

THE EVOLUTION OF AN ANTISEMITIC ANTI-ZIONIST

David Miller's Radical
Alterity Reconsidered

Cary Nelson



THE INSTITUTE FOR THE STUDY OF
GLOBAL ANTISEMITISM & POLICY

INSTITUTE FOR THE STUDY OF GLOBAL ANTISEMITISM AND POLICY

Oxford • Cambridge • New York • Jerusalem • Toronto • Rome

www.isgap.org
info@isgap.org

Chair

Natan Sharansky

Executive Director

Charles Asher Small

All papers in the ISGAP Occasional Papers Series are peer reviewed through processes administered by ISGAP's Academic Steering Committee.

The Series Editor is Charles Asher Small.

The opinions expressed in this paper are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Institute for the Study of Global Antisemitism and Policy, its officers, or the members of its boards.

© 2026

ISBN 978-1-940186-41-2

ISGAP PUBLICATIONS

ANTISEMITISM IN COMPARATIVE PERSPECTIVE

Collected Papers edited by Charles A. Small

The Yale Papers

The ISGAP Papers, Vol. 2

The ISGAP Papers, Vol. 3

GLOBAL ANTISEMITISM: A CRISIS OF MODERNITY

Conference Papers edited by Charles A. Small

Volume I: Conceptual Approaches

Volume II: The Intellectual Environment

Volume III: Global Antisemitism: Past and Present

Volume IV: Islamism and the Arab World

Volume V: Reflections

MONOGRAPHS

Industry of Lies: Media, Academia, and the Israeli-Arab Conflict

Ben-Dror Yemini

The Caliph and the Ayatollah: Our World under Siege

Fiamma Nirenstein

*Antisemitism and Pedagogy: Papers from the ISGAP–Oxford Summer Institute
for Curriculum Development in Critical Antisemitism Studies*

Charles A. Small (ed.)

*Putin's Hybrid War and the Jews: Antisemitism, Propaganda,
and the Displacement of Ukrainian Jewry*

Sam Sokol

All the above-mentioned publications are available on Amazon.

CO-PUBLICATIONS

WITH ACADEMIC STUDIES PRESS

*College Zionists Confront the Abyss: The Aftermath of October 7 in
Higher Education and Its Consequences for Progressive Politics*

Cary Nelson

Redemptive Antisemitism after Ten/Seven

David Patterson

*Hate Speech and Academic Freedom:
The Antisemitic Assault on Basic Principles*
Cary Nelson

Poisoning the Wells: Antisemitism in Contemporary America
Corinne E. Blackmer and Andrew Pessin (eds.)

OCCASIONAL PAPER SERIES

*Erasure and Demonization: Antisemitism and Anti-Zionism
in Contemporary Social Movements*
Sylvia Barack Fishman

*The “Merah Affair”: The “Sea Change” in Islamism’s
Terror Footprint to Holy Jihad in France*
Ellen Cannon

The Negotiations between Rahab the Harlot and the Israelite Spies
Avner Saar

*Genocidal Antisemitism:
A Core Ideology of the Muslim Brotherhood*
Markos Zografos

Antisemitism in Post-Colonial Indian Political Rhetoric
Navras J. Aafreedi

*Explanations of Racism and Antisemitism in
Global White Supremacist Thought*
Dr. Lev Topor

*The Seeds of Campus Antisemitism: Similarities Between
Heideggerian Philosophy and Identity Synthesis Ideology*
Sabrina Soffer

*Omer Bartov and the Politics of Holocaust Memory:
From Activism to Historiography—and Back Again*
Sabrina Soffer

*October 7 and the Ukrainian Pogroms of 1919:
A Comparative Analysis of Motives, Impacts, and Reactions*
Sharon Vance

*The Evolution of an Antisemitic Anti-Zionist:
David Miller’s Radical Alterity Reconsidered*
Cary Nelson

**The Evolution of an Antisemitic Anti-Zionist:
David Miller’s Radical Alterity Reconsidered**

Cary Nelson*

Table of Contents

Introduction 2

The David Miller Case..... 3

Dating Miller’s Anti-Zionism..... 6

David Miller’s External Funding at Bath 12

Anti-Zionism Takes Center Stage..... 16

A Crisis Escalates 24

A Misguided Tribunal..... 29

David Miller’s Academic Freedom..... 38

The Sins of the Jewish Fathers..... 40

Pax Judaica..... 48

Miller’s Journey to Radical Alterity..... 49

Conclusion..... 56

Notes..... 58

Bibliography 70

* Cary Nelson is an ISGAP faculty member and Jubilee Professor of Liberal Arts & Sciences Emeritus at the University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign. He wishes to thank Joanna Michlic and Jim Wald for advice about this project and Dave Rich for comments on a draft of the essay.

Introduction

The only way for moral civilization to be saved is for it to be saved by the Islamic Republic. It won't be saved by China. It won't be saved by Russia. It's only the Islamic Republic who can stand for civilization and stand for the Palestinians. Those two things of course are very very closely linked. If the Palestinians fall, if the axis of resistance falls, we will have a thousand year Reich ruled over by the Zionists in Greater Israel where they will consolidate their power over the region and indeed of course consolidate their power over the Western nations as well.¹

—David Miller

This remarkable statement, recorded and posted on Instagram in September 2025, indicates where David Miller, a prolific and once respected scholar, has arrived politically and spiritually after a twenty-year academic career.

Miller was born in Scotland in 1964. He earned a bachelor's degree in biological science and a PhD in sociology, both from the University of Glasgow. Miller was Professor of Sociology at the University of Strathclyde (2004–2011), the University of Bath (2011–2018), and Professor of Political Sociology at the University of Bristol (2018–2021). How he got ideologically from where he began to where he is now has never been adequately traced. Much of the explanation may remain a mystery, hidden in the depths of his character. But his voluminous publications—academic essays, books, and political op-eds—give clear evidence of the conscious commitments that mark his evolution. Miller may be the most accomplished faculty member fired from a research university in North America or Britain because of his antisemitic statements, making interest in his case inevitable. It continued to make news in 2025 and 2026, and disputes over applicable legal issues are ongoing.

This report offers the first comprehensive review of Miller's record and relevant publications. It begins by describing the 2021 fatal crisis in Miller's career. It then goes back to analyze his earlier record of anti-Zionism, testing its demonstrable development against the misleading account he gave to a British Employment Tribunal that reconsidered his termination from a tenured professorship at the University of Bristol. The next three sections deal primarily with the government-funded

anti-Zionist research that he conducted previously at the University of Bath, followed by an analysis of the more combative public anti-Zionist persona Miller adopted at Bristol. A paragraph-by-paragraph companion to the problematic 2024 tribunal decision follows, after which I address the academic freedom issues central to his case. That will bring us to the present, and a series of distinctly antisemitic pseudo-academic essays about Jewish history in Scotland that Miller began to publish in 2025. The final section covers the eventual devolution of his politics that lands him in collaboration with Iran.

The David Miller Case

Miller first became controversial on the campus of the University of Bristol in 2019, when during a lecture he presented a slide that visualized his claim that a powerful Zionist propaganda network was operating in Britain. Complaints against him were filed on behalf of unnamed students by the Community Security Trust, a group with a respected history of monitoring British antisemitism, and by the campus chapter of JSoc, the Bristol Jewish Society. The university contracted with an independent barrister, Aileen McColgan, to review the complaint. After completing her investigation she concluded that his conduct could not reasonably be categorized as misconduct” and that his remarks targeting Israel were “not sufficient per se to amount to antisemitism.”²

Two years later, in 2021, he turned to targeting Jewish students. “Zionism,” he declared emphatically, “is and always has been a racist, violent, imperialist ideology premised on ethnic cleansing. It is an endemically anti-Arab and Islamophobic ideology. It has no place in any society.”³ That seemed to suggest that radical assaults on community members embodying that “racist, imperialist ideology” were not only warranted but called for. Miller repeated some of these views in an email sent directly to a Bristol student. He railed against Jewish student groups, calling them “political lobby groups,” and charged that “there is a real question of abuse here—of Jewish students on British campuses being used as political pawns by a violent, racist foreign regime engaged in ethnic cleansing.”⁴

I was among the roughly 750 faculty members from numerous countries who signed a “Response to Recent Comments by Prof. David Miller.” We condemned Miller’s remarks and concluded the following:

Rather than geopolitical, some of these are statements directed at Jewish students, UK university Jewish Societies (JSocs) and the Union of Jewish Students. We believe that these statements are morally reprehensible and risk the personal security and wellbeing of Jewish students and, more widely, Jews in the UK. Prof. Miller’s views represent a conspiracy theory, and bring great shame upon UK academia as well as upon UK political discourse. We are of the opinion that these statements risk undermining community relations in the UK, while giving aid and comfort to antisemites everywhere.⁵

We made no recommendation for university disciplinary action against him, but as his statements were widely covered in the press, others had no hesitation doing so. The university appointed George Banting, an Emeritus Professor of Molecular Cell Biology and former dean of the Faculty of Biomedical Sciences, to review the dossier and decide whether there was a case to be made against Miller. He decided in the affirmative, later revealing that although sympathetic to Miller’s view of Zionism, he nonetheless found his statements “beyond the pale.”⁶ In a separate proceeding, Ms. McColgan was again appointed, this time to decide if Miller’s 2021 statements exceeded the boundaries of accepted speech. Once again she found that they did not. Some believe that her ruling, which relied on a very narrow definition of antisemitism as “hostility to Jews as Jews,” had the effect of weakening all subsequent inquiries.⁷

In July 2021, the university asked Professor Jane Norman, then dean of the Faculty of Health Sciences, to conduct a formal disciplinary hearing. After it was held, she ruled that Miller was guilty of gross misconduct and recommended summary dismissal, telling him, “Singling out students and their societies in the way you did was an abuse of the significant power differential between you and students.... Universities are not places where students with opposing views to you should expect to be attacked in a public forum by someone of your level of expertise and years of engagement.”⁸ The University of Bristol announced his termination on October 1, 2021.

Miller filed an appeal that November, and a panel consisting of three faculty members was appointed to review it. In February 2022, the seven counts in Miller's appeal were all dismissed, and the university accepted and acted on Professor Norman's recommendation to dismiss him. While Miller had clearly received full due process, British law provided him potential avenues of redress. He submitted his case to a government Employment Tribunal, arguing that his "anti-Zionist beliefs qualified as a philosophical belief and as a protected characteristic pursuant to section 10 Equality Act 2010." After an investigation that included testimony from a number of those involved in the earlier proceedings, the tribunal ruled that Miller's anti-Zionism was a protected philosophical belief and his dismissal was thus unfair.⁹

While the decision may have been at least partially due to the university's desire to protect its own interests, it made a catastrophic error by effectively stipulating that Miller's views were not essentially antisemitic. In fact, Miller's accusations—about a worldwide web of Zionist discourse and institutions emanating from Israel that manipulated Bristol students—replicated traditional antisemitic depictions of a tentacled Jewish spider or octopus seeking world domination.

As Matthew Bolton, a scholar at Queen Mary School of Law, argues in a superb legal analysis of the tribunal verdict, drawing a firm line between Miller's anti-Zionist beliefs and antisemitism and then granting the former legal protection has very serious implications for British law and the safety of British Jews. It risks elevating antisemitism to something analogous to religious faith. As Bolton emphasizes in his opening paragraph, the university substantially weakened its position:

The university's acceptance of Miller's minimalist account of his core belief ... hindered its case from the outset. Pushing for a "comprehensive" account of Miller's "full views" would have hindered his claim for protection, making it much easier to demonstrate the proximity of his broader worldview to forms of antisemitic belief previously ruled unworthy of legal protection.¹⁰

I would go further and suggest it was a serious error to stipulate that a consistent conception of anti-Zionism had guided his politics for twenty years. The evidence suggests that, contrary to his testimony, his

views evolved considerably; not in a steady, linear fashion, but rather in a series of notable leaps forward at specific moments.

At that point, encouraged by Campaign Against Antisemitism (CAA), a UK-based charity, I reviewed his case again. I had read some of his essays and a number of commentaries about the 2021 case. Now, I read his wider work more extensively—he has about 300 publications—to get a better sense of how his views had developed over time. Throughout his career Miller has written about his political views, and year after year there is substantial textual evidence to determine whether his positions represent conventional political opinion or deeply held political belief. It was a substantial error and a public disservice for the Employment Tribunal to reach conclusions about Miller’s political views without due consideration of the contemporary evidence Miller presented in his name.

Dating Miller’s Anti-Zionism

When David Miller testified before that British Employment Tribunal in 2023, he went to great lengths to establish that his anti-Zionist beliefs were deeply held and of substantial duration. The tribunal noted that “his belief system is to some extent informed by his research on Northern Ireland which was the subject of his PhD thesis.”¹¹ I reached the same conclusion, but with reservations. Save for a few minor adjustments in wording, his 1994 thesis is identical to his book published that year, *Don’t Mention The War: Northern Ireland, Propaganda and the Media*.¹² It contains detailed critiques of the media coverage of political events in Northern Ireland, evaluating its accuracy. He could have staged a contrast of deeply held political beliefs about Ireland had he chosen to, but he did not. Israel is not mentioned.

The tribunal reports, “The claimant explained, in his evidence to the tribunal, that by the late 1990s, his beliefs in relation to Zionism were fully formed.” It adds, “It was a fundamental belief of his that the Irish and Algerian, South African, and Palestinian struggles were best explained as settler-colonial conflicts.”¹³ That belief, of course, is wholly unexceptional. Many contemporary anti-Zionists with an interest in

Northern Ireland make the same comparisons. But I have questions about the timing, character, and development of Miller's anti-Zionism as well as about the tribunal's unquestioning acceptance of his rather offhand, *ex post facto* account of his political development.

The textual evidence suggests that his anti-Zionism was not actually in evidence, or at least much less fully formed, as late as 1998. That was the year he published an ambitious edited collection, *Rethinking Northern Ireland: Culture, Ideology and Colonialism*.¹⁴ The book includes what remains Miller's most well-reasoned and persuasive essay on settler colonialism, "Colonialism and Academic Representations of the Troubles." So far as I can find, that is the first time he mentions Palestine in his work. He writes,

This chapter sets contemporary Northern Ireland in its colonial context.... Northern Ireland exhibits many of the characteristics associated with settler colonialism. Apposite parallels include Rhodesia, Palestine, and especially French Algeria. South Africa also exhibits some of the same features, though matters are made more complex by two competing groups of settlers.¹⁵

He goes on to develop some of these comparisons further, but *not* the comparison with Israel, and he never mentions Zionism. Are we to believe that Miller, despite being passionately and radically anti-Zionist, refrained from any elaboration about Israeli settler colonialism? He could have done so modestly and rationally without risking his career.¹⁶

One has to wait over a decade after 1999 to see Miller begin to show evidence of a more committed anti-Zionism. In 2011, in an essay coauthored with Idrees Ahmad, "The Palestine Anti-Solidarity Movement: *Spiked's* Coverage of Israel and Palestine," we find his first forceful critique of Israeli practices and motivation.¹⁷ In it, Ahmad described himself as "a Glasgow-based sociologist, born in Chitral and raised in Abbottabad and Peshawar." He and Miller opened their 5,000-word essay with a capsule account of the notorious Gaza flotilla of the previous year:

On 31 May 2010, Israeli commandos raided an aid flotilla in international waters off the coast of Gaza killing nine unarmed activists and injuring dozens more. Following worldwide condemnation, the Israeli authorities turned to a tried-

and-tested strategy to limit the fallout: they blamed the victims. The excessive use of force was justified on the grounds that the 600-plus passengers of the flotilla included alleged militant Islamists and “terrorists” committed to destroying Israel. This explanation was unsurprising—and it had few takers beyond die-hard pro-Israel activists and friendly US media outlets.¹⁸

This does not segue into the full-fledged anti-Zionism Miller would later display, but it does exemplify a condemnation of Israeli policy that would escalate further as his views evolved. Ahmad and Miller condemn Israeli actions but do not get into Zionism. Their main focus is on *Spiked*’s coverage of events in Palestine, its “elision of [Israeli] context (illegal occupation, creeping colonization, indiscriminate violence)” that, they claim, characterizes the magazine’s editorial practice and Israel’s conduct. The essay shortly turns to an orderly, unemotional list of the bias at work in essays by various *Spiked* contributors. While the *Spiked* website was launched in 2000, Ahmad and Miller concentrate on essays about Israel published there from 2007 to 2010. It’s worth quoting the introductory list of their arguments in full, because we are still quite far from the inflammatory anti-Zionism that would make Miller so controversial a decade later. Here are the flaws, prejudices, and political assumptions they identify as common to *Spiked*’s coverage of Israel:

- (1) the Palestinians are mostly missing from the picture;
- (2) the focus is on the perceived motivations of solidarity activists, which are deemed suspect (narcissistic if not anti-Semitic);
- (3) the activism is framed as “anti-Israel” rather than “pro-Palestinian”;
- (4) Israel is presented as the real victim besieged by Western activists, subject to unjust censure, facing the threat of military intervention;
- (5) critics of the Israel lobby are presented as closet anti-Semites, their arguments caricatured;
- (6) frequent references are made to Palestine solidarity activists as the “anti-Israel lobby”;
- (7) Palestine solidarity activists and critics of Israel are vilified using the Israel lobby’s “New Anti-Semitism” charge which equates anti-Zionism with anti-Semitism;
- (8) the boycott, divestment and sanctions campaign (BDS) is disparaged as hypocritical and anti-Semitic; and
- (9) Palestinians are only peripheral to the analysis of Israeli current affairs, national psyche, defence strategy and so on.¹⁹

Whatever one thinks of this list, which embodies its own political commitments and biases at every point, it offers debatable propositions that might contribute to a potential rational debate. Some of these points, like the attack on BDS, *Spiked's* editors would happily claim on their own. It is also notable how many issues, among them the repeated effort by Ahmad and Miller to contest *Spiked's* effort to equate anti-Zionism with antisemitism, remain standard features of disputes nearly fifteen years later. These are normal features of public debate, common both within and without the academy. Ahmad and Miller do not use their list to mount a general critique of Zionist ideology, but it is clear that that next step is entirely possible.

It is important to recognize, moreover, that Miller, from the outset of his career, blended committed political advocacy with academic research. His work on Ireland includes both academic books and a number of popular essays. He is not someone who hides his political views; he strives to reach mass audiences. And yet we are to believe he was content a decade earlier to keep his purportedly “fully formed” beliefs about Zionism under his hat? One can doubt whether Miller was altogether forthcoming about his political evolution in his Employment Tribunal testimony. Had he felt passionate about Zionism in 1998 or 1999 he would have let the world know. The account he gave the tribunal seems constructed, retroactive, and misleading.

Miller wanted the tribunal to look at his current language and the accusations that cost him his job and conclude “it was always thus,” that he’d believed such things and said such things for two decades. If that were true, there would be less reason to be outraged by what he said in 2021 and certainly less justification for the ultimate academic sanction, the one he received, termination of employment. But the evidence proves this to be false.

That being the case, it is important to give attention to the evolution of his views. The Ahmad-Miller essay details the arguments marshaled by *Spiked's* “most prolific contributor on Israel and Palestine, Nathalie Rothschild,” a print and broadcast journalist based in Stockholm who serves as an international correspondent for *Spiked* and *Judisk Krönika*, the Swedish Jewish Chronicle. They find her coverage of the flotilla self-

evidently offensive: “For her, the flotilla was a ‘self-serving political stunt’ orchestrated by ‘a motley crew of left-wing activists, politicians, writers and Islamists.’” She is, they claim, equally contemptuous of protestors who marched in opposition to Israel’s December 2008–January 2009 war in Gaza: “she writes, that ‘many Westerners on these marches are creating their own private Gazas—a place in which their disillusionments are played out in the most nightmarish form possible.’” Rothschild’s work is a key example of what they consider the “vituperative” language employed by *Spiked*’s pro-Israel writers.²⁰

The same year, Ahmad and Miller republished their essay in *Spin-Watch*, an online magazine cofounded in 2004 by Miller and other members of a seven-person collective. Miller, along with several coauthors, also issued the first of several substantial reports, *The Cold War on British Muslims*, under a University of Bath brand and distributed by both Spinwatch and Opus, a University of Bath online publication venue.²¹ It is an investigation into two right-wing think tanks, the Centre for Social Cohesion (CSC) and Policy Exchange, and the far-right political groups with which, according to Miller and his coauthors, they share political beliefs, among them the far-right British National Party (BNP) and its successor, the English Defence League. The core of the report notably gathers examples of the kind of evidence that Miller would later use to suggest the existence of an international Zionist conspiracy to control public attitudes toward Zionism, namely the wealthy pro-Israel donors and their trusts and foundations that help fund the think tanks. But Miller, at this point, does not claim, as he will later, that these donors are part of a linked web of influence and manipulation corrupting public understanding. Rather, the report suggests that “many of the donors revealed here have extremist political agendas, arguably calling into question the ability of these think-tanks to produce fair and balanced research.”²² Objecting to such agendas is part of conventional political dispute.

Dave Rich, the writer who has followed the twists and turns of Miller’s work most closely, decisively critiques his methodology: Miller’s evidence for the involvement of “pro-Israel trusts and foundations” in these “networks of money or power” seeking to “marginalise British Muslims”

came down to a handful of donors who had given money to two think tanks that Miller deemed to be Islamophobic. However, it is unclear what evidence he had that they gave their money specifically to fund research on Muslim-related issues, that their involvement in Jewish or Zionist activities was what motivated them to donate this money, or that they formed a coordinated ‘network’ that acted together.”²³

Although the report was issued in 2011, ten years after the terrorist attacks on New York’s World Trade Center and the Pentagon, it pre-dates widespread acceptance of the fact that large-scale Muslim immigration from antisemitic countries to Europe presents a cultural and political challenge to Western values. It can thus confidently condemn the “campaign against political Islam modelled on the Cold War counter-subversion narrative.”²⁴ Indeed, they argue that “it is arguably this counter-subversion strategy that is the greatest threat to the independence of British universities.”²⁵ As a culture war, it commits to “marginalizing legitimate political activity rather than focusing on genuine threats to the public.”²⁶ This is a pattern, he observes, that replicates British counter-subversion strategies in Northern Ireland. If it is not a conspiracy, it amounts to a coalition: “the counter-jihad movement is a coalition in which US militarists, the Christian right, European far-right nationalists and militant Zionists all play central roles.”²⁷ The counter-jihad movement in fact draws attention away from “the wars and occupations of the US, Britain and Israel.”²⁸ Israel is on the list, but Zionism is not yet condemned as the glue that holds imperialist colonization together everywhere.

Although ISIS did not control substantial territory until 2013 and declared itself the new Caliphate a year later, the report came out before these events, in 2011—so Miller and his coauthors attribute anxieties about jihadist designs on the Middle East and the world not to militant Israeli actions but to Islamophobia, a dystopian fantasy. They similarly discount evidence of Muslim university student endorsement of political violence. And so they charge the think tanks with conducting a general war on multiculturalism aimed at underwriting government anti-terrorism policies. They conclude that “the Islamophobic undercurrent of such policies simultaneously risks fueling the racist violence against

Muslims,” writing:

This report has described how two of Britain’s most influential right-wing think-tanks have used the fear of terrorism and of Islam to push an authoritarian political agenda. Their efforts should be understood as a response to a resurgence in progressive political movements which have challenged the militarism of the United States, Britain and Israel, as well as the model of globalisation championed by these states. Funded by wealthy businessmen and financiers, and conservative and pro-Israel trusts and foundations, these British neoconservatives are inspired by the operations against peace activists and trade unionists during the Cold War and explicitly seek to revive this tradition of political counter-subversion. Their modern targets are politically engaged Muslims, liberals and leftists, as well as liberal institutions such as schools, universities and public libraries.²⁹

They predict “the curtailment of civil liberties and the narrowing of political debate.”³⁰ While it is possible we will face such a future, it is doubtful that Islamophobia will fuel it.

David Miller’s External Funding at Bath

In 2012, Miller applied for a major grant from Britain’s Economic and Social Research Council. The University of Bath website includes a summary of his proposal titled “Understanding and Explaining Terrorism: Expertise in Practice.” Unsurprisingly, it summarizes its aims in rather neutral terms:

Because terrorism and counter-terrorism are highly significant issues in international relations and domestic politics, terrorism expertise is a valued asset in public policy. Using an innovative, mixed method approach, this study will explore which people and institutions are designated as in a variety of arenas, what impact their expertise have and address the question of whether there is such a thing as genuine expertise in terrorism and how we might identify it. It will measure, compare and contrast the prominence of different terrorism experts in different domains, including academia, the media, the internet, the criminal justice system and the national and the international policy community, and will analyse the historical and institutional development of the use of terrorism experts by courts, governments and the media. It will also explore the ideological and institutional origins and affiliations of terrorism expertise by investigating the various think-tanks and private research institutes which provide

support and funding. The research will provide an empirically grounded evidence base that can better inform public debate and policy decisions. The overall aim is to better understand terrorism expertise and to enable academics and other research users to more effectively make use of research on terrorism.³¹

No mention is made of Israel in this summary nor is there any suggestion of any particular political orientation. The project is to investigate and report on the character of publicly recognized terrorism expertise and help all interested parties to more accurately judge the nature, quality, and reliability of claimed or recognized expertise. The resulting “empirically grounded evidence base” is intended to guide those formulating official policy and those debating it in academia and the media. Since the application was forwarded through the University of Bath with approval from Miller’s department head, the dean, and the grants office, and Miller was the only Bath faculty member involved, he was, as one would expect, listed as PI, Principal Investigator.

The application was successful and Miller was awarded the substantial sum of £401,522 for a project that would run from January 1, 2013, to January 1, 2016. Based on the inflation rate recorded in the UK’s Consumer Price Index, that would represent £588,051 in 2025, which is equal to about US\$773,365. At present, indirect costs in Britain typically provide the university with an additional 10–15 percent in revenue. Miller’s collaborators over the years were graduate students, postdocs, and independent researchers, not faculty members. The grant may have provided salaries for these research partners. I do not know if Miller himself received any salary supplement.

Four reports resulted, all of them substantial documents—94, 83, 32, and 103 pages respectively, the first issued in 2013, the next two in 2015, and the fourth in 2016.³² Although many institutions and most journals require an acknowledgement of funding sources, Bath apparently did not, and so Miller does not mention his support from a government agency, which would, one would think, have added credibility to the overall project by indicating that it underwent external review.

Miller evidently received additional funding from other sources, so he lists them instead. *How Israel Attempts to Mislead the United Nations* (2015) announces that “this report has been commissioned by the Palestinian

Return Center.”³³ *The Henry Jackson Society and the Degeneration of British Neoconservatism* (2015) says it is “sponsored by The Cordoba Foundation.”³⁴ *The Israel Lobby and the European Union* (2016) lists multiple sources of support: “Public Interest Investigations gratefully acknowledges financial and in-kind support from EuroPal Forum. This report was also made possible by funding from Friends of Al Aqsa and Islam Expo as well as drawing on more general fundraising and donations to Public Interest investigations.”³⁵

Perhaps the government grant is buried in the “more general funding” reference. In any case, some of these groups have more commitment to anti-Zionist advocacy than the British government did during the grant period.

Another notable feature of the reports is their exhaustive documentation of financial support for Israel from wealthy Jews or their family foundations. A great deal of research must have gone into exploring the donors’ political backgrounds and motivations. I was surprised by the level of detail the reports put forward about the funders, which I found quite out of balance with their substantive discussions of the issues, and the discrepancy between the obsessive interest in how other groups are funded alongside the decision to reveal little of one’s own.

In February 2021, Dave Rich, in his *Times of Israel* blog, pointed out:

Miller produced reports which aimed to prove that the “wealthy businessmen and financiers” who gave money to organisations he deemed to be Islamophobic, also gave money to pro-Israel and Jewish causes; thereby putting “the financial and political resources of the Israel lobby” in the service of global Islamophobia.³⁶

In March, UK Lawyers for Israel (UKLFI) wrote to the Economic and Social Research Council (ESRC) highlighting concerns raised about Miller’s funding. The headline on the UKLFI website reads, “UKLFI urges Research Body to cease funding Professor Miller.”³⁷ In 2025, the Global Influence Operations Report (GIOR) claimed that Miller’s investigative platform Spinwatch “received funding from organizations with ties to the Global Muslim Brotherhood and Hamas.”³⁸

So far as can be determined, Miller’s grants received no attention

from the press until his career began to implode in 2021. The *New Statesman* gave the grants a headline on July 1 of that year: “Revealed: Bristol Academic Under Investigation for Alleged Anti-Semitism Received £400k of Public Funds.” The *Jewish Chronicle* was more explicit the following day: “Professor Miller accused of using £400,000 public grant for work attacking ‘Israel lobby groups.’” The Campaign Against Antisemitism said much the same: “Disgraced Bristol University Professor David Miller Accused of Using £400,000 Research grant to Further Research on ‘British Zionist Scene.’” *Jewish News* announced, “Bristol’s professor Miller received £400k in taxpayers’ cash for research grants.”³⁹ As so often happens, this “Jewish news” did not make its way into the mainstream press.

What the news stories missed is the complete disconnect between the grant’s funded aims and the reality of what Miller and his team produced, at least based on the summary that Miller provided and the publications credited to the grant. The reports never offer anything resembling the “empirically grounded evidence base” that is promised. While they aim to discredit some people’s expertise, they never give any general account of which people can and cannot be relied on for expertise in terrorism. That includes the several essays on terrorism credited to the grant, which offer general overviews of the ethical and political changes that have affected terrorism research. The examples come from Britain and the US.⁴⁰

Instead, the introduction to the report on the Henry Jackson Society announces its polemical direction on its opening page, describing the group’s “unflinching support for Israel and the promotion of increasingly Islamophobic policies,” its “strong track record of funding hard-line pro-Israeli/Zionist and Islamophobic causes,” and concluding that “by solidifying a transatlantic alliance between anti-Islam groups and those unconditionally supportive of Zionism, the Islamophobia network has successively tapped into the financial and political resources of the Israel lobby.”⁴¹

One may reasonably conclude that Miller used government funds to create what amounted to an anti-Zionist research group. Before long he would insist that Zionism “is engaged in a global struggle to wipe out

Islam.”⁴² With over two billion Muslims worldwide, I doubt whether Saudi Arabia is much worried about this “struggle,” to say nothing of Indonesia or Pakistan. This is the sort of warning a conspiracist can issue with no more than internal confirmation.

Anti-Zionism Takes Center Stage

We thus find that Miller’s research begins to focus on Israel and its allies when he received his £400k grant, some fifteen years after the late 1990s, which is when he located the beginnings of his anti-Zionist convictions in his testimony before the Employment Tribunal—and even then, his rhetoric and arguments are still a far cry from what produced the firestorm in 2021–2023.

Contrary to the neutral, objective plan explained in his grant proposal, Miller’s 2013 report—*The Britain Israel Communications and Research Centre: Giving Peace a Chance?*—is an effort to discredit advocacy for a two-state solution to the Israeli/Palestinian conflict. His approach is both unusual and unique. BICOM, the acronym by which the organization named in the report’s title is best known, has consistently supported a two-state solution, contrary to Miller’s claim that it merely “pays lip service to the abstract idea.”⁴³ It is, in fact, the political commitment that defines *Fathom*, the journal it sponsors, for which I have often written over the years.

The Miller report begins with slander through guilt by family connection. Shlomo Zabłudowicz is the father of Poju Zabłudowicz, the art collector and philanthropist who is BICOM’s major donor. Miller mentions the art collection in passing, but one would hardly know from his account that it is one of the world’s most significant collections of post-1960 art and that Poju and his wife Anita loan works without charge to museums throughout the world. The senior Zabłudowicz is a Polish Jew who was the only member of his family to survive the Holocaust.

Miller opens with a detailed account of the father’s arms business, even though the son inherited his money, not the business. Miller seems intent on irresponsibly implying that the son and BICOM alike are somehow encumbered by the father’s business interests. One would

hardly know that Poju is on record insisting that West Bank settlements are illegal. But what does that matter when one claims that the Oslo peace process is “a superficial one that preserved Israel’s supremacy over the Palestinians.”⁴⁴ Miller wants us to believe that Oslo was primarily grounded in neoliberal economic opportunism, rather than in any authentic desire for peace. The report also includes the first of Miller’s strange Zionist network charts.⁴⁵ They purport to visualize a web of implicitly conspiratorial patterns of influence and collaboration, but the many crisscrossing lines instead suggest an irrational and finally meaningless obsession. They reflect not a respectable set of beliefs, but rather a deplorable drift into antisemitic conspiracism.

Sociologist Keith Kahn-Harris provides an astute reading of these charts, pointing out that they “do not in fact tell us anything meaningful, because there isn’t any meaningful distinction to be made.” Rather they construct

a kind of “flatland,” a world in which networks of power and influence are so intricately connected that they form a seamless system. Each node that he exposes in this system, each connection that is traced between it and other nodes, is functionally identical to others. What we end up with is a process of progressively revealing a system so overwhelming that the only rational response to its exposure must be despair shot through with liberation.⁴⁶

One may regard the web of nodes as frozen in place or vibrating endlessly and ever changing. It doesn’t matter since it’s no more or less informative or intelligible either way. Miller has used one or more charts as slides in a number of presentations. As Dave Rich, Head of Policy at the Community Security Trust points out, “The picture of a transnational Jewish or ‘Zionist’ network using finance and lobbying to subvert public life that Miller paints is in keeping with his view of how power operates, but the way it echoes certain facets of anti-Semitic conspiracism should have set off alarm bells” for his audiences.⁴⁷

Some of the report’s claims can now be generously excused for being outdated. I would not expect to see a full account of *Fathom*, since the journal was only founded in 2012, and its long-time editor Alan Johnson retired in 2024. I worked closely with him and the rest of the staff for a

decade and can attest to their serious devotion to a two-state solution. I cannot claim to know the BICOM staff as well, but Miller presents no evidence for his assertion that their promotion of a two-state solution is not authentic. His claim that the BBC is primarily pro-Israel in its coverage would provoke laughter from most who have watched its television coverage of the last few Gazan wars. Still less forgivable is the assertion that “BICOM’s strategy is to insulate the political elite from pressure to support Palestinian human rights.”⁴⁸ Of course, if they mean the illegitimate “right” to return to Israel proper then they have a point. Once again, all these views represent conventional political disagreements.

Two years later, Miller coauthored the widely condemned piece, “The five pillars of Islamophobia,” which asserts that Zionism is one of those pillars.⁴⁹ Miller and his colleagues work from the conventional, politically correct position that criticism of Islam and Islamism are Islamophobic. Like much of Miller’s other work, it does not gather evidence for its claims; it just declares as truths those the declarations themselves should establish. Zionism, importantly, is treated as a subsidiary pillar. Of the five, “the first and most important is the institutions of the state—most notably the sprawling ‘counterterrorism’ apparatus, the key nexus of institutions and practices which targets ‘extremists’ and those said to have been ‘radicalised.’”⁵⁰ This, at least, is a clear and debatable definition, unlike the later casual gloss on Zionist Islamophobia.

Of the four lesser pillars, “the first is the most well-known—the far right,”⁵¹ which includes both longstanding neo-fascist parties and a number of newer groups scattered across Europe. He adds Zionism toward the end, saying weakly that “Zionist movements ... provide information, ‘research’ and advocacy which can drag the state and politics to the right and sharpen Islamophobic policies.”⁵² Perhaps he assumes the identification of Zionism with Islamophobia is obvious, a given. Nonetheless, it is a wounding and unwarranted insult to the Jewish community, and that may well have been his aim. He has expressed his view in a popular political venue, not a limited readership academic journal. And yet here he is, in 2015, naming Zionism as a lesser pillar of Islamophobia. Where is either the passion or the philosophical commitment

of Miller's alleged "deeply held political belief," the one the Employment Tribunal found credible from his testimony?

The essay helps set up the next funded report, issued the following month: *How Israel Attempts to Mislead the United Nations: Deconstructing Israel's Campaign Against the Palestinian Return Centre*.⁵³ The PRC conducts advocacy for the Palestinian right of return. But it also supports BDS divestment and boycott campaigns, and it has done so since the 2001 Durban conference. This purported "report," then, is in reality a deplorable piece of propaganda. It claims quite falsely that "Israel's campaign against the PRC relies on innuendoes, hearsay and circumstantial evidence," and pointedly disparages the claim that the PRC has any links with Hamas.⁵⁴ Since the report discounts any evidence from NGO Monitor, which conducts extensive research and issues scrupulously factual reports, I will dispute Miller's view by relying on its most recent report on the PRC, dated March 19, 2025.⁵⁵ In 2016, the Miller group would say that "NGO Monitor is dedicated to campaigning against the public financing of human rights and peace activists working towards equality of Israelis and Palestinians, accusing such activists of striving to 'eliminate' Israel."⁵⁶ In fact, NGO Monitor has researched European financial support for terrorist-linked and boycott-advocacy groups.

A 2011 Intelligence Service report from the German Ministry of the Interior concluded that while Hamas does not operate openly in Europe, it uses the London office of the PRC as a forum. A 2012 PRC book, *Understanding the Nakba: An Insight into the Plight of the Palestinians*, argues that the "disappearance of Palestine" was "the inevitable consequence of implementing a racist colonial ideology."⁵⁷ The following year it published an essay quoting Nobel Laureate José Saramago declaring, "the [Israelis] have turned into Nazi Jews."⁵⁸ In October 2016, the year after the Miller report was issued, the PRC announced a campaign calling on Britain to renounce the 1917 Balfour Declaration that endorsed the goal of creating a Jewish national home.

Miller and his colleagues find it disqualifying that the Meir Amit Intelligence Center issued a report condemning the PRC that repeatedly mentions Ismael Haniyeh. Miller identifies him as a former prime minister of

Gaza, failing to note that Haniyeh served in Gaza from 2007 to 2014, after Hamas took power. Miller is confused.⁵⁹ Haniyeh held the title of prime minister when he was head of the Palestinian Authority from 2006 to 2007. He became Hamas's political leader in 2017 and was assassinated while visiting Tehran in 2024.

To this day, the PRC persists in referring to Hamas and Palestinian Islamic Jihad as resistance groups, and it has declared Israel responsible for the events of October 7, 2023. Clearly, Israel's campaign against the PRC is both warranted and necessary.

Wall-to-Wall Anti-Zionism

The following year, 2016, Miller's group issued *The Israel Lobby and the European Union*,⁶⁰ the last item produced during the period of its government-financed grant, though several later essays on terrorism also credit that funding source. It is his most comprehensive anti-Zionist position paper. At 102 single-spaced, 8.5-by-11-inch pages, the report is a substantial document and has a broader scope than its title suggests.

The report begins by detailing lobbying efforts in Brussels by Israelis and by American NGOs and foundations. Anthony Julius, a practicing solicitor advocate and law professor at University College, London, is blunt about the merits of Miller's methodology and the weight of his evidence: "Its thesis is no more than that Jews support Israel, and that a few of the wealthier among them contribute money to bodies that advocate for Israel's interests in Europe."⁶¹ In fact, that fills just over half the report and would be of minor interest without detailed updating. The second half of the report, beginning with the fourth chapter, "Criminalizing Resistance," is of greater concern since the main "resistance" groups defended are Hamas and Hezbollah, followed by a section defending Iran against Israeli claims that the regime is fomenting regional terrorism.

Here, more so than with the previous year's paper on the PRC, we must reckon with actions that had recently been taken by Miller's "resistance" groups: Hezbollah had not stopped building its arsenal of missiles and rockets designed to decimate Haifa and Israel's northern communities, Iran had not abandoned its "ring of fire" campaign against

Israel, and Hamas had not ceased its “resistance.”

Like most Hamas apologists—for that is what Miller had become by 2016—Miller ignored the group’s 1988 Charter in which it dedicated itself to murdering Jews. That is just one of the many key facts elided in a text that only serves the needs of Hamas allies and misleads those ignorant of Middle East history who are ready to embrace its wholesale misrepresentation. In the course of whitewashing that history, Miller complains that “In September 2003, in the midst of the second Palestinian intifada, the EU caved in and declared Hamas a terrorist organisation.”⁶² There is no suggestion that perhaps the European Union “caved” because Hamas was organizing suicide bombings that killed Israeli civilians. It did not require pro-Israel lobbying to recognize what Hamas was and is. It just required facing the horror of the merciless slaughter of innocents.

Early on, the section about Hamas complains that Matthew Levitt’s *Hamas: Politics, Charity, and Terrorism in the Service of Jihad*, published in 2006, “is particularly notable for failing to distinguish between the movement’s political, social and military activities, instead even conflating them,” as if that is a distinction all careful observers are obliged to honor.⁶³ I have always regarded the distinction as fundamentally deceptive, designed to pretend that Hamas has a non-terrorist, conventionally political component. The one meaningful difference is that Hamas’s political spokespersons have been safe from military targeting while living safely in Qatar.

The Miller report goes on to quote, with umbrage, a United Jewish Committee staff member who accused Hamas of using civilians as shields during the 2014 conflict and turning “every Palestinian killed into a trophy with which to sway public opinion against Israel”⁶⁴ In truth, supporting documents were found in 2025 that made it clear that this was Hamas’s explicit strategy: Civilians were denied entry into the tunnels in order to maximize casualties. Also, the contested claim that Hamas was diverting aid funds to build military tunnels, which Miller considers both false and malicious, is actually incontrovertible. The report proceeds to draw still larger implications from the terror designation: “The blacklisting of Hamas has had profound consequences for Palestinians,” limiting

Hamas's "ability to trade and rebuild after three devastating Israeli wars"⁶⁵ Rebuilding for Hamas was always secondary to rearming and remilitarizing. Moving Hamas to victim status was always a stretch, but not impossible for those convinced it was a force for liberation.

Miller and his coauthors are equally misleading about Hezbollah. They concede that it had early training from Iran's Revolutionary Guard but dispute its terrorist designation, insisting that it now participates in the Lebanese government as a political party. In fact, Hezbollah has dominated Lebanese affairs as a heavily armed Iranian proxy and Islamist paramilitary force. Its power, diminished in 2025, has not been eliminated.

Miller is quite correct, however, in writing that Israel has long insisted that "the Islamic Republic of Iran is an imminent threat to Israel and the West."⁶⁶ Iran's determination to eliminate the Jewish state is at the core of its foreign policy and can only be reversed by regime change. The report, however, never mentions that other countries in the region also feel increasingly threatened by Iran. For Miller, the only political opposition to Iran emanates from American and Israeli lobbying, and thus the Iranian people are the unwarranted victims of America's organized sanctions: "These sanctions and similar ones introduced by the US were so comprehensive that they reduced the supply of medicines to Iranian hospitals."⁶⁷

The report concludes with a substantial, 5,000-word chapter titled "Silencing Dissent." The style is polemical but rational, the politics unforgiving and resolutely anti-Israel. It opens with a critique of what some European Union officials see as a version of the "new antisemitism," which, Miller's report says, is part of a campaign to silence any and all criticism of Israel at a time when Europeans increasingly regard "Israel as the most dangerous of the countries listed—ahead of Iran, North Korea and the US." The concept of the new antisemitism, it is claimed, has even "conflated criticism of Israel's human rights abuses with anti-Semitism."⁶⁸

A central component of that campaign, they argue, is the European Union Monitoring Centre (EUMC) on Racism and Xenophobia's definition of antisemitism, the predecessor to the International Holocaust

Remembrance Alliance (IHRA) definition. Miller and his associates warn against the dangers to free speech flowing from its adoption. Indeed, in their view, efforts to promote it are part of “the lobby’s efforts at undermining academic freedom.”⁶⁹ The goal, they claim, is to thoroughly normalize the definition, to make it inseparable from the popular understanding of Israel and disable any critique of Israeli policies. At the campaign’s core, they argue, is Islamophobia, since “many of those waging the campaign against ‘the new anti-Semitism’ are at best seeking to censor any criticism of Israel and at worst guilty of Islamophobia.”⁷⁰ Like much of the left, Miller seems to have no awareness that there is a genuine and substantial antisemitic threat from Islamism. It is not clear that he even recognizes the existence of the ideology.

Rather than condemn the impulse to use the EUMC definition as a way to criminalize dissent and punish speech—impulses that I reject—they go to the very heart of the uses I endorse, namely encouraging “universities to use the ‘working definition’ as a ‘basis for education, training and orientation.’” Given that they reject the educational use of the definition, it follows that their concluding condemnation has wide application: “The same groups that are silencing dissent are themselves complicit in Israel’s crimes.”⁷¹ They have thus established a sharp division between Zionists and their opponents, thereby heralding the emergence of the polarized debate we have faced since October 7, 2023.

Miller has used his government grant to map out a comprehensive anti-Zionist project. It is remarkable that he has largely escaped criticism for doing so, though the length of the reports no doubt discourages people from reading them. Moreover, they are now a decade or more old, with donor data that is out of date. But the four reports should help us understand the Miller case.

What should be the consequences of using taxpayer funds for an undeclared use, for a political purpose that was never declared and never approved? Recall that Miller never acknowledges the grant funds on the reports themselves, although Bath’s research portal does list them under the outputs from the grant, suggesting his awareness of the discrepancy between the grant’s funded rationale and the animating purpose of the reports actually produced.⁷² As the institution receiving the funds and

responsible for administering them, Bath should have looked into the matter. Had it done so the money might have had to be returned to the government and Miller sanctioned for unethical and unprofessional misuse of public funds. The appropriate sanction would have been dismissal. Furthermore, Bristol's multi-year tolerance, unremarked, of an activist, public antisemite on its faculty, and in particular its failure to address the character of the 2016 report leads to a necessary conclusion: There was an honored place for antisemitism in Bristol's faculty lounge.

A Crisis Escalates

In February 2019, Miller delivered a course lecture detailing his “five pillars” theory implicating Zionist Islamophobia. JSoc filed a complaint, but it did not succeed. The following year, Miller appeared with Norman Finkelstein, Tariq Ali, Jackie Walker, and other anti-Zionist allies, organized under the banner of “Labour against Witchhunt,” part of a campaign to defend the Labour Party against charges of antisemitism. Miller used the occasion to lay out the principles that must guide pro-Palestinian activism if it was to move beyond mere solidarity to achieve political victory:

There is no constructive dialogue with the Zionist movement. The Zionist movement isn't interested in dialogue, in truth, in finding out how best to tackle antisemitism ... these are people who must only be faced and defeated.... The Zionist movement and the Israeli government are the enemy of the left, the enemy of world peace, and they must be directly targeted.... Zionism as a philosophy and an ideology must be defeated.⁷³

This was a declaration of war issued not only for the off-campus political community but also for the university, beginning with a specific disavowal of the principle of dialogue that is supposed to structure higher education. Miller, to be sure, is not alone in condemning dialogue when confronting Zionism. Anti-Zionist academics in many countries who make rejecting dialogue a centerpiece of their program, for example Lara Sheehi, formerly of George Washington University, now relocated to South Africa, in her 2021 book *Psychoanalysis Under Occupation*.⁷⁴

But the explicit rejection of dialogue was a new feature of Miller's politics. More importantly, so too was the insistence that nothing less than the worldwide elimination of Zionism would suffice. It's not the escalating vehemence alone that distinguishes Miller's positions from 2019 onward, though it is an important emerging feature. Equally important, and arguably more so, are the new positions he stakes out for himself. The Employment Tribunal's assumption these new positions are continuous with earlier convictions is simply not true.

In February 2021, Miller opens "We must resist Israel's war on British universities," an essay published in the relentlessly anti-Zionist online journal *The Electronic Intifada*, with an unqualified declaration: "Britain is in the grip of an assault on its public sphere by the state of Israel and its advocates."⁷⁵ He immediately adds some specification to this fantasy: "Meaningful conversations about anti-Black racism and Islamophobia have been drowned out by a concerted lobbying campaign targeting universities, political parties, the equalities regulator and public institutions all over the country." And he expands the accusation: "Israel's lobby is busily stealing the language of Black liberation to justify ethnic cleansing, racism and apartheid." But it is "the exposure of Zionist Islamophobia that most terrifies Israel's fanatical advocates." "Zionism," he marvels disingenuously, "is somehow a facet of Jewish identity rather than a racist, modern ideology." He emphasizes that "the lobby is keen to maintain the fiction that its campaign of subversion on British campuses on behalf of a violent foreign regime is the work of independent students who are genuinely distressed."⁷⁶

It is difficult to find an objective explanation for this multifaceted assault, let alone evidence supporting his claims, but he does tell us he was smeared after testifying on behalf of Sheikh Raed Salah ten years earlier during efforts to bar the Sheikh from the UK. While it seemed a bit too late for Miller to claim victim status on that count, he tried nonetheless.

Part of what is remarkable about Miller's 2021 diatribe about Israeli propaganda is the truism that most nations, hardly Israel alone, seek to defend themselves and justify their actions. Also, by the time he mounted his attack, Israel was already facing widespread criticism from both the international press and a growing pro-Palestinian constituency in higher

education, as it had during each of its successive post-withdrawal wars in Gaza. As Miller himself said in 2024: “It’s becoming increasingly clear that Zionists are losing the war of public opinion badly.”⁷⁷ Apparently, he had forgotten that an all-powerful Zionist lobby is an imminent threat to British freedom.

These are not the only problems with Miller’s remarks. Even when viewed as self-aware and disingenuous, his expression of incredulity upon realizing that Zionism is “somehow” part of Jewish identity is difficult to understand. The Jewish longing for Zion resounds through centuries of Jewish life and culture, and escalated as racialized antisemitism supplemented religious hostility in the late 19th century. And it is perhaps still more difficult to make sense of the claim that Israel is “stealing the language of Black liberation” as part of its campaign to win over public opinion. In the wake of the Holocaust, Zionists certainly did not need to echo the struggle for racial equality in order to see its 1948 War of Independence as one of Jewish liberation.

Unsupported and obnoxious though these public arguments may be, they would not on their own have likely triggered a successful disciplinary case against Miller, though they certainly justify filing a complaint. Academic freedom generally covers faculty speech of this sort and worse. A problem arises, though, when the same observations are made in class. The vilification of Zionists obviously applies to Zionist students and puts them in an untenable position if they are in one of Miller’s classes, no matter where Miller makes the comments. He could walk the statements partly back regarding students and escape serious consequences, but Miller would still be on the edge of professional catastrophe.

Yet he doubled down on his inclination to implicate college students, perhaps in recompense for the complaints lodged against him. Miller regularly reminds listeners that he was personally criticized by Bristol’s JSoc chapter and by the head of the Jewish Student Union, but there is only so much sympathy to be garnered from that story. Better to be the target of a malign international power emanating from the (now) unholy city of Jerusalem. His local critics, we are to believe, are tied to greater powers of influence: “As some of you know,” he points out, “I’ve been

attacked and complained about by the head of the Bristol JSoc along with the President of the Union of Jewish Students, both of which organisations are of course formally members of the Zionist movement. JSocs are part of the UJS, the UJS is a member of the World Union of Jewish Students, which is a direct member of the World Zionist Organization,” the latter an NGO based in Israel.⁷⁸ Of course, Israel controls it all.

As Bolton summarizes the situation, “Miller alleged that British Jewish students were directed by the Israeli state to make mendacious attacks on critics of Israel and to spread Islamophobia.”⁷⁹ Rich is again on target when he writes: “This five-stages-removed organizational relationship isn’t evidence that some functionary in an Israeli ministry is instructing the head of Bristol Jewish Society to invent fake allegations of antisemitism to spike Miller’s career. He has no concrete evidence to justify this claim at all—no smoking gun email or text message telling Jewish students what to say and do—because no such evidence exists.”⁸⁰ The test the Employment Tribunal was supposed to apply includes the principle that the beliefs at stake are “worthy of respect in a democratic society.”⁸¹ Miller’s conspiratorial effusions do not pass that test.

Nonetheless, Miller is dead serious. On February 16, 2021, the UK’s *Jewish News* reported that Miller had called for an end to Zionism, warning that there is an “attempt by the Israeli government to impose their will all over the world.”⁸² He doubled down shortly thereafter, for many observers crossing a line into abusive speech in remarks to the *Jewish Chronicle* that implicated Jewish university students: “There is a real question of abuse here—of Jewish students on British campuses being used as political pawns by a violent, racist foreign regime engaged in ethnic cleansing.”⁸³ Then he shifted gears, realizing perhaps that he should show concern about student welfare, not simply anger at Israel: “The UJS lobbying for Israel is a threat to the safety of Arab and Muslim students as well as of Jewish students and indeed of all critics of Israel.”⁸⁴ As British sociologist and specialist in contemporary antisemitism David Hirsh writes, “by calling them ‘assets of Israel’ he encouraged people to think of students who go to their JSocs as unpatriotic traitors.”⁸⁵ And in the words of Dave Rich, “It is impossible to ignore the echo of anti-semitic tropes in Miller’s depiction of ordinary Jewish students as the

agents of a global conspiracy directed from Jerusalem.”⁸⁶ As tools of a murderous, racist state, the student pawns become a clear and present danger to everyone else. Miller wants us to ask what we do to protect ourselves? What must be done collectively and by the state? The Jews too are at risk. We’re all potential victims of Israel.

We have passed far beyond the point where Miller could reasonably claim a long-term, deeply held political/philosophical belief, which is what he claimed before the tribunal. As of 2021, he found himself in mortal professional combat with those he perceived to be his personal enemies, including Jewish students on his own campus: As he told *The Tab* and wrote in *The Electronic Intifada*, “The UJS and Bristol JSoc have consistently attacked me with a campaign of manufactured hysteria for two years, attempting to have me sacked,” thereby repeating the exact language he used in his February 18, 2021, email to the Bristol student Ben Bloch.⁸⁷ Nor is he simply criticizing Israeli policies and actions. He is waging a campaign to obliterate every vestige of Zionism, even if this includes students enrolled at Bristol University.

He has come an incalculable distance from where he was in the late 1990s and a very great distance from where he was a decade ago. His scorched earth anti-Zionism was not yet in place in 1998 or even 2017. He did not think Jewish student activists were his enemies then. But on February 18, 2021, he told *The Tab* that Zionism “is an endemically anti-Arab and Islamophobic ideology. It has no place in any society.”⁸⁸ Two days later he repeated the lines for *The Electronic Intifada*.⁸⁹ The obvious implication, as David Feldman suggests, is that “members of the university JSoc” are “people whose political attachments have no place in any society.”⁹⁰ That claim effectively asks action from the university, surely justifying a charge of discriminatory harassment against both Miller and the university itself.

It was the threat to students that put Miller’s employment at risk, and that was Professor Norman’s primary reason for recommending termination. Next we explore the 120-page text of the tribunal’s decision that ruled in Miller’s favor.

A Misguided Tribunal

The three-person Employment Tribunal that heard Miller's case was composed of Rohan Pirani, a regional employment judge, and two lay members, Ms. J. Kaye and H. Launder. The legal issues they addressed were brilliantly dissected by Matthew Bolton of the University of London. Here, I will continue interrogating Miller's own assertions to the tribunal and examine how they and Miller's previous statements were interpreted by the tribunal.

The main body of the report consists of 495 numbered paragraphs. I will proceed through those I wish to address in sequence, so as to provide a kind of running commentary. The tribunal refers to Miller and the university, respectively, as "claimant" and "respondent," but I will revert to their normal titles. The numbers given to the paragraphs below are the numbers used in the report itself.

¶ 13

The tribunal takes note of the university's claim that Zionism as Miller defines it "is not worthy of respect in a democratic society and is incompatible with human dignity and the rights of others." It takes issue with this by using a bland, neutral definition of Zionism rather than carefully parsing what Miller had actually been saying about Zionism since 2018. One might have begun by asking what impact Miller's characterization of Jewish students as pawns of Israel had on their human dignity and what effect Miller's words might have had on their rights.

¶¶ 14–16

These paragraphs raise the significant issue of whether Miller "believes that violent opposition to Zionism is acceptable." The report concludes that "we did not accept that the clear implication of the more recent evidence was that they show that violence is in any way an acceptable form of opposition to Zionism." But Miller explicitly insisted that Zionism must be eradicated everywhere on earth. Are we to assume that this result

can be obtained through prayer? He wants to hunt down Zionists themselves, including those who are British students, and subject them to serious consequences. Will a severe scolding suffice? What actions do Miller's numerous tweets about Zionism imply others should take? These questions arise whether or not Miller's hostile tweets from 2023 and later are admitted into evidence.

The more recent tweets it should be noted, add to Miller's claims about a malicious takeover of British cultural institutions.⁹¹ Politicians and entertainers alike get similar treatment. Here is an October 25, 2024, tweet: "Yes, it's true that Sacha Baron Cohen is an Islamophobe. It's because he's a Zionist. But he comes from a whole school of such low life." On November 8, 2024, he tweeted, "As well as being unwelcoming to Zionist colonists coming from Occupied Palestine, Europe must be unviable as a base for Zionist terror by Jewish supremacists who have infiltrated and are camouflaged among us. Zionist terrorist entryists must be expunged from European institutions, whether political parties, media, think tanks or elsewhere. Again, either institutions take the lead and conduct this work in orderly fashion with advice from experts on Zionist subversion, or the people will take care of it for them." This tweet was among those presented as part of a private prosecution against Miller brought by the Campaign Against Antisemitism.⁹²

¶ 24

"At the time [Miller] commenced his role with the University his views and activities in relation to Zionism were well known." This implies that Bristol knew what it was buying, and therefore buyer's remorse several years later was unfair. In reality, the Bristol faculty includes numerous anti-Zionists, but not many who demand the eradication of Zionism and declare their students to be unwitting agents of a foreign power. Based on Miller's pre-2018 statements, Bristol had every reason to assume they were hiring a garden variety anti-Zionist, not an exceptionally fierce crusader against Israel and its allies. If a packet of Miller's 2019–2021 statements were handed to administrators reviewing his appointment there is a good chance Miller would have been rejected. The tribunal assumed

all anti-Zionists are the same, but it might have made sense to assume that American, British, and French anti-Zionists who commit violent acts—let alone Hamas anti-Zionists who raped and murdered on 10/7—are anti-Zionists of a different character. The Miller of 2021 was not the Miller of 2018, when he had clearly become more hostile and more motivated.

¶ 28

As detailed above, Miller’s assertion “that by the late 1990s, his beliefs in relation to Zionism were fully formed” does not comport with the considerable evidence available. The tribunal’s acceptance of Miller’s account, while perhaps not mendacious, was surely incompetent.

¶ 29

Miller testified that “his anti-Zionism is a fixed belief and is not amenable to change.” I agree that he cannot be persuaded to abandon his beliefs, but his views have considerably evolved over the years.

¶ 77

The tribunal notes that McColgan’s earlier 2020 report concluded that Miller did “not express ‘hatred towards Jews,’” but Miller’s 2021–2023 statements in print and through social media suggest otherwise to many faculty authorities on antisemitism, myself included.

¶ 97

The tribunal report reprints in full the February 18, 2021, email that Miller set to Ben Bloch, a Bristol student:

Ben

This is on the record: Zionism is and always has been a racist, violent, imperialist ideology premised on ethnic cleansing. It is an endemically anti-Arab and Islamophobic ideology. It has no place in any society. Bristol’s JSoc, like all JSocs, operates under the auspices of the Union of Jewish Students (UJS), an Israel lobby

group. The UJS is constitutionally bound to promoting Israel and campaigns to silence critics of Zionism or the State of Israel on British campuses. This campaign of censorship renders Arab and Muslim students, as well as anti-Zionist Jewish students, particularly unsafe.

The UJS and Bristol JSoc have consistently attacked me with a campaign of manufactured hysteria for two years, attempting to have me sacked. The campaign reached new heights of absurdity when a Zionist activist pretended to be a student in one of my classes for which she was not registered, expressly for the purpose of political surveillance.

This is an age-old Israel lobby tactic imported from the US, where academics are routinely harassed for teaching about Zionism and its effects. To be clear, this campaign of censorship, which has attacked British universities, political parties and public institutions, is directed by the State of Israel. Any similar attempt by another racist, militaristic foreign regime—such as Israel’s allies in Saudi Arabia or the UAE—to decide what is taught and who is employed in British universities would be laughed out of the room. Israel and its advocates deserve the same treatment.

I find this to be an aggressive and accusatory email. While perhaps not a firing offense, it does display a combative attitude and contributes to creating a hostile environment. At issue is whether the letter represents “personalized or vitriolic abuse, as distinct from a robust expression of professional disagreements.”⁹³ The tribunal later notes that “Professor Banting was persuaded that Mr. Bloch had been ‘genuinely impacted’ by [Miller’s] email to him.”⁹⁴

¶ 116

The university’s Acceptable Behaviours Policy includes the requirement for all members to treat colleagues and students with respect at work. I find Miller’s 2021–2023 statements to be in violation, though the 2023 comments are the worst. The tribunal refused to include the latter tweets, examples of which are quoted with dates in this essay, in evidence, since they postdated his dismissal.

¶ 121

Professor Ruth Levitas wrote to George Banting, one of Miller’s reviewers, to say that his “claim that Jewish students are pawns of the Israeli

government potentially fosters antagonism towards them on the part of other students, especially those who are pro-Palestinian. Such antagonism is likely to lead to online and perhaps direct abuse. It certainly fosters antisemitism. It is therefore a threat to the mental health and potentially the physical safety of Jewish students.” I agree with her.

¶ 135

Professor Norman reached a similar conclusion: “The statements that you made single out students and student societies. You connected a properly constituted University of Bristol student society to activities that any reasonable person would object to—violence, racism, ethnic cleansing, and making other protected groups feel unsafe. Given the relevant background and context, the manner of your public engagement and the way in which your statements were made was, in my view, wrong and inappropriate.” She adds: “To my mind, singling out students and their societies in the way you did was an abuse of the significant power differential between you and students.”

¶ 154

Miller “made it clear at various points throughout the disciplinary process that his statements were deliberate, considered, made with care and mutual respect, and made professionally.” While it was in his interest to say this, I find it difficult to agree.

¶¶ 156–159

Miller tries an *ex post facto* explanation for his August 2023 tweet that began “Judeophobia barely exists these days,” stating, “They [Jews] are overrepresented in Europe, North America and Latin America in positions of cultural, economic and political power.” Only two months later the Hamas assault took place and antisemitism surged worldwide. Miller does not even mention that both the assault itself and the worldwide endorsements of it are the most obvious counters to his claim that Jew hatred

“barely exists.”⁹⁵ Only two years later he would be in Iran praising what Hamas did on 10/7. Of course, that is after the university completed its investigation, but it suggests he held antisemitic beliefs earlier. One may reasonably ask what justifies the claim that Jews are overrepresented? Should their place in various professions be limited to their percentage in the society as a whole? And what should be done about “overrepresentation”? The resentment about overrepresentation can, to be sure, be reversed and made a source of community pride. But antisemites commonly consider “overrepresentation” to be a threat to their own cultural and political power.

¶ 217

This one of several places where Miller invokes his “research into anti-Zionism.” Miller is certainly a capable researcher, as demonstrated by his investigations into media coverage of the conflict in Northern Ireland. But the only topic regarding Israel or Zionism about which he has done somewhat academically credible research is that of NGO financing, and even there he failed to question his conclusions about what he found or decided to be true, and the financing details are a product of confirmation bias. I challenge anyone to find evidence of serious research on Zionism anywhere in his publications. He offers tendentious, undocumented, unsupported opinions and conspiracy theories, but no documented research. It is regrettable that the tribunal accepted Miller’s false assertions as true. “I did research” is a claim some nonacademics make when they have done nothing more than absorb a flood of malicious prejudice on social media.

Bolton notes that “in order to make his views fit into the law’s structure of ‘belief,’ Miller argued that his research on the ‘Zionist movement’ followed, rather than acted as the basis for his unfalsifiable convictions about the inherently malign character of Zionism.” Ironically, then, “the more Miller’s research is understood as being derived from a set of prior convictions that are impervious to evidence, the less it fulfils the basic norms of scholarly practice that are the condition for the additional legal protections granted to academic free expression.”⁹⁶

¶ 218

Miller claims that his wide reading has made him familiar with opposing viewpoints, but he provides little evidence of this.

¶¶ 223–224

Miller told the tribunal that his views have nothing to do with “the inherent nature of the state of Israel.” And yet in the very next paragraph he insists that the Zionist state is “inherently racist, imperialistic and colonial,” views he has expressed repeatedly. As Bolton incisively points out, Miller “did not claim that the Israel state has historically acted in racist or colonial ways, and that this led him to conclude that Zionism is now racist and colonial. Rather for Miller, Zionism and racism and colonialism are tautologous at a *conceptual* level, preceding any appeal to historical evidence,” and thus a Zionist state can never offer equality to a non-Jewish population. The “more Miller’s views are a dehistoricised ‘belief,’ the more they are antisemitic.” Again, for the university to concede they were not antisemitic is both a philosophical and political error.

¶ 231

Miller’s claim that Israel could reform its policies so as to be no longer Zionist is disingenuous. If Israel welcomed millions of Palestinians to return to its territory it would cease to be Jewish. It would be an Islamic state, quite possibly an Islamist one.

¶¶ 256–257

The tribunal conceded that there was a significant difference between Miller’s October 2020 and February 2021 attacks on the student complaints about him. In the earlier comment, produced for the student newspaper *The Tab*, he charged that there was an effort to stop him from teaching about “the important relationship between Zionism and rising Islamophobia” but then, he depersonalized the issue, calling the complaint “an

example of the significant number of fraudulent antisemitism complaints which have been all too common in the febrile atmosphere encouraged by supporters of the Israeli state.”⁹⁷ The following year, his remarks became more personal: “I’ve been attacked and complained about by the head of the Bristol JSoc (the Jewish society) along with the President of the Union of Jewish Students.” He then posed a broad challenge: “How do we make sure Zionism is ended essentially?”⁹⁸ The two February 2021 statements obviously implicate each other. Even while raising the possibility that debates will help, he insists that dialogue with Zionists is hopeless.

The tribunal only concedes that “manifestations of [Miller’s] beliefs were writ large in the February 2021 statements,” a remarkably inadequate characterization of the difference between them. The tribunal then reverted to the flawed view that guided all its reasoning: the 2020 and 2021 statements were fundamentally “manifestations of the claimant’s belief.” Instead of recognizing that Miller’s beliefs evolved over the years, the tribunal accepted Miller’s self-interested claim that he held a static, fully formed view of Zionism over the previous quarter century, from 1998 to 2023. The facts prove otherwise.

¶ 273

The university conceded that nothing Miller said or did was discriminatory. I disagree and think it was an error to make that concession. Other witnesses could have provided a different perspective.

¶ 278

Miller denied that his comments had “any impact whatsoever on the ability of JSoc to operate or of Zionist students at the University to express Zionist views.” Other witnesses might have disagreed, suggesting that Miller’s attacks had a chilling effect on Zionist expression, just as after 10/7/23 the massive eruption of antisemitism had a considerable chilling effect. The tribunal later quotes from a February 16, 2021, *Jewish News* story that says, “David Miller has been allowed to target Jewish

students for their imagined part in his global Zionist conspiracy fantasy.”⁹⁹ I consider that an accurate observation, but the tribunal failed to consider its relevance to the case.

¶ 279

The tribunal agreed that Miller’s “comments themselves caused significant reputational harm to the university.” That alone would not justify dismissal but could be a factor in imposing lesser sanctions. Miller’s subsequent remarks, from 2023–2025, would have vastly magnified the reputational issues.

¶ 285

The tribunal found it “highly significant that [Miller] chose to air his grievances with students and student associations publicly,” adding that it was “extraordinary and ill-judged to express himself in the way he did.”

¶ 344

Although the report declares “it is not for the Tribunal to make a case or a party,” I believe that is substantially what it did.

¶ 492

As the tribunal reports, “considerable time was spent ... comparing and contrasting the comments [Miller] made in February 2021 with those made by Professor Greer about Brisoc.”¹⁰⁰ I believe fairness to Steven Greer would require a separate essay that gives full attention to his 2023 book *Falsely Accused of Islamophobia*, along with his subsequent *Islamophobia and Free Speech*.¹⁰¹

¶ 493

Reviewing Miller’s 2023 comments, the tribunal commented that “there is sufficient evidence for us to conclude that there is a realistic chance that the claimant would have been dismissed by the University after

these further actions ... there is a 30% chance that [Miller] would have been fairly dismissed two months after the tweets were made in August 2023.” This remarkable concession acknowledges not only that Miller’s manner of expression changed, but also that his substantive claims about Zionism also did. The tribunal offers no reason why it set the probability at 30 percent. I cannot give any credibility to that figure.

In 2025, Bristol University filed an appeal against the tribunal’s verdict. In November, a three-person panel, presided over by Lord Fairley, KC, the Employment Appeal Tribunal (EAT) president since February 2025, held three days of hearings to consider the university’s arguments. They may reach a decision in 2026, but Miller himself could file further appeals.¹⁰²

David Miller’s Academic Freedom

The faculty members who came to Miller’s defense, while generally not likely to defend his actual remarks, claimed that academic freedom gave him the virtually unfettered right to say what he wished without fear of sanction. Of course, while a professor may establish a Substack and self-publish, nothing guarantees that any given venue will consider what someone writes to be worthy of publication; it might be judged unconvincing, insufficiently supported, misguided, poorly reasoned, or flatly wrong. Similarly, a university can consider a candidate for a job or for indefinite tenure to be undesirable for the same set of reasons. It is not a violation of academic freedom to conclude that someone’s work is substandard, nor is it professionally unacceptable to decide that a candidate’s speech or writing is racist or antisemitic and thus categorically unacceptable. Faculty members may face severe consequences for *exercising* their academic freedom in ill-considered ways. Many faculty members prefer to forget this distinction when they think of academic freedom as a set of rights unencumbered by responsibilities, among them a responsibility to the truth, an issue I discuss in *Hate Speech and Academic Freedom* (2024).

Academic tenure grants further protections that typically offer greater tolerance than a hiring or tenure committee would provide, but

it is not absolute. The bar between what would be more and less severely sanctioned is not fixed and can be a matter of professional judgment varying according to the beliefs and expertise of the committee members serving on a review panel. Bristol provided safeguards against capricious judgment in the form of an independent appeals process. A subsequent nonacademic tribunal, on the other hand, applied much narrower standards of review: It was not concerned with the truth or falsity of a person's beliefs, which academic evaluators certainly should be. The tribunal mainly asked whether the beliefs were deeply held and worthy of some respect in a democratic culture, not whether Miller's beliefs upset people, or disturbed Jewish students or faculty. A belief would have to be clearly unworthy of any respect in a democratic society for it to run afoul of the tribunal. In my view and that of others, some of Miller's convictions met that severe standard, but the tribunal's grasp of issues was so circumscribed that it could not see things that way.

Academic beliefs have for decades been tested against what a person's scholarly discipline held to be true. Comments outside one's areas of teaching and research, indeed, even just outside your expected base of disciplinary expertise, could be excused, but statements that contradicted the universally accepted truths in your field could define you as professionally unfit. In the US, a European historian could not safely claim that the Holocaust did not happen, but a plant pathologist in many cases could. Quite apart from how academia would handle that issue, however, a number of countries classify Holocaust denial as a civil crime, though the US does not. That is a good way of remembering that not all countries will resolve such questions in the same way. While most elements of academic freedom are recognized throughout the West, some national differences obtain.

More recently, the problem has arisen that some academic disciplines are so thoroughly politicized that—in some areas—it has become very difficult to resolve questions of truth reliably. That means looking to faculty outside the discipline to make necessary academic judgments. Some, David Hirsh among them, would argue that Miller's discipline, sociology, is unable to make sound judgments about the current social conditions of antisemitism. I do not have the expertise to decide that matter.

Employment tribunals in Britain operate under unique rules quite different from those governing the academy. In Miller's case it accepted the idea that Miller was an authority possessing expertise in antisemitism. Many academic specialists, including myself, would not.

With extensive publications—several-score academic essays and seven books dealing with antisemitism—I have recognized expertise in that field and in the study of academic freedom. Academic freedom does not protect faculty who threaten Jewish students or contribute to creating significantly hostile environments for them. It does not protect faculty who urge discriminatory actions against members of recognized Jewish groups. It does not protect faculty who make false political claims about students, faculty, or staff that might put them at risk of bodily harm.

In short, Bristol's decision about David Miller did not violate his academic freedom.

The Sins of the Jewish Fathers

In 2025, Miller took up a new project that enabled him to fully realize the antisemitic impulses that had driven his work for almost a decade. Its goal was to demonize and indict the Jewish community of Glasgow, home of the largest surviving Jewish community in Scotland, and Miller's own home for more than three decades.

Underlying the project has been Miller's sense that Scotland's Jews are a Zionist cabal burrowing their way into his very national origin. This psychological and methodological assumption were already evident in "The Cold War on British Muslims" discussed above, his account of the Zabłudowicz family funding of the British NGO BICOM, which purportedly disclosed a linked web of Jewish donors behind what he claimed was the growth of Islamophobia. In an ongoing series of 2025 articles about Scottish Jews, he ramps up more sinister and conspiratorial connotations behind every effort to sustain a Jewish community amid the declining number of Scottish Jews.¹⁰³ Zionism, in this conspiratorial view, is a collaborative project of land appropriation and ethnic cleansing, genocidal at its core.

I cannot claim to offer more than an overview of the project nor am

I qualified to judge the accuracy of all the many claims woven into the series of essays Miller has written on the topic. It would take an expert on Scottish Jewish history to sort out fact from fiction since Miller mixes credible information with pervasive confirmation bias, personal speculation, and vitriol. But one can recognize when Miller lends a sinister spin to facts that can and should be interpreted quite differently.

The “Caledonian Cousinhood” is Miller’s coinage, adapted from the more familiar and well established British Jewish Cousinhood chronicled by Chaim Bermant in his 1971 book *The Cousinhood*.¹⁰⁴ Miller names the families that he claims to have controlled Scottish Jewish peoplehood, propelled its Zionism for decades, and corrupted the country as a whole. The reference to Caledonia, which invokes the popular name for northern Scotland first assigned by the Romans, suggests an ancient authenticity that is increasingly imperiled, paradoxically, by the increasingly small number of Scottish Jews.

There were some 20,000 Scottish Jews in the 1960s, and there were just under 6,000 as of 2025. Miller omits key people and distorts his narrative to serve his purposes. While he hopes that the allusion to the British Cousinhood will automatically lend credibility to his Scottish “Cousinhood,” the scholarship on the British Cousinhood chronicles wealthy Jews often dedicated to philanthropy, not lifetime greed, as Miller falsely asks us to believe about the influential Scottish Jews. Sir Moses Montefiore, whom Bermant says “bestrides the Jewish history of the nineteenth century like a colossus,” earned his living in trade, then “retired at the age of forty to devote his money and the rest of his life to public welfare.”¹⁰⁵

The third entry in Miller’s series of essays, “Scottish Zionism’s Inner Circle: The Caledonian Cousinhood That Bankrolls Occupation and Genocide,” opens by picturing a pastoral Scottish past now corrupted by a Zionist fifth column:

Tucked into the leafy suburbs of the Southside of Glasgow, behind quiet streets and luxury homes, lies the real engine of Scottish Zionism. It is not a government office, a public institution or a charity, but a web of interlinked families whose wealth, marriages, and political networks have shaped the Zionist movement in Scotland for over a century ... a web of siblings, children, and business vehicles designed to concentrate wealth and continuity.¹⁰⁶

Miller announces that “this article uncovers how that network—the so-called Caledonian Cousinhood—has quietly expanded its reach, drawing in new families who now steer some of the most powerful Zionist organizations in the country.”¹⁰⁷

Miller’s diction helps conjure up a conspiratorial enterprise. He sees an “engine,” a malevolent superhuman force. It is a “web,” an echo of the historical Jewish spider of longstanding antisemitic tropes, which moves silently, like many conspiracies. And, of course, it is funded by Jewish wealth, a requirement of almost every antisemitic conspiracy, its philanthropic aims ignored.

Bernard Wasserstein, an established expert in the study of European Jewry, gives the lie to Miller’s claims: “There was no Scottish equivalent of the ‘Cousinhood,’ the wealthy patriciate, largely of German-Dutch origin, interlinked by crisscrossing marriages, who dominated Anglo-Jewry until the early twentieth century.”¹⁰⁸ Although Miller ignores them, the differences between the British Jewish Cousinhood and Miller’s purported Scottish parallel are many. Unlike in Britain, once the era of mass immigration was underway, wealthy Scottish Jews had much the same national and cultural origins as the much larger number of impoverished Jews who grew the population. In Scotland, as Wasserstein writes, the monied Jews “were for the most part self-made men with east European roots who had clambered up from much the same social origins as their fellow congregants.”¹⁰⁹ The relative lack of industrially employed proletarians among Scottish Jews—and the resulting absence of a major Jewish trade union movement—also limited class conflict within the Jewish community. Jews were hardly to be found among agricultural workers, miners, sailors, fishermen, shipyard workers, dock laborers, or heavy industry overall. “As traders, hawkers, and craftsmen, Jews were not seen as threatening causes of competition in the menial labor markets.”¹¹⁰

Both in Britain and Scotland, wealthy Jews had substantial influence in Jewish organizations because of their ability and willingness to fund them. Yet in Britain, the Cousinhood largely opposed Zionism, whereas in Scotland the entire Jewish community supported it, though the poorest Jews had little opportunity to actively participate because they lacked

even the limited resources necessary to pay annual dues to Zionist groups. For Miller, of course, the universal support Scottish Jews gave Zionism made them still more sinister.

The second entry in Miller's series, "The Caledonian Cousinhood: How the Zionist Movement Embedded Itself in Scottish Life," includes a clear summary of its goals. Over time, he tells us, thousands of Zionists have come and gone, lived in or passed through Scottish cities and towns. Some have gone on to greater things after leaving Scotland; others have ended up in occupied Palestine as settler colonists, often joining the Israeli occupation forces responsible for ethnic cleansing and war crimes. They were not simply Scottish Jews like Scottish Christians. The Jews could never be native to Caledonia. They arrived from elsewhere; they occupied; they passed through. They embodied colonialism and carried it with them to Palestine.

He writes that his essay will "illustrate the complex familial, business and political networks that gave rise to, and continue to shape, the Scottish Zionist movement. It aims to show how deeply embedded the Zionist movement is in Scotland—and, by implication, throughout the West. Understanding these networks is crucial to grasping the social foundations of Zionism—and, therefore, to determining the most effective way to dismantle the movement."¹¹¹ To his credit, perhaps, Miller offers no illusion of scholarly objectivity. His research has a political purpose, guided less by an ideal than by a sense of political necessity.

Giving the lie to Miller's unwarranted conspiratorial image of Scottish Zionism are some quite unmysterious facts of Scottish history, a number of which are clarified by an ambitious data-driven research project initiated by the International Institute for Jewish Genealogy in Jerusalem and drawing on records held by the Scottish Jewish Archives Centre in Glasgow, whose results were published in 2016 and 2018. The first Zionist societies, chapters of *Chovevei Zion* ("Lovers of Zion"), were established in Edinburgh (1890) and Glasgow (1891). Derek Penslar describes *Chovevei Zion* as an "informal network" rather than the tightly focused propaganda machine that Miller castigates.¹¹²

By that time, the Scottish Jewish community, previously small and substantially German, was being reconfigured by mass immigration

from Eastern Europe. These Jews were fleeing discrimination in Poland and Lithuania and state-sanctioned pogroms and antisemitism in Russia. By 1901, only 35 percent of Scotland's Jews were Scottish born. In 1861 there were only 444 Jews in the whole of Scotland; by 1911, the number had grown to nearly 12,000. The Jews who joined *Chovevei Zion* had first-hand experience of paralyzing discrimination and homicidal antisemitism.¹¹³ They were motivated by the need for a Jewish homeland, not, as Miller would have it, to Jewish supremacy and ethnic cleansing.¹¹⁴ Many of the Eastern European Jews were quite poor, and moved into the slum tenements in Gorbals, south of the River Clyde in Glasgow.¹¹⁵ The Jews who had arrived earlier, many now middle class and some quite well off, established charities to help the impoverished arrivals with basic living costs. Because the sheer numbers were smaller, the Jewish social service groups in Glasgow were better able to handle the task than those in London. Non-Jewish resentment of the burden was consequently much rarer in Scotland, but suspicion of these "foreigners," as Cindarella Petz notes, did gradually rise.¹¹⁶

"Pedlar" was an especially precarious occupation for the poor well into the twentieth century. You obtained a sack of goods, walked out from Glasgow or Edinburgh to the surrounding mining camps, and tried to sell what you carried. "Pedlars were especially involved in the sale of cheap jewelry, clothing lace and such household decorations as picture frames."¹¹⁷ It was better, if possible, to work in a market stall or apprentice in a small trade shop, from which you might hope to graduate to a business of your own. Some did, and their children sometimes went to Scottish universities and entered the professions. Medicine was a favorite choice, especially after the First World War.¹¹⁸

But even in smaller cities Jews eventually had far more varied occupations than Miller's selective, maliciously truncated account allows. Nathan Abrams lists "electrician, bookmaker, hairdresser, upholsterer, greengrocer, pharmacist, and doctor," along with multiple people in the clothing and furniture industries in Dundee by 1945. In Glasgow, even the blacksmith trade included a number of Jews. As Wasserstein points out, "the characteristic Jewish itinerant trader, small shopkeeper, tailor, and cabinet-maker of the period of high immigration generally faded

away after one or two generations.”¹¹⁹ Soon Jews were teaching in Scottish universities. After World War II, Jews entered the legal profession in significant numbers. Meanwhile, the Jewish population was enhanced by refugees from Nazi Germany and Nazi-occupied Europe.¹²⁰ Their personal experience with persecution provided motivation for their support of Zionist groups.

Miller constructs Goldberg, Links, Walton, and Sellyn family histories as constituting a network that will later expand. Miller claims that these “same families continue to play central roles in promoting genocide today,” by which he means they donate to Israel.¹²¹ Yet, he adds, “the data presented here points to something more profound, and perhaps more troubling: Zionist networks are active across every sector and geography.”¹²² The enemy within is everywhere. Are such ideas worthy of respect, as the Employment Tribunal wanted us to believe a year earlier? Are they examples of credible faculty research?

The Goldberg family came to Scotland from Lithuania in the mid-1800s, according to Miller, becoming “the most prominent Zionist family in Scotland.” They founded several department stores, Miller reports, including the flagship store in Edinburgh. It included a rooftop café and menagerie that Miller frequently visited as a child. “Little did I know that underneath the glitz, the family running the shop was supporting the racist settler colony in Palestine.”¹²³ Isaac Walton emigrated from Russia in the early twentieth century “and became a ‘pedlar’ in the Highlands.” Mayer Links, who arrived in 1911, was a “Clothier, Draper and money lender.” His son, Nathan Links, “was also a moneylender.” In Miller’s account, the Goldberg family is connected by marriage to other families, including the Ognalls. Geoffrey Philip Ognall “was unapologetic about his debt collection business, even describing it as a source of professional pride.”¹²⁴ The Lewis family “amassed their millions from collecting debts from the poor.” They “built on debt collection to fund political ambitions.”¹²⁵

Miller has deposited some of the most familiar resentments in the history of antisemitism in these essays, and for him the sins of the fathers are inherited by their sons. Of course there are aggressive businessmen in Glasgow and Scotland, as in every other city and country, but the

small Jewish community in no way dominates Glasgow or Scottish business as a whole.

Contrary to Miller's account, Glasgow's wealthiest Jew was Dundee-born Sir Maurice Bloch (1883–1964), who became the city's most influential leader. He made his fortune in the whiskey distilling business. He then spent years giving away his money and was knighted in recognition of his philanthropic work. Bloch was preceded by Michael Simmons, who helped organize art exhibitions and promoted cultural activities for Glasgow's working classes. Abraham Goldberg actually arrived in Glasgow from Dublin in 1905, first establishing a trade in bales of cotton before graduating to department stores. Collins has the main store in Glasgow. Abraham transferred the business to his sons Ephraim and Michael in 1934. For many years Michael chaired the Citizen's Theatre. "He encouraged a wider repertoire of plays and was the key figure behind the development of the Close Theatre where more experimental plays ... were performed."¹²⁶

In a particularly vulgar move, Miller coins names for Jewish streets and neighborhoods. Of one small street in Giffnock, he writes, "let us call it *Genocide Gardens*." He offers two alternatives for streets in Glasgow, "Racists' Row" or "Nakba Avenue."¹²⁷ And he marvels at discovering how close he lived to the hive of "genocidaires": "As it happens, for part of the time I was a Glasgow resident, I lived in a house just around the corner in Blairhall Avenue (between 1994 and 2012), which is a one-minute walk (according to Google Maps) from No. 16 Camphill Avenue, where Isaac [Wolfson] lived."¹²⁸ "Little did I then realize how close elements of the Zionist movement were to me."¹²⁹ Concentration in neighborhoods, he suggests, exemplifies "how they effectively groom and indoctrinate their children, grandchildren, and great-grandchildren into the racist, genocidal ideology of Zionism."¹³⁰ Miller spent 30 years in Glasgow overall: "for almost all of that period I was blissfully unaware that genocidal Zionists were living, working and encouraging their racist and genocidal ideology in the neighbourhoods in which I lived and worked."¹³¹ Of course there are ethnic neighborhoods throughout the world, many of them popular destinations for culture and cuisine. Those neighborhoods can have a darker side as well, but Jewish neighborhoods,

for Miller, only have one character, and it is always sinister. They are exclusively self-interested and demonic, devoted to amassing power.

Miller's most telling observations about Sir Isaac Wolfson (absent the "Sir" in Miller's narrative) are that he was wealthier than it seemed, that he worked with Scotsmen (Wolfson himself was born in Glasgow), that his family business was "impenetrable" because of its "almost claustrophobic closeness."¹³² But as Kenneth Collins has shown, Wolfson "supported many charities, Jewish, Israeli and numerous academic and medical bodies across Britain. Colleges were named after him at both Oxford and Cambridge.... He received a baronetcy in the Queen's 1962 New Year's Honour's list and the following year was elected a Fellow of the Royal Society."¹³³ Neither any of this nor the millions of pounds his foundation disbursed make their way into Miller's essays, where Wolfson's life is described as dedicated to "the Zionist genocide." After all, he did finance the Chief Rabbinate building in Jerusalem.

An objective account of Glasgow Jewry would mention the number of Jews who served in the British army in both World Wars, including the women who served as drivers, nurses, clerks, and administrators in the second, and one might acknowledge those who lost their lives in the process. Glasgow Jewry has also long included prominent figures in the arts and entertainment industries, something Miller does not tell us. Jewish graphic arts ranged from Hannah Franks' exquisite Art Nouveau drawings to Hans Jackson's viscerally disturbing paintings from his *Prelude to the Holocaust* series.

Miller characterizes these families' support of foundations as a form of "Genteel Genocide." But worst of all, I would argue, is his repeated reference to families' involvement in "the genocidal Chabad cult," which "styles itself as a friendly outgoing Jewish movement dedicated to helping Jews reconnect with Judaism. However, in reality, it is a supremacist, hate-mongering Zionist cult."¹³⁴ Miller irresponsibly tries to tie Chabad as a whole to the notorious 2010 King's Torah, the product of a small West Bank group.¹³⁵ "The tenacity of the racist ideology of Zionism," he advises, "in sometimes inhospitable circumstances, is one of the reasons we still have to deal with and finally conquer the ideology and its practical expressions, which most obviously are seen in the genocide in Gaza."¹³⁶

Pax Judaica

In fall 2025, Miller gave several YouTube interviews and issued a series of Instagram posts warning of an emerging “Pax Judaica” that threatened freedom worldwide.¹³⁷ He thus became part of a conspiratorial fantasy that Richard David Hames has called “an exceptionally convoluted phenomenon in its origin, development, and contemporary manifestation.”¹³⁸

Miller, on Instagram, explains: “Pax Judaica is the emerging new imperial arrangement in which the Zionist movement usurps all the powers formerly held by the US Empire.”¹³⁹ Indeed, he claims, that we already see an occupation by Zionists of Western institutions, by which he means that Israel’s control of the literal West Bank renders plausible a claim about ideological occupation. The wide adoption of the IHRA definition of antisemitism, for Miller, is clear evidence of the spread of Zionist power. In his formulation, the US has become “merely a client state.”¹⁴⁰ Given that US powers include a military force that quite far dwarfs any Israeli aspirations, economic influence vastly superior to Israel’s, and coercive political capacity of global stature, no rational observer can take the Pax Judaica concept seriously. But there are plenty of bloggers and fellow travelers eager to do so.

Miller joins others in claiming that Pax Judaica has material roots in the dream of a Greater Israel, a plan for territorial conquest that will produce a Jewish state substantially larger than one limited by the incorporation of Gaza and the West Bank. Miller insists Israel seeks parts of Lebanon, Jordan, Iraq, and Egypt. But territorial conquest is only the beginning. “Pax Judaica describes an empire made possible by proxy sustained leverage over existing powers rather than direct occupation.”¹⁴¹ Hames defines one contemporary strand of the threat: “a coming global order in which Jews, or Israel more specifically, preside over a digital gulag—an omniscient AI surveillance architecture, run from Jerusalem, that subordinates nation states, controls access to basic services, and keeps the world’s population on a tight algorithmic leash.”¹⁴² This “shamelessly folds” AI “into one of the oldest and most poisonous stories humans have told about themselves: that a secret cabal of Jews is

orchestrating world events behind the scenes.”¹⁴³ As Miller himself warns, AI gives Zionism far greater power than it has ever wielded before. Although the Latin word *pax* means peace, *Pax Judaica* doesn’t mean actual peace, but rather dominance and control.

In his February 26, 2026, interview with Sulaiman Ahmed, Miller adds both broad historical reach to his account of *Pax Judaica* and a particularly telling version of a Nazi equivalence. “Over the last 30 or 40 years or so, the Zionists have been able to infiltrate most of the Western powers.” But that, in turn, has been enabled by Jewish financial power building for centuries—as a consequence of “the way in which Jewish people have engaged historically in finance and business.” As a result, “*Pax Judaica* actually runs quite a lot of the financial infrastructure of the entire world.” Indeed, “ten percent of the world’s billionaires are Jews.” He caps this mix of paranoia and resentment by drawing on traditional antisemitic tropes with a signal warning: “If we don’t stop” the expansion of the Jewish empire, it will achieve its aim “to be a thousand-year Reich.”¹⁴⁴

The ideological complications are enhanced by *Pax Judaica*’s role in Islamist eschatology, as formulated, among others by Sheikh Imran Bazar Hosein, who sees Israel’s empire as part of the historical end stage of the Antichrist’s dominion, emanating from an epicenter in Jerusalem.¹⁴⁵

Miller’s Journey to Radical Alterity

There are, however, yet further steps into radical alterity, the categorical otherness of antisemitism, that David Miller would take that would render him not just unemployed but unemployable in the academy. For one, he issues a call to replicate the murder sprees of October 7. On March 25, 2025, he tweeted “Protests are not enough. Listen to our brothers and sisters in Gaza.”¹⁴⁶ Then he continues: “Those who are interested in ending this genocide must begin by targeting those responsible near them: the entire Zionist movement globally must live in fear of accountability until it is dismantled and its ideology eradicated.” He adds a final flourish: “And let’s be clear, there are Zionists everywhere. In every town and city. Find out where they are.”¹⁴⁷ He thus gives threatening substance to his 2024

call for a “maximalist anti-Zionism” to combat “a maximalist and genocidal Zionism.”¹⁴⁸ “We must build a maximalist anti-Zionist movement whose minimum demand is the liberation and decolonization of Palestine; but it must also mobilise to decommission Zionism wherever it is found in this world.”¹⁴⁹

On June 10, 2025, Miller posted on X the principle that now governs his radical anti-Zionism, that there can be no tolerance for the existence of a Jewish state:

There is no world in which anyone anywhere can live in “equality” with Jewish supremacists, whether in al-Quds (where they control the smallest details of Palestinian life) or Arizona (where they decide who is eligible for government contracts on the basis of commercial fealty to the State of Israel).

Either you are too dense to understand what Jewish supremacism is, and therefore genuinely believe “equality” is possible with those committed to wiping out millions of souls on the basis of being God’s Chosen People, or you are a coward who believes that after two years of Zionist holocaust across the Levant and at a moment when knowledge of Zionist crimes is more widespread than ever, it is impossible to confront and politically defeat the Zionist war machine.¹⁵⁰

Miller provides few specifics about how this should be achieved, but he does mention some key features. Most important, in his view, is the need to erase what he terms the “westoxicated drivell” that urges oppressed people to embrace nonviolence as a form of resistance.¹⁵¹ Such calls for nonviolence aim to sabotage the pro-Palestinian movement and are typically carried out by leftwing groups “infested with Zionist entry-ists” supposedly acting in “secret dialogue with state intelligence” or in league with the Mossad and Israel’s other intelligence agencies. Miller, in the wake of October 7, demands violent resistance, a message that intersects with his demands for action against his pro-Israel countrymen. Thus he can call, vaguely, for “a focus on individuals returning from committing genocide as members of the occupation forces,” including British and Americans who served in the IDF, without detailing what the “focus” will entail. There is a recurrent emphasis on the enemy within, even as he downplays “the alleged continued significance of Judeophobia,” the “largely mythical threat of anti-Semitism in the UK.”

In 2024, David Miller entered what is, at least for now, the final phase of his political, cultural, and conceptual anti-Zionism. I include the third term, “conceptual,” with reservations, because it dignifies what is no more than a delusional obsession. Miller now lives, apparently altogether, in his alternative universe, which is in part why I label it radical alterity. It runs in clumsy parallel to the overlapping universes that are home to the rest of us. It is a universe in which the plans outlined in the fictional *Protocols of the Elders of Zion* have finally come to fruition. The Jews, operating from their Zionist redoubt, control the world. We must act immediately if we are to free ourselves from the menace.

To introduce this phase of his psychic life, Miller issues online what represents a personal manifesto defining his evolving anti-Zionism, and it puts the lie to the Employment Tribunal’s nonsensical declaration that throughout Miller’s adult life he has held to an anti-Zionism that *cannot change*. In fact, he made no anti-Zionist statement at all until 2019. It then took five more years to marinate before Miller issued his manifesto on October 21, 2024. It is long, but it needs to be read in its entirety. The bold emphases are in the original:

I know it’s bleak but there is an inescapable fact that, through my work, I have long been trying to explain: the war in the Levant has no borders, because **Zionism has no borders**.

So when you, in **Britain** or **France** or **Germany**, are having mosques shut down and Muslim homes are raided and academics are fired and journalists are arrested by “counter-terror” police, that is being done directly on behalf of the State of Israel. And yes, as you say, it has been going on for at least 23 years.

Your state is at war with you because the **State of Israel** is at war with you. And the soldiers of Zion have penetrated the security establishment of your state to make its policy; penetrated the media to make you a public enemy; and penetrated political parties to create extremist footsoldiers who will execute their strategies in government.

Take **Geert Wilders**, in the **Netherlands**, whose statements have been published by the **Gatestone Institute** for 16 years. Wilders can be said to be a creation of the **State of Israel** and its foreign intelligence assets, like **Gatestone**. But there are hundreds like him across Europe.

So the answer is not just to be “pro-Palestinian,” whatever that means. The challenge is to be anti-Zionist, to materially contribute to the global struggle against Jewish supremacism. Your war is right where you are.

Once you recognise a war has been declared on you and has already been fought for 20 years, you will no doubt find it strange that all that's been done to resist is some mild-mannered protests. Does it make sense to protest those who are at war with you? Or do you accept that you're in an existential war and act accordingly?

What do people think schools teaching "British values" is about? Who is it for? The purpose is to suppress, demobilise and disincentivise any political dissent, but especially that coming from Muslims, because it tends to be more coherent, universalistic and material than other varieties.

Not only are you supposed to shed your beliefs but also your values. That's the price of existence the State of Israel seeks to extract from Muslims globally, from the Gulf to Europe.

Defeating this Zionist strategy requires a few things:

1. Waking up from the stupor of denialism to accept that there is a global, maximalist, eliminationist war being waged against Islam and Muslims (and all dissenters to Jewish supremacy) by the **State of Israel**.
2. Understanding that the Zionist movement, and Jewish supremacists in general, fight this war by occupying institutions, whether the state or local activist groups or your council or even your mosque. It's not just about "the lobby" and megadonors. The war goes all the way down, street to street, everywhere in Europe. Wherever you find Jewish supremacists, you will find the war. Confront it where you find it.
3. Evolving away from woolly liberal methods like A to B protests on weekends, which, while symbolic and raised morale in Palestine in the early days of the war, do nothing material to prevent the genocide or create accountability for its perpetrators. And again, the perpetrators of this genocide are all around you. Donors to the **IDF** and to other Zionist institutions may be on your street or in your workplace and certainly in your neighbourhood or your city. **Zionist** "charities," which funnel cash for the purpose of Zionist terrorism, or to advance the cause of Jewish supremacism, are in all the major British cities. They cannot be allowed to operate as normal while perpetrating this genocide. We in Britain may not liberate Palestine, but Palestine may liberate us.

Finally: there's no such thing as "foreign" policy. The British state has made a colossal miscalculation by participating so directly in this genocide, via the **RAF**, **SAS** and its intelligence agencies (including **MI5**, **MI6**, **GCHQ** and the **Homeland Security Group**). Such direct intervention to destroy Palestine is on a par with the **Balfour Declaration** in historic scale, and will have effects on the future of Britain itself larger even than the invasion of Iraq, which permanently destroyed public trust in domestic institutions.

The British people will have to repair this trajectory by taking British political and public institutions out of the grip of Zionist fanatics. This is the only way to preserve the balance of British society in the long-term. It is essential that Britain is **de-Zionised**, both to protect others internationally from the harms that this Zionist entryism and subversion has caused, as well as to create a viable and sovereign Britain accountable to its own citizens rather than the US Empire or the **State of Israel** and its assets. A de-Zionised Britain could be an example to other post-imperial states in how to confront centuries of imperial violence and chart a course away from the suicidal client relationship with the US. It's the least we can do.¹⁵²

Miller annotated this agenda the following year: “De-Zionisation needs to focus not just on the territory of Palestine, but the presence of the Zionist movement in the UK (and everywhere else it rears its ugly head, radicalizes Jewish kids, recruits forces for genocide and represses Palestinians, Arabs, Muslims, and many others domestically via counter terrorism and extremism policies adopted by Western governments).”¹⁵³

Miller closes his case against the all-powerful Zionist state by constructing dual, paired fantasy entities: an imperialist Zionist state with no limits to its desire or influence, and a victimized, subservient West under Zionist control. He wants readers to accept the idea that Israel is both philosophically and operationally at war with all the institutions of the West. None are beyond Israel's reach. The West, invaded, consumed, and reconceived, is already nearly unrecognizable. The window for salvation is very short.

Miller's vision of the world is, of course, insane. Notably, he introduces it at a time when Israel's explanations and justifications for its military activities are more widely rejected by world governments and international media than ever before, as casualties of the bombing and ground campaigns in Gaza are alienating many worldwide. The much demonized “Israel lobby” is losing its grip on world opinion. Yet Miller imagines that support for Israel is at a high water mark.

The manifesto was released as a major change occurred in Miller's life. After being fired from Bristol, Miller found his way to Iran, where he frequently appears on the Iranian Press TV weekly program “Palestine De-classified,” which premiered in January 2022 and credits him variously as

producer or editor. It has been described as “the fastest growing program in the Iranian English-language disinformation universe.”¹⁵⁴ It was on that program in August 2022 that Miller offered his antisemitic claim that the Odessa area in Ukraine was a settler-colony where Jews came from other parts of the continent and settled there and then later many of them moved to Palestine and became part of the occupation of Palestine. Izabella Tabarovsky, an authority on Russia, observed in response, “Former Prof David Miller colonizes Russian/Ukrainian/Jewish history to make it fit his conspiracy theories about Jews.”¹⁵⁵

In November 2025, angling for yet another way to depict the Israeli imperium, he tried again:

“The lobby” in the US is a tiny part of the wider Zionist movement, which in turn is a part of a far broader, global Jewish Empire with interests stretching from Argentina to Azerbaijan to Australia. If you do not look at these transnational links as a whole, you will simply fail to understand what Zionism is; how the Zionist project works in practice; and what its power relations are with any of its client states, assets or targets for predation.¹⁵⁶

Deciding what is Miller’s most irresponsible comment over the last few years presents something of a challenge, though his 2025 remark that “Britain is, in fact, run from Tel Aviv” merits consideration.¹⁵⁷ But the following intervention at Tehran’s 2025 Third International Sobh Media Festival, delivered on May 8, the final day of the Festival, at a panel on the “Future of West Asia after Al-Aqsa Op” surely merits consideration as well. He said:

That is something that is not just about Israel. It goes all the way through the Zionist movement. It’s not just that there is a rape epidemic and a child abuse epidemic in Israel; it is throughout the whole Zionist movement. Most of, many of, the Zionist leaders in the U.K. are serial rapists of young children. It’s a well-known thing, but we don’t talk about it. We don’t conceive of it in the same kind of way. So yeah, this is a sick society which has to be dismantled. It has to be removed from—what was the phrase by Ahmadinejad—from the pages of history.¹⁵⁸

Other comments by Miller raise the possibility that he has descended into insanity. In a tweet on October 25, 2024, he told Britons, “Your

Prime Minister does not work for you. He works for a handful of genocidal Jewish supremacists. He's their errand boy and he will send your sons to die for 'Israel.'"¹⁵⁹ When, that year, Israel exploded Hezbollah's hand-held electronic pagers, he vented in response: "Anyone who defends this terrorist attack in Lebanon has outed themselves as an intelligence asset for a hostile state and should be dealt with as such."¹⁶⁰ I cannot say why the same principle should not be triggered by Miller's services to Iran. And in March 2025 he urged: "Find out where [Zionists] are," and ensure that they "live in fear of accountability."¹⁶¹

Does the loss of his faculty position mean we will not see him invited to present a guest lecture at a university? I'm not sure, though he has a 2024 gloss on the very campus solidarity movement that would invite him: "It will forever be impossible to build a Palestinian liberation movement internationally based on the patronizing 'solidarity' model, which seeks perpetual victims rather than heroic, God-conscious guerillas."¹⁶² While no doubt meant as praise for the God-conscious heroes of Hamas, for most Western faculty members being a paid spokesperson for Iran would put him beyond the pale as well. That role has certainly led to unusual statements on behalf of Iran's ruling powers. On January 9, 2026, the same day Iran's supreme leader, Ayatollah Ali Khamenei, ordered the Supreme National Security Council, the body tasked with safeguarding the country, to crush the escalating public protests by any means necessary, Miller tweeted this: "If anything, the major structural problem with the Islamic Republic is that it has been far too liberal/democratic for too long. This has led to an anarchic stasis which does not allow for effective centralised policy planning or execution in line with Republican objectives—and indeed collective interests."¹⁶³ The alternative to being "too liberal" is presumably to enforce state policy more ruthlessly. We saw that result throughout the first half of 2026.

The end of his academic career has probably had some effect on Miller's behavior over the last few years. I have seen several friends denied tenure, which is not what happened to Miller, but they did lose their jobs, so I know how devastating it is to identity and self-esteem. It can take some time for people to accept responsibility for what happened to them. No doubt Miller's dismissal increased his hostility to Zionist students, a

passion in which he indulged even before losing his position. Some suggest he simply became less inhibited after 2021, more forthcoming in revealing his true feelings. Irrationality and honesty of course, are not necessarily incompatible, and there is no reason to assume that only one factor has led to Miller's bizarre psychic evolution.

Conclusion

I am not inclined to claim a thumbs up or thumbs down judgment on Jane Norman's recommendation for dismissal that would apply in all contexts, though I believe the tribunal's counter-arguments are fatally flawed. Indeed, the fact that the tribunal decided a lesser punishment was warranted discredits Miller's view that he was just a persecuted innocent. That was what it recognized when it declared that he shared responsibility and ruled that any financial settlement should accordingly be reduced by half. Miller appealed the settlement reduction to the Employment Appeal Tribunal, evidently refusing to accept any responsibility for his fate.

Bristol deserves some credit for its willingness to support the Norman recommendation. Overall, its actions for years spoke more to its inclination to manage reputational risk and legal compliance than to its concern for student welfare. In that it mirrored university priorities worldwide. Invoking academic freedom was thus arguably as much a strategy to manage image and avoid action rather than uphold a deeply held value.

But Bristol's position is fatally flawed by its reluctance to confront the radically antisemitic character of Miller's anti-Zionism. If multiple versions of anti-Zionism are distributed along a spectrum, Miller's version is, in a real sense, off the charts. Not only does he want the Jewish state eliminated; he wants every vestige of Zionism wiped from the face of the earth. Indeed, he seems to want all Zionists cast out of the social compact, and that means the vast majority of Jews. How that view merits the status of a protected belief—protected, that is, from consequences when it is promoted by a teacher responsible for educating students—is difficult to understand. The IHRA definition of antisemitism does not even

contemplate a version of antisemitic anti-Zionism that extreme. “Eliminationist” anti-Zionism, the recognized extreme for the concept, ordinarily means delegitimizing and decommissioning the Jewish state, however unrealistic or impractical that may be. Not since the Second World War has there been a major Western constituency behind a position as extreme and evidently homicidal as the one Miller has espoused over the last decade.

Especially since the onset of the new millennium, anti-Zionism has been the dominant face of antisemitism. For Miller, since 2021 that focus has taken on a uniquely dark character. All the old antisemitic tropes persist and are rearticulated to the demonized image of the Jewish state: Israel coordinates the Jewish plot to take over the world; Israel now poisons Western culture as Jews once purportedly poisoned the wells of Europe. Israel is the crafty, scheming Jew.

No educated observer, or at least no honest one, argues that criticizing Israeli state policy constitutes either anti-Zionism or antisemitism. The IHRA definition makes that perfectly clear. Criticizing Israeli policies in the way you would take issue with those of other countries doesn’t belong on the spectrum either. It represents normal political debate. Miller’s unchecked hostility is a different order of belief altogether. Why the tribunal did not seek to understand the radical evolution of Miller’s beliefs I cannot say. It wouldn’t have required a major investigation, just some reading and thinking about his publications and public statements. Instead, the tribunal committed a public disservice by accepting Miller’s patently false claim that his anti-Zionism was well formed in the last century and has remained unchanged since then.

Notes

- 1 See Press TV Highlights, “David Miller: Only Iran Can Save World Civilization,” Instagram, September 2025, <https://www.instagram.com/reel/DODTQ3OjAw2/>.
- 2 See Asa Winstanley, “David Miller Was Cleared of Anti-Semitism, Leaked Document Shows,” *Asa Winstanley’s Blog*, Electronic Intifada, October 22, 2021, <https://electronicintifada.net/blogs/asa-winstanley/david-miller-was-cleared-anti-semitism-leaked-document-shows>.
- 3 Andrew Chitty, “Materials on the David Miller Case,” Medium, April 18, 2021, <https://andrewchitty.medium.com/materials-on-the-david-miller-case-ff0adf8ddf34>.
- 4 Chitty, “Materials.” For a straightforward account of events, see Anna Bond, “Professor’s ‘Anti-Zionist’ Beliefs Were Protected,” Lewis Silkin, February 12, 2024, <https://www.lewissilkin.com/insights/2024/02/13/professors-antizionist-beliefs-were-protected>. For a useful collection of news stories, opinion pieces, and transcriptions of Miller’s statements (through 2021), see Chitty, “Materials.”
- 5 See the full list of signatures at *Response to Recent Comments by Prof. David Miller* (blog), “Recent Statements by Prof. David Miller Concerning Bristol University Jewish Society and the Union of Jewish Students,” accessed July 6, 2026, <https://recentstatementsbyprofdavidmillerconcerningbristoluniversity.wordpress.com>.
- 6 Gwyn Wright, “Academic ‘More Inclined’ towards Sacked Professor’s Views on Zionism – Tribunal,” *Independent*, October 23, 2023, <https://www.the-independent.com/news/uk/david-miller-zionism-israel-university-of-bristol-jewish-b2434493.html>.
- 7 Asa Winstanley, “Second Bristol Report Exonerated David Miller of Anti-Semitism,” *Asa Winstanley’s Blog*, Electronic Intifada, November 26, 2021, <https://electronicintifada.net/blogs/asa-winstanley/second-bristol-report-exonerated-david-miller-anti-semitism>. For the full report, *Investigation Carried Out Under the University of Bristol’s Ordinance 28 by [Aileen McColgan]*, see <https://web.archive.org/web/20211128165712/https://www.jewishvoiceforlabour.org.uk/app/uploads/2021/11/Miller-legal-opinion-2.pdf>.
- 8 Professor Norman’s conclusions are printed in detail in numbered sections 132–35 of the Employment Tribunal’s decision in Miller’s case, which is Case No. 1400780/2022. The passage quoted here is from section 135. Also see the tribunal’s comments on Norman’s conclusions in sections 243–57 of the decision.
- 9 *Dr David Miller v. University of Bristol*, Bristol Employment Tribunal, Case No. 1400780/2022, Judgment, February 5, 2024,

<https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/6707c243366f494ab2e7b67d/Miller-judgment-1400780.2022-JDT...pdf>.

- 10 Matthew Bolton, "Anti-Zionism as 'Protected Belief': The Case of David Miller," *Industrial Law Review* 55, no. 1 (2026): 213–46, <https://doi.org/10.1093/indlaw/dwaf048>.
- 11 *Miller v. University of Bristol*, ¶ 26.
- 12 David Miller, *Don't Mention the War: Northern Ireland, Propaganda and the Media* (Pluto, 1994).
- 13 *Miller v. University of Bristol*, ¶ 28.
- 14 For the record, Miller's coauthored 1998 book on media coverage of the AIDS crisis makes no mention of Zionism either (David Miller et al., *The Circuit of Mass Communication: Media Strategies, Representation and Audience Reception in the AIDS Crisis* [Sage Academic, 1998]). It is one of several valuable, altogether professional research projects that Miller undertook in the 1990s.
- 15 Miller, *Rethinking Northern Ireland*, 4.
- 16 Perhaps lightning struck in 1999 to verify his claim before the tribunal, and his passionate anti-Zionism was suddenly in place, but I doubt it. Does it matter? Yes, because years later he made deeply hostile anti-Zionist remarks and accusations that appear to be of much more recent vintage. Indeed, it's not simply a matter of degree. At stake is the nature of the hostility he displayed at Bristol to which he subjected the university's students. While I do not know what motivated his radical political transformation, I will do my best to document it.
- 17 Idrees Ahmad and David Miller, "The Palestine Anti-Solidarity Movement: *Spiked's* Coverage of Israel and Palestine," *Spin Watch*, July 14, 2011, <https://www.spinwatch.org.uk/-articles-by-category-mainmenu-8/73-middle-east/5439-the-palestine-anti-solidarity-movement-spiked-coverage-of-israel-and-palestine/>.
- 18 Ahmad and Miller, "Palestine Anti-Solidarity Movement."
- 19 Ahmad and Miller, "Palestine Anti-Solidarity Movement."
- 20 Ahmad and Miller, "Palestine Anti-Solidarity Movement."
- 21 Tom Mills et al., *The Cold War on British Muslims: An Examination of Policy Exchange and the Centre for Social Cohesion* (Public Interest Investigations, 2011), https://purehost.bath.ac.uk/ws/portalfiles/portal/232268/SpinwatchReport_ColdWar.pdf. For a critique of Spinwatch methodology, see Dave Rich, "Walking a Mile in Asghar Bukhari's Shoe: Conspiracy Theories, Antisemitism, and Extremism," in *Unity and Diversity in Contemporary Antisemitism: The Bristol-Sheffield Colloquium on Contemporary Antisemitism*, ed. Jonathan G. Campbell and Leslie D. Klaff (Academic Studies Press, 2019), 139–155.
- 22 Mills et al., *Cold War*, 9.

- 23 Dave Rich, “Why ‘Academic Freedom’ Is No Defence of the Bristol University Professor David Miller,” *New Statesman*, updated October 5, 2023, <https://www.newstatesman.com/politics/2021/03/why-academic-freedom-no-defence-bristol-university-professor-david-miller>.
- 24 Mills et al., *Cold War*, 4.
- 25 Ibid., 5.
- 26 Ibid., 15.
- 27 Ibid., 29.
- 28 Ibid., 45.
- 29 Ibid., 52.
- 30 Ibid.
- 31 David Miller, “Understanding and Explaining Terrorism: Expertise in Practice,” University of Bath, accessed July 6, 2026, <https://researchportal.bath.ac.uk/en/projects/understanding-and-explaining-terrorism-expertise-in-practice/>.
- 32 See Tom Mills et al., *The Britain Israel Communications and Research Centre: Giving Peace a Chance?* (Public Interest Investigations, 2013), 61, https://purehost.bath.ac.uk/ws/portalfiles/portal/167837994/Mills_et_al_Spinwatch_report_The_Britain_Israel_Communications_and_Research_Centre_Giving_peace_a_chance_2013web.pdf?__cf_chl_f_tk=90mRzT.xJxyG7ISumL9RcHo3DP7QEat9s33tYYrQ6U-1783009524-1.0.1.1-8yVur2cPXsUGERaqoD6WXa1dqblbNM36jBRje1xny84; Sarah Marusek and David Miller, *How Israel Attempts to Mislead the United Nations: Deconstructing Israel’s Campaign Against the Palestinian Return Centre* (Public Interest Investigations, 2015), https://purehost.bath.ac.uk/ws/portalfiles/portal/167838176/Marusek_and_Miller_How_Israel_attempts_to_mislead_the_United_Nations.pdf; Tom Griffin et al., *The Henry Jackson Society and the Degeneration of British Neoconservatism: Liberal Interventionism, Islamophobia and the “War on Terror”* (Public Interest Investigators, 2015), <https://researchportal.bath.ac.uk/en/publications/the-henry-jackson-society-and-the-degeneration-of-british-neocons/>; and David Cronin et al., *The Israel Lobby and the European Union* (Public Interest Investigations, 2016), https://purehost.bath.ac.uk/ws/portalfiles/portal/167838098/PII_IsraelLobbyEUreport2016_Cronin_Marusek_Miller.pdf.
- 33 Marusek and Miller, *How Israel Attempts to Mislead*.
- 34 Griffin et al., *Henry Jackson Society*.
- 35 Cronin et al., *Israel*.
- 36 Dave Rich, “The Professor Miller Scandal Is Entirely of Bristol University’s Own Making,” *Dave Rich* (blog), *Times of Israel*, February 19, 2021, <https://blogs.timesofisrael.com/the-professor-miller-scandal-is-entirely-of-bristol-universitys-own-making/>.

- 37 See UK Lawyers for Israel, “UKLFI Urges Research Body to Cease Funding Professor Miller,” March 24, 2021, <https://www.uklfi.com/uklfi-urges-research-body-to-cease-funding-professor-miller>.
- 38 See GIOR, “Pro-Hezbollah Academic Alleges Foreign Influence Led to Prosecution over Antisemitism,” July 7, 2025, <https://www.global-influence-ops.com/pro-hezbollah-academic-david-miller-blames-foreign-influence/>.
- 39 Harry Clarke-Ezzidio, “Revealed: Bristol Academic Under Investigation for Alleged Anti-Semitism Received £400k of Public Funds,” *New Statesman*, July 1, 2021, <https://www.newstatesman.com/politics/2021/07/revealed-bristol-academic-under-investigation-for-alleged-anti-semitism-received-400k-of-public-funds>; Jenni Frazer, “Professor Miller Accused of Using £400,000 Public Grant for Work Attacking ‘Israel Lobby Groups,’” *Jewish Chronicle*, July 2, 2021, <https://www.thejc.com/news/professor-miller-accused-of-using-400-000-public-grant-for-work-attacking-israel-lobby-groups-h7clg8n0>; Campaign Against Antisemitism, “Disgraced Bristol University Professor David Miller Accused of Using £400,000 Research Grant to Further Research on ‘British Zionist Scene,’” July 2, 2021, <https://antisemitism.org/disgraced-bristol-university-professor-david-miller-accused-of-using-400000-research-grant-to-further-research-on-british-zionist-scene/>; Lee Harpin, “Bristol’s Professor Miller Received £400k in Taxpayer’s Cash for Research Grants,” *Jewish News*, July 2, 2021, <https://www.jewishnews.co.uk/bristols-professor-miller-received-400k-in-taxpayers-cash-for-research-grants/>.
- 40 See, for example, Narzanin Massoumi et al., “Secrecy, Coercion and Deception in Research on ‘Terrorism’ and ‘Extremism,’” *Contemporary Social Science* 15, no. 2 (2020), 134–52, <https://doi.org/10.1080/21582041.2019.1616107>; and Tom Mills et al., “The Ethics of Researching ‘Terrorism’ and Political Violence: A Sociological Approach,” *Contemporary Social Science* 15, no. 2 (2020), 119–33, <https://doi.org/10.1080/21582041.2019.1660399>.
- 41 Griffin et al, *Henry Jackson Society*, 5.
- 42 See David Miller (@Tracking_Power), “A rare miss from Comrade Ashok here,” X, August 8, 2024, https://x.com/Tracking_Power/status/1821464731535761675.
- 43 Mills et al., *Britain Israel Communications and Research Centre*, 61.
- 44 *Ibid.*, 17.
- 45 For the network charts, see Mills et al., *Britain Israel Communications and Research Centre*, 34, 36, 58, 67.
- 46 Keith Kahn-Harris, “Into the Flatlands with Professor David Miller,” *JewThink*, February 22, 2021, <https://www.jewthink.org/2021/02/22/into-the-flatlands-with-professor-david-miller/>.

- 47 Rich, “Academic Freedom.”
- 48 Mills et al., *Britain Israel Communications and Research Centre*, 53.
- 49 Hilary Aked et al., “The Five Pillars of Islamophobia,” openDemocracy, June 8, 2015, <https://www.opendemocracy.net/en/five-pillars-of-islamophobia/>.
- 50 Aked et al., “Five Pillars.”
- 51 Aked et al., “Five Pillars.”
- 52 Aked et al., “Five Pillars.”
- 53 Marusek and Miller, *How Israel Attempts to Mislead*.
- 54 Ibid., 3.
- 55 NGO Monitor, “Palestinian Return Centre (PRC),” March 19, 2025, https://ngo-monitor.org/ngos/palestinian_return_centre_prc_/.
- 56 Cronin et al., *Israel Lobby*, 19.
- 57 Nasim Ahmed, *Understanding the Nakba: An Insight into the Plight of the Palestinians* (Palestinian Return Centre, 2012), 18.
- 58 NGO Monitor, “Palestinian Return Centre.”
- 59 See Marusek and Miller, *How Israel Attempts to Mislead*.
- 60 Cronin et al., *Israel Lobby*.
- 61 Anthony Julius, “Willed Ignorance: Reflections on Academic Free Speech, Occasioned by the David Miller Case,” *Current Legal Problems* 75 (2022): 37, <https://doi.org/10.1093/clp/cuac001>.
- 62 Cronin et al., *Israel Lobby*, 58.
- 63 Ibid.
- 64 Ibid., 59.
- 65 Ibid., 60.
- 66 Ibid., 63.
- 67 Ibid., 64.
- 68 Ibid., 66.
- 69 Ibid., 69.
- 70 Ibid., 74.
- 71 Ibid., 71.
- 72 Here is the URL for the Bath research portal’s list of the grant output: <https://researchportal.bath.ac.uk/en/projects/understanding-and-explaining-terrorism-expertise-in-practice/publications/>.
- 73 Labour against Witchhunt, “Campaign for Free Speech! with Norman Finkelstein, Tariq Ali, Jackie Walker and Others,” YouTube, July 29, 2020, <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=MSjLMHNkEWg&t=2s>. The event was organized in response to the campaign to deal with antisemitism in the Labour Party. He would amplify that sentiment in a June 22, 2022, tweet: “The Zionist regime depends for its lifeblood on the transnational Zionist movement. To dismantle the regime, every single Zionist organisation, the world over, needs to be ended. Every. Single. One.” See David Miller

(@Tracking_Power), Twitter (now X), https://x.com/tracking_power/status/1539861575053594624.

- ⁷⁴ See Cary Nelson, *College Zionists Confront the Abyss* (Academic Studies Press, 2026) for a detailed analysis of Sheehi's work.
- ⁷⁵ David Miller, "We Must Resist Israel's War on British Universities," *Electronic Intifada*, February 20, 2021, <https://electronicintifada.net/content/we-must-resist-israels-war-british-universities/32391>.
- ⁷⁶ Ibid.
- ⁷⁷ David Miller, "Zionist Infiltrators on Streets of London Seek to Sabotage Pro-Palestine Demos," Press TV, April 13, 2024, <https://www.presstv.ir/Detail/2024/04/13/723590/zionist-infiltrators-streets-london-sabotage-palestine-demos>.
- ⁷⁸ Miller made these remarks at a February 13, 2021, online conference entitled "Building the Campaign for Free Speech" hosted by Labour Against the Witchhunt.
- ⁷⁹ Bolton, "Anti-Zionism," 225.
- ⁸⁰ Dave Rich, "Anti-Zionism After the Pogrom," *Everyday Hate*, Substack, October 16, 2023, <https://everydayhate.substack.com/p/anti-zionism-after-the-pogrom>.
- ⁸¹ In *Grainger plc v Nicholson*, a 2010 UK employment discrimination law case, the ruling established five requirements to determine what will qualify as a protected belief. The fifth requirement is as follows: "It must be worthy of respect in a democratic society, be not incompatible with human dignity and not conflict with the fundamental rights of others." The Employment Tribunal quotes the requirement in section 232.
- ⁸² Josh Salisbury, "Action Urged over Bristol Academic Who Called to 'End Zionism as an Ideology,'" *Jewish News*, February 16, 2021, <https://www.jewishnews.co.uk/action-urged-over-bristol-academic-who-called-for-end-zionism-as-an-ideology/>.
- ⁸³ "Academic Calls Bristol JSoc 'Israel's Pawn,'" *Jewish Chronicle*, February 18, 2021, <https://www.thejc.com/news/academic-calls-bristol-jsoc-israels-pawn-lopahkbe>.
- ⁸⁴ See the Support David Miller website for a collection of Miller's full responses to press inquiries: <https://supportmiller.org/press-comments>.
- ⁸⁵ David Hirsh, "The David Miller Ruling Risks Protecting Antisemites," *Jewish Chronicle*, February 7, 2024, <https://www.thejc.com/opinion/the-david-miller-ruling-risks-protecting-antisemites-against-jews-rce5l93z>.
- ⁸⁶ Rich, "Anti-Zionism."
- ⁸⁷ For the full email to Bloch, see section 97 of the tribunal report on Miller's case.
- ⁸⁸ Lee Harpin, "Academic Calls Bristol JSoc 'Israel's Pawn,'" *The Tab*, February 18, 2021.

- 89 Miller, “We Must Resist.”
- 90 David Feldman, “The David Miller Case: A Textbook Example of Anti-Zionism Becoming Vicious Antisemitism,” *Haaretz*, March 4, 2012, <https://www.haaretz.com/israel-news/2021-03-04/ty-article-opinion/david-miller-textbook-case-of-anti-zionism-becoming-vicious-antisemitism/0000017f-db6a-db5a-a57f-db6a4e720000>.
- 91 A considerable number of Miller’s social media posts (using the handle @Tracking_Power), can be viewed on the platform X: https://x.com/Tracking_Power?lang=en.
- 92 Regarding the private prosecution, see “Professor Prosecuted over Tweets Calling for Jews to Be ‘De-Zionised,’” *The Telegraph*, June 4, 2025, <https://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/2025/06/04/professor-prosecuted-over-tweets-jews-de-zionised/>.
- 93 ¶ 116.
- 94 ¶ 328.
- 95 For documentation and analysis of the enthusiasm over the Hamas assault among academics, see Nelson, *College Zionists Confront the Abyss*.
- 96 Bolton, “Anti-Zionism,” 215.
- 97 See Sabrina Miller, “I’m a Jewish UoB Student and I’m Sick of Worrying About Professor David Miller,” *The Tab*, October 22, 2020, <https://archive.thetab.com/uk/bristol/2020/10/22/im-a-jewish-uob-student-and-im-sick-of-worrying-about-professor-david-miller-41136>.
- 98 Miller’s statement is reported in Elliott Cohen and Keith Feldman, *Anti-semitic Discourse in Britain 2021* (Community Security Trust, 2022), 16, <https://cst.org.uk/data/file/5/a/Discourse%20Report%202021.1669911533.pdf>.
- 99 For a review of this and related statements, see Union of Jewish Students, “Latest Updates: Bristol—Hate Off Campus,” updated October 4, 2021, https://www.ujs.org.uk/bristol_hate_off_campus.
- 100 That is Greer’s way of referring to Bristol JSoc.
- 101 Steven Greer, *Falsely Accused of Islamophobia: My Struggle Against Academic Cancellation* (Academica, 2023); Steven Greer, *Islamophobia and Free Speech* (Academica, 2026).
- 102 See Jenni Frazer, “David Miller’s Employment Tribunal Win Challenged,” *Jewish News*, November 12, 2025, <https://www.jewishnews.co.uk/david-millers-employment-tribunal-win-challenged/>; Sophia Dourou, “University Says Professor’s Zionism Views Are Not Protected,” *Law360*, November 12, 2025, <https://www.law360.com/articles/2409959>.
- 103 David Miller, “The Rise and Fall of Zionism in Scotland, Part 1,” *Al Mayadeen*, February 23, 2025, <https://english.almayadeen.net/articles/analysis/the-rise-and-fall-of-zionism-in-scotland--part-1>; David Miller, “The Caledonian Cousinhood: How the Zionist Movement Embedded

Itself in Scottish Life,” Mint Press News, June 18, 2025, <https://www.mintpressnews.com/cousinhood-zionism-scotland/290025/>; David Miller, “Scottish Zionism’s Inner Circle: The Caledonian Cousinhood That Bankrolls Occupation and Genocide,” Mint Press News, July 21, 2025, <https://www.mintpressnews.com/caledonian-cousinhood-scotland-zionist-families-israel/290252/>; David Miller, “Neighbours: Inside the Tight-Knit Caledonian Counsinhood of Scottish Zionism,” *Tracking Power* (blog), Substack, October 15, 2025, <https://trackingpower.substack.com/p/neighbours-inside-the-tight-knit>. Note, Al Mayadeen is a Hezbollah-affiliated Lebanese media venue. For a convenient objective online introduction, see Kenneth E. Collins et al., *Scotland’s Jews: A Guide to the History and Community of the Jews in Scotland*, 2nd ed. (Scottish Council of Jewish Communities, 2008). Like many older histories, this does not address either the anti-Zionist debates within the Scottish church or the surge of antisemitism in the wake of October 7, 2023.

¹⁰⁴ Chaim Bermant, *The Cousinhood* (Cambridge University Press, 1971).

¹⁰⁵ *Ibid.*, 39.

¹⁰⁶ Miller, “Scottish Zionism’s Inner Circle.”

¹⁰⁷ *Ibid.*

¹⁰⁸ Bernard Wasserstein, “Jews in Scotland, 1817–2017: Some Comparative Perspectives,” in *Two Hundred Years of Scottish Jewry*, ed. Kenneth Collins et al. (Scottish Jewish Archives Centre, 2018), 330.

¹⁰⁹ *Ibid.*

¹¹⁰ Thomas Devine, “Foreword,” in *Two Hundred Years of Scottish Jewry*, ed. Kenneth Collins et al. (Scottish Jewish Archives Centre, 2018), vii.

¹¹¹ Miller, “Caledonian Cousinhood.”

¹¹² Derek J. Penslar, *Zionism and Technocracy: The Engineering of Jewish Settlement in Palestine, 1870–1918* (Indiana University Press, 1991), 20. Penslar’s analysis leads to the conclusion that the *Chovevei Zion* were by no means united on the question of the best form that Jewish settlement was to take. Some thought settlements should be exclusively agricultural. Others favored industry and manufacturing. The Center for Israel Education adds, “All of the [Chovevei] Zion societies operate independently, with virtually no centralization of their efforts to apply the various ideas of how a Jewish territory or state would be ideologically or physically configured” (“First Gathering of Hovevei Zion Takes Place,” Center for Israel Education, accessed July 6, 2026, <https://israeled.org/first-gathering-of-the-hovevei-zion/>).

¹¹³ These statistics are readily available in Kenneth Collins, *The Jewish Experience in Scotland: From Immigration to Integration* (Scottish Jewish Archives Centre, 2016). For much more detailed data, also see Collins et al., *Two Hundred Years*.

- ¹¹⁴ For a detailed, objective history of the first decades of Glasgow Zionism, see Kenneth E. Collins's chapter "Glasgow Zionism 1898–1914" (pp. 117–33) in his *Second City Jewry: The Jews of Glasgow in the Age of Expansion, 1790–1919* (Scottish Jewish Archives, 1990); and Collins et al., *Two Hundred Years*. The first decade following the founding of *Chovevei Zion* saw lively Zionist and anti-Zionist speakers debate, but the 1903 pogrom in Kishinev convinced Jews of the need for a territorial solution to anti-semitism. Rival Zionist groups still competed for attention for a time thereafter. Glasgow Bnei Zion became the leading early-twentieth-century Zionist organization. A local branch of the Zionist socialist movement *Poalei Zion* was established in 1907. As one would expect, the Balfour Declaration galvanized the local community in 1917, as did the establishment of Israel in 1948 and the Six Day War a generation later. A few Glasgow Jews settled in Palestine, while others raised funds for planting trees on the Dr. Herzl Forest.
- ¹¹⁵ See Harvey L. Kaplan, *The Jewish Community in 1901* (Scottish Jewish Archives Committee, 2006), and Eric Eunson, *The Gorbals: An Illustrated History* (Richard Stenlake, 1996). As Eunson writes, "By 1903, six thousand Jewish refugees had arrived in Glasgow, most of whom could not speak English and were virtually penniless. They settled in the poorest parts of the city, and particularly Gorbals, which became home to around two thirds of Glasgow's Jewish population" (41).
- ¹¹⁶ Cindarella Petz, "Between Tartan and Tallit? On Zionism in Scotland," in *Two Hundred Years of Scottish Jewry*, ed. Kenneth Collins et al. (Scottish Jewish Archives Centre, 2018), 238–62.
- ¹¹⁷ Kenneth E. Collins et al., *Jewish Glasgow: An Illustrated History* (Scottish Jewish Archives Centre, 2013), 127.
- ¹¹⁸ See Kenneth Collins, *Go and Learn: The International Story of Jews and Medicine in Scotland* (Aberdeen University Press, 1988). Also see Kenneth Collins, *Be Well! Jewish Immigrant Health and Welfare in Glasgow, 1860–1914* (Tuckwell, 2001).
- ¹¹⁹ Wasserstein, "Jews in Scotland," 343.
- ¹²⁰ See Rayner Kölmel, "German-Jewish Refugees in Scotland," in *Aspects of Scottish Jewry*, ed. Kenneth Collins (Glasgow Jewish Representative Council, 1987), 57–84.
- ¹²¹ Miller, "Caledonian Cousinhood."
- ¹²² *Ibid.*
- ¹²³ *Ibid.*
- ¹²⁴ Miller, "Scottish Zionism's Inner Circle."
- ¹²⁵ *Ibid.*
- ¹²⁶ Collins, *Jewish Experience in Scotland*, 114.

- 127 Miller is sufficiently proud of his invention of these hostile street names that he repeats them in “Neighbours” and “Scottish Zionism’s Inner Circle.”
- 128 Miller, “Neighbours.”
- 129 Miller, “Caledonian Cousinhood.”
- 130 Miller, “Neighbours.”
- 131 See David Miller (@Tracking_Power), “Here is the link to the full article. It’s a long read but its a necessary tale to understand just how deeply Zionists are embedded in Western Societies even those which have a relatively small and seemingly insignificant Jewish population, and even in those places, like Scotland which are popularly perceived to be pro-Palestine,” X, June 18, 2025, https://x.com/Tracking_Power/status/1935437298457526517.
- 132 Miller, “Neighbours.”
- 133 Collins, *Jewish Experience in Scotland*, 116.
- 134 Miller, “Scottish Zionism’s Inner Circle.” Miller routinely brands Chabad as genocidal. Thus, in “Rise and Fall of Zionism,” he references “a genocidal ultra-Zionist cult called Chabad.”
- 135 See Daniel Estrin, “The King’s Torah: A Rabbinic Text or a Call to Terror?,” *Haaretz*, January 22, 2010, <https://www.haaretz.com/2010-01-22/ty-article/the-kings-torah-a-rabbinic-text-or-a-call-to-terror/0000017f-e58c-dea7-adff-f5ff8b080000?fromLogin=mailNotValidated>.
- 136 Miller, “Rise and Fall of Zionism.”
- 137 See, for example, Propaganda & Co., “Rise of the Jewish Empire with Prof. David Miller,” YouTube, November 11, 2025, <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=crLL-WcjO7s>; Propaganda & Co., “Pax Judaica Explained: Prof. David Miller,” YouTube, February 18, 2026, https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=fRvE_TN8aF0; and Sulaiman Ahmed, “Pax Judaica Explained: Prof. David Miller,” February 27, 2026, <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=08NT4mKshxA>.
- 138 Richard David Hames, “Pax Judaica and the AI Gulag,” *The Hames Report* (blog), Substack, December 25, 2025, <https://richarddavidhames.substack.com/p/pax-judaica-and-the-ai-gulag>.
- 139 David Miller (@Tracking_Power), “Pax Judaica: Explained,” Instagram, February 23, 2026, <https://www.instagram.com/p/DVHWRuRCM4U/?hl=en>.
- 140 David Miller (@Tracking_Power), “Greater Israel does not just cover the Levant and the Arabian Peninsula,” X, October 29, 2025, https://x.com/Tracking_Power/status/1983486669098488041.
- 141 Propaganda & Co., “Rise of the Jewish Empire.”
- 142 Hames, “Pax Judaica.”
- 143 Ibid.
- 144 Ahmed, “Pax Judaica Explained.”

- ¹⁴⁵ See Hussein Aboubakr Mansour, “Pax Judaica,” *The Abrahamic Metacritique* (blog), Substack, September 2, 2025, <https://critiqueanddigest.substack.com/p/pax-judaica>, for an analysis of the broad cultural roots of the concept: In the West, “to be a modern man or woman meant to inhabit a Pax Judaica—an epoch in which Judaism determined the spirit of the age, its institutions, its horizons of possibility, its styles of living, its artistic forms, and, most crucially, its pervasive alienation from authentic existence.”
- ¹⁴⁶ *The Telegraph*, “Professor Prosecuted over Tweets.” Also see “Written Evidence Submitted by the Board of Deputies of British Jews (COM0039),” <https://committees.parliament.uk/writtenevidence/142968/pdf/>.
- ¹⁴⁷ In 2025, Miller began finding Zionists where others didn’t. Thus, on November 5, 2025, he responded to the election of Zohran Mamdani, New York City’s resolutely anti-Zionist new mayor, by posting on X: “Zohran Mamdani is a Zionist and a servant of Zionists. If you want to keep getting mugged by shysters like him while they spit in your face and then stand on your shoulders, good luck to you. But materialists, socialists, anti-Zionists, anti-imperialists and Muslims have a duty not to be naive when confronted with transparently careerist ghouls who piggyback on our popular movements and use us as vote banks” (https://x.com/Tracking_Power/status/1986161056733946205). On July 3, 2025, he had gone after Jeremy Corbyn on X, posting, “Jeremy Corbyn is a liberal, a Zionist, and a coward who—despite being buoyed by the most popular mass political movement in recent British history—threw it all away to the Zionist movement rather than stand and fight, betraying all his comrades and ensuring certain defeat” (https://x.com/Tracking_Power/status/1940930389620531214). As Daniel Sugarman writes, “Miller has not been shy about attacking institutions and people on the anti-Israel side of the equation whom he has deemed as insufficiently dedicated to the cause” (Daniel Sugarman, “Inside the Fracturing Pro-Palestine Movement: Purges, Paranoia and a Far-Left Revolt,” *Jewish News*, November 21, 2025, <https://www.jewishnews.co.uk/inside-the-fracturing-pro-palestine-movement-purges-paranoia-and-a-far-left-revolt/>).
- ¹⁴⁸ David Miller, “Liberation, Not ‘Solidarity’: Towards a New Anti-Zionism—Part 1,” *Al Mayadeen*, August 23, 2024, <https://english.almayadeen.net/articles/opinion/liberation--not--solidarity---towards-a-new-anti-zionism---p>.
- ¹⁴⁹ David Miller, “Why Is the British Anti-Racist Movement Weak on Zionism?,” *Al Mayadeen*, August 30, 2024, <https://english.almayadeen.net/articles/opinion/why-is-the-british-anti-racist-movement-weak-on-zionism>.

- ¹⁵⁰ See David Miller (@Tracking_Power), “Entirely on brand for the centrist weasel @michaeljswalker to use last evening’s @novaramedia stream to mock anti-Zionists who have rightly been protesting Zohran Mamdani’s campaign events,” X, June 10, 2025, https://x.com/Tracking_Power/status/1932368673835995329.
- ¹⁵¹ David Miller, “Sabotaging the Anti-Zionist Movement,” *Tracking Power* (blog), Substack, June 19, 2024, <https://trackingpower.substack.com/p/sabotaging-the-anti-zionist-movement>.
- ¹⁵² The manifesto was posted on X: David Miller (@Tracking_Power), “I know it’s bleak but there is an inescapable fact that, through my work, I have long been trying to explain: the war in the Levant has no borders, because Zionism has no borders,” X, October 21, 2024, https://x.com/Tracking_Power/status/1848280899491692989.
- ¹⁵³ Miller, “Liberation, not ‘Solidarity.’” Also see David Miller, “How Do We De-Zionise British Schools?,” Islamic Human Rights Commission, December 3, 2024, <https://www.ihrc.org.uk/how-do-we-de-zionise-british-schools/>; Miller calls for closing schools run by Chabad, investigating funding for all Jewish schools, and finding out “their role in indoctrination into genocide.”
- ¹⁵⁴ Press TV’s host is Chris Williamson, former shadow minister for the UK Labour Party. He was suspended from the party in 2019. See Nathan Kohlenberg, “British Commentators Promote Pro-Russian Conspiracy Theories on Iranian State-Backed Media,” Alliance for Securing Democracy, October 2, 2022. The ADL reports that “half of the programme’s episodes promote antisemitic narratives—purporting anti-semitic myths that ‘Zionists’ control world events, ‘groom’ young people in schools and universities, and the well-worn conspiracy that ‘Zionists’ exercise a network of control in the world, specifically in the UK.... *Palestine Declassified* has leveraged social media audiences to disseminate deadly hate to up to 11.5 million followers, the majority on Twitter and Facebook” (Anti-Defamation League, “State Hate: How Iran’s Press TV Uses Social Media to Promote Anti-Jewish Hatred,” April 27, 2023, <https://www.adl.org/resources/report/state-hate-how-irans-press-tv-uses-social-media-promote-anti-jewish-hatred>).
- ¹⁵⁵ Izabella Tabarovsky (@IzaTabaro), “‘The Odessa area of Ukraine was a settler-colony. Jews came from other parts of the continent & settled there.’ Former Prof David Miller colonizes Russian/Ukrainian/Jewish history to make it fit his conspiracy theories about Jews,” X, August 2, 2022, <https://x.com/IzaTabaro/status/1554531367970656257>.
- ¹⁵⁶ David Miller (@Tracking_Power), “Mearsheimer’s analysis is decades out of date,” X, November 16, 2025, https://x.com/Tracking_Power/status/1990028368427778079.

- ¹⁵⁷ See David Miller (@Tracking_Power), “Thank you to our comrades at the Scottish Mail on Sunday for clarifying that Britain is, in fact, run from Tel Aviv,” X, June 29, 2025, https://x.com/Tracking_Power/status/1939194269064929608.
- ¹⁵⁸ Middle East Media Research Institute TV, “British Sociologist David Miller at Tehran Media Festival,” May 8, 2025, <https://www.memri.org/tv/british-sociologist-david-miller-tehran-zionist-leaders-serial-child-rapists>.
- ¹⁵⁹ See Miller’s post on the X platform: https://x.com/Tracking_Power?lang=en.
- ¹⁶⁰ See David Miller (@Tracking_Power), “Anyone who defends this terrorist attack in Lebanon has outed themselves as an intelligence asset for a hostile state and should be dealt with as such,” X, September 18, 2024, https://x.com/Tracking_Power/status/1836408894815359160.
- ¹⁶¹ See Miller’s post on the X platform: https://x.com/Tracking_Power?lang=en.
- ¹⁶² Miller, “Weak on Zionism?”
- ¹⁶³ David Miller (@Tracking_Power), “Yes, indeed. If anything, the major structural problem with the Islamic Republic is that it has been far too liberal/democratic for too long,” X, January 9, 2026, https://x.com/Tracking_Power/status/2009625975873569136.

Bibliography

- Ahmad, Idrees, and David Miller. “The Palestine Anti-Solidarity Movement: *Spiked’s* Coverage of Israel and Palestine.” *SpinWatch*, July 14, 2011. <https://www.spinwatch.org.uk/-articles-by-category-mainmenu-8/73-middle-east/5439-the-palestine-anti-solidarity-movement-spiked-s-coverage-of-israel-and-palestine/>.
- Ahmed, Nasim. *Understanding the Nakba: An Insight into the Plight of the Palestinians*. Palestinian Return Centre, 2012.
- Ahmed, Sulaiman. “Pax Judaica Explained: Prof. David Miller.” YouTube, February 26, 2026. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=08NT4mKshxA>.
- Aked, Hilary, David Miller, Tom Mills, and Narzanin Massoumi. “The Five Pillars of Islamophobia.” openDemocracy, June 8, 2015. <https://www.opendemocracy.net/en/five-pillars-of-islamophobia/>.
- Anti-Defamation League. “State Hate: How Iran’s Press TV Uses Social Media to Promote Anti-Jewish Hatred.” April 27, 2023. <https://www.adl.org/resources/report/state-hate-how-irans-press-tv-uses-social-media-promote-anti-jewish-hatred>.

- Bermant, Chaim. *The Cousinhood*. Cambridge University Press, 1971.
- Bolton, Michael. "Anti-Zionism as 'Protected Belief': The Case of David Miller." *Industrial Law Review* 55, no. 1 (2026): 213–46.
<https://doi.org/10.1093/indlaw/dwaf048>.
- Bond, Anna. "Professor's 'Anti-Zionist' Beliefs Were Protected." Lewis Silkin, February 12, 2024. <https://www.lewissilkin.com/insights/2024/02/13/professors-antizionist-beliefs-were-protected>.
- Campaign Against Antisemitism. "Disgraced Bristol University Professor David Miller Accused of Using £400,000 Research Grant to Further Research on 'British Zionist Scene.'" July 2, 2021. <https://antisemitism.org/disgraced-bristol-university-professor-david-miller-accused-of-using-400000-research-grant-to-further-research-on-british-zionist-scene/>.
- Center for Israel Education. "First Gathering of Hovevei Zion Takes Place." Accessed July 6, 2026. <https://israeled.org/first-gathering-of-the-hovevei-zion/>.
- Chitty, Andrew. "Materials on the David Miller Case." Medium, April 21, 2021. <https://andrewchitty.medium.com/materials-on-the-david-miller-case-ff0adf8ddf34>.
- Clarke-Ezzidio, Harry. "Revealed: Bristol Academic Under Investigation for Alleged Anti-Semitism Received £400k of Public Funds." *New Statesman*, July 1, 2021. <https://www.newstatesman.com/politics/2021/07/revealed-bristol-academic-under-investigation-for-alleged-anti-semitism-received-400k-of-public-funds>.
- Cohen, Elliott, and Keith Feldman. *Antisemitic Discourse in Britain 2021*. Community Security Trust, 2022. <https://cst.org.uk/data/file/5/a/Discourse%20Report%202021.1669911533.pdf>.
- Collins, Kenneth. *Be Well! Jewish Immigrant Health and Welfare in Glasgow, 1860–1914*. Tuckwell, 2001.
- Collins, Kenneth. *Go and Learn: The International Story of Jews and Medicine in Scotland*. Aberdeen University Press, 1988.
- Collins, Kenneth. *The Jewish Experience in Scotland: From Immigration to Integration*. Scottish Jewish Archives Centre, 2016.
- Collins, Kenneth E. "Glasgow Zionism, 1898–1914." In *Second City Jewry: The Jews of Glasgow in the Age of Expansion, 1790–1919*. Scottish Jewish Archives, 1990.
- Collins, Kenneth, Aubrey Newman, and Bernard Wasserstein, eds. *Two Hundred Years of Scottish Jewry*. Scottish Jewish Archives Centre, 2018.
- Collins, Kenneth E., with Ephraim Borowski and Leah Granat. *Scotland's Jews: A Guide to the History and Community of the Jews in Scotland*. 2nd ed. Scottish Council of Jewish Communities, 2008.
- Collins, Kenneth E., Harvey L. Kaplan, and Stephen Kliner. *Jewish Glasgow: An Illustrated History*. Scottish Jewish Archives Centre, 2013.

- Cronin, David, Sarah Marusek, and David Miller. *The Israel Lobby and the European Union*. Public Interest Investigations, 2016. https://purehost.bath.ac.uk/ws/portalfiles/portal/167838098/PII_IsraelLobbyEUreport2016_Cronin_Marusek_Miller.pdf.
- Devine, Thomas. "Foreword." In *Two Hundred Years of Scottish Jewry*, edited by Kenneth Collins, Aubrey Newman, and Bernard Wasserstein. Scottish Jewish Archives Centre, 2018.
- Dourou, Sophia. "University Says Professor's Zionism Views Are Not Protected." *Law360*, November 12, 2025. <https://www.law360.com/articles/2409959>.
- Estrin, Daniel. "The King's Torah: A Rabbinic Text or a Call to Terror?" *Haaretz*, January 22, 2010. <https://www.haaretz.com/2010-01-22/ty-article/the-kings-torah-a-rabbinic-text-or-a-call-to-terror/0000017f-e58c-dea7-adff-f5ff8b080000?fromLogin=mailNotValidated>.
- Eunson, Eric. *The Gorbals: An Illustrated History*. Richard Stenlake, 1996.
- Feldman, David. "The David Miller Case: A Textbook Example of Anti-Zionism Becoming Vicious Antisemitism." *Haaretz*, March 4, 2012. <https://www.haaretz.com/israel-news/2021-03-04/ty-article-opinion/david-miller-textbook-case-of-anti-zionism-becoming-vicious-antisemitism/0000017f-db6a-db5a-a57f-db6a4e720000>.
- Frazer, Jenni. "David Miller's Employment Tribunal Win Challenged." *Jewish News*, November 12, 2025, <https://www.jewishnews.co.uk/david-millers-employment-tribunal-win-challenged/>.
- Frazer, Jenni. "Professor Miller Accused of Using £400,000 Public Grant for Work Attacking 'Israel Lobby Groups.'" *Jewish Chronicle*, July 2, 2021. <https://www.thejc.com/news/professor-miller-accused-of-using-400-000-public-grant-for-work-attacking-israel-lobby-groups-h7clg8n0>.
- Global Influence Operations Report. "Pro-Hezbollah Academic Alleges Foreign Influence Led to Prosecution over Antisemitism." July 7, 2025. <https://www.global-influence-ops.com/pro-hezbollah-academic-david-miller-blames-foreign-influence/>.
- Greer, Steven. *Falsely Accused of Islamophobia: My Struggle Against Academic Cancellation*. Academica, 2023.
- Greer, Steven. *Islamophobia and Free Speech*. Academica, 2026.
- Griffin, Tom, Hilary Aked, David Miller, and Sarah Marusek. *The Henry Jackson Society and the Degeneration of British Neoconservatism: Liberal Interventionism, Islamophobia and the "War on Terror."* Public Interest Investigators, 2015. <https://researchportal.bath.ac.uk/en/publications/the-henry-jackson-society-and-the-degeneration-of-british-neocons/>.
- Hames, Richard David. "Pax Judaica and the AI Gulag." *The Hames Report* (blog), Substack, December 25, 2025. <https://richarddhames.substack.com/p/pax-judaica-and-the-ai-gulag>.

- Harpin, Lee. "Academic Calls Bristol JSoc 'Israel's Pawn.'" *The Tab*, February 18, 2021.
- Harpin, Lee. "Bristol's Professor Miller Received £400k in Taxpayer's Cash for Research Grants." *Jewish News*, July 2, 2021. <https://www.jewish-news.co.uk/bristols-professor-miller-received-400k-in-taxpayers-cash-for-research-grants/>.
- Hirsh, David. "The David Miller Ruling Risks Protecting Antisemites." *Jewish Chronicle*, February 7, 2024. <https://www.thejc.com/opinion/the-david-miller-ruling-risks-protecting-antisemites-against-jews-rce5l93z>.
- Julius, Anthony. "Willed Ignorance: Reflections on Academic Free Speech, Occasioned by the David Miller Case." *Current Legal Problems* 75 (2022): 1–44. <https://doi.org/10.1093/clp/cuac001>.
- Kahn-Harris, Keith. "Into the Flatlands with Professor David Miller." *JewThink*, February 22, 2021. <https://www.jewthink.org/2021/02/22/into-the-flatlands-with-professor-david-miller/>.
- Kaplan, Harvey L. *The Jewish Community in 190*. Scottish Jewish Archives Committee, 2006.
- Kohlenberg, Nathan. "British Commentators Promote Pro-Russian Conspiracy Theories on Iranian State-Backed Media." *Alliance for Securing Democracy*, October 2, 2022.
- Kölmel, Rayner. "German-Jewish Refugees in Scotland." In *Aspects of Scottish Jewry*, edited by Kenneth Collins. Glasgow Jewish Representative Council, 1987.
- Mansour, Hussein Aboubakr. "Pax Judaica." *The Abrahamic Metacritique* (blog), Substack, September 2, 2025. <https://critiqueanddigest.substack.com/p/pax-judaica>.
- Massoumi, Narzanin, Tom Mills, and David Miller. "Secrecy, Coercion and Deception in Research on 'Terrorism' and 'Extremism.'" *Contemporary Social Science* 15, no. 2 (2020): 134–52. <https://doi.org/10.1080/21582041.2019.1616107>.
- Marusek, Sarah, and David Miller. *How Israel Attempts to Mislead the United Nations: Deconstructing Israel's Campaign Against the Palestinian Return Centre*. Public Interest Investigators, 2015. https://pure-host.bath.ac.uk/ws/portalfiles/portal/167838176/Marusek_and_Miller_How_Israel_attempts_to_mislead_the_United_Nations.pdf.
- Middle East Media Research Institute TV. "British Sociologist David Miller at Tehran Media Festival," May 8, 2025. <https://www.memri.org/tv/british-sociologist-david-miller-tehran-zionist-leaders-serial-child-rapists>.
- Miller, David. "The Caledonian Cousinhood: How the Zionist Movement Embedded Itself in Scottish Life," *Mint Press News*, June 18, 2025. <https://www.mintpressnews.com/cousinhood-zionism-scotland/290025/>.

- Miller, David. *Don't Mention the War: Northern Ireland, Propaganda and the Media*. Pluto, 1994.
- Miller, David. "How Do We De-Zionise British Schools?" Islamic Human Rights Commission, December 3, 2024. <https://www.ihrc.org.uk/how-do-we-de-zionise-british-schools/>.
- Miller, David. "Liberation, Not 'Solidarity': Towards a New Anti-Zionism—Part 1." Al Mayadeen, August 23, 2024. <https://english.almayadeen.net/articles/opinion/liberation-not-solidarity---towards-a-new-anti-zionism---p>.
- Miller, David. "Neighbours: Inside the Tight-Knit Caledonian Cousinhood of Scottish Zionism." *Tracking Power* (blog), Substack, October 15, 2025. <https://trackingpower.substack.com/p/neighbours-inside-the-tight-knit>.
- Miller, David. *Rethinking Northern Ireland: Culture, Ideology and Colonialism*. Routledge, 1998.
- Miller, David. "The Rise and Fall of Zionism in Scotland, Part 1." Al Mayadeen, February 23, 2025. <https://english.almayadeen.net/articles/analysis/the-rise-and-fall-of-zionism-in-scotland--part-1>.
- Miller, David. "Sabotaging the Anti-Zionist Movement." *Tracking Power* (blog), Substack, June 19, 2024. <https://trackingpower.substack.com/p/sabotaging-the-anti-zionist-movement>.
- Miller, David. "Scottish Zionism's Inner Circle: The Caledonian Cousinhood That Bankrolls Occupation and Genocide." Mint Press News, July 21, 2025. <https://www.mintpressnews.com/caledonian-cousinhood-scotland-zionist-families-israel/290252/>.
- Miller, David. "Understanding and Explaining Terrorism: Expertise in Practice." University of Bath, accessed July 6, 2026. <https://researchportal.bath.ac.uk/en/projects/understanding-and-explaining-terrorism-expertise-in-practice/>.
- Miller, David. "We Must Resist Israel's War on British Universities," *Electronic Intifada*, February 20, 2021. <https://electronicintifada.net/content/we-must-resist-israels-war-british-universities/32391>.
- Miller, David. "Why Is the British Anti-Racist Movement Weak on Zionism?" Al Mayadeen, August 30, 2024. <https://english.almayadeen.net/articles/opinion/why-is-the-british-anti-racist-movement-weak-on-zionism>.
- Miller, David. "Zionist Infiltrators on Streets of London Seek to Sabotage Pro-Palestine Demos." Press TV, April 13, 2024. <https://www.presstv.ir/Detail/2024/04/13/723590/zionist-infiltrators-streets-london-sabotage-palestine-demos>.
- Miller, David, Jenny Kitzinger, Kevin Williams, and Peter Beharrell. *The Circuit of Mass Communication: Media Strategies, Representation and Audience Reception in the AIDS Crisis*. Sage Academic, 1998.
- Miller, Sabrina. "I'm a Jewish UoB Student and I'm Sick of Worrying About Professor David Miller." *The Tab*, October 22, 2020. <https://archive.the->

- [tab.com/uk/bristol/2020/10/22/im-a-jewish-uob-student-and-im-sick-of-worrying-about-professor-david-miller-41136](https://www.bristol.ac.uk/news/2020/10/22/im-a-jewish-uob-student-and-im-sick-of-worrying-about-professor-david-miller-41136).
- Mills, Tom, Tom Griffin, and David Miller. *The Cold War on British Muslims: An Examination of Policy Exchange and the Centre for Social Cohesion*. Public Interest Investigations, 2011. https://purehost.bath.ac.uk/ws/portalfiles/portal/232268/SpinwatchReport_ColdWar.pdf.
- Mills, Tom, Narzanin Massoumi, and David Miller. "The Ethics of Researching 'Terrorism' and Political Violence: A Sociological Approach." *Contemporary Social Science* 15, no. 2 (2020), 119–133. <https://doi.org/10.1080/21582041.2019.1660399>.
- Mills, Tom, David Miller, Tom Griffin, and Hilary Aked. *The Britain Israel Communications and Research Centre: Giving Peace a Chance?* Public Interest Investigations, 2013. https://purehost.bath.ac.uk/ws/portalfiles/portal/167837994/Mills_et_al_Spinwatch_report_The_Britain_Israel_Communications_and_Research_Centre_Giving_peace_a_chance_2013web.pdf?__cf_chl_f_tk=90mRzT.xJxyG7ISumL9RcHo3DP7QEat9s33tTYYrQ6U-1783009524-1.0.1.1-8yVur2cPXsUGERaqoD6WXA1dqblbNM36jBRje1xny84.
- Nelson, Cary. *College Zionists Confront the Abyss: The Aftermath of October 7 in Higher Education and Its Consequences for Progressive Politics*. Academic Studies Press, 2026.
- NGO Monitor. "Palestinian Return Centre (PRC)." March 19, 2025. https://ngo-monitor.org/ngos/palestinian_return_centre_prc/.
- Penslar, Derek J. *Zionism and Technocracy: The Engineering of Jewish Settlement in Palestine, 1870–1918*. Indiana University Press, 1991.
- Petz, Cindarella. "Between Tartan and Tallit? On Zionism in Scotland." In *Two Hundred Years of Scottish Jewry*, edited by Kenneth Collins, Aubrey Newman, and Bernard Wasserstein. Scottish Jewish Archives Centre, 2018.
- Propaganda & Co. "Pax Judaica Explained: Prof. David Miller." YouTube, February 18, 2026. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=fRvE_TN8aF0.
- Propaganda & Co. "Rise of the Jewish Empire with Prof. David Miller." YouTube, November 11, 2025. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=crLL-WcjO7s>.
- Response to Recent Comments by Prof. David Miller* (blog). "Recent Statements by Prof. David Miller Concerning Bristol University Jewish Society and the Union of Jewish Students." Accessed July 6, 2026. <https://recent-statementsbyprofdavidmillerconcerningbristoluniversity.wordpress.com>.
- Rich, Dave. "Anti-Zionism After the Pogrom," *Everyday Hate*, Substack, October 16, 2023, <https://everydayhate.substack.com/p/anti-zionism-after-the-pogrom>.

- Rich, Dave. "The Professor Miller Scandal Is Entirely of Bristol University's Own Making." *Dave Rich: The Blogs, Times of Israel*, February 19, 2021. <https://blogs.timesofisrael.com/the-professor-miller-scandal-is-entirely-of-bristol-universitys-own-making/>.
- Rich, Dave. "Walking a Mile in Asghar Bukhari's Shoe: Conspiracy Theories, Antisemitism, and Extremism." In *Unity and Diversity in Contemporary Antisemitism: The Bristol-Sheffield Colloquium on Contemporary Antisemitism*, edited by Jonathan G. Campbell and Leslie D. Klaff. Academic Studies Press, 2019.
- Rich, Dave. "Why 'Academic Freedom' Is No Defence of the Bristol University Professor David Miller." *New Statesman*, updated October 5, 2023. <https://www.newstatesman.com/politics/2021/03/why-academic-freedom-no-defence-bristol-university-professor-david-miller>.
- Salisbury, Josh. "Action Urged over Bristol Academic Who Called to 'End Zionism as an Ideology.'" *Jewish News*, February 16, 2021. <https://www.jewish-news.co.uk/action-urged-over-bristol-academic-who-called-for-end-zionism-as-an-ideology/>.
- Sugarman, Daniel. "Inside the Fracturing Pro-Palestine Movement: Purges, Paranoia and a Far-Left Revolt." *Jewish News*, November 21, 2025. <https://www.jewishnews.co.uk/inside-the-fracturing-pro-palestine-movement-purges-paranoia-and-a-far-left-revolt/>.
- Telegraph*. "Professor Prosecuted over Tweets Calling for Jews to Be 'De-Zionised.'" June 4, 2025. <https://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/2025/06/04/professor-prosecuted-over-tweets-jews-de-zionised/>.
- UK Lawyers for Israel. "UKLFI Urges Research Body to Cease Funding Professor Miller." March 24, 2021. <https://www.uklfi.com/uklfi-urges-research-body-to-cease-funding-professor-miller>.
- Union of Jewish Students. "Latest Updates: Bristol—Hate Off Campus." Updated October 4, 2021. https://www.ujs.org.uk/bristol_hate_off_campus.
- Wasserstein, Bernard. "Jews in Scotland, 1817–2017: Some Comparative Perspectives." In *Two Hundred Years of Scottish Jewry*, edited by Kenneth Collins, Aubrey Newman, and Bernard Wasserstein. Scottish Jewish Archives Centre, 2018.
- Winstanley, Asa. "David Miller Was Cleared of Anti-Semitism, Leaked Document Shows." *Asa Winstanley's Blog*, Electronic Intifada, October 22, 2021. <https://electronicintifada.net/blogs/asa-winstanley/david-miller-was-cleared-anti-semitism-leaked-document-shows>.

Founded in 2004, the Institute for the Study of Global Antisemitism and Policy (ISGAP) is the first interdisciplinary research center dedicated to the study of antisemitism to be established in North America. Its mission is to explore antisemitism from a wide range of approaches and perspectives within an academic framework, including the study of such topics as the changing historical phases of antisemitism, how antisemitism relates to other forms of hatred, to what extent it is unique, how some societies are able to resist antisemitism, and how policies can be developed and implemented to combat it.

ISGAP's Occasional Paper Series covers topics that have profound implications for our understanding of contemporary antisemitism, its impact on Jews and non-Jews, and our efforts to combat this irrational yet enduring prejudice. With the publication of this series, as well as its other academic efforts, ISGAP continues to fight antisemitism on the battlefield of ideas.