org/Boycott%20U.S.%20Labs.htm.

Newman, David and Benjamin Pogrund. "A Boycott Will Only Strengthen the Israeli Right." *The Guardian*, May 25, 2005. (Reprinted on *The Tikkun* website). http://www.tikkun.org/rabbi_lerner/current_thinking/news_item.2005-05-25.7002191145/.

Newman, David. "Degrees of Dishonour." *Jewish Chronicle*, April 29, 2005. http://www.biu.ac.il/rector/academic_freedom/files/JC_2904_20C1.pdf.

Newman, David. "Lock Up those 'Peaceniks' in the Ivory Tower." *The Times Higher Education Supplement*, March 15, 2004. http://www.thes.co.uk/search/story.aspx?story_id=2005020.

Newman, John Henry Cardinal. *The Idea of the University*. Hertfordshire, UK: Anthony Clarke, 1927.

Newsom, David. "Boycotts May Boomerang on US." *Christian Science Monitor* 88, no. 157 (1996):20. http://weblinks2.epnet.com.proxy1.lib.umanitoba.ca/

Nicklin, Julie L. "Radcliffe Group Urges Boycott of Harvard Fund Drive." *Chronicle of Higher Education*, November 24, 1995. http://chronicle.com/.

Nordvelle, Yngve. "The Academic Boycott of South Africa Debate." *Studies in Higher Education* 15 no. 3 (1990):254.

Nusseibeh, Sari and Menachem Magidor. Joint Statement signed in London, May 19, 2005. Embassy of Israel in London (Public Affairs) *Weekly Update*, May 2005. http://london.mfa.gov.il/mfm/Data/79275.doc.

O'Brien, Conor Cruise. *Memoir: My Life and Themes*. Dublin: Poolbeg, 1998.

O'Hear, Anthony. "Academic Freedom and the University." *Academic Freedom and Responsibility,* edited by Malcolm Tight, 6-12. Philadelphia, USA: Open University Press, 1988.

Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. *Universities Under Scrutiny*. Paris: OECD, 1987.

Oudraat, Chantal De Jonge. "UN Sanctions Regimes and Violent Conflict." In *Turbulent Peace: The Challenges of Managing International Conflict*, edited by Chester A. Crocker and Fen Osler Hampson and Pamela Hall, 323-351. Washington, D.C., USA: United States Institute of Peace Press, 2001.

Palestinian Campaign for the Academic and Cultural Boycott of Israel. "Palestinian Academics Call for International Academic Boycott of Israel." Right to Education website, July 7, 2004. http://right2edu.birzeit.edu/news/article178.

Palestinian Campaign for the Academic and Cultural Boycott of Israel, letter to fellow academics, intellectuals and activists. Right to Education website, July 7, 2004. http://right2edu.birzeit.edu/news/article178.

Palestinian Civil Society. "Palestinian Civil Society Calls for Boycott, Divestment and Sanctions Against Israel." July 9, 2005. http://www.bricup.org.uk/downloads/Call_by_Palesti_Sanctions.pdf.

Pappe, Ilan. "Back the Boycott." *The Guardian*, May 24, 2005. http://education.guardian.co.uk.

Pappe, Ilan. "Public Enemy for a Week." *News from Within* 21, no. 3 (April/May 2005):18.

Pappe, Ilan. "The Case for Boycot (sic)." *News from Within* 19 (January 2003). http://www.newsfromwithin.org/free_articles/pappe.htm.

Parekh, Bhikhu. "Free Speech and the Universities." In *Academic Freedom and Responsibility*, edited by Malcolm Tight, 66-73. Milton Keynes, UK: Open University Press, 1988.

Parnell, Charles Stewart. "The Initiation of Boycotting: Speech at Ennis, September 18, 1880." In *"As it was Said" Extracts from Prominent Speeches and Writings of the Parnellite Party 1878-1886*. Dublin: Irish Loyal and Patriotic Union, 1886.

Pearson, Carole. "B.C. Government Continues to Defend Controversial New University." *The Peak*, November 3, 1997. http://www.cufa.bc.ca/tubc/Article-November_3.html.

Phillips, Barbara Ashley. *The Mediation Field Guide: Transcending Litigation and Resolving Conflicts in Your Business or Organization*. San Francisco, USA: Jossey-Bass, 2001.

Physics Today. "APS Issues Statement on Helping South African Physicists." (June 1992):73.

Pike, Andy. Letter to HE Branch Circular. "London Metropolitan University – Academic Boycott." June 21, 2004.

Polin, Raymond. "Freedom of Mind and University Autonomy." In *The Western University on Trial*, edited by John W. Chapman, 40-6. London: University of California, 1983.

Povey, Malcolm. "AUT Boycott Debate the Has Put Palestine Back on the Map." *Socialist Worker*, June 4, 2005. www.socialistworker.co.uk/article.php4?article_id=6627.

Powers, Roger S. and William B. Volgele, eds. *Protest, Power, and Change: An Encyclopedia of Nonviolent Action from ACT-UP to Women's Suffrage.* London: Garland Publishing, 1997.

Primoratz, Igor. "Boycott of Serbian Academics." *Perspectives on the Professions* 15, no. 1 (Fall 1995). http://www.iit.edu/departments/csep/perspective/pers15_1fall95_5.html.

Pruitt, Dean G. and Sung Hee Kim. *Social Conflict: Escalation, Stalemate, and Settlement.* 3rd ed. London: McGraw Hill, 2004.

Quinn, Robert. "Defending 'Dangerous' Minds: Reflections on the work of the Scholars at Risk Network." *Mitteilungen der Arbeitsstelle Friedensforschung* 2 (2004):1.

Ramsey, Paul. Letter to Robert Clift. July 8, 1997. http://www.cufa.bc.ca/tubc/Ramsey-July_8.html.

Randle, Michael. *Civil Resistance.* London: Fontana Press, 1994.

Rangarajan, L. N. *The Limitations of Conflict: A Theory of Bargaining and Negotiation.* London: Croom Helm, 1985.

Rapoport, Meron. "Alone on the Barricades." *Ha'aretz,* last updated May 6, 2005. http://www.haaretz.com/hasen/objects/pages/PrintArticleEn.jhtml?itemNo=572912.

Rassool, Naz. Black Women as 'Other' in the Academy." In *Feminist Academics: Creative Agents for Change*, edited by Louise Morley and Val Walsh, 22-41. London: Taylor and Francis, 1995.

Reaney, Patricia. "Experts Urged Not to Boycott AIDS Conference" Reuters, April 10, 2000. www.virusmyth.net/aids/news/reutboycott.htm.

Reinhard, Tanya. "Why Us? On the Academic Boycott." *Electronic Intifada*, May 25, 2005. n.d. (Accessed June 22, 2005) http://electronicintifada.net/v2/printer3879.shtml.

Reinhart, Tanya. "Why Academic Boycott – A Reply to an Israeli Comrade." Letter to Baruch Kimmerling. May 17, 2002. http://www.inminds.co.uk/boycott-news-0083.html.

Reinhart, Tanya. "Why the World Should Boycott Israeli Academic Institutions." *The Mighty Organ*. n.d. (Accessed March 1, 2004) http://www.themightyorgan.com/features_parisiv.html.

Reynolds, Sheila. "Cloverdale Still on U List, Says President." *Metro Valley News*, August 20, 1997. http://www.cufa.bc.ca/tubc/Article-August_20.html.

Reynolds, Sheila. "Tech B.C. to be Blackballed." *Surrey/Delta News Leader*, June 30, 1997. http://www.cufa.bc.ca/tubc/Article2-July_30.html.

Rooney, Philip. *Captain Boycott*. Republic of Ireland: Anvil Books, 1966.

Rose, Hilary and Steven Rose. "Reply to Nature." Coordination des Scientifiques pour une Paix Juste au Proche-Orient website, May 6, 2002. http://www.pjpo.org/letter_rose.html.

Rose, Hilary and Steven Rose. "The Choice is to do Nothing or to Try to Bring about Change: Why We Launched the Boycott of Israeli Institutions." *The Guardian*, July 15, 2002. http://www.guardian.co.uk/print/0,3858,4461378-103552,00.html.

Rose, Steven and George Fink. "Boycott Israeli Science – Yes or No." Interviewed by Robyn William, *The Science Show*, May 25, 2002. http://www.abc.net.au/rn/science/ss/stories/s559922.htm.

Rose, Steven and Hilary Rose. Letter to the Editor. *Nature* 417 (May 2002):221.

Rose, Steven. "A Whiff of Hypocrisy." *The Guardian*, May 27, 2004. http://www.academicsforjustice.org/pMachine/more.php?id=1692_0_1_0_M.

Rose, Steven. Letter to the Editor. *New Scientist* 184, no. 2477 (2004):26. http://weblinks2.epnet.com.proxy1.lib.umanitoba.ca/.

Rose, Steven. Speech Given to the AUT Special Council. May 26, 2005. www.bricup.org.uk/home/rose.html.

Rotblat, Joseph (ed). *Scientists: The arms race and disarmament*. London: Taylor and Francis, 1982

Ruina, Jack. "SDI Boycott Violates Academic Freedom." *The Scientist* 1, no. 7 (1987):12. www.the-scientist.com.

Russo, Eugene. "A Science Publishing Revolution." *The Scientist* 15, no. 8 (2001): 1. http://www.the-scientist.com/yr2001/apr/russo_pl_010416.html.

Sachs, E.S. *The Anatomy of Apartheid.* London: Collet's, 1965.

Sanford, Gillian. "Serb Students Hit in Row Over Rector." *The Times Higher Education Supplement*, January 7, 2005. www.thes.co.uk.

Saunders, Craig. "Boycott Lifted on New BC University." *Canadian University Press*, March 26, 1998. http://ursu.uregina.ca/~carillon/mar26.98/news/news6.html.

Saunders, Craig. "Breaking the Rules: New University Challenges the Norms, Raises Ire of Faculty and Students." *The Marlet*, September 4, 1997. http://www.cufa.bc.ca/tubc/Article-September_4.html.

Saunders, Craig. "Harsh Opposition Over New B.C. University Grows." *Varsity News* (Toronto), September 8, 1997. http://www.varsity.utoronto.ca/archives/118/sep08/news/bc.html.

Scholfield, Randy. "Scientists Right to Boycott Evolution Hearings." March 30, 2005. www.kansas.com.

Schuster, Marilyn R. "Transforming the Curriculum." In *Changing the Subject: Women in Higher Education*, edited by Sue Davis, Cathy Lubelska, and Jocey Quinn, 192-208. London: Taylor and Francis, 1994.

Sharp, Gene. "Beyond Just War and Pacifism: Nonviolent Struggle towards Justice, Freedom and Peace." In *Violence and Its Alternatives: An Interdisciplinary Reader*, edited by Manfred B. Steger and Nancy S. Lind, 317-333. London: MacMillan, 1999.

Sharp, Gene. "Nonviolent Action." In *Encyclopedia of Violence, Peace and Conflict. Vol. 1,* edited by Lester Kurtz, 567-574. London: Academic Press, 1999.

Sharp, Gene. *Making Europe Unconquerable: The Potential of Civilian-based Deterrence and Defence.* London: Taylor and Francis, 1985.

Sharp, Gene. *The Politics of Nonviolent Action (Part One): Power and Struggle.* Boston, USA: Extending Horizons Books, 1973.

Sharp, Gene. *The Politics of Nonviolent Action (Part Two): The Methods of Nonviolent Action.* Boston, USA: Extending Horizons Books, 1973.

Sharp, Gene. *Waging Nonviolent Struggle: 20th Century Practice and 21st Century Potential.* Boston, USA: Extending Horizons Books, 2005.

Shaw, William H. "Boycotting South Africa." *Journal of Applied Philosophy* 3, no. 1 (1986):59-72.

Sheehan, Bernie and Ron Dickson. Letter to Robert Clift et al. March 16, 1998. www.cufa.bc.ca/tubc/Side_Letter-March_16.html.

Sheppard, Tony. Letter to Glen Clark. July 21, 1997. http://www.cufa.bc.ca/tubc/Clark-July_21.html.

Shlonsky, Ur. Webletter to the Editor. *The Nation*, March 6, 2003. http://www.thenation.com/doc.mhtml?I=20030324&s=webletter20030306.

Sinoski, Kelly. "Proposed Tech B.C. Facing Boycott." *Surrey Now*, July 30, 1997. http://www.cufa.bc.ca/tubc/Article3-July_30.html.

Smith, Richard. "A Tainted University." *The Guardian*, May 21, 2001. www.guardian.co.uk/print/0,3858,4189428-103614,00.html.

Smithers, Rebecca. "Private Schools Boycott Bristol over Selection." *The Guardian*, March 5, 2003. http://education.guardian.co.uk/print/0,3858,4618428-108229,00.html.

Sorel, Georges. *Reflections on Violence.* Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press, 1999.

Steinberg, Gerald M. "Academic Freedom and the AUT Boycott Campaign: Examining the Lessons." Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the National Postgraduate Committee UK, Glasgow, August 12, 2005.

Stiehm, Judith. "Nonviolence is Two." In *Nonviolent Direct Action: American Cases: Social-Psychological Analyses,* edited by A. Paul Hare and Herbert H. Blumberg, 447-474. Washington, US: Corpus Books, 1968.

Story, Louise. "Petition Planned to Protest Clinton's Speech." *Yale Daily News*, March 28, 2001. www.yaledailynews.com/articlefunctions/Printerfriendly.asp?AID=15137.

Students for Progressive Education and Action. "Why Divest?" n.d. (Accessed November 28, 2005) http://www.princeton.edu/~speac/demands.htm.

Sunstein, Cass R. *Why Society Needs Dissent.* Cambridge, Massachusetts, USA: Harvard University Press, 2003.

Surrey/North Delta News Leader. "Boycott Bad News for City's Image." Editorial. July 30, 1997. http://www.cufa.bc.ca/tubc/Editorial2-July_30.html.

Swain, Harriet. "New Deal Enrages Natfhe." *The Times Higher Education Supplement*, January 29, 1999. www.thes.co.uk.

Taraki, Lisa. "The Palestinian Campaign for the Academic and Cultural Boycott of Israel." Paper presented at *Resisting Israeli Apartheid: Strategies and Principles, An International Conference on Palestine*, SOAS, London, December 5, 2004. www.bricup.org.uk/downloads/Lisa%20Taraki%20paper.doc.

Taylor, Philip M. *Munitions of the Mind: War Propaganda from the Ancient World to the Nuclear Age.* England: Patrick Stephens Limited, 1990.

TechBC / CAUT / CUFA/BC Agreement. March 19, 1998. http://www.cufa.bc.ca/tubc/Agreement-March_19.html.

Tedeschi, James T. and Thomas V. Bonoma. "Measures of Last Resort: Coercion and Aggression in Bargaining." In *Negotiations: Social-Psychological Perspectives*, edited by Daniel Druckman, 213-241. London: Sage Publications.

Teixeira, Bryan. "Nonviolence Theory and Practice." In *Encyclopedia of Violence, Peace and Conflict Vol 2*, edited by Lester Kurtz, 555-65. London: Academic Press, 1999.

Thomson, Oliver. *Easily Led: A History of Propaganda.* United Kingdom: Sutton Publishing, 1999

Thoreau, Henry David Thoreau. "The Challenge to Governmental Power: Civil Disobedience." In *Nonviolence in Theory and Practice*, edited by Robert Holmes, 29-40. Belmont, California, USA: Wadsworth Publishing, 1990.

Times Higher Education Supplement. "Call for Serbian Boycott." July 8, 2005. www.thes.co.uk/search/story.aspx?story_id=2016579&window_type=print.

Times Higher Education Supplement. "University of North London Talks." Editorial. February 26, 1999. www.thes.co.uk.

Tobias, Phillip V. "The Academic Profession and Contemporary Politics." *Minerva* 26, no. 4 (1988):575-597.

Toh, Swee-Hin and Virginia Floresca-Cawagas. "Institutionalization of Nonviolence." In *Encyclopedia of Violence, Peace and Conflict Vol. 2*, edited by Lester Kurtz, 211-22. London: Academic Press, 1999.

Tolstoy, Leo. *On Civil Disobedience and Non-Violence.* New York, USA: Bergman Publishers, 1967.

Traubman, Tamara. "The Intifada Reaches the Ivory Tower: European Scientists are Calling for a Boycott of Israel." *Ha'aretz*, April 25, 2002. (Reprinted on Boycott Israel) http://www.inminds.co.uk/boycott-news-0033.html.

Triesman, David. Letter to Amy Harland. "Open Letter to Oxford Union." May 4, 2001. www.aut.org.uk/index.cfm?articleid=356.

Troup, Freda. *Forbidden Pastures: Education Under Apartheid.* London: International Defense and Aid Fund, 1976.

Troy, Gil. "Degree of Dishonour at McGill." *Israeli Insider*, May 5, 2004. (Originally published in the Montreal Gazette) http://web.israelinsider.com.

Tyrrell, Fiona. "Ex-president Carter defends Robinson." *The Irish Times*, April 16, 2004. www.ireland.com/newspapers/ireland/2004/0416/pf593064551HM7ROBINSON.html.

Ubell, Bob. "Cuba's Great Leap." *Nature* 302 (2003): 745-748.

Ucko, Peter. *Academic Freedom and Apartheid: The Story of the World Archaeological Congress*. London: Duckworth, 1987.

United Nations General Assembly. "Resolutions Adopted on the Reports of the Special Political Committee." Twenty-third Session. Resolution 2396, 19-21.

University of Haifa. "The University of Haifa Response to the AUT Decision." May 1, 2005. http://boycottnews.haifa.ac.il/html/html_eng/response_f.htm.

Ury, William. *Getting Past No: Negotiating with Difficult People*. London: Century Business, 1991.

Vancouver Sun. "Be Open to a New U." Editorial. July 30, 1997. http://www.cufa.bc.ca/tubc/Editorial-July_30.html.

Vergnani, Linda. "2 South African Groups Vote Not to Call for Renewal of Academic Boycott, but Students Seek Selective Action." *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, August 5, 1992. http://chronicle.com/.

Vergnani, Linda. "South African Scientists fear Boycott of AIDS Conference over President's Comments." *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, April 4, 2000. http://chroa.virtualave.net/mbeki-aids7.htm.

Veriava, Yosef. Letter to the Editor. *The New England Journal of Medicine* 317, no. 18 (October 1987): 1161.

Vetlesen, Arne Johan. Genocide: A Case for the Responsibility of the Bystander" *Journal of Peace Research.* 37:4 (2000) 519-532.

Vuyisile, Voyi, Xola Mtshona and Trevor Abrahams. "South Africa." In *Academic Freedom 1990: A Human Rights Report*, edited by Laksiri Fernando, Nigel Hartley, Manfred Nowak, and Theresa Swinehart, 125-149. Geneva: World University Service, 1990.

Wainberg, Mark A. "Say no to Boycott of AIDS Conference." *Nature* 398 (April 1999):555.

Walker, David. "British Academics Endorse Protest Over Salaries." *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, May 21, 1999. http://chronicle.com/prm/weekly/v45/i37/37a05403.htm.

Walker, David. "Dismissal of a Tenured Faculty Member for Financial Reasons is upheld in Britain." *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, October 25, 1989. http://chronicle.com/.

Weber, Thomas. "Gandhian Philosophy, Conflict Resolution Theory and Practical Approaches to Negotiation." *Journal of Peace Research* 38, no. 4 (2001):493-513.

Weber, Thomas. "Nonviolence is Who? Gene Sharp and Gandhi" *Peace and Change* 28, no. 2 (2003):250-270.

Weigert, Kathleen Maas. "Structural Violence." In *Encyclopedia of Violence, Peace and Conflict Vol. 3*, edited by Lester Kurtz, 431-40. London: Academic Press, 1999.

Weinbaum, Batya. "NWSA Childcare Organizing." *Off Our Backs* (August/September 2000). www.findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_qa3693/is_200008/ai_n8925660/print.

Wiener, Jon. "Israeli Boycott: A Mistake." *The Nation*, June 6, 2005. http://thenation.com/doc/20050606/wiener.

Wilmot, William W. and Joyce L. Hocker. *Interpersonal Conflict.* 6th ed. New York, USA: McGraw-Hill, 2001.

Wilson, Robin. "Parents say Women's –Studies Association Provides Inadequate Child Care." *Chronicle of Higher Education*, February 16, 2001. http://chronicle.com/.

Wilson, Tom. "Is it Time to Take Sides?" *Independent (U.K.),* April 18, 2002. http://education.independent.co.uk/higher/story.jsp?story-286373.

Woehrle, Lynne. "Gender Studies." In *Encyclopedia of Violence, Peace and Conflict Vol. 2*, edited by Lester Kurtz, 41-52. London: Academic Press, 1999.

Woito, Robert. "Nonviolence, Principled." In *Protest, Power, and Change: An Encyclopedia of Nonviolent Action from ACT-UP to Women's Suffrage*, edited by Roger S. Powers and William B. Volgele, 357-364. London: Garland Publishing, 1997.

Wojtas, Olga. "AUTS Blames Govt for Boycott." *The Times Higher Education Supplement*, August 13, 1999. www.thes.co.uk.

Wolfe, Alan. "The Risky Power of the Academic Boycott." *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, March 17, 2000. www.ebscohost.com.

Yeshurun, Yosef. "A Message from the Rector." Bar-Ilan University website, May 26, 2005. www.biu.ac.il/rector/academic_freedom/amessage.htm.

Yeshurun, Yosef. Letter to Brenda M Gourley. May 22, 2005. www.biu.ac.il/rector/academic_freedom/files/OpenUniversity.response.22-5-05pdf.pdf.

Yonai, Yuval. Letter to Rector and Staff of Haifa University. April 2005. www.monabaker.com/pMachine/more.php?id=2810_0_1_0_M.

York, Herbert and Allen Greb. "Scientists as advisors to governments." In *Scientists: The Arms Race and Disarmament*, edited by Joseph Rotblat, 83-99. London: Taylor and Francis, 1982.

Young, Jeffrey R. "Boycott over Lack of Online Access to Journals is a Bust." *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, May 31, 2002. http://chronicle.com/prm/weekly/v48/i38/38a03402.htm.

Zandonella, Catherine. "Mixing Science and Politics." *The Scientist* 17 (June 2003):39. http://student.cs.ucc.ie/cs1064/jabowen/IPSC/articles/article0004007.html.

Ziman, John. "Basic Principles." In *Scientists: The Arms Race and Disarmament*, edited by Joseph Rotblat, 161-78. London: Taylor and Francis, 1982.

Zionism on the Web. "The Argument Against the AUT Israel Boycott." Zionism on the Web website. n.d. (Accessed August 18, 2005) www.zionismontheweb.org/AUT/arguments.htm.