



Antisemitism: At the Epicenter of Campus Intolerance

**Antisemitic Activity in 2016 at U.S. Colleges and Universities
With the Largest Jewish Undergraduate Populations**

April 2017

I. Introduction

This study investigated antisemitic activity in 2016 on more than 100 college and university campuses with the largest Jewish student populations.

AMCHA's 2015 study provided, for the first time, a quantitative account of the prevalence of antisemitic activity at schools most popular with Jewish students, as well as ample empirical evidence showing that the presence of anti-Zionist student groups, faculty boycotters and anti-Israel Boycott, Divestment, Sanctions (BDS) activity are each strong predictors of anti-Jewish hostility.¹

Focusing on the same schools and utilizing an identical research methodology as the 2015 study, the current study allows for a direct comparison of antisemitic activity in 2016 and 2015. While the 2016 study replicated the 2015 findings that the rise of anti-Zionism – particularly BDS campaigns and anti-Zionist student groups and faculty – is fueling the rise of anti-Semitism on campus, the comparison across years and other analyses of the data revealed illuminating and disturbing trends and insights about campus antisemitism and its contribution to a growing climate of intolerance at many schools.

Summary of Findings:

- Antisemitic activity on campuses most popular with Jewish students continued to rise, increasing by 40% from 2015 to 2016.
- While antisemitic incidents increased, the total number of schools affected by campus antisemitism did not, indicating that a select number of schools are experiencing surges in antisemitic activity. In fact, all of the schools with the largest surges in antisemitic activity were those that played host to anti-Israel divestment votes in 2016 but not in 2015.
- The two major ideological sources of acts that targeted Jewish students for harm were classic antisemitism, which was identified as the motive in 57% of the incidents, and anti-Zionism, which was identified as the motive in 43% of the incidents.
- While the number of anti-Zionism-motivated acts of anti-Jewish hostility stayed approximately the same from 2015 to 2016, the number of acts motivated by classic antisemitism rose sharply, with anti-Jewish genocidal expression more than doubling from 2015 to 2016. Many of these same incidents involving anti-Jewish genocidal expression also targeted students from other campus groups – eg. immigrants, students of color, LGBTQ students, students of differing political opinions or ideologies -- suggesting a troubling increase in universally intolerant, hateful behavior.

¹ <http://www.amchainitiative.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/03/Antisemitic-Activity-at-U.S.-Colleges-and-Universities-with-Jewish-Populations-2015-Full-Report.pdf>

II. Research Methods

Data Collection

The 113 schools investigated in the current study were those included in AMCHA's 2015 study, which were the 120 North American schools identified by Hillel International as the public and private colleges and universities with the largest populations of Jewish students, minus the seven schools in Canada.

Data were gathered by reviewing submitted incident reports, media accounts, social media postings and on-line recordings. In addition, the presence or absence of active anti-Zionist student groups and the number of faculty who had signed one or more petitions or statements endorsing an academic boycott of Israeli universities and scholars were noted for each school.

Identifying Antisemitic Activity

In determining what constitutes an antisemitic incident, we make a qualitative distinction between behaviors that are directed at Jewish members of the campus community and cause them some degree of measurable harm (e.g. assault, harassment, destruction of property, etc.), and behaviors, primarily speech or imagery, that are expressions of classic or contemporary antisemitic tropes, but which are not directed specifically at Jewish members of the campus community. The first kind of activity we have called Targeting of Jewish Students and Staff for Harm, and the second kind, Antisemitic Expression. In addition, we distinguish a third category, called BDS Activity, which involves the promotion or endorsement of efforts to boycott, divest from or sanction Israel but contains no other evidence of direct harm to Jewish members of the campus community or the inclusion of classic or contemporary antisemitic tropes.

While all three kinds of activity contribute to the overall prevalence of campus antisemitism, conduct that targets Jewish students or staff for harm has special significance and is used as a direct measure of anti-Jewish hostility at a given school, allowing for an analysis of the factors that have had the most deleterious effect on campus climate for Jewish students.

When examining the data, each incident was evaluated for one or more of the following categories and their associated subcategories:

- 1) **Targeting of Jewish Students and Staff for Harm** – Incidents involving violence or harmful behavior directed toward Jewish members of the campus community based on their Jewishness or perceived association with Israel were identified. Harms consisted of direct threats to the safety and well-being of Jewish students or violations of their civil rights, and included behaviors such as physical assault, harassment, destruction of property, discrimination and suppression of speech. (See Appendix A for the full list of Targeting subcategories and examples of incidents that occurred in 2016.)
- 2) **Antisemitic Expression** – Incidents were identified as having antisemitic expression if they contained language or imagery that used one or more of eight tropes included in the U.S. State

Department definition of antisemitism.² This definition, used extensively by the U.S. State Department to monitor antisemitic activity in countries around the world, identifies both classical and contemporary manifestations of antisemitism, and includes anti-Zionist expression³. (See Appendix B for the full list of Antisemitic Expression subcategories and examples of incidents that occurred in 2016.)

- 3) **BDS Activity** – Incidents involving the promotion or endorsement of an anti-Israel boycott, divestment or sanction (BDS) effort were identified as BDS activity. Virtually all of the BDS activity on college campuses today is a direct response to the 2005 Palestinian National Call for BDS,⁴ which was established by a coalition of Palestinian organizations for the express purpose of isolating the Jewish state through economic, academic and cultural boycotts, in order to eliminate it. As such, BDS activity is categorized as antisemitic for its eliminationist intent, which has been identified by the U.S. State Department and several other governmental agencies throughout the world as being an expression of antisemitism.

Each incident was counted once toward the total number of antisemitic incidents. Frequently, however, one antisemitic incident included multiple kinds of antisemitic activity. In those cases, the incident was catalogued under each of the appropriate categories. For example, a single incident of a protest of a Jewish student event that consisted of students holding signs calling for BDS, chanting slogans such as “Israel is a Nazi state,” and disrupting or shutting down the event, was counted as one incident in the tally of overall antisemitic incidents, and counted as one instance under each of these three categories of activity – BDS Activity, Antisemitic Expression, and Targeting of Jewish Students.

III. Findings

1. Antisemitic Activity Continued to Rise Overall, Surging on Some Campuses

In 2016, AMCHA Initiative documented a total of 660 discrete incidents containing one or more kinds of antisemitic activity, with **432** occurring at **72** U.S. colleges and universities most popular with Jewish students. This was a significant increase of **40%**⁵ over the total number of incidents documented at the same schools in 2015.⁶ Interestingly, however, there was a slight decrease (**-9%**) in the number of schools that played host to these incidents.

A similar pattern was found with each kind of antisemitic activity: the incidence of Targeting Jewish Students and Staff for Harm, Antisemitic Expression, and BDS Activity were somewhat higher in 2016 than 2015, though not significantly so. However, the number of schools playing host to them did not increase, or even decreased slightly.

² <http://www.state.gov/j/drl/rls/fs/2010/122352.htm>

³ In this report, the term “anti-Zionist” is understood to mean “opposed to the existence of Israel as a Jewish state.”

⁴ <https://bdsmovement.net/call>

⁵ A previous AMCHA Initiative study found a 45% increase when comparing the number of antisemitic incidents in the first half of 2016 to those in the first half 2015: <http://www.amchainitiative.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/07/Report-on-Antisemitic-Activity-During-the-First-Half-of-2016.pdf>. The discrepancy is accounted for by the slower growth of antisemitic activity in the second half of 2016 compared to the second half of 2015.

⁶ A T-Test for paired means showed that the incidence of overall antisemitic activity was significantly larger in 2016 than in 2015 ($t = 2.31$; $p < .05$).

A further analysis of the data showed that in 2016, fewer schools played host to a greater number of antisemitic incidents, and that all of the schools with the largest surges in antisemitic activity were those that played host to anti-Israel divestment votes in 2016 but not in 2015.

Table 1 provides a comparison of the incidence of antisemitic activity in 2015 and 2016, as well the percentage increase, and Table 2 provides the same comparisons for the numbers of schools affected.

Consistent with the 2015 findings, in 2016 the number of incidents containing each kind of antisemitic activity was not associated with whether the school was public or private,⁷ the school's undergraduate population,⁸ or the percentage of Jewish undergraduate students at the school.⁹

Table 1
Number of Incidents of Overall Antisemitic Activity and Each Kind of Activity Occurring in 2015 and 2016 and Percent Increase

	# Incidents 2015	# Incidents 2016	% Increase Incidents 2015 to 2016
Overall Antisemitic Activity	309	433	40%
Targeting Jewish Students	79	104	24%
Antisemitic Expression	219	286	31%
BDS Activity	168	195	16%

Table 2
Number of Schools that Played Host to Overall Antisemitic Activity and Each Kind of Activity Occurring 2015 and 2016 and Percent Increase

	# Schools 2015	# Schools 2016	% Increase Schools 2015 to 2016
Overall Antisemitic Activity	79	72	-9%
Targeting Jewish Students	46	47	2%
Antisemitic Expression	73	68	-7%
BDS Activity	61	46	-25%

⁷ Public or private schools: Overall Antisemitic Activity (Mann-Whitney U = 1542; n₁ = 54 and n₂ = 59; p = .77); Antisemitic Expression (Mann-Whitney U = 1557; n₁ = 54 and n₂ = 59; p = .84); BDS Activity (Mann-Whitney U = 1521.5; n₁ = 54 and n₂ = 59; p = .68); Targeting of Jewish Students (Mann-Whitney U = 1536; n₁ = 54 and n₂ = 59; p = .74).

⁸ Undergraduate population: Overall Antisemitic Activity (Pearson r = .10; n = 112; p = .29); Antisemitic Expression (Pearson r = .07; n = 112; p = .50); BDS Activity (Pearson r = .10; n = 112; p = .27); Targeting of Jewish Students (Pearson r = .04; n = 113; p = .64).

⁹ Percentage of Jewish undergraduate students: Overall Antisemitic Activity (Pearson r = .01; n = 112; p = .89); Antisemitic Expression (Pearson r = .05; n = 112; p = .60); BDS Activity (Pearson r = -.02; n = 112; p = .89); Targeting of Jewish Students (Pearson r = .004; n = 112; p = .97).

Table 3 shows the schools with the highest incidence of overall antisemitism and each kind of activity in 2016.

Table 3
Schools with the Largest Incidence of Overall Antisemitic Activity, Targeting of Jewish Students for Harm, Antisemitic Expression, and BDS Activity in 2016

Highest Overall Antisemitic Activity	Highest Incidence Targeting	Highest Incidence of Antisemitic Expression	Highest Incidence of BDS Activity
Columbia U. (35)	U. of Wisconsin (8)	Columbia U. (23)	Columbia U. (22)
Vassar College (25)	Vassar College (5)	Vassar College (13)	Vassar College (16)
U. of Chicago (18)	Northwestern U. (5)	U. of Wisconsin (12)	U. of Minnesota (15)
New York U. (16)	Brown U. (5)	New York U. (12)	U. of Chicago (14)
U. of Minnesota (15)	UC Berkeley (4)	UCLA (10)	Ohio State U. (11)
Northwestern U. (13)	U. of Southern Calif. (4)	U. of Washington (9)	Northwestern Univ. (7)
U. of Wisconsin (13)	U. of Illinois U-C (4)	U. of Mass. Amherst (8)	U. of Mass. Amherst (7)
Ohio State U. (13)	U. of Chicago (3)	San Francisco State U. (8)	New York U. (7)
U. of Mass. Amherst (12)	U. of Mass. Amherst (3)	Brown U. (7)	U. of Michigan (7)
U. of Washington (12)	Boston U. (3)	UC Berkeley (7)	U. of Washington (6)
U. of Michigan (11)	Claremont Colleges (3)	U. of Illinois U-C (7)	U. of Florida (6)
UCLA (11)	Harvard U. (3)	U. of Chicago (7)	U. of Georgia (5)
Tufts U. (10)	Brandeis U. (3)	Boston U. (7)	San Francisco State U. (4)
U. of Georgia (10)	UC Santa Cruz (3)	Northeastern U. (7)	Northeastern U. (4)
UC Berkeley (10)	UC Davis (3)	Oberlin College (7)	UCLA (4)

Table 4 shows the schools with the greatest increase in antisemitic activity from 2015 to 2016.

Table 4
Schools with the Largest Increase in Antisemitic Activity from 2015 to 2016¹⁰

Schools	# Incidents 2016	# Incidents 2015	Increase # 2015 to 2016
**Columbia University	35	6	29
**Vassar College	23	6	17
**New York University	16	2	14
*University of Chicago	18	5	13
**University of Wisconsin Madison	13	1	12
University of Minnesota	15	4	11
*Ohio State University	13	3	10

¹⁰ All of the schools in this table showed increases in overall antisemitic activity that exceeded two standard deviations from the mean for the 113 schools in the study. The schools marked with two asterisks (**) showed increases in antisemitic activity excluding BDS activity that exceeded two standard deviations from the mean, while the schools marked with one asterisk (*) showed increases that exceeded one standard deviation from the mean.

It is important to point out that each of the seven schools in Table 4 was one of the 11 schools whose student governments, graduate student associations or student bodies considered BDS resolutions in 2016 but not in 2015. This undoubtedly accounts for the surge in overall antisemitic activity, particularly since that figure included specifically BDS-related activity. However, the four schools marked with two asterisks (**) – Columbia University, Vassar College, New York University and University of Wisconsin – also showed the largest increases in antisemitic activity (i.e. increases of more than two standard deviations from the mean of all schools in the study) when activity that was specifically BDS-related activity was excluded from the tally of incidents, while the schools marked with one asterisk (*) – University of Chicago and Ohio State University – showed relatively large increases (i.e. increases of more than one standard deviation from the mean) when BDS-related activity was excluded. These results provide strong evidence that anti-Israel divestment campaigns are directly linked to incidents that target Jewish students for harm and antisemitic speech and imagery.

- 2. Classic antisemitism and anti-Zionism continued to be the ostensible ideological sources of acts that targeted Jewish students and staff for harm, with the number of acts motivated by classic antisemitism sharply increasing from 2015 to 2016, and the number of anti-Zionism-motivated acts remaining constant.**
 - a. Anti-Jewish hostility motivated by classic antisemitism, particularly genocidal antisemitism, rose sharply in 2016.**

An analysis of the possible motivation of the incidents involving acts of anti-Jewish hostility that appeared to be primarily motivated by historical antisemitism rose by **76%**, from **34** incidents in 2015 to **60** in 2016, with the vast majority including Holocaust-related symbols such as swastikas and other expressions of support for the genocide of the Jewish people, such as:

- “Kill all Kikes” was written in a men’s restroom at University of Buffalo.¹¹
- “GAS JEWS DIE” was written in a note tucked behind the mezuzah on the doorframe of a Jewish professor at Oberlin College.¹²
- “Gas the Kikes” was painted on a bridge at Duke University.¹³
- “Death to Israel and to all Jews” was a comment posted on the Clark University Hillel’s Facebook page.¹⁴
- “Holocaust 2.0” was scrawled on the exterior of a dormitory at Brown University with many Jewish residents.¹⁵

As can be seen in Table 5, such anti-Jewish genocidal expression more than doubled from 2015 to 2016, and the number of schools affected nearly doubled.

¹¹ <http://www.timesofisrael.com/suny-buffalo-campus-graffiti-threatens-to-kill-all-jews/>

¹² <http://talkingpointsmemo.com/livewire/oberlin-college-professor-anti-semitic-hate-crime>

¹³ <http://www.dukechronicle.com/article/2016/10/racial-anti-semitic-and-homophobic-slurs-painted-under-the-east-campus-bridge-before-naacp-event-sunday>

¹⁴ <https://www.facebook.com/ClarkUniversityHillel/posts/828707493923149>

¹⁵ <https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2016/03/21/two-events-unsettle-jewish-students-brown-university>

Table 5

**A Comparison of Incidents of Anti-Jewish Genocidal Expression
in 2015 and 2016**

Genocidal Expression	2015	2016	% Increase
# Incidents	28	57	103% ¹⁶
# Schools	20	37	85%

The sharp rise in the number of incidents motivated by classic antisemitism in general and genocidal expression in particular was principally accounted for by a surge of Neo-Nazi and/or White Supremacist flyers that were sent by hackers to fax machines and printers¹⁷ or posted widely¹⁸ on more than a dozen campuses across the country. In the 2015 study only **one** instance of Neo-Nazi and/or White Supremacist expression was documented, while in the 2016 study there were **19** instances.

It is important to note that in several of the incidents of genocidal expression included in the 2016 study, antisemitic speech or imagery was accompanied by bigoted expression targeting other groups such as non-whites (22), immigrants (17), LGBTQ individuals (2), and those with differing political or ideological perspectives (8). This was a large increase from 2015, when anti-Jewish genocidal expression was only accompanied by racist expression in 4 instances and by homophobic expression once, suggesting that anti-Jewish genocidal expression may be part of a more general increase in intolerant expression on college campuses.

b. Anti-Zionism Continued to be a Major Motivator of Acts of Anti-Jewish Hostility

Consistent with our 2015 study, in 2016 we found that BDS activity,¹⁹ the presence of anti-Zionist student groups,²⁰ and faculty who have endorsed an academic boycott of Israel²¹ were each strong predictors of conduct that targeted Jewish students and staff for

¹⁶ A T-Test for paired means showed that the incidence of genocidal expression was significantly larger in 2016 than in 2015 ($t = 2.34$; $p < .05$).

¹⁷ See, for example, this flyer printed on many networked printers at the University of California Santa Cruz: http://www.amchainitiative.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/03/ucschate_flyer.png

¹⁸ See, for example, this flyer posted at the University of Central Florida: <http://www.amchainitiative.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/11/UCFracist1.jpg>

¹⁹ Incidents involving the targeting of Jewish students and staff for harm were significantly more likely to occur on campuses where BDS activity was present than where it was not ($\chi^2 = 16.07$; $p < .001$), with there being 2.5 times the likelihood of encountering targeting at schools with BDS activity than without. Furthermore, schools with more incidents of BDS activity tended to have more incidents that targeted Jewish students for harm (Pearson $r = .33$; $p < .001$).

²⁰ Incidents involving the targeting of Jewish students and staff for harm were significantly more likely to occur on campuses where an anti-Zionist student group was present than where it was not ($\chi^2 = 19.00$; $p < .001$), with there being five times the likelihood of encountering targeting at schools with one or more active anti-Zionist groups.

²¹ Incidents involving the targeting of Jewish students and staff for harm were significantly more likely to occur on campuses where there was one or more faculty boycotters than where there was none ($\chi^2 = 13.27$; $p < .001$), with there being

harm. An analysis of the possible motivation of each of the incidents involving acts of anti-Jewish hostility sheds considerable light onto these strong statistical associations. In both 2015 and 2016, anti-Zionism was a major motivator of incidents in which Jewish members of the campus community were singled out and targeted for harmful behavior by individuals who were demonstrably motivated by antipathy towards the Jewish state, as demonstrated by their affiliation with an anti-Zionist group (e.g. Students for Justice in Palestine) or expressions of anti-Zionism that they had made prior to, or at the time of, the incident in question.

Anti-Zionism-motivated acts of anti-Jewish hostility constituted **45 (43%)** of the total number of actions that targeted Jews for harm at the schools in the 2016 study.²² In three-quarters of these incidents, there was a clear intention to suppress pro-Israel speech or impede participation in Israel-related activities. These included:

- The successful or attempted cancellation, disruption or shutting down of Jewish student events or events hosted by groups perceived to be pro-Israel. For example:
 - At San Francisco State University, members of an anti-Israel student group disrupted a Hillel event involving a speech by Jerusalem Mayor Nir Barkat. They succeeded in stopping the event due to the loud disruptions that occurred for more than an hour. The mayor could only speak to a handful of attendees that circled around him. The majority of the audience was prevented from partaking in the event.²³
 - At the University of Chicago, a Hillel-sponsored event featuring an Arab Israeli speaker was disrupted by protesters, who shouted down the speaker to the point that the event had to be prematurely terminated. Protesters were reported to have threatened to kill Eid if he did not stop speaking,²⁴ and in a video of the event a young man can be heard yelling in Arabic, “I’m going to destroy this place!”²⁵
 - A pro-Israel student group’s event at University of California Irvine was disrupted by members of an anti-Zionist student group, who physically and verbally intimidated attendees, loudly chanted “Intifada, Intifada,” and threatened a student attempting to enter the event. Police had to escort attendees out of the event for their own safety.
 - At the University of Maryland, about two dozen protesters arrived at a Hillel and Jewish Student Union event called “Israel Fest” and loudly disrupted the event. The protesters blocked a pathway and had to be instructed to move by police.²⁶

more than eight times the likelihood of encountering targeting at schools with at least one faculty boycotter. Furthermore, schools with more faculty boycotters tended to have more incidents that targeted Jewish students for harm (Pearson $r = .40$; $p < .001$).

²² In the 2015 study, 46 anti-Zionism-motivated acts of anti-Jewish hostility were identified, although this constituted 58% of all incidents that targeted Jewish students and staff for harm in 2015.

²³ <http://goldengatexpress.org/2016/04/07/general-union-of-palestine-students-storm-meeting-with-jerusalem-mayor/>

²⁴ <https://www.chicagomaroon.com/2016/02/23/police-intervene-as-i-house-event-turns-heated/>

²⁵ <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=807iDWPFZTg>

²⁶ <http://www.dbknews.com/2016/04/19/palestine-protest-at-umd-israel-fest/>

- At Brown University, bestselling author Janet Mock cancelled a speech at Hillel in response to a petition that stated signatories were not against Mock speaking on campus, so long as she did not do so at Hillel, since it has “consistently defended and even advocated for the Israeli state’s policies of occupation and racial apartheid.”²⁷
- The defamation, denigration or intimidation of Jews or Jewish groups, or individuals and groups perceived as pro-Israel, in order to thwart the individuals’ or groups’ freedom of speech or access to full and equal participation in campus activities. For example:
 - A Jewish student at Northwestern University was prevented from participating in an anti-racism march on campus by the march’s organizers, who said to her: “You support Israel, so you cannot also support us.”²⁸
 - An Ohio State University student threatened to murder students on his campus if the student government did not approve an anti-Israel divestment resolution, tweeting: "Yo if USG messes this up tomorrow I'm coming for everyone's life tomorrow. Every one. Every single, blessed life. Every one."²⁹
 - After several Jewish groups, including Hillel, protested the fact that an anti-Zionist course was being taught at University of California Berkeley, a number of posters appeared on campus that maligned the groups with classic antisemitic tropes, claiming: "Jewish bullies smash free speech at Cal and are pledged \$38 billion. Attention Non-Jews: PAY UP AND SHUT UP!"³⁰
 - During a student government meeting deliberating over an anti-Israel divestment resolution at Vassar College, one Jewish student was jeered at by divestment proponents when she stated, in tears, how she had been emotionally traumatized by the BDS campaign. Another Jewish student who talked about Israel’s founding in the wake of the Holocaust was accused of using the Holocaust as a political tool to justify “the ‘genocide’ of another people.”³¹

IV. Discussion and Recommendations

Intolerance – the unwillingness to accept, or merely recognize and respect, beliefs and identities that differ from one’s own – is a serious and growing problem in our nation. Borne of a deep antipathy toward or hatred of another individual or group, intolerance expresses itself in behavior that seeks to suppress the hated individual’s or group’s expression of belief or identity. The most extreme forms of intolerant suppression are designated as hate crimes, acts of violence motivated by racial, religious, sexual, or other extreme prejudice. In 2016, such hate crimes rose nationally by about 13%, and in

²⁷ <http://www.thetower.org/3103-black-trans-rights-activist-cancels-speech-at-brown-hillel-after-anti-israel-protests/>

²⁸ <http://www.haaretz.com/opinion/.premium-1.735800>

²⁹ <http://www.dailywire.com/news/4508/osu-student-im-coming-everyones-life-tomorrow-if-pardes-seleh>

³⁰ <https://www.algemeiner.com/2016/09/25/posters-demonizing-jews-crop-up-on-uc-berkeley-campus-as-controversial-anti-zionism-course-reinstated/>

³¹ <http://forward.com/opinion/335947/how-jewish-students-like-me-got-bullied-at-vassar-bds-vote/>

some localities they hit a multi-year high, with antisemitic attacks in several major American cities accounting for some of the sharpest increases.³² Indeed, Jews have been one of the most frequently targeted groups in the country for acts of extreme intolerance. Since the U.S. Federal Bureau of Investigation began publishing its annual audit of hate crimes in 1997, crimes targeting Jews have constituted the majority of all religiously motivated crimes every single year.³³

On college campuses, Jewish students have often been subjected to severely intolerant behavior: actions that target them for harm and deprive them of their freedom of expression, as well as hateful speech and imagery that threaten violence against them or portray them as worthy of harm. As documented in our studies, these intolerant behaviors have two major ideological sources. The first is classical antisemitism, a hatred of and desire to harm Jews individually or collectively, which is most often exhibited in anti-Jewish genocidal expression such as graffiti and social media postings calling for the death of Jews and the production of swastikas and swastika-like symbols that evoke the heinous crimes committed by the Nazis in the era of the Holocaust, especially the genocidal murder of six million Jews. Expressions of genocidal antisemitism directly threaten Jewish students and cause them to feel less safe on their campus.

Anti-Zionism is the second ideological source of acts of intolerant behavior directed at Jewish students, particularly behavior that limits their freedom of expression when it comes to Israel. This is not surprising, given that anti-Zionism is, by definition, opposed to Zionism and any expression of Jewish national self-determination, whether it manifests itself in the existence or functioning of a Jewish state, or expressions of identification with or support for that state. For this reason, many campus groups that identify as anti-Zionist have adopted as part of their mission the strategic goal of “anti-normalization” – actively opposing every expression of pro-Israel sentiment or even acknowledgement of Israel’s right to exist, lest it legitimize or “normalize” the Jewish state. Thus, members of anti-Zionist groups have carried out an array of intolerant activities to silence Jewish and pro-Israel voices, most frequently through the attempted cancellation, shutting down or disruption of pro-Israel events, but also through the vilification and intimidation of Jewish and pro-Israel groups and individuals, with the clear intention of delegitimizing their perspective or causing them to be too afraid or uncomfortable to express it. Given that the program to boycott, divest from and sanction Israel is itself an anti-normalization tactic to ensure the isolation, delegitimization and elimination of the Jewish state, it is no wonder that the intensive BDS activities leading up to anti-Israel divestment votes at several schools in our study correlated strongly with spikes in antisemitic expression and the targeting of Jewish students and staff for harm at those schools.

Although these diverse ideological sources of anti-Jewish hostility have made Jewish students particularly vulnerable to intolerance, they are far from the only students who have been targeted for harm on many campuses. As we noted, the sharp increase in genocidal expression from 2015 to 2016, coupled with the use of classic symbols of genocidal antisemitism to express hatred not only of Jews but of other campus groups as well, suggests that there are deep divisions within the campus community that are resulting in profoundly intolerant behavior threatening the safety and well-being of many students. And this disturbing trend does not seem to be abating. In the first two and a half

³²

<https://csbs.csusb.edu/sites/default/files/Special%20Status%20Report%20Metro%20Areas%202017%20Final%20Draft%2032517.pdf>

³³ <https://ucr.fbi.gov/hate-crime/>

months in 2017 alone, there were more than **30** incidents involving anti-Jewish genocidal expression on the schools in our study, with several of these incidents affecting not only Jewish students but other members of the campus community who have been targeted for their opinion or identity.

In addition, while Jewish and pro-Israel students are the most frequently and consistently targeted victims of anti-normalization campaigns, other groups have been targeted in a similar fashion, as the recent violent protests of speakers brought to campus by Republican student groups at UC Berkeley³⁴ and Middlebury College³⁵ demonstrate. Such intolerance not only deprives students of their freedom of expression and beliefs, it also tremendously undermines the academic mission of the university and its commitment to being a free marketplace of ideas.

In the current climate of increasing polarization and acts of extreme intolerance, we believe that Jewish students, and all students, will be best served when university administrators treat antisemitism and other acts of bigotry as forms of intolerant behavior that must be addressed with a single behavioral standard applied equitably to all forms of intolerance. We urge administrators to take the following steps to reduce intolerance and promote free expression on their campus:

- Review, update and diligently enforce campus policies and procedures to guarantee that all members of the campus community, irrespective of their opinions, beliefs or identity, are equitably and adequately protected from intolerant behavior that infringes on their freedom of expression and denies them equal rights.
- Ensure that prompt and appropriate disciplinary measures are taken when any individual or group engages in behavior that suppresses the freedom of expression or civil rights of others.
- Develop protocols for ensuring that university-approved student groups do not engage in behaviors that violate the freedom of speech or civil rights of others. We recommend that before granting university approval to a new or renewing student organization, leaders of each group should be required to adequately explain how their activities will avoid impinging on the freedom of expression of other members of the campus community.
- Develop protocols for equitably and adequately condemning intolerant expression, even when it is protected under the First Amendment. At a minimum, university administrators should publicly condemn speech or actions that suppress the freedom of other members of the campus community to express their opinions, beliefs or identity.
- Make public and easily accessible all policies, procedures and protocols for responding to intolerant behavior, along with a written statement of the university's commitment to their equitable enforcement for all students, regardless of identity, belief or opinion.
- Develop educational and training programs that can:
 - Help members of the campus community to recognize and avoid intolerant behavior and be aware of all campus policies and procedures regarding such behavior;

³⁴ <http://ktla.com/2017/02/02/uc-berkeley-protests-of-breitbart-milo-yiannopoulos-caused-100000-in-damage/>

³⁵ <http://www.newsweek.com/charles-murray-my-free-speech-ordeal-middlebury-564419>

- Teach and encourage the expression of diverse views in a productive and respectful manner;
- Foster a tolerance and appreciation of diverse opinions and identities; and
- Inculcate an understanding of and appreciation for the First Amendment and its critical role in supporting the academic mission of the university.

Appendix A

Categories of Targeting Jewish Students and Staff for Harm With Examples from 2016

Actions that directly target Jewish students on campus or other Jewish members of the campus community for harmful or hateful action based on their Jewishness or perceived support for Israel:

- **PHYSICAL ASSAULT** – Physically attacking Jewish students, or causing them to fear that they are about to suffer physical harm.

E.g. A Jewish student walking on a campus sidewalk at the University of Missouri was hit in the head by a water bottle thrown from a vehicle and called an antisemitic slur.

- **DISCRIMINATION** – Unfairly treating individuals because they are Jewish.

E.g. At Northwestern University, a Jewish student was told by the organizers of an on-campus march to combat racism that she could not participate in the march, saying, “You support Israel, so you cannot also support us.”

- **DESTRUCTION OF JEWISH PROPERTY** – Inflicting damage or destroying property owned by Jews or related to Jews

E.g. At University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign, a large menorah in front of the Illini Chabad house was vandalized three times during the year.

- **GENOCIDAL EXPRESSION** – Using imagery (e.g. swastika) or language that expresses a desire for, or will to, exterminate the Jewish people.

E.g. “Kill all Kikes” was written in a men’s bathroom at University of Buffalo.

- **SUPPRESSION OF SPEECH/MOVEMENT/ASSEMBLY** – Preventing or impeding the expression of Jewish students, such as by removing or defacing Jewish students’ flyers, attempting to disrupt or shut down speakers at Jewish events, or blocking the entrance to a Jewish student event.

E.g. At a Jewish student event featuring Bassem Eid at the University of Chicago, protesters shouted down the speaker, to the point where the event ended early. One protestor even threatened the speaker physically. The young man is heard in a video of the event yelling in Arabic, “I’m going to destroy this place!” Later, he was heard saying, “I’m going to kill this motherf*****!” and “Wait until you go to your car!”

- **VERBAL ASSAULT** – Verbally insulting or abusing Jewish students.

E.g. During the planned disruption of a Hillel-sponsored event featuring a talk by the mayor of Jerusalem at San Francisco State University, protesters screamed repeatedly at the speaker, "Get the hell off our campus!"

- **INTIMIDATION** – Intentionally frightening Jewish students in order to force them into or deter them from some action.

E.g. An Ohio State University student threatened to murder every person on his campus if the college did not join the BDS movement. Cailin Pitt posted on his twitter account prior to a BDS vote: "Yo if USG messes this up tomorrow I'm coming for everyone's life tomorrow. Every one. Every single, blessed life. Every one."

- **HARASSMENT** – Intentionally disturbing or upsetting Jewish students.

E.g. Large paper swastikas and a picture of Adolf Hitler were taped on the dorm room door of a Jewish student at the University of Wisconsin Madison.

- **DENIGRATION** – Unfairly disparaging, vilifying or defaming Jewish students.

E.g. During the debate over an anti-Israel divestment resolution in a student government meeting at Vassar College, one Jewish student talked about how the BDS campaign had invoked every anxiety nightmare she had ever had. She was crying as she spoke. Pro-BDS students laughed at her. Another Jewish student who talked about Israel's founding in the wake of the Holocaust was immediately accused of using the Holocaust as a political tool to justify the "genocide" of another people.

Appendix B

Categories of Antisemitic Expression With Examples from 2016

Language, imagery or behavior deemed antisemitic by the U.S. State Department definition of antisemitism³⁶:

- **HISTORICAL ANTISEMITISM** – Using symbols, images and tropes associated with historical antisemitism, including by making “mendacious, dehumanizing, demonizing, or stereotypical allegations about Jews as such, or the power of Jews as a collective—especially but not exclusively, the myth about a world Jewish conspiracy or of Jews controlling the media, economy, governments, or other societal institutions” (U.S. State Department).

E.g. During a student senate discussion at Stanford University, a senator argued that it is not antisemitic to question whether Jewish people control the media and banks, saying that “questioning these potential power dynamics...[is] a very valid discussion”.

- **CONDONING TERRORISM AGAINST ISRAEL OR JEWS** – Calling for, aiding or justifying the killing or harming of Jews.

E.g. Vassar College SJP sold t-shirts with an image of convicted terrorist Leila Khaled holding a gun, with the caption “resistance is not terrorism.”

- **COMPARING JEWS TO NAZIS**

E.g. In a departmentally-sponsored symposium at San Francisco State University, one of the speakers referred to Israelis as “Neo-Nazis”.

- **ACCUSING JEWS OF INVENTING OR EXAGGERATING THE HOLOCAUST**

E.g. At an SJP event at UCLA, one of the speakers claimed that Israel exploits the Holocaust “to justify what it does to the Palestinians.”

- **DENYING JEWS SELF-DETERMINATION** – Opposing Israel’s right to exist as a Jewish state or promoting its elimination.

E.g. At the University of Rutgers, t-shirts were sold at a student fundraising event featuring a picture of the outline of the state of Israel superimposed in its entirety with the Palestinian flag.

- **DEMONIZATION OF ISRAEL** – Using symbols, images and tropes associated with classic antisemitism to characterize Israel or Israelis, e.g. claims that Israelis are evil or blood-thirsty and deliberately murder children or Jews control the world.

³⁶ <https://2009-2017.state.gov/documents/organization/156684.pdf>

E.g. At CUNY Hunter College, a speaker at a departmentally-sponsored event made the false claim that “Israel is a state that is built on murder and mass rape of Palestinian women.”

- **DELEGITIMIZATION OF ISRAEL** – Insinuating that Israel is an illegitimate state and does not belong in the family of nations.

E.g. At the University of Washington, a SUPER event featured a speaker who falsely accused Zionism of “infecting the mind of millions with racism,” and Israel of being a “settler colonial state with appropriated culture...a racist, exclusivist, supremacist state.”