

PC(USA)Boycott

of all Israeli Goods from the Occupied Palestinian Territories

The Presbyterian Church (USA) calls upon all nations to prohibit the import of products made by enterprises in Israeli settlements on Palestinian land. The PC(USA) calls for the boycott of all Israeli products coming from the occupied Palestinian Territories.

July 2012, 220th General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church (USA)



WHY BOYCOTT ISRAELI SETTLEMENT PRODUCTS?

Short answer: Because the Israeli settlements on Palestinian land are the chief obstacle to peace through a two-state solution. And because Palestinian Christians and Muslims are asking for *non-violent economic pressure* to help end their dispossession and subjugation. The Church has long supported boycotts that allow consumers to show solidarity and put our money where our values are.

A bit longer: Honoring self-determination and human rights, the Presbyterian Church (USA)'s General Assembly has long supported two viable states. Since the occupation of the West Bank, East Jerusalem and Gaza (still actually under Israeli control) began in 1967, Israel has moved in approximately 550,000 settlers against the 4th Geneva Convention, taking Palestinian land and water, walling in inhabitants (as in Bethlehem), and ruling by more than 2,500 military orders. This has strangled the Palestinian economy and, out of desperation, educated Palestinians (including many Christians) have emigrated when possible. The Presbyterian Church has condemned terrorism by Israelis and Palestinians alike, while noting that most Palestinians have always sought peace even when subjected to loss of land and freedom. The growth of settlements continues and, unless halted, will soon make a two state solution inconceivable.

Palestinian Christian leaders have explicitly called for nonviolence and economic pressure in the courageous confessional document Kairos Palestine, invoking the example of South Africa, where churches played a key role in that nonviolent transition. The United Methodist Church and the United Church of Canada adopted virtually identical boycott positions as that of PC(USA), also after years of making words-only statements that are easily ignored by Israel, a country that has not yet declared its borders.

The Presbyterian Church (USA)'s study Boycotts: Policy and Criteria (1979) describes the range of concerns for which Presbyterians have used economic pressure. Beyond the specific issues, church bodies have taken actions that maintain the integrity of not supporting exploitation and show effectiveness—sometimes measured in controversy. Moreover, boycotts have proven to be an effective way to bring about change while not being complicit with injustice.

"we do affirm the legitimacy of Israel as a state, but consider the continuing occupation of Palestine... to be illegitimate, illegal under international law, and an enduring threat to peace in the region. Furthermore, we recognize that any support for that occupation weakens the moral standing of our nation internationally and our security."

Breaking Down the Walls 219th General Assembly July 2010 Shouldn't our government be doing something? Yes, US governments have repeatedly called for a "freeze" on settlements and a peace process, but have also continued to give Israel over \$3 billion in military aid each year. The US has also been Israel's main ally at the United Nations, vetoing over 30 resolutions over the years that tried to hold Israel accountable to international law. Participating in the boycott means exercising your right as a citizen to purchase according to your moral values without waiting for the Federal government.

Is criticism of Israeli policy anti-Semitic? No. Remember the prophets! The General Assembly policies envision an Israel that will be safer when there is a just peace with its neighbors and a one-person, one-vote policy with equal civil rights for all its inhabitants.

Shouldn't we wait for negotiations between Israel and the Palestinians?

Such negotiations have never worked without outside involvement, as the parties are vastly unequal in power. In fact, the Oslo Accords and other agreements, have been steadily undermined by the ever-expanding settlements. which cannot be explained away with security concerns. Settlements are not about security.