



**Report on Antisemitic Activity During the First Half of 2016
At U.S. Colleges and Universities
With the Largest Jewish Undergraduate Populations**

I. Introduction

This study investigated antisemitic activity from January to June of 2016 on more than 100 college and university campuses with the largest Jewish student populations. It picks up from where AMCHA Initiative's previous study, "Report on Antisemitic Activity in 2015 at U.S. Colleges and Universities With the Largest Jewish Undergraduate Populations,"¹ left off.

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.

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 during the first half of 2015 and 2016. 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 also revealed several illuminating and disturbing trends.

Summary of 2016 Trends:

- There were nearly 100 more antisemitic incidents in the first six months of 2016 compared with the same time period in 2015.
- The number of incidents involving the suppression of Jewish students' freedom of speech and assembly approximately doubled from 2015 to 2016.
- The consideration of anti-Israel divestment resolutions in student government or by the student body was strongly linked to a surge in antisemitic activity.
- The number of incidents opposing Israel's right to exist nearly tripled from 2015 to 2016 and was highly correlated with behavior that targeted Jewish students for harm.

II. Research Methods

Data Collection

The 113 schools investigated in the study were those included in AMCHA's 2015 study, which were identified by Hillel International as the public and private colleges and universities in the United States with the largest populations of Jewish students.

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 students 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.

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>

Identifying Antisemitic Activity

When examining the data, three different kinds of activity were distinguished:

- 1) **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.
- 2) **Targeting of Jewish Students**⁴ – Incidents involving conduct that targeted Jewish students for particular harm 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.
- 3) **BDS Activity** – Promotion or endorsement of an anti-Israel boycott, divestment or sanction effort. Campus BDS campaigns routinely employ rhetoric and imagery intended to demonize and delegitimize Israel, expression which is consistent with the U.S. State Department definition of anti-Semitism.

III. Findings

- 1) **From January to June 2016, one or more kinds of antisemitic activity were found at more than half the schools most popular with Jewish students.**

287 incidents involving either Targeting of Jewish Students for Harm, Antisemitic Expression, BDS Activity, or some combination of these, occurred in 2016 at the schools most popular with Jewish students. 64 (57%) of these schools had incidents involving one or more kinds of these activities.

Table 1 shows the prevalence of each kind of activity, and the number and percentage of schools that played host to it.

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 While all three kinds of activity contributed to the overall prevalence of campus antisemitism, conduct that targeted Jewish students for harm took on special significance. This was 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.

Table 1

Number of Incidents of Each Kind of Antisemitic Activity Occurring January to June 2016 and the Number and Percentage of Schools that Played Host to Them

	Total # Incidents Jan-June 2016	# Schools with ≥ 1 Incidents	% Schools with ≥ 1 Incidents (Out of Total 113)
Targeting of Jewish Students	69	34	30%
Antisemitic Expression	201	59	52%
BDS Activity	131	36	32%

The number of incidents at each school ranged from 1 to 5 for Targeting of Jewish Students, 1 to 12 for Antisemitic Expression, and 1 to 16 for BDS Activity.

2) Consistent with the findings from the 2015 study, anti-Zionist activity, particularly BDS, and the presence of student groups and faculty that engage in anti-Zionist activity, are strong predictors of antisemitic activity in general, and conduct that targets Jewish students for harm in particular.

- a. BDS Activity** - The occurrence of BDS activity was strongly associated with the occurrence of antisemitic activity in general, and with incidents that targeted Jewish students for harm in particular.
 - Overall antisemitic activity was significantly more likely to occur on campuses where BDS was present than where it was not ($\chi^2 = 21.29$; $p < .001$)⁵, with there being more than twice the likelihood of encountering antisemitic activity at schools with BDS activity. Furthermore, schools with more incidents of BDS activity tended to have more incidents of antisemitic activity (Pearson $r = .54$; $p < .001$).
 - Targeting was significantly more likely to occur on campuses where BDS activity was present than where it was not ($\chi^2 = 9.92$; $p < .01$)⁶, with there being more than twice the likelihood of encountering targeting at schools with BDS activity. Furthermore, schools with more incidents of BDS activity tended to have more incidents that targeted Jewish students for harm (Pearson $r = .27$; $p < .01$).
- b. Anti-Zionist Student Group(s)** – The presence of one or more active anti-Zionist student groups such as SJP was strongly associated with the occurrence of overall antisemitic activity generally, and with incidents that targeted Jewish students for harm in particular.
 - Overall antisemitic activity was significantly more likely to occur on campuses where an active anti-Zionist student group was present than where it was not ($\chi^2 = 52.54$; $p < .001$), with there being more than eight times the likelihood of encountering antisemitic activity at schools with at least one anti-Zionist group.
 - Targeting was significantly more likely to occur on campuses where an anti-Zionist student group was present than where it was not ($\chi^2 = 19.54$; $p < .001$), with there being more than nine times the likelihood of encountering targeting at schools with one or more active anti-Zionist groups.

⁵ In determining the association of these two variables, we did not count BDS Activity when it co-occurred with either Antisemitic Expression or the Targeting of Jewish Students, and we excluded from the count of overall antisemitic activity those incidents that involved only BDS Activity.

⁶ In determining the association of these two variables we did not count BDS activity when it co-occurred with the Targeting of Jewish Students.

- c. **Faculty Boycotters** – The presence of one or more faculty who have endorsed an academic boycott of Israel was strongly associated with the occurrence of antisemitic activity generally, and with incidents that targeted Jewish students for harm in particular.
- Overall antisemitic activity was significantly more likely to occur on campuses where there was one or more faculty boycotters than where there was none ($\chi^2 = 17.30$; $p < .001$), with there being almost six times the likelihood of encountering antisemitic activity at schools with faculty boycotters. Furthermore, schools with more faculty boycotters tended to have more incidents of antisemitic activity (Pearson $r = .63$; $p < .001$).
 - Targeting was significantly more likely to occur on campuses where there was one or more faculty boycotters than where there was none ($\chi^2 = 9.6$; $p < .01$)⁷, with there being more than seven 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 $r = .36$; $p < .001$).

3) Antisemitic activity increased significantly from 2015 to 2016.

The overall incidence of antisemitic activity was significantly higher in the first half of 2016 than in the same months of 2015, as was the incidence of Antisemitic Expression and Targeting of Jewish Students. The incidence of BDS Activity was slightly higher in 2016 than 2015, though not significantly so.

Table 2 provides a comparison of the incidence of antisemitic activity from January to June of 2015 and 2016, as well the percentage increase.

Table 2

Number of Incidents of Overall Antisemitic Activity and Each Kind of Activity Occurring January to June 2015 and 2016

	# Incidents Jan-June 2015	# Incidents Jan-June 2016	% Increase Jan – June 2015 to 2016
Overall Antisemitic Activity	198	287 ⁸	45%
Targeting Jewish Students	42	69 ⁹	64%
Antisemitic Expression	123	194 ¹⁰	58%
BDS Activity	115	131	14%

⁷ In determining the association of these two variables we did not count BDS activity when it co-occurred with the targeting of Jewish students.

⁸ A T-Test for paired means showed that the incidence of overall antisemitic activity was significantly larger in 2016 than in 2015 ($t = 2.31$; $p < .05$).

⁹ A T-Test for paired means showed that the incidence of Targeting of Jewish Students was significantly larger in 2016 than in 2015 ($t = 2.18$; $p < .05$).

¹⁰ A T-Test for paired means showed that the incidence of Antisemitic Expression was significantly larger in 2016 than in 2015 ($t = 3.11$; $p < .01$).

Table 3 shows the schools whose overall antisemitic activity increased significantly from 2015 to 2016.

Table 3

Schools with the Largest Increase in Antisemitic Activity from 2015 to 2016¹¹

Schools with Largest Increase 2015 to 2016	# Incidents Jan – June 2015	# Incidents Jan – June 2016
Columbia University	2	20
Vassar College	3	20
University of Chicago	2	14
New York University	1	13
University of Minnesota	2	12
Univ. of Massachusetts (Amherst)	3	10
Univ. of Wisconsin (Madison)	1	8
University of Florida	2	8
University of Washington	5	11

III. Significant Trends in Antisemitic Activity in 2016

1) Shutdowns and other Suppression of Speech on the Rise

Suppressing Jewish students’ freedom of speech, movement or assembly is one of the ways in which Jewish students are targeted for harm on several college campuses. Often events organized by Jewish students, particularly those expressing a pro-Israel sentiment, are disrupted or shutdown by members of anti-Zionist student groups such as SJP.

A recent example occurred in April 2016, when approximately two dozen members of the General Union of Palestine Students at San Francisco State University disrupted and ultimately shut down a Jewish student event featuring a speech by Jerusalem Mayor Nir Barkat.¹² A few minutes after Barkat’s speech had begun, protestors stormed into the hall and loudly chanted slogans such as “Get the hell off our campus,” “Long live the Intifada,” and “From the River to the Sea, Palestine Will be Free” until the speech was prematurely terminated.

Other forms of suppression include physically blocking or hindering the movement of the attendees of Jewish student events or engaging in efforts to get these events canceled. The latter occurred in March 2016 at Brown University, when bestselling author Janet Mock cancelled a speech at the Brown Hillel after receiving a petition falsely accusing Hillel of defending “racial apartheid” and being “complicit in pinkwashing.”¹³

¹¹ All of the schools in this table showed an increase in overall antisemitic activity that exceeded two standard deviations from the mean for the 113 schools in the study.

¹² <http://www.jweekly.com/article/full/77319/sfsu-president-promises-full-investigation-after-protesters-disrupt-jerusal/>

¹³ <http://forward.com/news/breaking-news/336426/transgender-activist-janet-mock-cancels-talk-at-brown-u-hillel-after-pinkwa/>

In 2016, 14 incidents of Targeting Jewish Students by suppressing their speech, movement or assembly were found on 12 campuses. This is a significant increase from the first half of 2015, in which 8 incidents of suppression occurred on 7 campuses.

An analysis of the 12 schools hosting incidents of suppression in 2016 shows that this form of targeting is closely associated with antisemitic expression, especially the use of language or imagery containing antisemitic tropes to demonize and delegitimize Israel: all 12 of the schools at which the speech, movement or assembly of Jewish students was suppressed played host to one or more incidents of Antisemitic Expression ($\chi^2 = 12.73$; $p < .001$), and the greater the number of incidents the higher the likelihood that Jewish student expression would be suppressed (Pearson $r = .33$; $p < .001$).

2) Anti-Israel Divestment Resolutions Fuel Antisemitism

One of the primary kinds of BDS activities on many college campuses involves the promotion of anti-Israel divestment resolutions that are discussed and voted on by representatives in the student government, or occasionally, by the entire undergraduate or graduate student body.

In 2016, the student governments or student bodies of ten schools in the study considered anti-Israel divestment resolutions. Of these ten schools, eight showed the largest increases in antisemitic activity from 2015 to 2016 (see Table 3), with none of these considering divestment resolutions in 2015.

Conversely, seven of the nine schools in the 2015 study that considered or voted on divestment resolutions showed a marked decrease in antisemitic activity in the first half of 2016, when no divestment resolution was considered, whereas the two schools that did not decrease in antisemitic activity from 2015 to 2016 also hosted discussions and votes on divestment in 2016.

These data suggest that campaigns promoting anti-Israel divestment resolutions can significantly increase the overall incidence of antisemitic activity on a given campus, and that once a campaign has finished, antisemitic activity is likely to decrease.

3) Opposition to Israel's Right to Exist Sharply Rises

Opposing the existence of Israel¹⁴ is the essence of “anti-Zionism,” a recognized form of antisemitism.

The first half of 2016 saw an almost three-fold increase in the number of campus incidents that contained expression opposing the existence of Israel as a Jewish state: there were 43 such incidents in 2016 compared to 15 incidents during the first half of 2015. Incidents in 2016 included:

- Several SJP groups circulated images of a map of the state of Israel with a Palestinian flag over all of it, indicating the replacement of Israel with a Palestinian state. Such an image was painted on the SJP’s “apartheid wall” at University of California Berkeley,¹⁵ imprinted on a T-

¹⁴ Opposition to the existence of a Jewish state is identified as “Denying Jews Self-Determination” in this study’s Categories of Antisemitic Expression.

¹⁵<https://www.facebook.com/calsjp/photos/ms.c.eJw90ccNw0AMBMCODObQf2NmOn0MjJdJUkaiCrooCLn~:cszmwa6Jaw3rHCHWxtE5R55NxsZnz64H1LXj5ni5C7Qpbp9nVH2Ns3UIjFXOQWokdVLfy27Xn2ZjuvsvEdHrDxgbSNY~ q5~zR~ cUfE4f2~ 4zxM1lckavRMLT4pw1gZDY14HRebid~ ~:1QTcmz13ytElnX~:ZMDnMW73~ XmZUw~:8PYTIHU~:y7NNvdHW1x1U9WCqnztnos~:Vz3n3IHNy~:OptHc8x894~ jp0vr74ed~ r3fhLoh6vXn59nn9qzTD~:xGWnr6RknR~:vy6X~:7hXY~:6DOv5cw59e95hed70Ld~:vgfod5~:I~ t0jey~:aH2vgoT8~.bps.a.989154161170945.1073741832.442429532510080/989323764487318/?type=3&theater>

shirt sold as a fundraiser for the SJP group at Rutgers University,¹⁶ and posted to the SJP's Facebook page at New York University, along with the caption "Je Suis One State."¹⁷

- There were more than 15 talks and symposia, at least four of them sponsored by academic departments, in which speakers called for "the right of return" to Israel of millions of Palestinians and the implementation of a "one-state" solution that would eliminate the state of Israel. At an event co-sponsored by the Arab and Muslim Ethnicities and Diasporas initiative of the College of Ethnic Studies at San Francisco State University, Professor Rabab Abdulhadi claimed that "Zionism is racism" and "there can only be peace if Israel is defeated."¹⁸ And at Brown University, the Middle East Studies department hosted a symposium in which one of the speakers, Haneen Zoabi, said that "the main opposition to democracy [in Israel] is the definition of Israel as a Jewish state," and she advocated for its elimination.¹⁹
- Several schools hosted talks by anti-Zionist Jewish groups arguing that Zionism is an illegitimate movement that has nothing to do with Judaism. For example, at Rutgers University a member of the fringe ultra-Orthodox group Neturei Karta gave a talk in which he claimed "the existence of a so-called Jewish state...is antithetical to Judaism," and he called on members of the audience to "pray to God every day for the speedy and peaceful dismantlement...of the Zionist state of Israel."²⁰ And a presentation at the University of Michigan by a member of the International Jewish Anti-Zionist Network (IJAN) advocated "ending Zionism" in order to "hasten the end of Israeli colonialism and other forms of oppression."²¹ These events were organized and hosted by pro-BDS, anti-Zionist student groups including SJP.

In the first half of 2016, the incidence of language and imagery opposing Israel's right to exist was highly correlated with the Targeting of Jewish Students ($r = .38$; $p < .001$). Expression promoting Israel's elimination was also very highly correlated with BDS Activity ($r=.58$; $p < .001$).

Taken together, these findings provide an important window into the true motivations and intentions of BDS proponents. Although members of SJP and similar groups defend their activities as legitimate criticism of Israeli government policy that is in no way antisemitic, increasingly these activities have included language and imagery opposing Israel's very right to exist. In chants and signs at protest rallies, painted on "apartheid walls," written in op-eds in the student newspaper, posted on social media, and argued in numerous talks and symposia, Zionism – Israel's founding ideology – is portrayed as wholly illegitimate, "solutions" to the Palestinian-Israeli conflict that would eliminate Israel are promoted, and open calls for the destruction of Israel are made. The three-fold increase in such expression from 2015 to 2016 proves that the intended goal of groups like SJP is not to offer legitimate criticism of Israel, but to destroy it.

¹⁶<https://www.facebook.com/StudentsForJusticeInPalestineNB/photos/gm.514961915355628/1024201690993697/?type=3&theater>

¹⁷<https://www.facebook.com/NYCSJP/photos/a.1022584467754848.1073741828.899935043353125/1188169621196331/?type=3&theater>

¹⁸ https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=rE1_nEO19ro

¹⁹ <http://middleeastbrown.org/event/futuresofpalestiniansinIsrael/>

²⁰ <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=1YOeSIXw1Qs>

²¹ <http://www.ijan.org/projects-campaigns/educ/jewish-anti-zionism-workshop-ann-arbor-april-21st/>

IV. Conclusions and Recommendations

These findings and trends serve to highlight the serious and growing problem of campus antisemitism. The sheer number of incidents are increasing at an alarming rate, particularly those involving the systematic and often violent suppression of Jewish students' freedom of speech and assembly. And the link between antisemitic activity and anti-Zionism has become abundantly clear and is openly acknowledged with ever greater frequency by the perpetrators of these activities.

The injection of the anti-Zionist movement onto campus in the past decade has fueled a significant resurgence and increase in antisemitism. Jewish students have long reported that anti-Zionist activists single out, harass, intimidate, and even assault them, regardless of their personal feelings on Israel. And far too often, anti-Zionist expression is laced with centuries-old classic antisemitic stereotypes. AMCHA's 2015 study provided the first empirical evidence for students' anecdotal reports. This examination of the first half of 2016 replicates and expands upon those findings.

What we found is that, in 2016, those promoting an anti-Zionist agenda on campus have become significantly more brazen in both their strategy and their tactics, and this has translated into a disturbing increase in conduct that targets Jewish students for harm, including harassment, intimidation, discrimination and suppression of speech and assembly. The phenomenon also illuminates the true goals of anti-Zionist activity.

BDS advocates on campus have long portrayed their activities as peaceful and legitimate criticism of Israeli government policy that is in no way antisemitic. However, what used to be a masked agenda is now coming to light, and in a particularly unabashed way that directly harms Jewish students. The following trends provide evidence for this reality:

- 1) **Trampling on Jewish students' civil rights doubled in 2016.** "Anti-normalization" is a known tactic employed by those promoting BDS on campus. Its goal is to stifle all pro-Israel expression.²² Adherents of "anti-normalization" target not only pro-Israel students, but anyone presumed to support Israel, first and foremost Jewish students, regardless of their actual personal feelings on Israel. As a result, Jewish students engaging in Jewish activity having nothing to do with Israel -- wearing their Jewish sorority or fraternity letters, displaying Star of David necklaces, walking to Hillel for Sabbath dinner -- report fearing for their safety and well-being. In addition, because of their support, or even just presumed support, for Israel, Jewish students report being rejected from progressive social justice activities such as pro-choice rallies, anti-rape demonstrations, Black Lives Matter events and racial justice conferences.

In addition to ostracizing and alienating Jewish students from certain areas of campus life, anti-Zionist students repeatedly attempt to shutdown events organized by Jewish students and suppress their free speech about Israel and other topics. Sadly, because of strong emotions on Israel, Jewish students are being targeted, discriminated against and ostracized, and their civil rights are being egregiously violated.

Ironically, the strong correlation found in this study between Antisemitic Expression and the suppression of Jewish students' speech and assembly underscores the blatant hypocrisy of "anti-normalization" activists, who vigorously exercise their own freedom of expression but deny Jewish students that same right and freedom.

²² <http://www.adl.org/israel-international/anti-israel-activity/c/anto-normalization-campaign.html>

- 2) **Calls for Israel's utter elimination tripled in 2016.** Note that criticism of the Israeli government or Israel's policies does not fall within this category. Nor does it include language expressing concern for Israel's treatment of Palestinians or settlements, calls for greater rights for Palestinians, or arguments in favor of a two-state solution and/or peace. This is expression advocating for the elimination of Israel, a view that is recognized as antisemitic by the U.S. government, the 31 nations of the International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance,²³ world leaders such as President Obama,²⁴ Pope Francis,²⁵ prime ministers of Canada,²⁶ Britain,²⁷ and France,²⁸ virtually all scholars of contemporary antisemitism and the vast majority of world Jewry.

In addition to being inherently antisemitic, this expression also breeds the most dangerous and severe antisemitism on campus: behavior aimed at harming Jewish students. As evidenced in the report, incidence of language and imagery opposing Israel's right to exist closely correlated with conduct targeting Jewish students for harm. This correlation suggests that on many campuses anti-Zionist activists seek to harm not only Israel, but Jewish students as well.

This comprehensive examination and analysis of incidents in the first half of 2016 affirms anti-Zionism's true antisemitic nature and the antisemitic tactics it uses to execute its strategy. The lines between political discourse on Israeli policy and discrimination toward Jewish students have become blurred. Criticism of Israel, Israeli policies, settlements, or Israel's treatment of Palestinians are appropriate and welcomed on the campus. However, applying classic antisemitic tropes to Israel, condoning violence against Israel or its supporters, or promoting Israel's complete destruction or elimination, even when brought up in the context of political speech, are antisemitism. And they all too often incite anti-Jewish hostility on campus.

To properly address this rise in anti-Jewish bigotry that is a direct result of the rise of the anti-Zionist movement, universities must clarify when political speech crosses the line into antisemitism. Specifically, universities must adopt a proper definition of contemporary antisemitism and use it to educate the campus community about the distinction between criticism of Israeli policies or the Israeli government and discrimination against the Jewish people. Universities must also clarify what constitutes a peaceful demonstration protected under the First Amendment and behavior that violates others' civil rights. Understanding where legitimate criticism of Israel ends and antisemitism begins is essential. Therefore, we recommend that college and university leaders implement the following plan of action on their campuses:

1. Adopt a definition of antisemitism that identifies all forms of anti-Jewish bigotry, including when criticism of Israel crosses the line into antisemitism.
2. Swiftly, forcefully and publicly acknowledge and condemn all acts of antisemitism.
3. Train campus administrators and staff involved in discrimination prevention, student affairs, and equity, diversity and inclusion, to identify contemporary antisemitic behavior, including antisemitic forms of anti-Zionism, and direct them to develop clear protocols for responding to

²³ <http://www.jta.org/2016/06/02/news-opinion/world/comparing-israel-to-nazis-is-anti-semitic-31-western-states-declare>

²⁴ <https://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2016/01/27/remarks-president-righteous-among-nations-award-ceremony>

²⁵ <http://www.newsweek.com/pope-remarks-antisemitism-israel-388157>

²⁶ <http://www.haaretz.com/israel-news/1.569559>

²⁷ <http://www.theatlantic.com/international/archive/2015/04/david-ferguson-on-anti-zionism-and-anti-semitism/390759/>

²⁸ <http://www.haaretz.com/jewish/news/1.636485>

campus antisemitism with the same promptness and vigor as they do other forms of racial, ethnic, and gender bigotry and discrimination.

4. Allocate resources and publicly commit to educating students and faculty about contemporary forms of antisemitism and anti-Jewish discrimination.
5. Establish clear guidelines and educate the entire campus community about free speech protected under the First Amendment and conduct which violates others' civil rights, including by disrupting or shutting down their campus events and restricting their free speech and right of assembly.

This past spring, the University of California took a critical stand against the rising antisemitism plaguing its 10 campuses. Its Board of Regents issued a statement acknowledging that anti-Zionism is a form of antisemitism which incites additional Jew hatred and, like other forms of discrimination, has no place at the University of California. More universities must follow suit.

V. Lead Researchers

Leila Beckwith is Professor Emeritus at UCLA and the co-founder of AMCHA Initiative. After receiving her Ph.D. from the University of Chicago, Beckwith went on to teach and do statistical research for more than 30 years at the Neuropsychiatric Institute and the Department of Pediatrics at UCLA. She has published more than 80 research publications in scientific, peer-reviewed journals. She is a board member of the California Association of Scholars and Scholars for Peace in the Middle East. A renowned scientist and researcher, she has been an editorial board member of *Child Development*, *Infant Behavior and Development*, and the *Infant Mental Health Journal*, as well as an ad hoc reviewer for research papers submitted to *Developmental Psychology*, and grants submitted to the National Science Foundation and the National Foundation for the March of Dimes. Beckwith served as an appointed member of research review committees for the National Institute of Mental Health, the National Institute of Drug Abuse and the National Institute of Child Health and Development. She was also a prevention research advisory committee member for the National Institute of Mental Health and a principal investigator for research grants from the National Institute of Mental Health, the National Institute of Child Health and Development, and the Center for Disease Control.

Tammi Rossman-Benjamin is cofounder and director of AMCHA Initiative, and was a faculty member in Hebrew and Jewish Studies at the University of California Santa Cruz from 1996 - 2016. Rossman-Benjamin has written articles and reports about academic anti-Zionism and antisemitism and lectured widely on the growing threat to the safety of Jewish students on college campuses. She has presented her research in scholarly talks and academic conferences at several universities, including Indiana University, the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, Harvard University and McGill University. Rossman-Benjamin's research has been featured in several volumes on antisemitism. In July 2010, she co-organized a two-week scholarly workshop entitled "Contemporary Antisemitism in Higher Education" at the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum in Washington, D.C. Articles and opinion pieces from Rossman-Benjamin have been published in *Newsweek*, *The Hill*, *New York Daily News*, *Los Angeles Daily News*, *San Jose Mercury News*, *Sacramento Bee*, *Contra Costa Times*, *Jewish Journal of Los Angeles*, and dozens of others.

Appendix A

Categories of Targeting Jewish Students for Harm With Examples

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. At University of California Berkeley, an SJP member grabbed a pro-Israel sign from a Jewish student and then shoved him.

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

E.g. At UCLA, a Jewish student's candidacy for the school judiciary board was challenged by members of the student government because of her affiliation with Jewish organizations.

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

E.g. At Northeastern University, a mezuzah was ripped off the door of a Jewish student.

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

E.g. A Yik Yak posting at the University of California read: "Gas them, burn them, and dismantle their power structure. Humanity cannot progress with the parasitic Jew."

- **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 Goucher College, members of an anti-Zionist student group disrupted a Jewish student event with a series of actions that included chanting anti-Israel slogans and verbally disrupting the event speaker.

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

E.g. At Harvey Mudd College, someone approached a Jewish student at a holiday party and said, "I can tell you are Jewish because of your nose and your hair" and then declared that he wanted to "fucking kill all of you people."

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

E.g. After a Jewish fraternity member at the University of Oregon told a suspicious man to get away from the fraternity house, the man shouted antisemitic epithets and promised to return with a firearm.

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

E.g. A Jewish student at Drexel University who was heavily involved in Jewish life discovered a swastika and the word “Jew” written near an Israeli flag outside his dorm room.

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

E.g. At the University of Michigan, hateful tweets on the day of an anti-Israel divestment vote included “Has anyone else noticed the zionzazi trash talking on the #UMDivest thread this morning?”

Appendix B

Categories of Antisemitic Expression With Examples

Language, imagery or behavior deemed antisemitic by the U.S. State Department definition of antisemitism²⁹:

- **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.

- **COMPARING JEWS TO NAZIS**

E.g. At Warren Wilson College, an invited speaker stated, "Jews are doing the same thing to the Palestinians as the Nazis did to the Jews" in response to a question about his use of the phrase “Nazi Zionism.”

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

E.g. At the University of Missouri during a screening of the anti-Israel film “The Zionist Story,” Jews were accused of exaggerating the Holocaust for personal gain, stating that the Holocaust is the Zionists’ “biggest asset.”

- **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.

E.g. At Vassar College, Professor Jasbir Puar gave a lecture in which she invoked the classic blood libel, claiming Israel harvests the organs of Palestinians.

²⁹ <http://www.state.gov/j/drl/rls/fs/2010/122352.htm>

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

E.g. An invited speaker at Princeton University falsely accused Israel of being an “apartheid state” based on “a nationalist movement of ingraining [Jews] with...supremacist messianic thinking.”