

ACADEMICS AGAINST ISRAEL AND THE JEWS

Books by the Same Author

Revaluing Italy, with Lorenzo Necci (Italian), 1992

Environment and Confusion: An Introduction to a Messy Subject, 1993

Israel's New Future: Interviews, 1994

The State as a Business: Do-It-Yourself Political Forecasting (Italian), 1994

Judaism, Environmentalism and the Environment, 1998

The Environment in the Jewish Tradition: A Sustainable World (Hebrew), 2002

Europe's Crumbling Myths:

The Post-Holocaust Origins of Today's Anti-Semitism, 2003

American Jewry's Challenge:

Conversations Confronting the 21st Century, 2004

Israel and Europe: An Expanding Abyss? 2005

European-Israeli Relations: Between Confusion and Change? 2006

Books Edited

The New Clothes of European Anti-Semitism, with Shmuel Trigano (French), 2004

Monograph

The Autumn 2005 Riots in France: Their Possible Impact on Israel and the Jews, 2006

ACADEMICS AGAINST
ISRAEL AND THE JEWS

Edited by Manfred Gerstenfeld



Jerusalem Center for Public Affairs

Copyright © 2007 by Jerusalem Center for Public Affairs (JCPA)
and Manfred Gerstenfeld

All rights reserved

No part of this book may be reproduced or transmitted in any form, or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying or recording, or by any information storage and retrieval system—except for brief quotations in critical articles or reviews—without written permission from the JCPA, 13 Tel Hai Street, Jerusalem, 92107, Israel. Tel: +972 2 561 9281, Fax: + 972 2 561 9112. E-mail: jcpa@netvision.net.il, www.jcpa.org

ISBN: 965-218-057-2

Set in New Times New Roman at Marek Lasman, Jerusalem
Printed at Ahva—Coop. Printing Press Ltd

Cover design by Rami & Jacky

Dedicated to all those who fight against the demonizers and
defamers of Israel and Jews on campuses worldwide

Table of Contents

Acknowledgments	9
Introduction	11
<i>Natan Sharansky</i> : Foreword	13
<i>Manfred Gerstenfeld</i> : Academics against Israel and the Jews	17
ESSAYS	
<i>Rebecca Leibowitz</i> : Defeating Anti-Israeli and Anti-Semitic Activity on Campus: A Case Study: Rutgers University	83
<i>Noah Liben</i> : The Columbia University Report on Its Middle Eastern Department's Problems: A Paradigm for Obscuring Structural Flaws	95
<i>Martin Kramer</i> : Columbia University: The Future of Middle Eastern Studies at Stake	103
<i>Jonathan Jaffit</i> : Fighting Sheikh Zayed's Funding of Islamic Studies at Harvard Divinity School	108
<i>Leila Beckwith</i> : Anti-Zionism/Anti-Semitism at the University of California-Irvine	115
<i>Leila Beckwith, Tammi Rossmann-Benjamin, and Ilan Benjamin</i> : Faculty Efforts to Combat Anti-Semitism and Anti-Israeli Bias at the University of California-Santa Cruz	122
<i>Edward S. Beck</i> : Scholars for Peace in the Middle East (SPME): Fighting Anti-Israelism and Anti-Semitism on the University Campuses Worldwide	134
<i>Roz Rothstein</i> : StandWithUs: A Grassroots Advocacy Organization Also on Campus	147
<i>Alain Goldschläger</i> : The Canadian Campus Scene	154

<i>Corinne Berzon: Anti-Israeli Activity at Concordia University 2000-2003</i>	163
<i>Aryeh Green: European Universities and the New Anti-Semitism: Issues, Examples, Prescriptions</i>	174
<i>Ruth Contreras: On the Situation in Austrian Universities</i>	184
<i>Ronnie Fraser: The Academic Boycott of Israel: Why Britain?</i>	198
<i>Manfred Gerstenfeld: The UCU May 2007 Boycott Resolution and Its Aftermath</i>	214
<i>Gavin Gross: Anti-Israeli Activity at the School of Oriental and African Studies: How Jewish Students Started to Fight Back</i>	224
<i>Manfred Gerstenfeld: Utrecht University: The Myth of Jewish Cannibalism, Censorship, and Fear of Muslim Intimidation</i>	236
<i>Itamar Marcus and Barbara Crook: Anti-Semitism among Palestinian Authority Academics</i>	242
<i>Ted Lapkin: Academic Anti-Zionism in Australia</i>	250
List of Contributors	259
Index	263

Acknowledgments

Several donors who wish to remain anonymous have supported parts of this project over the past few years. I express my gratitude to them for helping generously in this way.

I would like to thank the following people at JCPA: Dore Gold and Chaya Herskovic, president and director-general, respectively, for their supportive attitude since the project's beginning; Edna Weinstock-Gabay, who was responsible for the production of this book; Elizabeth Mayman, who has guided several student interns in the research for their articles; Tamas Berzi, for his observations on the book's content as well as his technical assistance; and, last but not least, Ashley Perry for all his help.

I learned much from Anne Herzberg's legal comments. Many thanks are due as well to David Hornik for his copyediting.

I would like to thank all the student interns who, over the past five years, have collected material for this book. Naming only some of them would do injustice to many others.

Manfred Gerstenfeld

Introduction

In the new century, many attempts to discriminate against Israel, its academic institutions, and its scholars have been made in several Western countries. These include issues such as boycotting Israeli universities and academics as well as calling for the divestment of Israeli securities. The campaigns frequently use anti-Semitic motifs and sometimes also involve violent anti-Semitic acts. Although the phenomena on campus are heterogeneous, the assailants come mainly from two specific segments of the academic world: the extreme Left and Muslims.

The Jerusalem Center for Public Affairs has been following the developments in the academic world since the first call for a boycott over five years ago. Various lecturers visiting the JCPA have provided us with knowledge and perspective. We are also extremely grateful to many others who have shared with us their insights on campus developments. Students from all over the world interning at the JCPA have been an additional source of information as we discussed their personal experiences with them.

It is difficult to obtain a grip on dispersed, multifaceted phenomena. They involve many countries, each with its own peculiarities as far as academia's functioning and organization are concerned. The process of defaming and demonizing Israel has many aspects as do the reactions to it by faculty, students, as well as nonacademic bodies and individuals.

The introductory overview essay lays the broad infrastructure for understanding the complexities of the issue in question. This book also contains eighteen essays dealing with its key facets on four continents.

The authors of the essays highlight the great variety of the problem's characteristics in a number of countries. Some are academic teachers; others are present or former student leaders; yet others are monitors of academia from the outside. This not only leads to varying perspectives but also to very diverse writing styles and approaches. Some articles cover specific periods. Many thanks are due to all the authors for having made the effort to analyze so many aspects of the campaign against Israel and Jews at universities.

The attacks on Israel and Jews in academia are part of a large and dynamic process. Many of the problems described in these essays will not disappear. One purpose of this book is thus to lay the groundwork for ongoing monitoring of the demonization and defamation of Israel and Jews in the academic world, as well as the efforts to fight these trends.

Because part of the information for this text comes from the Internet, much of it may no longer be available in a few years. This book, therefore, fulfills another function as well: it documents for future reference many details of the initial years of this process and the attitudes of important proponents. While not being comprehensive, it aims to capture the mood of this period.

Natan Sharansky

Foreword

Anti-Semites succeeded in murdering six million Jews only after significant parts of the supposedly enlightened world accepted as a matter of fact that Jews were dangerous and inferior beings. Genocide became legitimate when this attitude permeated universities, the intelligentsia, and other elites.

Against this historical background the inroads of the anti-Israeli campaign into the Western academic world are extremely worrying. The infrastructure for future crimes or even genocide is being laid by ideologists at universities of the free world. To demonstrate how academic freedom is regularly abused on campuses I have developed the “three Ds” test, which stands for Demonization, the application of Double standards against Israel, and its Delegitimization.

After I became minister for Jerusalem and Diaspora affairs in 2003, I invented this test of the “three Ds” to distinguish new anti-Semitism from legitimate criticism of Israel. It is anti-Semitism and demonization when comparisons are being made between Israelis and Nazis, or between Palestinian refugee camps and Auschwitz.

It is equally anti-Semitic when Israel is singled out by the United Nations for human rights abuses while the behavior of major abusers such as China, Iran, Cuba, and Syria is ignored. Similarly it is anti-Semitism when only Israel’s fundamental right to exist—alone among all the people of the world—is questioned.¹

Examples from Personal Experience

In light of these observations, when I was minister I visited many dozens of university campuses abroad to gain firsthand knowledge of the defamation of Israel and the discrimination against those who support it in the academic world as well as to encourage the resistance of activists.

I thus can contribute some personal experience to the important case studies in this book. My first campus visit in 2003 took place at York University in Toronto where we had a good audience of mainly sympathetic Jews. A Jewish student asked the first question: “Please explain why we need Israel? For me as a Jew, the existence of Israel is a big problem. I want to be a normal person, and I am being identified by my colleagues with an immoral state. If Israel did not exist, I would feel much easier.” This student, under pressure, had internalized the anti-Semitic atmosphere he encountered on that campus.

At many universities I spoke to Jewish students who, because Israel has a bad image on their campus, distanced themselves from anything Jewish or pro-

Israeli. This was not because they were ashamed of Israel but for opportunistic reasons. At Harvard Business School (of all places) a student told me that if she signed the open letter against divestment from Israel some of her professors would not like it—and that this would affect her grades. She added: “I am a very good student about to complete my thesis. These professors may consider my pro-Israeli position when giving me marks, which in turn can influence my career. It is better for me to wait and only afterward speak out in favor of Israel.”

On a Canadian campus, a student said to me: “In the past when I was active for Israel, I was often criticized and lost many friends. Now I promote ecological agriculture, and everybody loves me.”

These types of remarks I heard again and again on different campuses in Western countries. They reminded me of communist rule. We were called the Jews of silence because we were not supposed to express our opinions, yet some courageous people did speak out. It is very worrying to see that some in the free world volunteer to be Jews of silence.

At Columbia University I spent a Shabbat with a few hundred Jewish students who were happy to be—for that day—among Jews where they could feel at home. They studied on a campus where more than one-third of the students were Jewish, yet many felt that they should keep a low profile on their pro-Israeli feelings outside their Jewish social circle.

Through meetings like these I saw how the system functions. Israel’s enemies on campus are so powerful because they feel that the progressive world, the media, and intellectual powers support them. They are not interested in the truth and can propagate lies because few challenge them or even check what they say. At the same time I saw again and again how a small critical mass of people who are not afraid to stand up for Israel, who are good debaters armed with powerful arguments can change the situation. After all the truth is all on our side. And it is of crucial importance to have Jewish and non-Jewish faculty members—and not only students—on campus who are willing to go against the tide and speak out for Israel.

In the academic world, it is the faculty who remain active for decades, disseminating their warped perspective on Israel and the Middle East conflict, while students come and go every few years. Organizations such as Scholars for Peace in the Middle East, which is described in an essay in this book, play an important role at several universities in building such an opposition.

Europe

In Europe the nature of university life is different. Many problems we found in North America are even more pronounced across the Atlantic.

At Amsterdam University I had an interesting experience. The academic who chaired the session finished his polite introduction by saying that he was interested to hear how I, as a former political prisoner and a human rights activist,

could defend “one of the most awful regimes on earth, and be a member of its government which committed so many war crimes.”

When it came to question time after the lecture, I was pleasantly surprised that my host did not choose one of the many Muslim students who raised their hands but an old Jew who sat in front of me and looked a bit like my father. This feeling did not last long. When the man opened his mouth I immediately recognized the arguments of the veteran communist, who spoke about “fascist Israel that had no right to exist.” The next questioner was an Arab woman who told an invented horror story about how she, when living in Israel, was abused and raped by Israeli soldiers.

A large part of the audience, however, were baffled by my lecture. I told them that those who believed, like me, that the Palestinians deserved their own democratic state should never have supported Arafat. He brought much suffering upon his nation. I spoke about how the Palestinians had suffered from their leaders, from the Arab states, from the killings of Palestinians by Palestinians, the discrimination against women, the Arab states keeping all these generations of refugees in camps while other countries had solved much larger refugee problems.

Many present in the hall were in a fix. They were in favor of human rights, but psychologically could not agree with me because I represented the Israeli government. They were like the Israeli extreme Left who accept automatically that human rights belong to the Palestinians. The Amsterdam audience had clearly never been challenged in this way about democracy and human rights.

In Milan, Jewish students said very similar things to what I heard from the Harvard Business School student. They were forced to keep a low profile in the hostile anti-Israeli atmosphere prevailing there.

By far the most understanding audience was at the University of Central Europe in Budapest. These people or their parents had lived under the communist dictatorship and identified a variant of that in the Arab states of the Middle East. They fully recognized the personality of Yasser Arafat as his methods resembled those of their former totalitarian rulers. They understood that Israel was on the other side, that of freedom.

But that experience was the exception to the rule. Every European country I have visited—from France to Switzerland, Belgium to Austria, and even the UK—reflects a basic anti-Israeli bias as described in the article here about European universities. (I am fond of describing North American universities as “little islands of Europe.”) This fact—that the general environment outside the university setting is strongly anti-Israeli—contributes to the dangerously anti-Semitic trend in the European academic milieu.

Where to Go from Here?

We need many people to stand up against the demonizers, the propagators of double standards, and those who delegitimize Israel. Manfred Gerstenfeld and the Jerusalem Center for Public Affairs were among the first to address the issue of the new academic discrimination globally. They published the first overview articles on the subject and made available case studies about a number of campuses.

This book is a further milestone in the exposure and analysis of the anti-Semitic forces in their various permutations on Western campuses. I congratulate the JCPA for this initiative. I hope that they and the authors of the case studies will build further on the wealth of experience detailed here to help Israel and the Jewish people against those who propagate hatred under the cover of social justice.

Notes

1. For more details, see Natan Sharansky, "Foreword," *Jewish Political Studies Review*, Vol. 16, Nos. 3-4 (Fall 2004): 5-8, www.jcpa.org/phas/phas-sharansky-s05.htm.

Manfred Gerstenfeld

Academics against Israel and the Jews

INTRODUCTION

This essay addresses the major aspects of the international attacks on Jews and Israel on campus. It also proposes ways to successfully challenge the harassment from the academic world.

Since early 2002, many attempts to discriminate against Israel, its academic institutions, and its scholars have been undertaken in several Western countries. These include issues such as boycotting Israeli universities and academics calling for divestment of Israeli securities. The campaigns frequently use anti-Semitic motifs and sometimes also involve violent anti-Semitic acts.

Such incidents also occurred more sporadically in earlier decades. To the best of our knowledge, however, they have not been systematically reviewed.

The academic boycott and similar attempts should be seen in the context of the much broader, multiple, ongoing attacks against the Jewish people and Israel. These initiatives are part of a postmodern global war and often directly related to anti-Semitism. This global war is multisourced, fragmented, and often diffuse and discontinuous.

The modern anti-Semitism of the 1930s could be compared to many large, centrally managed factories of a toxin-producing corporation. Its chief executive was Hitler and from its tall chimneys anti-Semitic poison spread in large quantities over a wide area. Postmodern anti-Semitism can be compared to the pollution produced by the millions of cars everywhere. These run on fuel that causes poisonous elements to escape in limited quantities through a large number of exhausts all over the world. Today such poison is spread on many campuses.¹

1. Boycotts: An Overview

The second Palestinian uprising and Israel's need to suppress the violence led to many anti-Israeli actions in the Western world, including boycott campaigns. The most publicized were those by academics.

The idea of ostracizing individuals, groups, organizations, or businesses for views held or actions taken goes back millennia. The term boycott, however, was coined more recently. The practice was named after Captain Charles Cunningham Boycott, an English land agent in Ireland. When Boycott refused to reduce rent,

the president of the Land League in that area, Charles Stuart Parnell, suggested that people avoid business dealings with him in an effort to force his hand.

The events surrounding this protest elicited much passion and considerable media attention. In November 1880, the *London Times* popularized the use of the word boycott to refer to this type of activism. By 1897, following Captain Boycott's death, the word had become part of the English language.²

Boycott Subcategories

Boycott activities can be categorized as follows:

Ongoing and Episodic Boycotts

An ongoing boycott entails efforts that continue until the foe is brought to its knees. The targets may be countries such as white-ruled South Africa, white-ruled Rhodesia, and more recently Mugabe-ruled Zimbabwe. Targets may also be companies, institutions, or individuals.

An example of an episodic boycott that involves a single event was when in 1995, Shell was forced to abandon its plans to dispose of the Brent Spar oil platform by sinking it in the Atlantic Ocean. Greenpeace had led a consumer boycott of Shell that was particularly successful in Germany.

Other such boycotts were those in which countries have refused to participate in one of the Olympic Games. Among the better-known cases was the 1980 boycott by the United States and sixty-four other Western countries of the Moscow Olympics to protest the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan. The Soviet Union and fourteen East European countries boycotted the Los Angeles Olympics in 1984, claiming that the safety of their athletes could not be guaranteed.

Economic and Noneconomic Boycotts

Typical examples of economic boycotts are those applied against investing in or buying products from a certain country such as South Africa or Rhodesia in the past, or Israel today. At the beginning of the Iraq war, a significant number of Americans chose not to purchase French products because of France's strong opposition to the war. That attitude gradually faded, however.

A distinction can be made between primary, secondary, and tertiary economic boycotts. Until the Oslo agreements, Arab states had applied all these types against Israel. They can be defined as follows:³

Primary boycott: Prohibiting Arab states, companies, and individuals from any commercial, financial, or trade relations with Israel.

Secondary boycott: The blacklisting and boycotting by Arab governments and companies of companies worldwide that invest in Israel.

Tertiary boycott: Extending the boycott to companies doing business with boycotted firms.

The secondary Arab boycott led some foreign companies to divest their Israeli holdings or to forgo investing in the country so as not to endanger their commercial ties with Arab countries. The Arab boycott has been particularly effective regarding investments in oil-related industries.

Global oil companies have avoided investing in Israel. Shell Oil and British Petroleum—joint owners of the Haifa oil refinery when Israel became independent—announced on 24 July 1957 that they were ceasing operations in Israel. Subsequently, Standard Oil, Socony Mobil, and Texaco stopped their dealings in Israel because of the boycott and their heavy reliance on Arab-controlled oil.⁴

In 1953, the Arab Central Boycott Office decided that any aircraft landing in Israel would be prohibited from operating in Arab countries. Although this was not effective, a similar approach proved effective for ships calling at Israeli ports.

A year later, the Saudi Arabian government announced that it would take harsh measures against foreign aircraft passing over its territory to or from Israel. That is still the case in many Arab countries.

The Arab states have also tried to establish a tertiary boycott, though its efficacy is doubtful. Beginning in the 1960s, their Central Boycott Office expanded its target base and threatened to blacklist not only firms that invested in Israel but the suppliers and customers of those companies as well. Several authors consider that the boycott efforts had some success and caused Israel to lose some business partners.⁵

An example of a noneconomic boycott is banning the participation of athletes from a certain country in international competitions. Such boycotts have been applied against countries such as South Africa and Taiwan. Israel has been excluded from various Asian competitions.

Government and Nongovernment Boycotts

Several governments have applied boycotts of other governments. These can be divided into two general categories: unilateral and multilateral. Unilateral boycotts—like those initiated by the United States against Castro's Cuba in its early days and by the British against Rhodesia—are imposed by only one country. Multilateral boycotts are those in which many countries participate.

The international legal basis for boycotts and economic sanctions can be found in Article 16 of the Covenant of the League of Nations. The Covenant stresses the right of a League member in certain circumstances to cease all economic relations with a country deemed to be in some way "aggressive."

Most boycott studies have focused on economic rather than social consequences. Boycotts are thus usually defined as “economic sanctions,” with “sanctions” being defined as “penalties inflicted upon one or more states by one or more others, generally to coerce the target nation(s) to comply with certain norms that the boycott initiators deem proper or necessary.”⁶

The most prominent case of a government boycott action was taken by the United States against the South African apartheid government. A report by the U.S. Senate Foreign Relations Committee gave a list of steps to be taken against the South African government and economy including:

- Discouraging business expansion in South Africa
- Refusing to protect any business that stayed in South Africa from problems involving the liberation movement
- Requiring that U.S. firms in South Africa establish fair employment practices
- Forbidding aircraft from South Africa to land in the United States
- Prohibiting the sale of South African goods

The British government declared an official governmental boycott of Rhodesia on 16 November 1965. It included the cessation of all British aid to Rhodesia, the removal of Rhodesia from the sterling area and Commonwealth preference system, and a complete ban on purchasing tobacco and sugar from Rhodesia. When these measures—accompanied by diplomacy—had little impact, the United Nations, on 16 December 1966, acted on articles 39 and 41 of the UN Charter, giving it the right to impose mandatory economic sanctions against a member state.⁷

Nongovernment boycott attempts include those of organizations or bodies to induce academic institutions to sever relations with Israeli universities. Similarly, corporations or retailers may refuse to purchase Israeli goods, and so on.

General and Selective Boycotts

A general boycott encompasses, for instance, all Israelis or all of the country’s academics. A selective boycott could target those Israelis who refuse to condemn their government’s policies.

An example of the latter occurred when in March 2006 a British dance magazine, *Dance Europe*, refused to publish an article on Israeli choreographer Sally-Anne Friedland. The editor said she would publish the article only if Friedland condemned “the occupation.” She refused and the article was not published.⁸

Declared and Concealed Boycotts

A differentiation should also be made between declared and concealed—or secret—boycotts. A concealed boycott might be considered a de facto boycott

that is not declared by its perpetrators. At the time of the Arab boycott, few foreign companies stated explicitly that they were not investing in Israel because they considered their connections with Arab countries more valuable. When approached by Israeli companies, they attributed their refusal to invest, for instance, to the proposed projects not fitting their strategy.

Nowadays, people may refuse to attend a conference in Israel or not conduct business with an Israeli supplier without truthfully revealing why. Although the distinction between open and secret is rarely made, it is important since concealed boycotts are among those most difficult to combat.

Boycotts and Counterboycotts

When boycotts are initiated they frequently elicit calls for counterboycotts. This approach is often mentioned in discussions about how to mitigate a boycott, but it requires much more analysis than those proclaiming a counterboycott usually undertake. How to apply counterboycotts in the academic field is discussed later in this essay.

Previous Boycotts of the Jews

Jews have been at the receiving end of boycotts and similar phenomena throughout much of Jewish history. From Roman times until today, numerous actions of this type have harmed Jews in the economic and social spheres.⁹

Such discriminatory actions were very often effective in subverting the Jewish population and forcing it to fight for its livelihood. In the Middle Ages, Jews in many parts of Europe were excluded from guilds and certain professions such as ironmongers, shoemakers, tailors, barbers, butchers, or rag dealers. Jews were also subject to discriminatory taxes and prohibitions on land ownership, and later they were often forced into ghettos, where commercial involvement with the outside world was barred.

For a long time Jews in the Western world could not become citizens of the countries they lived in. Also there were often restrictions on the number of Jews allowed to enter universities or certain professions, even after they received those rights in the nineteenth century.¹⁰

The Pre-Holocaust Period

Jews encountered numerous boycotts during the twentieth century that took many forms. In prewar Poland there was a not very effective campaign to get Christians to buy only from Christian merchants.

The most notorious example of an anti-Jewish boycott was that instituted by the Nazis in 1933. On 1 April, Nazi propaganda minister Joseph Goebbels announced that Germans should avoid commerce with any Jewish-owned

businesses for one day to try and counteract an American Jewish initiative to oppose Nazi anti-Jewish practices. He warned that if worldwide attacks on the Nazi authorities continued after that day, “the boycott will be resumed...until German Jewry has been annihilated.”¹¹

On the designated day, German police and SS troops stood guard over Jewish businesses, attacking many of them. Although the actual boycott only lasted for that one day, it was the starting point for a campaign against Jews that swept across the country in the months and years to come. A week later, all Jewish employees were fired from the German civil service.¹²

The Arab Boycott of Israel

The Arab countries adopted the concept of the anti-Israeli boycott even before the creation of the Jewish state. In December 1945, the newly formed League of Arab States initiated what they hoped would become an economic tool to destroy Zionist ambitions. The boycott was aimed at goods and services being offered by Jews living in Palestine. The league’s call to avoid purchasing such goods came as a formal resolution stating that “Jewish products and manufactured goods shall be considered undesirable to the Arab countries” and encouraging all Arabs “to refuse to deal in, distribute, or consume Zionist products or manufactured goods.”¹³

Although this represented the organization of the boycott attempt against the growth of Zionism, it was not the first time Arab bodies had called for such action. As early as 1922, a boycott of Jewish businesses was proposed at the meeting of the Fifth Arab Congress in Nablus. Similar calls were made by the First Palestine Arab Women’s Congress in October 1929. Anti-Zionist boycotts were instituted throughout the 1930s.

At the Pan-Arab Conference of September 1937 in Bludan, Syria, participants approved a resolution stating that a boycott of the Jews was a “patriotic duty.”¹⁴ The boycott was mostly put on hold until after World War II.

When the state of Israel was established, the Arab boycott was expanded to pursue the broader goal of undermining Israel’s economic strength in any way possible. To that end, in 1949 the Arab League set up the Central Boycott Office in Damascus, whose sole task was to coordinate Arab boycott activity. Since then the Arab boycott has targeted not only Israel but also governments, companies, organizations, and individuals with ties to Israel.¹⁵

Western countries have long imposed various arms embargos on Israel. One of the best-remembered ones was the French embargo after the Six Day War. It led to Israel secretly removing five ships from the Cherbourg harbor in 1969 after France decided not to supply them to the Israeli navy.

Jewish Counterboycotts

At times the Jews have also imposed boycotts on others, but the difference was that they were usually a last-resort effort. These included:

- Prewar boycotts of Germany. For example, when the Nazis came to power in Germany in January 1933, Jewish leaders in Poland declared a boycott of German goods. A special periodical was published focusing on anti-Nazi protests and the boycott. According to one source, “Jewish merchants in Poland, especially those engaged in foreign trade, suffered serious losses (losing business to non-Jewish competitors) probably exceeding the losses suffered by Germany.”¹⁶
- A boycott of Kurt Waldheim when he became Austria’s president.
- Threats of a boycott of Swiss banks in 1996 by the controllers of U.S. government agencies upon the initiative of the World Jewish Congress.¹⁷ This proved extremely effective. The threats were made only after the Swiss banks had stalled Jewish efforts to obtain greater clarity about dormant accounts for over fifty years.

Current Boycotts of Israel

The current boycotts of Israel can be categorized as follows:

- Embargos on weapons and strategic materials
- Various boycott attempts against Israeli academic institutions and scholars (discussed later in this essay)
- Commercial and investment boycotts such as:
 - Not buying Israeli products
 - Not investing in Israel
- Divesting Israeli securities
- Boycotting or disturbing performances by Israeli artists or speakers
- Sports boycotts
- Other acts of aggression that are nonviolent only in the classic definition of the word, such as blocking Israeli websites

2. A Broader Anti-Israeli Framework

The anti-Israeli boycott attempts and nonviolent warfare against the Jewish people and Israel must be seen within the much larger framework of the interrelationships between the Arab world, the West, the Jews, and Israel.

The Battle of the Narratives

In recent decades a battle of narratives has emerged. It was well defined by former Israeli ambassador to the European Union, Harry Kney-Tal, who expressed his concern about a new generation of West European leaders who were raised on the Palestinian Arab view of events:

That narrative, which is reinforced by Israeli or former Israeli researchers, has nearly totally taken over the academic, political and media discussion of the issues.... It is appropriate to the popular worldview in Europe nowadays, which is pacifist and post-modernist, full of guilt toward the former colonies and full of sympathy for oppressed nations demanding self-determination. It also serves electoral interests as well as the traditional interests of *Realpolitik*, which makes up a large part of E.U. policy.¹⁸

As long as Israel, the Jews, and their allies fail to grapple with the broader issue, the consequences of the anti-Israeli boycott attempts can at best be mitigated. The classic defensive, rather than proactive, approaches may be both time-consuming and only partly effective.

Contemporary Anti-Semitism and Its Recycling of Motifs

Another aspect of boycott attempts that needs to be analyzed is anti-Semitism, which in the West had been largely latent or subdued since the Holocaust but now manifests itself openly in various segments of Western society, including intellectual elites.¹⁹ Anti-Semites today are much less inhibited about exposing their anti-Semitism than in past decades. This is manifested, among other things, in hate mail Jews receive from senders who give their names and addresses—a phenomenon much more frequent than in the past.

Much of the anti-Semitic critique involves attacks on Israel. Some critics, particularly on the Left, state that they are anti-Zionists and not anti-Semites. Their behavior, however, often testifies to the contrary, indicating that for all practical purposes they are anti-Semites.²⁰

This is often clear from their semantics. One British daily noted a statement made by anti-Israeli boycott supporters in 2002 that “groups plan to picket Tesco, Marks & Spencer, Sainsbury’s and Co-Op because they sell Jewish-made produce.”²¹

It has become increasingly clear to many observers that anti-Zionism and anti-Semitism share the same major hate motifs. For instance, Lawrence Summers, the Jewish former president of Harvard University, referred to this similarity in his much-publicized “Address at Morning Prayers” in 2002.²²

France’s education minister Luc Ferry expressed a similar view when he introduced measures against racism and anti-Semitism in French schools in

early 2003. The French left-wing daily *Libération* commented: “Not everybody enjoyed the ministerial declarations. The main labor union of high school teachers, the SNES-FSU, hardly appreciated a statement by Luc Ferry that ‘some of the left-wing teachers who are anti-Israeli increasingly tolerate anti-Semitic statements under the pretext that these are not made by the extreme Right.’”²³

The EUMC Working Definition of Anti-Semitism

An important step forward in the battle against anti-Semitism was the establishment of a working definition of anti-Semitism. This was achieved by a small group of Jewish NGOs at the request of the European Monitoring Centre on Racism and Xenophobia (EUMC). This definition is now frequently utilized at international conferences to assess whether texts or speeches are anti-Semitic.

The EUMC working definition reads: “Antisemitism is a certain perception of Jews, which may be expressed as hatred toward Jews. Rhetorical and physical manifestations of anti-Semitism are directed toward Jewish or non-Jewish individuals and/or their property, toward Jewish community institutions and religious facilities.” The explanation states that: “such manifestations could also target the state of Israel, conceived as a Jewish collectivity.”

This document refers not only to matters such as calling for or justifying the killing of Jews, dehumanizing and demonizing them, accusing them of imagined wrongdoing, denying the Holocaust, and charging Jews with being like Nazis, but also with denying Jews the right to self-determination and applying double standards by requiring behavior of Israel that is not expected of any other democratic country.²⁴

The Demonization of the Jews

In its crudest verbal form, Jews are demonized by being attributed with characteristics of their bitterest enemies. It is now well understood that comparing Israeli actions to those of the Nazis is not an isolated anti-Semitic phenomenon. This motif has been around for decades and does not only originate from Arab sources.

Since the 1980s, several high-level European politicians have made such anti-Semitic declarations.²⁵ Greek Socialist prime minister Andreas Papandreu compared Israelis to Nazis in a public statement in 1982.²⁶ So did the Swedish Social Democratic leader Olof Palme shortly before he became prime minister and again a few months later.²⁷

One proponent of the current attempts at academic discrimination in Europe is Mona Baker, now at the University of Manchester. In a press interview she used extreme anti-Semitic language: “Many people in Europe have signed a boycott of Israel. Israel has gone beyond just war crimes. It is horrific what is going on

there. Many of us would like to talk about it as some kind of Holocaust which the world will eventually wake up to, much too late, of course, as they did with the last one.”²⁸

Another academic at the same institution, Michael Sinnott, professor of paper science, claimed in an email that there was a worldwide Zionist conspiracy:

[Israel’s] atrocities surpass those of Milosevic’s Yugoslavia. Uniformed Israeli troops murder and mutilate Palestinian children, destroy homes and orchards, steal land and water, and do their best to root out Palestinian culture and the Palestinians themselves.... With the recent crop of atrocities the Zionist state is now fully living down to Zionism’s historical and cultural origins as the mirror image of Nazism.²⁹

Sinnott apologized after the *Daily Telegraph* passed the email to the university authorities, stating: “I deeply regret sending it and regret any offense it has caused.”³⁰ This is a frequent type of apology. The defamer does not retract his views but expresses contrition for making them public.

There have been many other examples of extreme defamation in the new century. *The Guardian* wrote: “A young British lecturer working at the University of Tel Aviv decided he would like to take a post back home, in the United Kingdom. However, the head of the first university department to which he applied told him, ‘No, we don’t accept any applicants from a Nazi state.’”³¹

In September 2002, Ted Honderich, a Canadian-born philosophy professor at University College London, gave a lecture at the University of Toronto in which he said the Palestinians had a moral right to engage in terror: “To claim a moral right on behalf of the Palestinians to their terrorism is to say that they are right to engage in it, that it is permissible if not obligatory.”³²

At the end of 2002, the English Department of Harvard University invited Tom Paulin, a poet and academic from Hertford College at Oxford, to lecture at the university under the pretense of guaranteeing free speech. There was much opposition to this because, in an interview with the Egyptian paper *Al-Ahram*, Paulin was quoted as calling the Israeli settlers “Nazis and racists” for whom he felt “nothing but hatred” and who should be “shot dead.”³³ The department initially canceled Paulin’s invitation but then overturned the cancellation.

Paulin claimed he had been misrepresented in the Egyptian paper. However, in a poem published in February 2001 in *The Observer*, Paulin had called the Israeli army the “Zionist SS” that had deliberately shot “little Palestinian boys.”³⁴

Two Stereotypes of Jews

The abovementioned narrative is accompanied by a recent Western one in which two stereotypes of Jews come strongly to the fore.

The first one is the “humane” Jew. This Jew reflects on the Holocaust and draws politically correct conclusions from it. Those who posit this stereotype

consider that, whatever happens, the Jew's conclusion should be that Jews must always be humane, progressive, and peace-loving. Without saying so explicitly, they convey that in conflicts Jews are only acceptable as victims. This reflects a perverse mindset: the victim rather than the perpetrator should draw conclusions from the Holocaust. The other stereotype is the "violent" Jew, who becomes the Israeli portrayed as aggressive, a colonialist oppressor, and inhabiting a violent state.

The penetration of European discourse by these narratives has many interrelated aspects and consequences. It enables television and other media—in need of succinct, black-and-white explanations—to depict the Israeli as evil without explicitly stating that this is true of Jews in general. It also enables Western intellectuals to declare themselves anti-Zionists while claiming that they are neither anti-Semites nor racists.

Yet another accompanying phenomenon is the ignoring of anti-Semitism by organizations that claim to support human rights and oppose racism. This emerged, for instance, when the Canadian B'nai Brith reported an unprecedented 60 percent increase in anti-Semitic incidents across Canada in 2002. Its chairperson, Rochelle Wilner, stressed that Canada's multicultural and antiracist organizations had failed to support the Jews in their battle against anti-Semitism.³⁵

Jewish Self-Hatred

This double image of the Jew thus leaves a loophole through which some Jews can escape identification with the evil "violent Jew." To do so they must explicitly denounce acts of the Israeli government and dissociate themselves from it. They must identify with the suffering of the Palestinians and belittle or explain their major crimes, including their decades-long calling for genocide. In effect, these Jews say to the non-Jewish world: "We are among the examples of the Jews you should like. We are the good Jews."

The most extreme among these claim it is for ethical reasons that they have cut their ties with Israel, initiate actions against it, and support extremist peace claims against Israel such as taking back Palestinian refugees. Jews who take such positions form a disproportionate number of the initiators and supporters of the anti-Israeli boycott and other anti-Israeli actions.

In the 1950s, Gordon Allport discussed various aspects of self-hatred. Among these he cited the "subtle mechanism" whereby the victim agrees with the persecutors and "sees his own group through their eyes." He noted that a Jew "may hate his historic religion...or he may blame some one class of Jews...or he may hate the Yiddish language. Since he cannot escape his own group, he does in a real sense hate himself—or at least the part of himself that is Jewish."³⁶

New versions of this old motif have now emerged. Among these are Jews and Israelis who hate Israel or see it through the eyes of politically correct members of certain Western elites.

Self-hating Jews have become an important tool in the anti-Israeli campaigns of Western media. Israeli historian Robert Wistrich observes that in Britain “only those Jews who smash Israel appear in the media, and Israel is routinely represented as an ethnic-cleansing rogue state—when not compared to Nazi Germany and South Africa—and at the same time is held to a higher standard than other countries.”³⁷

So far there have been many rewards and limited penalties for some of the Jews who attack Israel. They have positioned themselves in society so that they are applauded by part of the non-Jewish environment. As Jews disparaging Israel, they provide an alibi for Israel’s Western enemies.

Current Examples

The new manifestations of Jewish self-hatred have only been minimally researched. Only now is this subject receiving more attention from defenders of Israel. It is important because many gentile assaults use statements by Israeli or Diaspora Jewish defamers to legitimize their denigrations of Israel or the Jews.

Furthermore, a small number of anti-Israeli Jews enable the media to portray a Jewish community divided over key Israeli policies. Among specific aspects of the anti-Israeli writings of some Jews—as compared to non-Jews—are the use of their family’s Holocaust experiences, their references to being Jewish, or an association of some kind with Israel.³⁸

Psychiatrist Kenneth Levin says the phenomenon of Jewish self-hatred now finds a parallel among parts of the Israeli cultural elites. He notes: “Segments of populations under chronic siege commonly embrace the indictments of the besiegers, however bigoted and outrageous.... The paradigm on the level of individual psychology is the psychodynamics of abused children, who almost invariably blame themselves for their predicament.”³⁹

Edward Alexander and Paul Bogdanor have edited a book of essays on the Jewish derogation of Israel. These discuss mainly, though not exclusively, North American academics such as Noam Chomsky, Norman Finkelstein, Tony Judt, Daniel Boyarin, and Michael Neuman.⁴⁰ Ofira Seliktar has made a detailed analysis of the modus operandi of radical academics in Israel.⁴¹

A small group called Israel Academia Monitor provides a record of extreme anti-Israeli statements by Israeli academics. It tries to bring this information to the attention of donors and alumni of the universities in which these academics teach, as well as journalists.⁴²

Anti-Israeli Jews include MIT linguistics professor Noam Chomsky, who has viciously attacked Israel from Boston for decades. Jewish author John Docker was one of the anti-Israeli academic boycott initiators in Australia.⁴³ Jean-Marc Lévy Leblond of the University of Nice, who had also signed the *Guardian* letter, played an important role in the initial academic boycott campaign in France. In

Austria the Jewish political scientist John Bunzl is in the forefront of the verbal attacks on Israel.⁴⁴

Self-hatred and Jewish/Israeli defamation of Israel are important because these factors play a significant role in the boycott actions against Israel. Finding ways to diminish the rewards of the publicity the anti-Israeli activists obtain should be an important strategic target in the battle against boycotts.

Another example of a Jew with anti-Israeli views is the South African minister Ronnie Kasrils, a former African National Congress (ANC) guerrilla. He initiated a discussion about a possible boycott of Israel in the South African cabinet.⁴⁵ He has also compared Israeli actions to those of Nazis.⁴⁶ Kasrils furthermore claimed in spring 2007 that Hamas had abjured violence while Hamas leaders were denying this.⁴⁷

Israeli Aspects

The World Jewish Congress drew attention to the Israeli self-hatred phenomenon in one of its publications, stating:

Certainly, a most disturbing element in the present situation is the fact that certain extreme left-wing Israeli organizations are often operating in concert with the Arabs in such campaigns and even orchestrating them. For several years now, such organizations have been circulating a list of Israeli firms operating in the West Bank, the Gaza District and the Golan Heights, and even the boundaries of east Jerusalem, and have called on Israelis to boycott these firms. Moreover, the same people have sent their list to the offices of the European Union in order to have those firms disqualified as Israeli companies and thus not receive certain benefits.⁴⁸

Tanya Reinhart—who passed away in 2007—was an Israeli who taught linguistics at Tel Aviv University and had been actively promoting the academic boycott of Israel. In an open letter to another left-wing academic who had come out against the boycott, Baruch Kimmerling of Hebrew University—who also passed away in 2007—she wrote: “But no matter what you think of the Oslo years, what Israel is doing now exceeds the crimes of South Africa’s white regime. It has started to take the form of systematic ethnic cleansing, which South Africa never attempted.”⁴⁹

Israel as a Paradigm of the West’s Future

What happens to Israel is also a tool for analyzing internal tensions in Western society. Israel and the Jews have to some extent become paradigms for how these tensions may expand. This is not a new concept; the Jews as a “canary in the mine” is a familiar metaphor. When the canary did not feel well, it meant there was something wrong with the air down below. Many current anti-Semitic and

anti-Israeli activities are indicative of ills that will affect other parts of Western society at a later stage.

The French authorities long ignored the anti-Semitic attacks there that started in late 2000. They wanted to maintain social peace, not realizing that the widespread Muslim racism that initially aimed at the Jews was concealing its main target: white Frenchmen. The autumn 2005 riots made this abundantly clear.⁵⁰

Josef Joffe, editor of the German weekly *Die Zeit*, commented on the linkage made by certain circles in Europe and the Arab world between hatred of America and hatred of the Jews:

Images that were in the past directed against the Jews are now aimed at the Americans: the desire to rule the world; the allegation that the Americans, like the Jews in the past, are interested only in money and have no real feeling for culture or social distress. There are also some people who connect the two and maintain that the Jewish desire to rule the world is being realized today, in the best possible way, by means of the “American conquest.”⁵¹

American political scientist Andrei Markovits has investigated the similarities and differences of European anti-Americanism and anti-Semitism. He points out that many Europeans see America and Jews as paragons of a modernity they dislike and distrust: money-driven, profit-hungry, urban, universalistic, individualistic, mobile, rootless, inauthentic, and thus hostile to established traditions and values. He adds that anti-Americanism and anti-Semitism are the only major icons shared by the European extreme Left and far Right, including neo-Nazis.⁵²

The Global War on Israel and the Jews

A further aspect to be studied in more detail concerns the methods used by the most extreme adversaries of the Jewish people and Israel. The multiple ongoing attacks on Israel and the Jews in the new century combine into a system that, as if controlled by an invisible hand, is very similar to a postmodern “total war.” This complex whole is of a radically different nature than the Nazis’ war against the Jews in the previous century.⁵³

The attackers comprise disparate groups and individuals who carry out their aggressions in many different ways. The ultimate aim of their “drip, drip” approach is to tear Israel apart limb by limb. It is particularly important to realize this because an array of enemies of Israel await new occasions after each failure of their attacks.

Those trying to dismantle the United States or to change Western society’s democratic system practice somewhat similar methods.

Lessons from Boycotts of Other Countries

Some past boycotts of other countries can be used as case studies to understand what Israel's enemies wish to achieve. The boycott of white-ruled South Africa is especially relevant as some of the organizations attacking Israel use it as a model.

At the United Nations World Conference against Racism in Durban in 2001, the South African NGO Committee (SANGOCO) promoted a proposal to act against Israel similarly to what was done in the past against white-ruled South Africa. SANGOCO has a close relationship with the PLO.

Shimon T. Samuels, international liaison director of the Simon Wiesenthal Center, summarized the eight points that SANGOCO proposed:⁵⁴

The first point: to launch an educational program to create worldwide solidarity against Israel, the last bastion of Apartheid. This word strikes a redolent chord across Africa and is meant to unleash the arsenal of the 1970s and 1980s Anti-Apartheid Movement, including the sanctions, boycotts, and embargoes known as the Sullivan Program.

The second point: to use all legal mechanisms in countries of universal jurisprudence against Israel. This we have seen in attempts to create war crime accusation cases against Sharon in Belgium, the Netherlands, Switzerland, and recently also in the United States. Eventually our enemies aim to use the International Criminal Court against Israel.

The third and fourth points of attack were to discredit the Law of Return, the foundation of Zionism and Israel, and to replace it with a Law of Return for all Palestinian refugees in order to create moral equivalence.

The fifth point: to re-institute the Arab boycott out of Damascus combined with a secondary boycott as in the 1970s and 1980s. We are already seeing the certificate of negative origin, once again, being demanded from European companies dealing with Arab countries.

The sixth point: to impose a sports, telecommunications, academic, scientific, and military embargo on Israel. Points seven and eight encapsulate their broad goals: the eventual rupture of all diplomatic relationships with Israel and measures against any state that does not accept ostracism of Israel. All of these eight points were to be carried out in a five-year program.

3. The Academic Boycott

As aforementioned, the previous decades already saw sporadic anti-Semitic incidents at universities that were not systematically recorded. We thus have to limit ourselves to a few examples.

Shouting Down Ambassador Ben Nathan in Germany

In June 1969, left-wing students verbally attacked Asher Ben Nathan, Israel's first ambassador to Germany. He was shouted down at Frankfurt University by members of the German leftist student group SDS, Palestinians, and Israelis from the leftist Matzpen group.

Two days later, Ben Nathan was unable to finish his lecture at Hamburg University because of numerous interruptions. When the ambassador wanted to lecture in September that year in Berlin, he was told that the climate at both the Free and the Technical universities was such that he should not do so. He then spoke at a meeting organized by the Young Christian Democrats.

Before that meeting, a leftist publication attacked Ben Nathan in a way that the German author Wolfgang Kraushaar interprets as an invitation to make an attempt on the Israeli ambassador's life. Ben Nathan's lecture at Munich University in December of that year was also severely disrupted. One poster in the auditorium carried the words: "Only when bombs explode in 50 supermarkets in Israel will there be peace."⁵⁵

Later years saw further examples of left-wing German extremist actions against Israelis at universities. Internationale Solidarität was an ad hoc group established to prevent the vice-chancellor of the Hebrew University from addressing a meeting at Kiel University. A leaflet distributed by this group concluded with the slogan, "Schlagt die Zionisten tot, macht den Nahen Osten rot (Beat Zionists dead, make the Near East red)."⁵⁶

Holocaust Denial

Holocaust denial in academia has developed in various countries. In France in particular, from the 1970s a central figure in this regard was Robert Faurisson, a former professor at Lyon University. Deborah Lipstadt noted that he "regularly creates facts where none exist and dismisses as false any information inconsistent with his preconceived conclusions."⁵⁷

In later years several other French scholars engaged in Holocaust denial. In 1985, at Nantes University, Henri Roques presented a PhD thesis containing Holocaust-denial elements. In 1990, Bernard Notin, who taught at Lyon 3 University, published a Holocaust-denying article in an important scientific journal.⁵⁸

In an analysis of anti-Jewish intolerance on Canadian university campuses, Stefan Braun mentioned various incidents at the end of the twentieth century:

In November 1989, Jewish students brought a police investigation against a Muslim Student Association film at the University of Toronto, which depicted Jews as Christ-killers, corrupt financiers, and world conspirators, to "ascertain whether the hate provisions of the Canadian Criminal Code had

been violated.” In 1997, Jewish students at the University of Toronto tried to have those responsible for a Palestinian campus display (put up during Arab culture week) equating Zionism with Nazism criminally charged under the Hate Propaganda provisions of the Criminal Code.⁵⁹

Space here is too limited to provide a detailed overview of worldwide developments. A selection of examples from several countries will indicate the range of actions against Israel and Jews on campus. The essays that follow this introduction complement these examples.

The United Kingdom

Elements in the United Kingdom have been in the forefront of anti-Israeli actions on campus. In his chapter in this book, Ronnie Fraser analyzes the reasons for this prominent role. These include, in his view, the fact that academics there are more organized than in the United States or continental Western Europe. Moreover, the labor unions allow the activists, many of them left-wing, to decide policies.

Fraser claims that the role played by British labor unions has been crucial to the success of the pro-Palestinian lobby. He also considers that the boycott has so much support in Britain because Israel is identified with Britain’s colonial past. He concludes that the passivity of UK Jewry contributed to the initial lack of resistance to the boycott campaign.

Two British professors, Steven Rose (who is Jewish) and his wife Hilary, initiated the first major academic boycott campaign against Israel. They claimed that Israeli academics were the only non-European Union scholars eligible for grants from the EU, and that given Israel’s policy toward the Palestinians, these grants should be suspended.⁶⁰

On 6 April 2002, an open letter appeared in *The Guardian*. It called for a moratorium on all cultural and research links with Israel at European or national levels until the Israeli government abided by UN resolutions and opened “serious peace negotiations with the Palestinians, along the lines proposed in many peace plans including most recently that sponsored by the Saudis and the Arab League.”⁶¹

Initially the Roses collected about 120 signatories, ninety of them from the UK. By 11 April the number had grown to several hundred, including ten Israeli academics—two from the Hebrew University, three from the University of Haifa, and five from Tel Aviv University.

The Roses obtained some international publicity for their attacks on Israel. In July 2002, *The Observer* published a sizable article by the Roses that opened:

The carnage in the Middle East continues; today a suicide bomber, tomorrow an Israeli strike on Palestinians with helicopters, missiles, and tanks. The Israelis continue to invade Palestinian towns and expand illegal settlements in the occupied territories. Ariel Sharon refuses to negotiate while “violence”

(i.e. Palestinian resistance) continues. Our own government sheds crocodile tears at the loss of life while inviting a prime minister accused of war crimes to lunch and providing his military with F16 spare parts.

The Roses avoided mentioning that the suicide bomber was a Palestinian. The entire paragraph makes no explicit reference to any negative Palestinian action. This well-known technique has been exposed, for instance, by Andrea Levin citing similar cases from the *New York Times*, *Washington Post*, *Los Angeles Times*, and *Boston Globe*.⁶²

In their article the Roses compared Israel to South Africa: “The international academic, cultural, and sporting communities had played a major part in isolating South Africa and we have increasingly learned of individuals who thought that cooperating with Israeli institutions was like collaborating with the apartheid regime.”

In December 2002, *The Guardian* devoted a major article to the boycott. It described the Roses as having “together and separately...been involved in left-wing political causes for decades.” The Roses reported receiving substantial hate mail as well as support, among other things, from people they called “pathologically anti-Jewish.” They went to great lengths to deny that they were Jewish anti-Semites.⁶³

Even the *Jerusalem Post* gave the Roses a substantial write-up without any criticism, where they could make their points and express moral outrage. Again they compared Israel to South Africa.⁶⁴

The Roses’ petition brought about the globalization of the boycott attempts. Academics from several countries signed it within a few days. Condemnations from official sources were much slower. On 23 April 2002, EU commissioner for research Philippe Busquin replied to one of the academics who had signed the open letter asking for the boycott:

As recently said on several occasions by the president of the European Commission, Mr. Romano Prodi, the European Commission is not in favor of a policy of sanctions against the parties to the conflict but rather advocates a continuous dialogue with them which is the best way to bring them back to negotiations. Moreover, the Council of Ministers took the same position on April 18th.⁶⁵

The Committee on Human Rights of Scientists of the New York Academy of Sciences also condemned the proposed moratorium on grants and contracts with Israeli research institutions on 3 May 2002: “The statement, co-sponsored by the Committee of Concerned Scientists, Inc., states that the ‘proposed moratorium/boycott on funding violates the basic principles of scientific freedom and scholarship’ and that science ‘will be undermined for the sake of some political goals.’”⁶⁶

The Baker Case

Following the open letter in *The Guardian*, a second case emerged in the UK in 2002 that attracted more attention. Mona Baker, an Egyptian-born professor of translation studies at UMIST in Manchester, sacked two Israeli academics from the editorial boards of the journals *The Translator* and *Translation Study Abstract* that she and her husband own and edit. The journals are published by their own press, St. Jerome Publishing. Her act of firing them for their Israeli identity and views was an example of a selective boycott.

Baker stated that the two Israelis, Dr. Miriam Shlesinger of Bar-Ilan University and Prof. Gideon Toury of Tel Aviv University, could remain on the board if they left Israel and severed all ties with it.⁶⁷ This resembles more the classic religious form of anti-Semitism, where a Jew could become a university professor if he converted, than the racial one. One ironic aspect was that Shlesinger had previously served as chair of Amnesty International's Israel branch.

The dismissal of the two Israeli scholars gradually led to many protests. Stephen Howe of Oxford University, who had signed the original Rose petition, asked for his name to be removed from it and expressed the hope that others would follow suit.⁶⁸ Two leading Oxford University scientists, Colin Blakemore and Richard Dawkins, also withdrew their names from the petition.⁶⁹ Sidney Greenblatt, a world-renowned Shakespeare scholar at Harvard University, condemned Baker and called her attitude "repellent, dangerous, and morally bankrupt."

Greenblatt added: "Excluding scholars because of the passports that they carry or because of their skin color, religion, or political party, corrupts the integrity of intellectual work."⁷⁰

Andrew Marks of Columbia University, editor of the prestigious *Journal of Clinical Investigation*, sent Baker an email telling her of his Iraqi deputy editor whom he would not think of dismissing because of his nationality, even if they have diametrically opposed political views.⁷¹

Geoffrey Alderman, academic dean of American InterContinental University-London, wrote in a personal capacity in *The Guardian*:

Those academics who have led the boycott movement have indeed opened a Pandora's box. But if they were now to make amends, by calling for a boycott of Mona Baker. . . I should certainly join them, and if I did so I would be acting only to uphold the academic values by which I live. The pursuit of these values depends crucially on personal contact and interaction. I shall continue to maintain contact with academics around the world, irrespective of the societies in which they live and work, and of the political or military environments in which they may find themselves.⁷²

Commentator Rod Liddle in *The Guardian* was less polite, writing: "Mona Baker 'unappointed' two Israeli academics from the journal for which she worked. She

hopes that, none the less, she can still be friends with them. I hope they punch her on the nose. Her husband, Ken, whined that they had received 15,000 emails in 24 hours, many 'abusive and obscene.' Just 15,000 huh? Better keep them coming."⁷³

The British education secretary, Estelle Morris, criticized Baker and said: "I understand that UMIST has very clearly disassociated itself from this action; and [Higher Education Minister] Margaret Hodge and I have made it clear that any discrimination on grounds of nationality, race, or religion is utterly unacceptable."⁷⁴

As a result of the multiple criticism, UMIST was forced to conduct an inquiry into the matter, which found Baker innocent because her journals were not under the university's auspices. UMIST vice-chancellor John Garside welcomed the outcome of the inquiry. However, he added that if the journals had been under the university's jurisdiction, it would have reinstated the Israeli professors. Not surprisingly, the UMIST ruling was seen as a victory for the anti-Israeli forces.⁷⁵

After several months, British prime minister Tony Blair also came out against the boycott at UMIST. In a private meeting on 28 October 2002, he told UK chief rabbi Jonathan Sacks that he would do anything necessary to stop the academic boycott at that university. One of his aides said: "The Prime Minister is appalled by discrimination against academics on the grounds of their race or nationality. He believes that universities must send a clear signal that this will not be tolerated."⁷⁶

In spring 2002, NATFHE, then one of the two UK university teachers unions, passed a motion at its annual conference asking institutions to sever their links with Israel.⁷⁷ The other teachers union, the Association of University Teachers (AUT), also passed a motion critical of Israel. At the time these motions had mainly rhetorical significance.⁷⁸ In 2005 and 2006, more intensive boycott campaigns developed in the AUT and NATFHE that Fraser describes in more detail in his chapter.

In 2006, AUT and NAFTHE merged into the University and College Union (UCU). At its first conference on 30 May 2007 in Bournemouth, a motion was passed calling for a debate on a comprehensive and consistent boycott of Israeli academic institutions. Some 158 delegates voted in favor and 99 against.

As a result the battle over the academic boycott of Israel internationalized. This led, among other things, to an advertisement in the *New York Times* in August 2007, signed by about three hundred American university and college presidents who stated they would not work with institutions that were boycotting Israeli academics. The debate surrounding the 2007 UCU resolution and the abandoning of the boycott are discussed in an essay by this author in this volume.

Australia

A few weeks after the 2002 open letter against Israeli academics in *The Guardian*, a similar effort began in Australia that secured ninety signatories. The initiators were John Docker, an Australian Jewish author from the Humanities Research Centre of the Australian National University, and a Lebanese Christian anthropology lecturer, Ghassan Hage of Sydney University.⁷⁹

In response, a group of Australian academics wrote an open letter to *The Guardian*:

Whereas we hold diverse political views with respect to the past and current policies of the Israeli government, and whereas we recognize the right of concerned citizens in Israel and elsewhere to express their opinions freely, we are united in our opposition to the proposed boycott.... The spectacle of a university or scientific body applying a boycott is inconsistent with the pursuit of intellectual freedom through research, debate and discussion. Such a boycott would have an effect opposite to that intended and would constitute an assault on intellectual freedom.⁸⁰

The Australian commented on the Docker-Hage initiative in an editorial:

We expect higher standards and greater objectivity from self-declared members of the intelligentsia who have put their signatures to what is little more than a piece of propaganda.... Academics and intellectuals have a right to express their opinions. But such a boycott transgresses the principles of academic freedom and university autonomy.⁸¹

The anti-Israeli boycott campaign in Australia did not take off. Several Australian academics, however, make frequent verbal attacks on Israel and Zionism. Ted Lapkin analyzes some of the most virulent cases in his chapter below.

Recent publications indicate that there has been a significant rise in anti-Semitism in its various forms on a number of Australian campuses. The verbal attacks come from the radical Left. There are also cases of physical violence against Jews on campus. One newspaper wrote that: "In Sydney some Jewish students feel so intimidated that they are wearing hats over their kippahs."⁸²

United States

In the United States, several campuses have become hotbeds for anti-Semitism and anti-Israeli activism. Even before the Iraq issue came to the fore, the pro-Palestinian student groups were grabbing attention with protest tactics made famous in the 1960s like demonstrating with body bags and gagged mouths. In the early years of this decade, the Palestinian effort had become—according to Jeffrey Ross, director of Campus and Higher Education Affairs at the Anti-Defamation League—the cause championed by all extreme left-wing groups.

Ross said, “The left has come into an alliance with the Palestinians, but to a certain degree the Palestinians have taken over the left agenda.”⁸³ ADL national director Abraham Foxman cautioned in an opinion piece that: “Many declared progressive groups, especially those against globalization, are joining with the pro-Palestinian groups. This alliance is active, vocal and frequently given to anti-Semitic actions and rhetoric.”⁸⁴ Israel Charny, editor of the *Encyclopedia of Genocide*, called the University of California at Berkeley the capital of the Western world’s anti-Semitism as of 2002.⁸⁵

Violence on Campus

One Jewish student activist on the Berkeley campus summed up the situation from 2000 to 2004 by saying there were many “cases of hate crimes, discrimination, vandalism of Jewish centers, and a great sense of intimidation from showing support for Israel.”⁸⁶

Prof. Laurie Zoloth, then at San Francisco State University—another breeding ground of anti-Semitism—wrote an email about the violent threats there that was widely circulated on the Internet. It mentioned a meeting organized by Hillel after which about fifty remained for afternoon prayers. Thereafter:

Counter demonstrators poured into the plaza, screaming at the Jews to “Get out or we will kill you” and “Hitler did not finish the job.” I turned to the police and to every administrator I could find and asked them to remove the counter demonstrators from the plaza, to maintain the separation of 100 feet that we had been promised. The police told me that they had been told not to arrest anyone.... The police could do nothing more than surround the Jewish students and community members who were now trapped in a corner of the plaza, grouped under the flags of Israel, while an angry, out of control mob, literally chanting for our deaths, surrounded us.... There was no safe way out of the Plaza. We had to be marched back to the Hillel House under armed S.F. police guard, and we had to have a police guard remain outside Hillel.⁸⁷

Simultaneously, students and teachers sought to convince universities to divest their holdings in Israeli securities and in those U.S. companies that supply arms to Israel. Although largely unsuccessful, the effort was perturbing in terms of the following it attracted. As of October 2002, petitions for divestment had been circulated at more than fifty campuses. Within the University of California system, more than seven thousand students and faculty members signed.⁸⁸

Although divestment at universities has not succeeded, it has made some inroads among mainline Protestant churches. One of these is the Presbyterian Church (USA), which initially supported some divestment moves but since has modified its position.⁸⁹

Divestment has been defined as “institutional groups removing financial support to companies in order to encourage a change in corporate behavior and/

or policy.”⁹⁰ It has become popular among radical college students as a way to attack Israel. Calls for divestment were similarly popular in American universities during the 1980s when their target was South Africa.

The divestment movement was the key focus of the Second National Student Conference of the Palestine Solidarity Movement held at the University of Michigan in October 2002. The conference website suggested that Israel, as opposed to “other oppressive states,” was worthy of being targeted by such a campaign because it “dictates the lives of over three million Palestinians, taxing them, yet denying them citizenship and the right to vote.” The conference organizers also claimed Israel was violating “more United Nations resolutions about human rights and international law than any other state in the world.”⁹¹ Since then similar meetings have been held at other universities.

Condemnation by Presidents

The divestment campaign has inspired much opposition among Jews and non-Jews alike on college campuses across the country. Many university presidents have condemned it. Judith Rodin, then president of the University of Pennsylvania, stated in a letter to the Penn community that:

Because Penn defends freedom of expression as a core academic and societal value, we will not use the power of the University either to stifle political debates or to endorse hostile measures against any country or its citizens. Divestiture is an extreme measure to be adopted rarely, and only under the most unusual circumstances. Certainly, many countries involved in the current Middle East dispute have been aggressors, and calls for divestment against them have been notably absent.⁹²

Lee C. Bollinger, president of Columbia University, wrote that he opposed the campaign that demanded Columbia to divest from all companies that produce or sell arms or other military hardware to Israel. “As President of Columbia...I want to state clearly that I will not lend any support to this proposal. The petition alleges human rights abuses and compares Israel to South Africa at the time of apartheid, an analogy I believe is both grotesque and offensive.”⁹³

In the debate at Yale University, pro-Israeli students argued in the *Yale Daily News* that the national divestment movement “has officially condoned terrorism.”⁹⁴ Defenders of the divestiture campaign claim that there is nothing anti-Jewish about the movement.

Abraham Foxman replied that this is not the case. In an article titled “Divestment Equals Anti-Semitism,” he stated: “The focus on Israel is ludicrous and clearly the result of a double standard being applied, which raises the possibility that anti-Semitism is the real motive of divestment campaigns.”⁹⁵

In a case study in 2004, Yonit Golub explained from her experience at Johns

Hopkins University how pro-Israeli activists can get organized, utilize the media, and maintain relationships with organizations, campus influentials, and the Jewish community.⁹⁶

Several case studies below describe developments at various other American campuses. Rebecca Leibowitz describes how Jewish students at Rutgers University were intimidated by the extreme anti-Israeli sentiment that in 2003 often crossed the line into anti-Semitic activity. She establishes a direct connection between anti-Israeli activities and anti-Semitic ones. Jonathan Jaffit relates how the single-handed action of a Jewish student, Rachel Fish, led Harvard University to suspend its tainted funding from the late Sheikh Zayed, the dictatorial ruler of the United Arab Emirates.

Leila Beckwith analyzes how Muslim student organizations have sponsored virulently anti-Zionist/anti-Semitic events on the campus of the University of California-Irvine. In another article together with Tammi Rossman-Benjamin and Ilan Benjamin, Beckwith describes faculty efforts to combat anti-Semitism and anti-Israeli bias at the University of California-Santa Cruz.

Recent Developments: Attacks Continue

In a 2006 report titled *Campus Antisemitism*, the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights found, among other things, that: “Anti-Israeli or anti-Zionist propaganda has been disseminated on many campuses that include traditional antisemitic elements, including age-old anti-Jewish stereotypes and defamation.” A second finding was that “antisemitic bigotry is no less morally deplorable when camouflaged as anti-Israelism or anti-Zionism.” It was also found that “substantial evidence suggests that many university departments of Middle East studies provide one-sided, highly polemical academic presentations and some may repress legitimate debate concerning Israel.”⁹⁷

The attacks on Israel at U.S. campuses are ongoing. At the beginning of the academic year 2006-07, the student government at the University of Michigan’s Dearborn campus passed a resolution calling for the university’s Board of Regents to vote to divest from Israel.⁹⁸ There was also an appeal for divestment at Wayne State University (WSU). WSU president Irvin D. Reid responded with a statement asserting: “Wayne State opposes divestiture and has no intention of divesting itself of stocks in companies doing business with Israel or any other legitimate state.”

He added: “We encourage our students to use their right to free speech, but accusations, acrimony and demands such as divestiture are counter to the intelligent dialogue and free discourse for which this university stands.”⁹⁹

Canada

In the academic and several other areas, Canada has gradually become a problematic country regarding attitudes toward Israel. Stefan Braun, who has published in detail on intolerance at Canadian university campuses, considers that: "The campaign to marginalize the Jewish voice and de-legitimize the historic Jewish identity, across progressive Canadian campuses with large and vocal Muslim voices, is not just a Jewish problem.... To be indifferent to their plight is, ultimately, to put Canadian multiculturalism at risk and Canadian democracy in jeopardy."¹⁰⁰

Concordia University in Montreal was for several years considered one of those universities in the Western world where anti-Israeli violence led to outright discrimination. One Jewish professor at Concordia, who prefers to remain anonymous, told this author in 2005 that in the past hardly anybody abroad had heard about his university. When he now said in Jewish circles abroad that he was teaching at Concordia, there was usually name recognition and immediate association with the anti-Semitic incidents there.

A speech scheduled at Concordia for former Israeli prime minister Benjamin Netanyahu on 9 September 2003 had to be canceled after protesters, before the lecture, broke into the building and smashed windows. In a report, Concordia rector Frederick Lowy said: "The level of violence that we saw was unprecedented on this issue in Montreal and contrary to all the advance intelligence."¹⁰¹

At the same university, the campus Hillel was banned by the Concordia Student Union because of claims that Hillel had displayed brochures for a program for foreign volunteers in the Israel Defense Forces at one of its functions. These had been placed there by an activist and not by the organizers. The university criticized the student union, noting that the vote for the ban took place on the last day of classes at midnight with little notice.

The situation at Concordia was so tense that at the end of 2002 the university administration had to impose a three-month moratorium on all Middle East-related events.¹⁰² Consequently, a Montreal judge issued an injunction against a lecture by a left-wing parliamentarian of the New Democratic Party, Svend Robinson, who holds strong pro-Palestinian views.¹⁰³

Ariela Cotler, president of Hillel Montreal, said about Concordia University: "Their only concept of freedom of expression here is when the Society for Palestinian Human Rights is involved, with the support of the Concordia Student Union."¹⁰⁴

An advertisement in the *Toronto Globe and Mail* on 17 December 2002, signed by one hundred people, stated that Canadian Jewish students are so traumatized by campus anti-Semitism that they do not dare to support Israel or even Judaism. This sparked a heated debate about whether the claim was true. Susan Bloch-Nevitte, communications director of Toronto University, admitted there had been incidents there that could be viewed as anti-Semitic.¹⁰⁵

Alain Goldschläger's essay below describes the overall anti-Israeli and anti-Semitic actions on Canadian campuses. He notes: "a virulently anti-Israeli discourse incorporating strong anti-Semitic elements has infiltrated the far-Left-leaning world of Canadian academia, beginning to rival the longstanding far-Right fringe. As in Europe, denunciation of Israel has become an acceptable expression of Jew-hatred in Canada." The case study by Corinne Berzon analyzes developments at Concordia University.

France

Holocaust denial has been a recurrent issue in France. On 15 November 2001, Education Minister Jack Lang decided to establish a commission to investigate racism and Holocaust denial at Jean-Moulin Lyon 3 University. In his letter appointing the commission, headed by the historian Henry Rousso, Lang referred to fifteen years of problematic cases in this area. The commission's final report was transmitted in 2004.¹⁰⁶ It concluded that the situation had improved in recent years, but that the university administration still needed to distance itself explicitly from the events that had tainted its image.

Toward the end of 2002, various types of anti-Israeli boycotts were proposed at French universities. Particular publicity was given to the Pierre and Marie Curie campus of Paris 6 University (also known as Jussieu). On 16 December 2002, the school's board adopted a motion expressing its opposition to the renewal of the association agreement between the European Union and Israel. Twenty-two members voted in favor, four against, six abstained, and one refused to participate in the vote. The vote was held toward the end of the meeting, which took place shortly before the Christmas vacation.¹⁰⁷

French Universities and Their Vichy Past

The Union of French Jewish Students (UEJF) heard about this only two days later. In reaction, it set itself two targets. The first was to vociferously oppose the boycott and ensure its elimination. The second was to prevent a similar boycott at Paris 7 University, where the board was supposed to vote on the same issue on 7 January 2003.¹⁰⁸

The UEJF rallied the support of the national student union, the Union Nationale des Etudiants de France (UNEF). An effort was made to mobilize personalities as well as teachers unions. One supporter was Jacques-Yves Bobot, member of the municipal council of Paris and board member of Paris 7 University. The UEJF obtained nineteen thousand signatures against the boycott, of which 5,200 were from French and foreign university teachers.¹⁰⁹

On 6 January 2003, the UEJF organized a demonstration against the boycott motion of Paris 7. Philosopher Bernard-Henri Lévy said: "The French university is the only major institution that has not repented its mistakes under the Vichy

regime. In this context the boycott [of Israeli universities] by Paris 6 seems even more shameful.”¹¹⁰ He added that the Israeli universities embody “the heart of the peace [process].”

Education Minister Luc Ferry and the mayor of Paris, Bertrand Delanoë, condemned the attitude of Paris 6 University. UNESCO director-general Koichiro Matsuura criticized the attempts by Paris 6 to isolate Israeli academics: “We must do everything possible to preserve the conditions for dialogue between the various scientific and academic communities throughout the world, as this dialogue is sometimes the last link between people divided by war and the first step toward reconciliation.”¹¹¹ After the public protests, the university canceled its motion and Paris 7 thereupon ruled a similar motion out of order. It claimed that the university was not entitled to debate political or religious issues.¹¹²

After Paris 6 changed its attitude, the pro-Israeli forces felt they had had a victory as the boycott had few supporters. Patrick Klugman, then president of the UEJF, said: “With our action we have proved through the university how abject the boycott is. Today it has become politically incorrect to penalize Israeli universities. This damnable process has been condemned. That’s our victory.”¹¹³

The problems remained, though. Writing in *Le Figaro*, Klugman observed:

On some university campuses like Nanterre, Villetaneuse and Jussieu, the climate has become very difficult for Jews. In the name of the Palestinian cause, they are castigated as if they were Israeli soldiers! We hear “death to the Jews” during demonstrations which are supposed to defend the Palestinian cause. Last April, our office was the target of a Molotov cocktail.

As a condition for condemning this attack, the lecturers demanded that the UEJF declare a principled position against Israel!¹¹⁴

Jussieu remained one of the problematic places for Jews. On 23 February 2006, at a debate on fighting the “colonization of Palestine” organized by the university, Jewish students were beaten up by pro-Palestinians.

Belgium

In Belgium, academic attacks on Israel and Jews occurred mainly at the French-speaking Free University of Brussels. In December 2002, several Jewish students put up pro-Israeli posters around the campus with texts such as: “Which was the first state in the Middle East that gave Arab women the right to vote?” and “Terror attacks against civilians are an abomination.”

The next morning the students received an anonymous phone call threatening that their families would be harmed if the posters were not removed. The Jewish students removed the posters, an act they later regretted. A few days later the Belgian Union of Jewish Students (UEJB) staged a public demonstration supporting the right of free speech that was backed by the university’s administration and

faculty, as well as Jewish and non-Jewish student groups and Belgian Jewish organizations. The rally attracted more than a thousand participants.¹¹⁵

In February 2003, the Federation of Belgian Students attempted to have an anti-Israeli motion passed by the Board of the Free University of Brussels (ULB). Two Jewish faculty members circulated a counterpetition that said, among other things:

While firmly condemning violence, wherever it comes from, in the Middle East conflict, ULB, in line with its philosophical tradition, must affirm that cooperation with all teaching and research institutions is the best means of promoting respect for the fundamental values of the international scientific community: humanism and tolerance. *Scientia vincere tenebras* [Science will triumph over darkness].

The ULB senate refused to hear the anti-Israeli motion, which was then withdrawn, and adopted a declaration along the lines of the Jewish professors' proposal.¹¹⁶

Italy

According to a regional Italian daily, *Corriere Del Veneto*, in early 2003 seven Italian professors of Ca' Foscari University in Venice signed a European petition with four hundred signatories that included the statement: "my conscience does not permit me to collaborate with official Israeli institutions, including universities."¹¹⁷

Prof. Francesco Gatti, who at Ca' Foscari occupies the chair of history of international relations in the Faculty of Language and Oriental Literature, said: "I have signed it because I am an anti-Zionist; certainly not an anti-Semite."¹¹⁸ Gatti added that while he hoped his and his Italian colleagues' actions would serve as a stimulus, he had not received even one email reaction. He concluded that the appeals had much less visibility than those during the 1968 student revolution.

The newspaper pointed out that following the recommendation of the seven professors would entail a diplomatic problem. Venice is also home to Venice International University (VIU), an international consortium with several member faculties including Ca' Foscari; Istituto Universitario di Architettura di Venezia (IUAV), a major architectural university; and Tel Aviv University (TAU).

The rector of Ca' Foscari, Maurizio Rispoli, declared that the boycott appeals by the university's professors were personal and did not reflect the institution's positions. He added:

The agreements on teaching and scientific collaboration with academic institutions are constantly expanded independent of the political orientation of governments of each state in the conviction that scientific communities

must contribute to disseminating knowledge and discoveries while also upholding the values of liberty, tolerance, and respect between people.

The IUAV rector said that the appeals seemed to indicate absolute silliness even if he totally disagreed with Ariel Sharon's policies. He added that this approach would lead to exactly the opposite of what one would want to achieve: "It is not that all Israeli universities are with Sharon, to the contrary. Our role is to keep a distinction between cultural and political activities."¹¹⁹

A few days after the article appeared in the Venice daily, the leading Italian weekly *Panorama* published the same story under the title "Winds of Anti-Semitism at Ca' Foscari."¹²⁰ It mentioned that eleven Italian professors had signed the boycott appeal. Besides Gatti, the paper also interviewed Rodolfo Delmonte, linguistics professor at Ca' Foscari.

As far as one can judge from the names, none of the boycott signatories were Jewish. This is different from the UK, where the academic boycott was initiated by Jews, and France, where Jews played a major role. It is also surprising, as in Italy Jewish communists and other leftists have often spearheaded actions against Israel.¹²¹ Recent years have seen anti-Israeli acts at several Italian universities.

David Meghnagi, a clinical psychology professor and director of the International Master's Program on Holocaust Remembrance at Rome 3 University, closely follows anti-Israeli and anti-Semitic activities at Italian universities. He mentions a number of current issues. The first is a passive boycott of Israeli scholars by certain university teachers. They do not come out openly against Israelis, but do not invite them for lectures. To counter this, Meghnagi has organized a group of several hundred Italian academics who see to it that every year a number of Israeli scholars are invited to teach at Italian universities. He notes that in 2005, at the University of Turin, one professor was strongly verbally attacked by extreme leftists because he had invited a representative of the Israel embassy to a meeting.

Meghnagi also mentions that at the University of Pisa in 2005, a representative of the Israeli embassy could not give a lecture because it was disrupted by extreme-Left students. All this has to be seen, Meghnagi says, in the context of the demonization of Israel by the Italian Left.

He adds:

A severe case also occurred when an eminent professor of the University of Bologna refused to participate in a ceremony in memory of the 1938 expulsion of Jews from Italian universities according to Mussolini's racial laws against the Jews. He said the ceremony should also deal with the Palestinians. Whatever one's political views are, it is clear that the racial laws of 1938 concern an eternal Italian guilt toward the Jews. His refusal and that of several others brings us to a gray area of anti-Semitism.

Two hundred academics jointly signed a full-page appeal in the leading Italian daily, *Corriere della Sera*, where we affirmed the need for

collaboration with Israeli colleagues and denounced the intolerance at the universities of Pisa and Turin as well as in France and Britain. Also the Italian Conference of University Rectors and the Italian education minister have condemned the discrimination against Israeli scholars.¹²²

Ireland

Ireland is one of the EU countries where anti-Israeli bias is strongest. Oded Eran, Israeli ambassador to the European Union, observed that: “Sweden and Ireland are probably the countries that most frequently raise their voices against Israel.”¹²³ Since then, however, in September 2006 the Swedish Social Democratic government that was hostile to Israel was replaced by a Center-Right one.

Rory Miller, an academic who has studied the Irish attitudes toward Israel, remarked: “If one were to throw a sack of flour over the Irish parliament, it is unlikely that anybody pro-Israeli would become white.”¹²⁴ He noted that since the boycott campaign started in 2002, only a few Irish professors have signed boycott appeals against Israel.

However, in September 2006 more than sixty Irish academics published a letter in the *Irish Times* calling for a moratorium on European grants to Israeli academic institutions at both the national and European levels.¹²⁵

Spain

In his analysis of Spanish bias against the Jews and Israel, anti-Semitism expert Gustavo Perednik mentions how the country’s leading daily, *El Pais*, regularly demonizes Zionism and Israel. For example, before the 2003 Israeli elections, a professor at one of the most prestigious Spanish universities, Gema Martín Muñoz, claimed there that Sharon was planning the “final solution of the Palestinian question.”¹²⁶

Perednik tells how he was invited to lecture at the Rovira i Virgili University in Tarragona, Catalonia, where an advanced student candidly asked: “It was explained to me a hundred times but I am still unable to understand it: why does Israel have a right to exist?”

Perednik responded: “Since there are a hundred and ninety-two countries in the world, I wish to congratulate the one hundred and ninety-one that have passed your demanding right-to-exist exam. Don’t you find it strange that there is one lone country, much smaller than Catalonia and attacked by the most atrocious regimes, which you have failed to grant a right to exist?”

He adds that the organized Jewish community in Spain has tried to keep a very low profile and not openly counterattack Judeophobia. Its youth often felt it was too difficult to confront the extremely hostile atmosphere on

university campuses because of a lack of backing from the Jewish community at large.¹²⁷

Raphael Bardaji, head of international policy studies at FAES, a Spanish foundation for social research and analysis that is headed by former prime minister José Maria Aznar, says: “A major source of support for the Palestinians is in universities. Over the last twenty years Palestinians have quietly pursued a strategy of planting exchange professors in departments of international relations, and in this way they have created a constituency.”

Bardaji speaks from his own experience:

In the late 1970s I tried to do my PhD at the Madrid Complutense University. My professor was pro-Palestinian, anti-American, and anti-Israeli. His only concern was promoting the cause of Yasser Arafat. I could not do my thesis with him. The subject I had chosen was NATO and Spain, and he literally told me that “if I wanted to talk about weapons, I should choose to defend Fatah and not the imperialistic Americans.”

Bardaji continues: “The main problems for Israel in Spanish universities are located in the international relations departments. There are only two exceptions: Rey Juan Carlos University in Madrid, which is private and small, and the University of Navarra, which is very conservative and linked to Opus Dei. They are not automatically anti-American.”¹²⁸

4. Reactions to the Academic Boycott

Jewish communities worldwide were ill-prepared for the wave of anti-Semitism over the past few years and the sudden calls to boycott Israel. After the Oslo agreements in 1993, many Jewish leaders had become lax as far as threats of anti-Semitism and attacks on Israel were concerned. As observers noted, an entire generation of Jewish students on campus was unfamiliar with the narrative of Zionism and Israel.

Thus, few knew how to respond effectively to the wave of aggression, even in large Jewish communities such as the American and French ones. It took a long time before Jewish defense organized itself. In France, where the community hesitated for many months to draw public attention to the many violent anti-Semitic incidents throughout the country, the government preferred to close its eyes to the crisis.¹²⁹

Similarly, Diaspora Jewry, the Israeli government, and Israel’s academic world were taken aback by the academic boycott and other discriminatory initiatives. They did not develop a strategic plan to counteract them. Individuals and institutions improvised in various ways without coordinating actions.

One important initiative came from the Hebrew University. It developed a website urging support for academics opposed to the boycott and attracted many signatories from all over the world.¹³⁰ By June 2003, fifteen thousand academics

had signed the antiboycott petition. Similar initiatives were taken elsewhere including Australia¹³¹ and the United States.¹³²

In France, two such petitions were launched. One group was close to Peace Now and obtained mainly Jewish signatures that were also from outside the academic world. Another petition was initiated by Jewish academics who, together with non-Jewish ones—many from leading institutions—published a condemnation of the boycott in the daily *Le Monde*. The initiators were Shmuel Trigano, Gregory Benichou, Raphael Drai, Georges Elia Sarfati, and Yves Charles Zarka.¹³³

Support for Israel

Some prominent scholars declared their personal support for Israel during the initial boycott campaigns. One was Baroness Susan Greenfield, a British brain researcher and head of the Royal Institution of Great Britain. She announced her intention to lead a delegation of top British scientists to Israel, Jordan, and Egypt in mid-March 2003 in what she called “a positive response to ongoing boycott efforts.”¹³⁴

In November 2002, seventy prominent U.S. professors of medicine, twelve of them from Harvard Medical School, held an international medical conference in Jerusalem to protest the divestment campaign and other anti-Israeli activities on American campuses. Conference chairman Ben Sachs stated that they had specifically come to show support for Israel.¹³⁵

Another initiative against the boycott was the establishment of the International Academic Friends of Israel (IAFI). This organization is headed by Andrew R. Marks, chairman of the Department of Physiology and Cellular Biology at Columbia University. Besides American scholars, its board members include academics from France, Israel, Italy, and Switzerland. It seeks:

To host and support international scientific meetings in Israel; bring Israeli and global academic and scientific leaders together in other forums; promote worldwide understanding and appreciation of Israeli scientific and academic achievements, and create research fellowships in the U.S. for Israeli and Palestinian students.¹³⁶

Has the Boycott Initiative Failed?

In September 2007, this author made a Google search for the word boycott. Many million references appeared. Among the first fifty, three concerned Israel. They were not specifically aimed at the academic community. One reference targeted President Bush; others aimed at companies such as Sony, Nike, Amazon,

Gillette, Microsoft, and so on. These sites are listed according to the frequency of visitors.

In 2003, several Israeli academics and American Jewish leaders told this author that the academic boycott and other discriminatory actions against Israel had failed. They pointed out that not one major academic institution or organization had supported the boycott; no American university had decided to divest Israeli shares and Paris 6 University had had to retract its anti-Israeli motion. Furthermore, many more academics in the world signed petitions against boycotting Israel than petitions for it.

This conclusion already seemed superficial at the time. There already were sufficient indications in 2003 that Israel's campus enemies—to call them opponents or adversaries would be too mild—were continuing with their plans. In May 2003 in Britain, a motion supporting an academic boycott of Israel received as much as one-third of the votes at a conference of the abovementioned AUT, which had forty-six thousand members.¹³⁷

Its initiator was Sue Blackwell, a very active anti-Israeli lecturer at Birmingham University's English Department. She said that "AUT support for the boycott, launched last year by the British academics Steven and Hilary Rose would 'add to the pressure on the country's economy and dent its international prestige.'"¹³⁸

Those who thought the boycott campaigns would disappear as rapidly as they had arisen made a conceptual mistake. It was wrong to compare the boycott actions against Israel with others such as, for instance, the American boycotts of France at the beginning of the Iraq war. Most American politicians who attacked France did so on the spur of the moment and had no previous record of animosity toward France. The widespread American boycott of France emerged rapidly and disappeared just as quickly.

Some of those who advocate the boycott of Israel, however, are longtime enemies. For them, boycotting Israel is one of many ways of confronting it. If one effort fails they will try another, especially since they do not incur any risks. Israel and the Jews concentrate on defense and hardly ever attack.

Lack of Research

Despite the multitude of academic boycott actions against Israel, neither the Israeli academic world nor the Jewish defense organizations have undertaken detailed research on the major international aspects of this campaign.

Such research is particularly important because new attacks emerge fast. If one lacks strategic understanding of what motivates one's enemies and how they operate, one remains unnecessarily vulnerable to future onslaughts.

Major elements that require a much more detailed analysis are:

- What are the main manifestations of the academic boycott and related discrimination issues?
- Who are the main actors and what, if any, organizations support them?
- How does the academic boycott relate to the wider issue of anti-Semitism?
- What actions have been undertaken to counter the boycott?
- Who are the major actors who have reacted against the boycott and what did they do?
- How could the Jews and Israel have responded better and how should one organize for the future?

The research presented in this book gives answers to some of these questions. Much more study, however, remains to be done.

The vicious attacks on Israeli academia started more than five years ago and have occurred on campuses in various countries. Yet only two conferences, both at the beginning of 2006, have addressed these attacks. In January, Bar-Ilan University held a two-day conference on academic freedom and the consequences of boycotts. Bar-Ilan is now Israel's most active university in the antiboycott field. It also operates the International Advisory Board for Academic Freedom.¹³⁹ The latter also played an important role in the fight against the 2007 UCU boycott campaign.

The second conference, held in February, focused on academic anti-Semitism and was organized by the Magenta Foundation in Amsterdam. It adopted a number of recommendations to the OSCE, including the suggestion that this body "prepare standards and guidelines on academic responsibility and the protection of students from harassment, discrimination, and abuse in the academic environment, including anti-Semitism and racism."

The conference also recommended that the OSCE, "in order to document and monitor the extent of the problem, conduct research into the promotion and tolerance of anti-Semitism in academia."¹⁴⁰

The Main Aspects of Anti-Israeli Actions on Campus

The various elements of the anti-Israeli actions in the academic world include:

- Promoting classic anti-Semitism. The main example in the world is MAUP (the Interregional Academy of Personnel Management) in Kiev. It is one of the primary sources of Ukrainian anti-Semitism and anti-Zionism. The chapter by Aryeh Green below provides a more detailed description.
- Urging academic institutions to sever relations with Israeli academic institutions and academics. These attempts are strongest in Britain.
- Trying to prevent Israeli academics from obtaining grants. This was a major aim of the scholars who published the April 2002 open letter in *The Guardian*.
- Convincing academics not to visit Israel.

- Not inviting Israelis to international conferences or to lecture at universities.
- Trying to prevent the publication of articles by Israeli scholars. *The Guardian* wrote about Prof. Oren Yiftachel, a left-wing Israeli academic at Ben-Gurion University who has made extreme anti-Israeli remarks such as “Israel is almost the most segregated society in the world.” He had submitted an article to the left-leaning journal *Political Geography* that was coauthored with an Arab scholar, Dr. Asad Ghanem of the University of Haifa. Yiftachel had claimed to *The Guardian* that his article was returned unopened, a note attached explaining that the journal could not accept a submission from Israel.¹⁴¹ In a subsequent clarification, *The Guardian* reported that *Political Geography*’s editor had asked for revisions and thereafter would have referred the article for review without guarantee that it would be published.¹⁴²
- Refusing to review work of Israeli scholars. Israeli universities often ask scholars abroad to review the work of Israeli academics in regard to promotion. Prof. Paul Zinger, former head of the Israeli Science Foundation, told the *Sunday Telegraph* that about seven thousand research papers are sent out each year for review. In 2002, about twenty-five came back from scholars who refused to look at them.¹⁴³ At the time, Hebrew University scholars told this author that their university had faced three cases of refusal to do so. One involved a Jewish scholar abroad who wrote an anti-Semitic refusal letter.
- Not publishing in Israeli publications. In 2006, for instance, Prof. Richard Seaford of Exeter University refused to review a book for the Israeli journal *Scripta Classica Israelica*.¹⁴⁴
- Promoting divestment of Israeli securities or those of American suppliers of weapons to Israel by university foundations. This is a particularly American phenomenon.
- Expelling Jewish organizations from campus. The one well-known case concerns the Hillel chapter at Concordia University in Montreal.¹⁴⁵
- Unofficial (or concealed) boycott. Not all boycott activities are official. Several Israeli academics told this author that some colleagues with whom they had long-term contacts had severed them, with or without explanation. Hebrew University lecturer Aaron Benavot was quoted saying there was anecdotal evidence of this type of boycott:

Two colleagues in the geography department, for example, received a letter from the section editor of an international journal who said he was unable to consider their papers because he was a signatory to the boycott. Another Israeli scholar in London was told by his coordinator that he could “foresee problems” with colleagues in Europe if he joined an EU-funded research team.¹⁴⁶

- Hampering the careers of pro-Israeli academics. Only few victims are willing to speak publicly about this.

David Hansel, a tenured neuroscientist who also works five months a year at the Hebrew University besides his position in France, told the *Boston Globe* in 2003: “In France, I feel people are trying to build momentum for this boycott, criticizing Israel and also identifying colleagues who are Jewish or Israeli.” Hansel, a French citizen, said he had been up for promotion in France for several months but colleagues had told him it had been blocked because of his affiliation with the Hebrew University.¹⁴⁷

In December 2002, St. Cloud State University in Minnesota agreed to pay nearly \$365,000, admitting that department administrators had tried to persuade students not to take courses taught by Jewish professors. The settlement proposal came after a lawsuit by faculty members had claimed that Jewish teachers were paid less than others, denied promotions, and not given full credit for their teaching experience. The president of the university, Ray Saigo, said the university “deeply regretted” any anti-Semitic acts that transpired on campus or in the university community.¹⁴⁸

- Refusing to give recommendations to students who want to study in Israel, or alternatively, to give credits for studies there.

There are other, related types of bias. One is to suppress publications about Islamic anti-Semitism, as described in the chapter below about Utrecht University in the Netherlands. Yet another aspect is when political science faculty members purchase mainly anti-Israeli books for university libraries.

Some authors have tried to define the origins of the academic boycott attempts. One of them, Ruth R. Wisse, wrote:

Like many such initiatives since the 1960s, the petition campaign against Israel is promoted by relatively small numbers of faculty with interlocking interests. Its driving force are Arabs, Arabists, and their sympathizers who help prosecute the war against Israel as a way of diverting attention away from Arab regimes. They are joined by Leftists—including Jews—who see in Jewish particularism the chief hindrance to their internationalist faith; by radicals who consider Israel and America to be colonial powers and who promote their reactionary or revolutionary alternatives; and by antiwar enthusiasts who blame Israel for inviting Arab aggression against it.¹⁴⁹

The Relationship to Anti-Semitism

An important question concerns the anti-Semitic aspects of the academic boycott of Israel. As mentioned earlier, the EUMC criteria for anti-Semitism are helpful in analyzing this problem.

The anti-Semitism on campus must be seen in the context of several earlier-

mentioned phenomena in Western society. The first is the major immigration of Arabs and other Muslims to Western countries and the radicalization of significant elements of this community, which is often accompanied by anti-Semitic hate propaganda.

In the academic world many radicals can be found in Middle Eastern and Islamic studies, one of the main disciplines promoting anti-Semitism at universities. Many Arab and Muslim student unions are also major propagators of Jew- and Israel-hatred.

Once again the aggression toward the Jews is only an indicator of more profound problems. In August 2006, Muslim terrorism suspects were arrested in the United Kingdom under suspicion of preparing to blow up airplanes. There were several connections with campus activism.

A second relevant factor is the permeation of the Palestinian narrative into Western society, especially its left-wing elements. A third is the widespread latent anti-Semitism, particularly in Europe, which has been largely ignored for years. Another, related problem is extreme left-wing Jews who have frequently been at the forefront of the attacks on Israel.

The academic boycott cannot be fought effectively in isolation. Countering it must also be part of the general struggle against anti-Zionism and other manifestations of anti-Semitism.

Another important factor is that the academic boycott does not relate only to general phenomena in society. It is also an expression of the specific problems of various Western universities where major antisocietal forces have developed over the decades. The boycott actions against Israel have brought further proof that “tenured radicals” have permeated a number of faculties and campuses, where they try to undermine society rather than objectively pursue knowledge.

Gary Tobin, president of the Institute for Jewish and Community Research (IJCR), observes that:

Anti-Israelism can flourish because the academy is afraid to confront this ideology and those who preach it for fear of going down some slippery slope that will infringe upon academic freedom. But other slippery slopes are just as profoundly damaging to the ideals of the university, including the failure to ensure both high quality and honest scholarship, adhere to principles of truth, preserve civil discourse, and provide freedom from intellectual intimidation. All of these affect academic freedom and define academic responsibility. All are tainted by anti-Semitic and anti-Israel ideology and expression on campus.¹⁵⁰

A survey by IJCR conducted in spring 2005 found that 63 percent of university faculty say that colleagues “are reluctant to express their true opinions when those opinions contradict dominant views on campus.... Professors are three times as likely to identify as liberal than as conservative. Social science and humanities faculty are five times as likely to identify as liberal than as conservative.”¹⁵¹

There are other major failures of academia, also relating to Israel, which bolster the case for limiting academic freedom. In his book *Ivory Towers on Sand*, Martin Kramer discusses the failure of Middle Eastern studies in America. He calls the departments dealing with this subject “factories of error.” He concludes that they have failed to explain any of the major developments in the Middle East.¹⁵²

When asking which of the anti-Israeli actions on campus are specifically anti-Semitic, assessments should utilize the main contemporary working definition of anti-Semitism. The EUMC definition includes applying double standards to Israel by demanding behavior of it that is not expected of any other country.

The divestment promoters and boycott advocates indeed apply double standards to Israel. They demand behavior of it that is not required of the Palestinians or, for that matter, anybody else.

Those who have signed the divestment petitions against Israel at the American universities, and those who have called for the boycott of Israeli universities elsewhere such as some members of the academic teachers unions in the United Kingdom, fit the EUMC criteria of anti-Semitism.¹⁵³ Many Western universities thus employ significant numbers of anti-Semites according to the EUMC definition.

What Has Been Done against the Discriminatory Actions?

Within the framework of researching the academic boycott issue, also required is a more systematic analysis of the actions taken against the boycott. These come under a number of categories:

- Efforts to assemble a list of signatories against the anti-Israeli measures.
- Trying to use personal contacts to influence the universities where the enemies of Israel teach.
- Convincing well-known personalities to condemn these academics. One example is the aforementioned speech by Laurence Summers, the then president of Harvard, who said that:

Where anti-Semitism and views that are profoundly anti-Israeli have traditionally been the primary preserve of poorly educated right-wing populists, profoundly anti-Israel views are increasingly finding support in progressive intellectual communities. Serious and thoughtful people are advocating and taking actions that are anti-Semitic in their effect if not their intent.¹⁵⁴

Another example is an article titled “I’m Ashamed” attacking the boycott action at Paris 6, published in *Le Monde* at the beginning of 2003. The author was Claude Cohen-Tannoudji, a French Jewish Nobel Prize winner and former professor at that university. He said, among other things:

I'm ashamed of those colleagues who dare to express abhorrence about other colleagues because of their nationality. I'm ashamed of those colleagues who in the case of a painful conflict, where two peoples suffer cruelly and daily, choose to demonize one of the two parties rather than trying to bring them closer to each other.¹⁵⁵

In summer 2003, twenty-four members of the European Council of Ben-Gurion University came out with a statement that the boycott “infringes the fundamental concept of academic freedom and restricts the flow of knowledge, which benefits all mankind.”¹⁵⁶ Among them were two Nobel Prize winners, David Trimble and Aron Klug. This statement mixed principled and utilitarian arguments: “The signatories from Britain, Germany, France, Italy, Spain, and the Netherlands note that Ben-Gurion University is at the cutting edge of research in desert studies, drylands agriculture, and water research—areas of critical importance to the Middle East and to much of the developing world.”¹⁵⁷

- Encouraging editors of scientific journals to condemn the boycott. The editors of the world's leading general science magazines, *Science*¹⁵⁸ and *Nature*,¹⁵⁹ are examples of those who came out against the boycott. Donald Kennedy, editor in chief of *Science*, went even beyond this. On the occasion of the conference “Frontiers in Cardiovascular Science” held in Eilat in June 2002, he told the *New York Times* that he was heartened to hear about this conference in Israel: “the principle is very important. I don't think academic boycotts do anyone any good.”¹⁶⁰
- Organizing protest demonstrations.
- Trying to get academics to come to Israel to show their support for the country.
- In private conversations, some Israeli scholars suggest that more cooperation should be initiated with Palestinian academics. This is hardly an effective approach. There are already a significant number of collaborations that could be mentioned in addition to those already known.

Methodological Analysis of Boycotts

Yet there are many more activities that can be undertaken. The subject of academic boycotts should also be analyzed more methodologically. One would expect human rights-oriented academics to focus their international boycott campaigns on those universities where teachers or student unions call for criminal acts. A rational, scientific approach would be to establish a list of institutions to boycott according to the severity of the criminal incitement on their campuses.

Heading the list should be those universities that employ teachers or admit students who call for genocide or mass murder. Next in line would be those where

suicide bombing is encouraged. These would be followed by campuses where murders are promoted. Below these on the list would be universities that teach systematic discrimination and defamation.

Universities are often ranked according to scholarship. A more complete view of the academic world would also rank them according to crime incitement. Many institutions in the Muslim and Arab Middle East would place high on such a list.

Palestinian Examples

Many anti-Israeli boycotters cite Israeli attitudes toward Palestinians as the official reason for their campaigns. Analyzing crime incitement at Palestinian universities sheds light on the true motives of the boycotters.

One example of genocidal incitement by a Palestinian academic is a 2004 statement by Dr. Ahmed Abu Halabiyah, rector of advanced studies at the Islamic University of Gaza. He said:

The Jews are the Jews.... They do not have any moderates or any advocates of peace. They are all liars. They must be butchered and must be killed.... The Jews are like a spring—as long as you step on it with your foot it doesn't move. But if you lift your foot from the spring, it hurts you and punishes you.... It is forbidden to have mercy in your hearts for the Jews in any place and in any land, make war on them anywhere that you find yourself. Any place that you meet them, kill them.¹⁶¹

Halabiyah made this statement on official Palestinian Authority TV as part of a Friday sermon. This genocidal call, then, issued from the governmental, academic, and religious spheres of the Palestinian Authority and its civil society.

A second example comes from Nablus's Al-Najah University. An exhibition there in September 2001 included a reenactment of a Jerusalem suicide bombing. Associated Press reported:

Wearing a military uniform and a black mask, a Palestinian set off a fake explosion in a replica of the Sbarro pizzeria in Jerusalem, where a suicide bomber killed himself and 15 other people.... The exhibit at Al-Najah University in Nablus was put on by students who support the militant Islamic movement Hamas, which carried out the Jerusalem attack. Support for Hamas traditionally runs high at the university, which is a hotbed for Palestinian militants and has produced a number of suicide bombers.... In another part of the exhibit, visitors looked through dark windows to see mannequins dressed as suicide bombers. Each had Islam's holy book, the Quran, in one hand, and an automatic rifle in the other. Real suicide bombers often assume this pose in videos they make before staging attacks.¹⁶²

This university's student union favors suicide attacks on Israeli civilians.

Terrorist organizations have also held rallies on its campus that feature demonstrations of how suicide bombers murder Israelis and blow up Israeli passenger buses.¹⁶³

A third example of a Palestinian university at which major crime incitement has occurred is Birzeit University near Ramallah. At the end of 2003, elections were held for the student government council. The campaign featured models of exploding Israeli buses. In the debate, the Hamas candidate asked the Fatah candidate: "Hamas activists in this university killed 135 Zionists. How many did Fatah activists from Bir Zeit kill?" Needless to say, the "Zionists" are largely Israeli civilians.¹⁶⁴

Israeli universities, for their part, score very low as far as incitement to crime is concerned. They do not employ academics or have student unions that promote genocide or murder. The fact that the anti-Israeli boycott campaigners do not boycott the crime-inciting Palestinian universities thus manifests strongly discriminatory behavior. Anti-Semitism among Palestinian Authority academics is discussed in more detail in a chapter by Itamar Marcus and Barbara Crook.

Some may rate academic freedom so high as a value that they oppose boycotting even those institutions where the most hideous crimes are encouraged. From this point of view, boycotting Israeli universities or academics is also highly discriminatory. The onus is thus on the boycotters to prove that they are not racists.

Who Has Been Fighting the Boycott?

Another important issue for analysis is who are the major actors fighting the anti-Israeli and anti-Jewish discrimination. It is necessary to distinguish between bodies on and off campus. Jewish student organizations are often leaders of this battle. In France, UEJF has been particularly active; Hillel has been in the forefront on many campuses in the United States and Canada.

One rapidly growing grassroots organization on campus that was founded in 2002 to address the increasing number of anti-Israeli and anti-Semitic incidents in classrooms and on campus is Scholars for Peace in the Middle East (SPME), which by now has become international. It has played a major role in the fight against the 2007 UCU boycott attempts. Its founder and president, Edward S. Beck, discusses its history and activities in a chapter below.

In the UK, the grassroots on-campus group Engage was launched in 2005 by AUT members Jon Pike and David Hirsh to combat the AUT boycott proposals. Well before that another British academic, Ronnie Fraser, had founded the Academic Friends of Israel.

Back in the United States, the Charles and Lynn Schusterman Family Foundation has funded an institutionalized initiative to support Israel's cause, whose task force is chaired by Mitchell Bard. The Israel on Campus Coalition

(ICC) is a network of over twenty-five national organizations, AIPAC and Hillel being the most active, that collaborate to promote education and advocacy regarding Israel on university campuses across the United States.

An off-campus organization such as AIPAC has provided many students with the tools and resources to reposition their university. In July 2006, AIPAC held a four-day leadership training seminar that focused on dealing with the campus in the aftermath of the Lebanon war. Three hundred Jewish and seventeen non-Jewish activists took part. AIPAC says it has trained four hundred non-Jewish activists in its programs “at schools as disparate as the Ivy Leagues, state schools, Christian institutions and traditional black colleges.”¹⁶⁵

StandWithUs is a grassroots advocacy organization in the United States that was founded in 2001. As part of its activities, it provides support and assistance to pro-Israeli groups in communities and on campus. Its campus activities are described below in a chapter by Roz Rothstein.

Other Jewish defense and other organizations have also played a role. In Canada, B’nai Brith Canada is among the active groups in the field.

Of a very different nature are the efforts to establish Israel studies at various campuses. This activity is at its beginning, and it will take many years to counterbalance the bias of Middle Eastern studies. Since part of the latter involves propaganda rather than academic inquiry whereas Israel studies aims to foster knowledge, the two have disparate goals.

University lecturers are a third category of defenders. Sometimes, however, they make mistakes in this discourse. Many reactions are apologetic or utilitarian rather than principled. It is asserted that one should not blame Israeli universities because many of their academics collaborate with Palestinians and oppose Israeli policy. This, however true, is irrelevant to the issue at stake, which is the racist attempt at a discriminatory boycott based on nationality or ethnicity.

Sometimes noncampus bodies have come out against the boycott. For instance, the International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC), which is part of the World Health Organization, stated that it would become concerned if the shunning of work by Israeli academics continued.¹⁶⁶

Actions by Israeli Academics

Israeli academics have tried to counteract the boycott in various ways. They too have often mixed principled, moral, utilitarian, and apologetic arguments. Basing oneself on academic freedom is a case of a principled argument. In an open protest letter, Israeli scholars Hillel Shuval, Eva Illouz, and Aaron Benavot of the Hebrew University criticized the boycott idea on several grounds:

- Much of the domestic criticism of current Israeli policy comes from Israeli academic circles (an apologetic argument).

- A boycott of Israel ignores ongoing attacks against Israeli citizens (a moral argument).
- A boycott could damage continuing academic cooperation between Israelis and Palestinians (a utilitarian argument).
- A unilateral boycott of Israeli academics unfairly identifies Israel as the only party responsible for the violent shift in Israeli-Palestinian relations, and such a one-sided perspective is contrary to academic standards of truth-seeking (a principled and moral argument).¹⁶⁷

As already pointed out, when fighting the academic boycott such a confusion of principled, moral, utilitarian, and apologetic arguments occurs frequently.

Another set of reactions came from universities as institutions. In an earlier-mentioned example, the Hebrew University created a central address to deal with the academic boycott under the auspices of the then dean of the Faculty of Social Sciences, Nachman Ben-Yehuda. In another case, the Israeli Academy of Sciences and Humanities collected supportive letters from other national academies and international academic organizations.

The Israeli or pro-Israeli academics who initially argued against the boycotters were professionals in their scholarly fields. As advocates of a cause they were largely amateurs, and few stressed principles or accused the accusers.

Top lawyers handle these matters better, and when sued they can more easily handle the costs. In his book *The Case for Israel*, Alan Dershowitz wrote succinctly: “Any moral person who is aware of the true facts would not sign a petition singling out Israel for divestiture. Those who signed it are either misinformed or malignant. There is no third alternative.”¹⁶⁸

When he spoke at Columbia University in February 2005, Dershowitz asserted: “This is the most unbalanced university that I have come across when it comes to all sides of the Middle East conflict being presented.... I have never seen a university with as much faculty silence.” Dershowitz announced that if the investigatory committee (see below) published a biased report, he would help organize an independent committee that would include Nobel Prize winners.¹⁶⁹

Dershowitz was also very active in the fight against the 2007 UCU boycott campaign. He announced that he would sue UK universities and British academics who supported the boycott, using a variety of legislative tactics.¹⁷⁰

Occasionally an individual, in this particular case unknown, has a brainwave on how to pierce an anti-Israeli or anti-Jewish action with little effort. In July 2006, over a thousand professors signed a petition on American college campuses to condemn Israel’s “aggression against Lebanon and Gaza.” One person signed the petition, which was further circulated, with the name “Mr H. Nasrallah, Joseph Goebbels Chair in Communications, Duke.”¹⁷¹

An Indication of the Future

In the boycott debate, the issue of academic freedom has been discussed in various ways. This is only one of the fundamental matters concerning the academic world that the boycott issue touches upon.

The concept of academic objectivity has always been a utopian one. The Western academic world supposedly operates according to certain rules. It officially fosters the utopian image that the best academics get promoted the fastest and the worthiest articles are published in the best journals. However, Allan Bloom, for instance, exposed the political character of many academic decisions in his book *The Closing of the American Mind*.¹⁷²

As so often, Israel and the Jews are on this matter as well an indicator of a society's failings. In his chapter below, Martin Kramer asserts that the tragedy of the academy is that it has become home to countless people whose mission is to prove the lie that Zionism is colonialism. He adds that research is undertaken, books written, and lectures delivered to establish an academic falsehood.

In a lengthy article on the academic boycott of Israel, *The Guardian* referred to a discussion that is indicative of how the boycotters of Israel could have launched a much wider destructive process in the academic world.

The article quoted a correspondence in June 2002 between Prof. Patrick Bateson and Harry Gee. The former, a professor of animal behavior and provost of King's College, Cambridge, signed the boycott letter initiated by Steven and Hilary Rose. Gee is a senior editor at the leading science magazine *Nature*. In the correspondence between the two, Gee wrote that he objected "as a Jew" to the academic boycott.

He said that while he would not boycott scientific articles submitted to the journal by Bateson and his colleagues, "I would get much less pleasure in reading them...knowing what I do of your attitudes...." Gee also stated that in view of this, he would not be inclined to visit Cambridge.¹⁷³ (Thereafter it turned out *The Guardian* had been quoting the correspondence without Gee's permission.)¹⁷⁴

This correspondence indicates that the fragile construct of academic objectivity could have been damaged much further if the anti-Israeli boycotters had made more of an impact. If journals start to accept articles according to authors' political views, academic quality takes a beating. This is not just because academic rules are transgressed but also because of inevitable reactions against the journals by others who, unlike Gee, would have concealed these reactions.

Politicization of Universities

Boycott actions against Israel blatantly break many academic rules. Their supporters explicitly promote the politicization of universities. Several academics have told this author privately that if they can damage the career of a boycotter of

Israel they will not hesitate to do so, as people who have introduced racism into academia do not merit equal treatment.

In a debate on CNN, Silvain Capell of New York University asked: "So what are we going to have? Are we going to have that you're going to boycott Israeli universities, and the next fellow is going to boycott Arab ones...and Hindus will be boycotting Muslims and Muslims Hindus, because of their conflicts?"¹⁷⁵

If the boycott actions against Israel were to succeed, counteractions would ensue and once these multiplied the present academic system would be harmed. The boycotters thus have become the enemies of the academic community at large.

This became particularly clear in the abovementioned case in August 2007 when a full-page ad sponsored by the American Jewish Committee was published in the *New York Times*. In it, as noted, close to three hundred American university and college presidents stated they would not work with institutions that were boycotting Israeli academics. The ad said: "Boycott Israeli Universities? Boycott Ours, Too."¹⁷⁶

Boycotts Inspire Counterboycotts

Tens of thousands of academics worldwide have come out publicly against the boycott of Israel. Only a limited number would publicly have to take discriminatory positions against boycotters and their allies to create a substantial disturbance of academic life. In some fields where the anti-Israeli forces are strong worldwide, such as Middle Eastern studies or linguistics, pro-Israelis might encounter difficulties. This is especially so because in these fields, anti-Israelis are supported by opportunists who want to increase their promotion chances by being fellow travelers. In other areas such as psychoanalysis or medicine, the anti-Israelis would be handicapped.

Unless the boycotted are exceptionally weak, each boycott will provoke a counterboycott. The Israeli academic world with its several Nobel Prize winners and many top scholars is rather strong. From a cycle of boycotts of Israeli academics and counterboycotts, the university world at large can only lose.

Allowing boycotts would further harm the cause of academic freedom at a time when there are already several reasons to limit it. Its abuse by academic ideologues and propagandists is a major argument against the prevailing near-absolute academic freedom. At present, academics can say what they want, it is difficult to fire tenured teachers, and there is no government interference in university affairs.

Yet there are a good many in academia who promote hate, bias, or manifest lies rather than seeking to advance knowledge. Responsibility is a precondition for academic freedom, but there are now many cases where it is lacking.

The academic world has been aiming at self-governance and trying to minimize outside interference. The many distortions in the academic and

administrative fields raise doubt as to whether universities are capable of reforming themselves. Boycott campaigns add another strong argument for external intervention in the academic world. As noted, the British 2002 anti-Israeli boycott campaign and French imitations of it already led to many condemnations by politicians. There were similar reactions as well to the various boycott resolutions of the UK academic trade unions.

The UK All-Parliamentary Inquiry into Anti-Semitism

A more detailed political assessment of campus attitudes toward Jews and Israel appeared in September 2006 when the issue of anti-Semitism on British campuses was addressed in the “Report of the All-Parliamentary Inquiry into Antisemitism.” The report mentioned that whereas extreme right-wing propaganda is often suppressed on campuses, left-wing or pro-Palestinian discourse on the Middle East is manipulated in anti-Semitic ways and often not dealt with by the university authorities. As a result, on British campuses “Jewish students can find themselves isolated and unsupported, or in conflict with large groups of their fellow students.”

The report also noted that “a number of university campuses are being used as recruiting grounds by extremist groups which have a history of anti-Semitic rhetoric and behaviour.”

The document concluded that “calls to boycott contact with academics working in Israel are an assault on academic freedom and intellectual exchange. We recommend that lecturers in the new University and College Lecturers Union are given every support to combat such selective boycotts that are anti-Jewish in practice.”

The parliamentarians also criticized the responses of heads of universities—called vice-chancellors in Britain—as inadequate. The report stated:

We recommend that Vice Chancellors take an active interest in combating acts, speeches, literature and events that cause anxiety or alarm amongst their Jewish students. We recommend that Vice Chancellors set up a working party to make clear that British universities will be free of any expression of racism, and take robust action against anti-Semitism on campus.¹⁷⁷

Damaging Columbia’s Image

How effective even small outsider groups can be in damaging the image of major academic institutions was demonstrated at Columbia University in a matter concerning discrimination against Jews with pro-Israeli views. The administration at best reacted weakly to the intimidation over several years of pro-Israeli students by teachers in its MEALAC Department.¹⁷⁸

Finally a small nonacademic grassroots group, the David Project, documented some of the abuses in a film called *Columbia Unbecoming*. Its

revelations generated major negative publicity for Columbia and forced its administration to undertake an internal inquiry. Although the investigators did not address several other crucial issues, they admitted that the grievance procedure was faulty. The Columbia affair also frightened other university administrations that somebody might “do a Columbia on them,” as several academics put it to this author.

The David Project has shown that a university’s misdeeds can be effectively exposed by a small outside actor without major financial resources. Because of this precedent, it now suffices at other universities to collect testimonies on a teacher’s misbehavior with a tape recorder. These can then be publicly exposed with an investment of a few dollars.

Another conclusion to be drawn from the success of the David Project’s exposure of Columbia is that if it had been undertaken by a more powerful group, the university would have been in much greater trouble. Other universities should take this into account when failing to act against misbehavior on their campus.

Had the Columbia inquiry not produced at least some minor results, the next step would probably have been outside pressure on major donors to stop supporting the school. This is yet another aspect of how the seemingly closed academic world can be dented by outsiders. In his chapter below, Noah Liben analyzes the Columbia report and concludes that it raises much larger questions than it answers.

5. Case Studies

A few early case studies illustrate that the academic boycott can be fought successfully. In the 7 June 2002 issue of *Science*—the leading general-interest magazine in the scientific field—an editorial criticized a scholar who published her research results in two medical journals and subsequently refused for political reasons to supply cell lines and other genetic materials from her laboratory to other scholars who wished to pursue this line of research.

The editor, Donald Kennedy, wrote that the consensus is that authors are “obliged to share material . . . with readers who request [it] unless such transfers are prohibited by laws or regulations, such as those designed to deter bio-terrorism.” The editorial also said the journal would take an active policy against authors who refused to comply. It would first try to persuade them and then, if necessary, impose penalties on future publications.¹⁷⁹

Kennedy wrote that the scientist, who had refused to supply a clone to an Israeli colleague, had a double rationale. The first was that “the government of Israel had committed a morally repugnant act.” The second was that “this justifies the cancellation of an obligation to the entire scientific community.” Kennedy considered the first issue to be irrelevant because the second “was so unimpressive.” He strongly rejected the view that “one’s personal political convictions trump all other commitments and values.”

Kennedy also condemned the behavior of the two journals that had published the original papers of the scientist who had refused to give the material to the Israeli scientist. He mentioned that the Israeli scientist had contacted the editors of both journals. Kennedy concluded: “One didn’t reply; the other contacted the publisher [of the journals], Ken Plaxton at Elsevier. Plaxton replied: ‘We do not have, nor wish to have, any influence on personal decisions made by contributors to our journals and cannot, I am afraid, in this instance help you further.’” Kennedy wrote: “That, it seems to us, is an inadequate response.”

Science mentioned in passing that the case was particularly ironic because the research group in Israel had collaborated with Palestinian scientists in a project beneficial to the Palestinians. This, though, was not a consideration at all in Kennedy’s judgment.¹⁸⁰

***Science’s* Position against the Boycott**

Kennedy’s strong position was important for several reasons:

- He blamed the behavior of boycotters of Israeli academics, without giving them any ethical credit.
- He warned potential contributors to *Science* who might behave similarly that if they persisted, *Science* would discriminate against their future publications.
- *Science* defended a matter of principle and considered the apologetic element of the Israeli scientist’s collaboration with Palestinian scientists as irrelevant.
- *Science* disapproved of the behavior of the two journals in which the original article appeared.

The original request for the material was made by Evelyne Zeira, a scientist at the Goldyne Savad Institute of Gene Therapy at Hadassah Medical Center in Jerusalem. She needed it to develop treatments for Palestinian victims of the blood disorder thalassemia.¹⁸¹

The scientist who refused the request for the clone was Dr. Ingrid Harbitz of Oslo University. In an email on 22 April 2002, she wrote:

I have received your email requesting the porcine EPO cDNA clone. My department has given away clones several times, however, due to the present situation in the Middle East I will not deliver any material to an Israelitic [*sic*] university. My institution, as well as most universities in Norway, have recently sent protests against the Israelitic military action on the West bank to the Embassy of Israel in Norway and to the Department of Foreign Affairs. In addition, our main university, the University of Oslo, has protested against the closing of all Palestinean [*sic*] universities that they collaborate with. On this background I find it impossible for me to deliver any material to an Israelitic university.¹⁸²

When he heard about this, an Israeli scientist at the Hebrew University School of Medicine in Jerusalem wrote to a colleague at the medical faculty of the University of Oslo. The latter asked his permission to write on the matter to the rector of the University of Oslo, Prof. Arild Underdal.

In his letter to the rector the Norwegian scientist wrote, among other things:

Ingrid Harbitz has in this matter made a personal political judgement in a very complicated and sensitive political situation. According to my opinion Norwegian scientists presently and in the future might play an important role in mediating contacts on different levels between the two parties in the conflict. It is therefore unfortunate indeed that a scientist *qua* a scientist employed by the University of Oslo not only takes a clear stand against one of the parties but also breaks international rules for scientific cooperation. Ingrid Harbitz' letter might also contribute to damage the reputation in Israel of the University of Oslo. Please remember that many of our Israeli colleagues actively have been involved in the peace process at many levels during the past year. I know for instance that Dr. ... who brought this issue to my attention as well as many of his Israeli colleagues during the years actively have worked to promote the health of Palestinian children. For instance Palestinian children have many times been transported to hospitals in Israel for optimal care. I myself have together with Israeli and Palestinian colleagues take [*sic*] part in the planning of joint Palestinian-Israeli projects with the aim of improving the general health condition for Palestinian children.¹⁸³

The scientist also asserted that the Israeli scientist deserved an apology from Harbitz for her letter refusing the clone.

Harbitz eventually changed her mind and made the clone available to the Israeli scientist. The rector of Oslo University replied to the letter, saying there was no reason to boycott Israeli scientists. Apparently parts of the story were reported in a Norwegian newspaper as well as on a Norwegian website (www.vartland.no).

Eithan Galun, head of the Goldyne Savad Institute, said there was "something racist and prejudicial in the fact that the Norwegian institute simply applied a blanket standard."¹⁸⁴ He expressed particular annoyance because the project involved Palestinian children and a colleague in Ramallah.

Analysis of the Harbitz Case

A number of conclusions can be drawn from this case:

- Because of the many international contacts of Israeli and pro-Israeli Jewish academics, interventions at specific universities or journals can be made on a case-by-case basis.
- Non-Jewish scholars can also be found to intervene in such matters. The

editor of *Science* is one example; the Norwegian academic who wrote to the rector of Oslo University is another. *Science*'s editorial could have been widely distributed in the academic community by Jewish organizations and much better utilized in the battle against anti-Israeli boycotters.

- Most important, though, is that this battle must be fought on matters of principle as the editor of *Science* did, and not by using apologetic arguments. For the issue at stake here, the collaboration of an Israeli scientist with a Palestinian one is irrelevant. The basic issue is that the refusal to supply the clone was in itself unethical and racist.

Exposing Norway and Its Academics

Had Harbitz not finally sent the material and had there been more such cases, this could have led to counterreactions, far from limited to the perpetrator. To mention just one: sooner or later an Israeli or pro-Israeli organization would have established a list of case studies of boycotts or discriminations against Israeli academics. This would be accompanied by a blacklist of the perpetrators and the universities where these cases had occurred.

Those prepared to act strongly against the boycott of Israel would consult this list. They would no longer invite Norwegian academics to any conferences unless they had publicly condemned Harbitz. Whenever they received requests from a Norwegian academic for reprints of their work or any other assistance, they would inform the counterpart that as long as Oslo University did not fire the offending scientist no help of any kind could be provided to Norwegian academics. Nor could articles by Norwegian academics be published in certain journals. This attitude would be motivated by the lack of outcry by the Norwegian scholars about the discrimination against other academics by one of their colleagues.

It would not be long before a further argument would be introduced: the vile anti-Semitism that has profoundly permeated parts of the Norwegian elite. Letters to Norwegian academics could be accompanied by copies of some of the many anti-Semitic cartoons in leading Norwegian papers, which are comparable to classic Nazi ones.¹⁸⁵ The more information became available about the country, the more it would become known that its World War II past is much darker than generally acknowledged. The Norwegian government would soon become aware that not only Norwegian academia but also the country has a problem.

This, though, would only be the beginning of anti-Norwegian activism. Jewish activist organizations could obtain a list of the email addresses of all laboratory colleagues of the offender and start to write to them about their inaction and thus complicity in the boycott. Norway is a particularly good target for two reasons. First, many current and past anti-Semitic attitudes are well represented there. Second, not being a member of the European Union, the country has less defensive capacity than other West European countries.

The Fonagy Case

Prof. Peter Fonagy of University College London (UCL) was among the Jewish signatories of the initial boycott letter published in *The Guardian*. An Israeli scientist from the University of Haifa, who knew Fonagy, wrote and asked him to convey the content of his reaction to all the other signatories as he did not have their email addresses.

The Israeli wrote that the petition calling for a moratorium on cultural and research links with Israel was one-sided; in times of war one needed to hear all sides. Silencing academic discourse was a violation of what academics and universities stand for. He also asked Fonagy: “Will you also protest and take concerted action against Palestinian terror deliberately aimed at innocent Israeli civilians?” The letter’s main shortcoming was the moral equivalence it created between Israel and the Palestinians. It was written out of an apologetic mindset.

Shmuel Erlich, president of the Israel Psychoanalytic Society, also wrote to Fonagy. He mentioned that besides writing to him because of their personal ties, he was also writing as president of the Israel Psychoanalytic Society. The letter said: “The petition is totally unbalanced, one-sided, and unfair in its allocation of guilt and responsibility. No such petition was addressed to the Palestinian academia, while innocent Israeli children, men, and women were indiscriminately butchered, and people are afraid to walk the streets or gather.”

Erlich’s letter contains a mix of principled and apologetic elements. The principled ones emphasize the one-sidedness of Fonagy’s approach. The apologetic ones include a statement—which remains to be proved—that the boycott attacks a segment of the community that is for the most part opposed to the government’s policy and has many contacts and cooperations with Palestinians.

One wonders whether the author was implying that the boycott would be justified if most Israeli academics supported the government’s policy, or if they did not wish to collaborate with Palestinians since, according to many opinion polls, most Palestinians support suicide attacks.

Fonagy Retracts

In his response, Fonagy stated that he had been under personal stress and was not thinking clearly when he signed the call for the boycott. He admitted that his signing had been a mistake. Fonagy indeed withdrew his signature from the petition, apologized to his colleagues, and asked their forgiveness.¹⁸⁶

This exchange of letters had a number of follow-ups. The correspondence between Erlich and Fonagy was, with the agreement of both, posted on the website of the American Psychoanalytic Association and thus came into the public domain.¹⁸⁷ Fonagy also added his name to the list of signatories on the

Hebrew University website opposing a European blocking of academic grants to Israel.¹⁸⁸

What is not publicly known is that before this correspondence took place, an Israeli academic was invited to lecture in memory of a deceased colleague at a major American university, and refused to participate if Fonagy was also going to be invited. This refusal also played a role in the latter's retraction. Fonagy's participation in this memorial service also became problematic for the host university, and this was only resolved after Fonagy's retraction of his support for the boycott.

However critical one may be of the apologetic elements of the Israeli academics' letters, the clear loser in this case was Fonagy, who admitted his poor judgment in signing the anti-Israeli statement. From an accuser he became the accused.

The Harbitz and Fonagy cases show that argumentation can persuade and pressure scientists who are not hard-core anti-Israeli extremists. This can be done either publicly or privately, or both.

The Wilkie Case

The third and most publicized case concerns Andrew Wilkie, Nuffield Professor of Pathology at the Weatherall Institute of Molecular Medicine, Oxford University. An Israeli student, Amit Duvshani, contacted him to request a research position in his lab. In an email dated 23 June 2003, Wilkie replied:

Thank you for contacting me, but I don't think this would work. I have a huge problem with the way that the Israelis take the moral high ground from their appalling treatment in the Holocaust, and then inflict gross human rights abuses on the Palestinians because the Palestinians wish to live in their own country.

I am sure that you are perfectly nice at a personal level, but no way would I take on somebody who had served in the Israeli army. As you may be aware, I am not the only UK scientist with these views but I'm sure you will find another suitable lab if you look around.

Duvshani sent Wilkie's email to, among others, Nathan Dascal, a professor of medicine at Tel Aviv University who is active in fighting the boycott. After reading it, he sent the information to Andrew Marks at Columbia University, head of the abovementioned International Academic Friends of Israel, whereupon Marks circulated an email to his contacts worldwide seeking another position for Duvshani.¹⁸⁹

Wilkie Condemned

The story was picked up in the UK through two different channels. A Jewish organization mobilized a number of prominent Jewish academics at Oxford who started pressurizing the university to act against Wilkie. Unrelated to this, Ronnie Fraser contacted the *Sunday Telegraph* on 26 June.¹⁹⁰

The paper approached Oxford University the next day. The university reacted swiftly. That same evening (Friday)—not a time when university administrations are usually very diligent—it published a press release condemning Wilkie's conduct and announcing an investigation into the matter. It said:

Our staff may hold strongly felt personal opinions. Freedom of expression is a fundamental tenet of University life, but under no circumstances are we prepared to accept or condone conduct that appears to, or does, discriminate against anyone on grounds of ethnicity or nationality, whether directly or indirectly. This candidate is entitled to submit an application and to have it dealt with fairly according to our normal criteria.

Professor Wilkie has issued a personal apology regarding remarks he made by email to an applicant for a research degree at Oxford. An immediate and thorough investigation of this matter is now being carried out in accordance with the University's procedures and a report will be presented to the Vice-Chancellor next week.¹⁹¹

This press communication was accompanied by a personal apology from Wilkie that said: "I recognise and apologise for any distress caused by my email of 23 June and the wholly inappropriate expression of my personal opinions in that document. I was not speaking on behalf of Oxford University or any of its constituent parts. I entirely accept the University of Oxford's Equal Opportunities and Race Equality policies."¹⁹²

Careful reading of Wilkie's statement indicates that he only apologized for what he wrote rather than retracting his offensive views. His discriminatory remarks to Duvshani may well have violated the statutory obligations of the Oxford University Equal Opportunities Policy and Code of Practice.¹⁹³

Wilkie Referred to a Disciplinary Panel

On 4 July, Oxford University stated in another press release that it had referred the Wilkie case to the university's disciplinary panel for academic staff.¹⁹⁴

The press release said, among other things:

The University of Oxford is appalled that any member of its staff should have responded to an inquiry from a potential graduate student in the terms in which Professor Wilkie emailed Amit Duvshani on 23 June.... While the

matter is under consideration by the Board, Professor Wilkie will not be taking part in the selection of any members of staff or students.¹⁹⁵

On 7 July 2003, the Oxford University Students Union (OUSO) also came out in favor of Duvshani and against Wilkie. Furthermore, Chris Griffin, vice-president (graduates) of OUSO said: "It is right and proper that admission to Oxford University be based solely on academic potential, and never on nationality, ethnicity, or religion. It is unacceptable for a member of academic staff to deter a student from applying by expressing such prejudiced views."¹⁹⁶

From Accuser to Accused

Within four days, by the end of June, Wilkie had been turned from a false preacher of ethics accusing Israel into an individual condemned by his university who was under investigation and accused of racial discrimination. The story was subsequently told in the *New York Times*, English dailies, the *Sydney Morning Herald*, Israeli papers, and other media throughout the world.

In October 2003, Oxford University suspended Wilkie for two months without pay, the most serious penalty short of dismissal that the institution could impose. He also had to take equal opportunity training.¹⁹⁷

More by chance than policy, certain elements came together in the Wilkie case: an informal, ad hoc network of Jewish activists mobilized non-Jewish allies. Although in other cases official Israeli representatives and universities as well as Jewish organizations have intervened, in this one the action was entirely private.

Several major conclusions can be drawn from the Wilkie case. Through it, Israel and its allies have stumbled on a paradigm for attacking the boycotters. Its major lesson is: *take on the boycotters one by one and expose them as racists who discriminate against people because of their country of origin*. As many organizations as possible should take part in the effort. The approach that turned Prof. Wilkie within a few days from accuser to accused can be emulated and refined in similar future cases.

6. Conclusion

Strategically speaking, though not as extreme as terrorists, Israel boycotters and many other anti-Israeli forces are highly pernicious. Regarding policy, what Alan Dershowitz said about terrorists is equally valid for boycotters: "The first and most important macro step is eliminating all possible incentives for terrorism by enforcing the principle that terrorists must never be permitted to benefit from it."¹⁹⁸

As of 2002, there were few early warning signs of the academic boycott attempts against Israel and other campus discrimination acts, nor of how rapidly they would develop in various Western countries. This indicates that Israel and

Diaspora Jewry need first of all an increased capability to foresee problems or, at least, ways of dealing quickly with emerging unforeseen ones.

More than five years have passed since the open letter initiated by the Roses was published in *The Guardian*. One can only wonder why academic institutions, the Israeli government, or Jewish defense organizations have subsequently not systematically studied the academic boycott issue, other campus discrimination issues, and how to prepare against their future development.

The problem is complex, and much more research is required. This includes an analysis and improved understanding of the methodology of Israel's adversaries. It has to be accompanied by the development of case studies of both successful and failed ways to deal with the discriminatory actions. Otherwise, as in the past, those involved in the battle against various attacks on campuses will continue to reinvent slowly what is already known elsewhere.

Research for this essay discovered several cases of academic anti-Israeli discrimination that were unknown to the authorities of the Israeli university to which the academics belonged. Those under attack must pool resources and start monitoring events more efficiently on an ongoing basis.

How to Organize?

It will be difficult to confront the boycott effectively without a central address that follows developments worldwide. A division of roles between the Israeli government, Diaspora organizations, academic institutions, and private activists may yield the best results. Access to a network of experts in various fields including law, psychology, and public relations can make this approach work even better. Furthermore, it is important to stress that principled arguments should be used against the boycott rather than apologetic or utilitarian ones.

The public dissemination of positive case stories of fighting the boycott will help defeat supporters of boycott and other discriminatory actions against Israel. It would be worth involving the Jewish defense organizations in this dissemination process.

It should also be investigated how to involve Israel's friends—both Jewish and non-Jewish—in taking positive action. This has several aspects. The initiative pioneered by IAFI of organizing international conferences in Israel is only one example of this strategy.¹⁹⁹ Boycott and other discriminatory actions can potentially be turned into more of an opportunity for Israel than a threat. That requires much more thought and effort than have been invested so far.

Israel and Jews should also become more proactive rather than only being on the defensive. The more extreme boycotters should be systematically exposed as racists who discriminate against scholars on the basis of their nationality or ethnicity.

Future Developments

One can only speculate about future developments concerning campus-related discriminatory actions against Israel. A variety of campuses employ hardcore enemies of Israel who will constantly seek new opportunities to discriminate against Israel and pro-Israelis.

If the battle against Israel heats up, actions against boycotters will also have to become more aggressive. One step could be setting up a network of academics who are willing to counteract academic boycotts—for instance, by severing relations with the universities and scholars who have called for a boycott. The statement made by hundreds of American university presidents against the 2007 UCU boycott shows that this could happen.

Another might be establishing a list of self-declared enemies of the Jewish people to enable taking action against them at a future date. The names of some of the most notorious have by now been widely publicized.

Presumably, if discrimination attempts against Israel are confronted more effectively, more boycotters will start to act surreptitiously. For instance, had he been aware of the consequences of his email reply to Duvshani, Wilkie could have ignored the application or lied about the reasons for his refusal. If concealed boycotting increases, more sophisticated modes of response will need to be developed.

Yet another possible development is a dramatic increase in violence against Jews and Israelis on certain campuses. The details of this scenario cannot be foreseen. One possible consequence might be the withdrawal of many from certain campuses where the only remaining Jews will be those with a substantial measure of Jewish self-hatred.

Whatever happens in the Middle East, many of the phenomena described above will be with us for a long time to come. Furthermore, the academic boycott attempts and other discriminatory actions against Israel are likely to be precursors of a long-lasting general reassessment of issues such as free speech, academic freedom, uncontrolled campus extremism including incitement to violence, university autonomy, the politicization of science, and the discrepancy in norms between academia and society at large.

The anti-Israeli boycott and divestment promotion campaigns prove that in many universities, academic freedom is abused as an astute device to protect misbehavior. This is one among many reasons why what happens on campuses should be subject to much more external scrutiny.

For instance, campus monitors should be encouraged. One group, Campus Watch, is a project of the Middle East Forum and critiques Middle East studies in North America. It attempts to address five specific types of problems: analytical failures, mixing politics and scholarship, intolerance of alternative views, apologetics, and the abuse of power over students.

A frequent Pavlovian response from the university world is to call such

monitoring McCarthyism. That should be exposed for what it is: an attempt to stifle a normal kind of criticism that exists in all other sectors of civil society. Campus monitors have nothing in common with McCarthyism. The latter took place in a government framework that had the possibility to impose penalties. It is telling that those who claim academic freedom of speech for themselves try with such arguments to limit the freedom of those who comment on their behavior.

The attitude toward Jews and Israel is furthermore a strong indicator of the need for a major reform of the academic world in many areas. Although forces within the academic world can help to achieve this, it will also require substantial pressure from outside sources.

Notes

1. Manfred Gerstenfeld, "The Twenty-First-Century Total War against Israel and the Jews, Part One," *Post-Holocaust and Anti-Semitism*, No. 38, 1 November 2005; "Part Two," *Post-Holocaust and Anti-Semitism*, No. 39, 1 December 2005.
2. www.boycott.org/boycott.
3. Anti-Defamation League, www.adl.org/israel/boycott.asp.
4. Aaron Sarna, *Boycott and Blacklist: A History of Arab Economic Warfare against Israel* (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 1986), 16.
5. *Ibid.*, 21.
6. Donald L. Losman, *International Economic Sanctions: The Cases of Cuba, Israel and Rhodesia* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1979), 1.
7. *Ibid.*, 94.
8. Jonny Paul, "The Emergence of a Silent Academic Boycott of Israel," *EJPress*, 28 May 2006.
9. Sarna, *Boycott and Blacklist*, xiii.
10. *Ibid.*
11. American Jewish Historical Society, www.ajhs.org/publications/chapters/chapter.cfm?documentID=230.
12. United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, www.ushmm.org/wlc/article.jsp?ModuleId=10005678.
13. Dan S. Chill, *The Arab Boycott of Israel: Economic Aggression and World Reaction* (New York: Praeger, 1976), 1.
14. *Ibid.*
15. Anti-Defamation League, www.adl.org/israel/boycott.asp.
16. Joseph Marcus, *Social and Political History of the Jews in Poland, 1919-1939* (Berlin: Mouton, 1981), 425.
17. Avi Beker, *The Plunder of Jewish Property during the Holocaust: Confronting European History* (Houndmills: Palgrave, 2001).
18. Sharon Sadeh, "Dialogue Needed, before We Turn into a Leper State," *Haaretz*, 21 August 2002.
19. Manfred Gerstenfeld, *Europe's Crumbling Myths: The Post-Holocaust Origins of Today's Anti-Semitism* (Jerusalem: JCPA, Yad Vashem, World Jewish Congress, 2003).
20. Manfred Gerstenfeld, "Anti-Semitic Motifs in Anti-Israelism," *Post-Holocaust and Anti-Semitism*, No. 2, 1 November 2002.
21. Institute of the World Jewish Congress, "The Architecture of Bigotry," Policy Dispatch, No. 80, June 2002.

22. Lawrence H. Summers, "Address at Morning Prayers," www.ajc.org, 17 September 2002.
23. "Ferry part à la chasse aux 'sales feuj's' et aux 'bougnoles' à l'école," *Libération*, 27 February 2003 [French]. See also Marc Perelman, "French Minister Unveils Plan to Fight Antisemitism," *Forward*, 7 March 2003.
24. Michael Whine, "Progress in the Struggle against Anti-Semitism in Europe: The Berlin Declaration and the European Union Monitoring Centre on Racism and Xenophobia's Working Definition of Anti-Semitism," *Post-Holocaust and Anti-Semitism*, No. 41, 1 February 2006.
25. Manfred Gerstenfeld, "The Deep Roots of Anti-Semitism in European Society," *Jewish Political Studies Review*, Vol. 17, Nos. 1-2 (Spring 2005), 3-46.
26. Daniel Perdurant, "Anti-Semitism in Contemporary Greek Society," *Analysis of Current Trends in Anti-Semitism*, No. 7, Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 1995, 10.
27. Per Ahlmark, "Palme's Legacy 15 Years On," Project Syndicate, February 2001.
28. Charlotte Edwardes, "Fury as Academics Are Sacked for Being Israeli," *Daily Telegraph*, 7 July 2002.
29. David Harrison, "Professor's Anti-Israeli Tirade Revives Sacked Academics Row," *Daily Telegraph*, 29 September 2002.
30. Ibid.
31. Rod Liddle, "Watch Who You Call Nazis," *The Guardian*, 17 July 2002.
32. Jonathan Kay, "Hating Israel Is Part of Campus Culture," *National Post*, 25 September 2002.
33. Oliver Burkeman, "Harvard Overturns Bar on Oxford Poet," *The Guardian*, 21 November 2002.
34. Tom Gross, "Welcome Voice?" *National Review Online*, 12 November 2002.
35. Leslie Scrivener, "Sharp Increase Seen in Anti-Semitic Hate," *Toronto Star*, 7 March 2003.
36. Gordon W. Allport, *The Nature of Prejudice* (New York: Doubleday, 1958), 147.
37. Abigail Radoszkowicz, "An Ancient Evil Stirs," *Jerusalem Post Magazine*, 17 January 2003.
38. Manfred Gerstenfeld, "Jews against Israel," *Post-Holocaust and Anti-Semitism*, No. 30, 1 March 2005.
39. Kenneth Levin, "The Psychology of Populations under Chronic Siege," *Post-Holocaust and Anti-Semitism*, No. 46, 2 July 2006. For an in-depth study, see Kenneth Levin, *The Oslo Syndrome* (Hanover, NH: Smith & Kraus Global, 2005.)
40. Edward Alexander and Paul Bogdanor, eds., *The Jewish Divide over Israel: Accusers and Defenders* (New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers, 2006).
41. Ofira Seliktar, "'Tenured Radicals' in Israel: From New Zionism to Political Activism," *Israel Affairs*, Vol. 11, No. 4 (October 2005), 717-36.
42. www.israel-academia-monitor.com.
43. Patrick Lawnham, "Academics Split on Israel Sanctions," *The Australian*, 22 May 2002.
44. See the essay by Ruth Contreras in this book.
45. Brendan Boyle, "Boycott Israel, Says Jewish Minister," *Dawn International*, 25 April 2002.
46. Amir Mizroch, "S. African Jewish Paper Causes Storm," *Jerusalem Post*, 22 November 2006.
47. Amir Mizroch, "SA's Kasrils: Hamas Abjures Violence," *Jerusalem Post*, 13 May 2007.
48. Institute of the World Jewish Congress, "The Revival of the Arab Boycott—Round Two," Policy Dispatch, No. 59.

49. Tanya Reinhart, www.nthposition.com/politics_boycott.html, 17 May 2002.
50. Manfred Gerstenfeld, *The Autumn 2005 Riots in France: Their Possible Impact on Israel and the Jews* (Jerusalem: JCPA, 2006).
51. Yair Sheleg, "Enemies, a Post-National Story," *Haaretz*, 7 March 2003.
52. Manfred Gerstenfeld, interview with Andrei S. Markovits, "European Anti-Americanism and Anti-Semitism: Similarities and Differences," *Post-Holocaust and Anti-Semitism*, No. 16, 1 January 2004.
53. Gerstenfeld, "Twenty-First-Century Total War" (Part 1).
54. Manfred Gerstenfeld, interview with Shimon T. Samuels, "Anti-Semitism and Jewish Defense at the United Nations World Summit on Sustainable Development, 2002, Johannesburg, South Africa," *Post-Holocaust and Anti-Semitism*, No. 6, 2 March 2003.
55. Wolfgang Kraushaar, *Die Bombe im Jüdischen Gemeindehaus* (Hamburg: Hamburger Edition HIS), 2005, 86-104. [German]
56. Gerd Langguth, "Anti-Israel Extremism in West Germany," in Robert S. Wistrich, ed., *The Left against Zion: Communism, Israel and the Middle East* (London: Vallentine Mitchell, 1979), 257.
57. Manfred Gerstenfeld, interview with Deborah Lipstadt, "Denial of the Holocaust and Immoral Equivalence," *Post-Holocaust and Anti-Semitism*, No. 11, 1 August 2003.
58. Henry Rousso, *Le dossier Lyon III* (Paris: Fayard, 2004), 100. [French]
59. Stefan Braun, "Second-Class Citizens: Jews, Freedom of Speech, and Intolerance on Canadian University Campuses," *Washington and Lee Journal of Civil Rights and Social Justice*, Vol. 12, No. 2 (Spring 2006), 25-26.
60. "Protest against Call for European Boycott of Academic and Cultural Ties with Israel," *The Guardian*, Original Press Release, 6 April 2002, www.euroisrael.huji.ac.il/original.html.
61. Ibid.
62. Andrea Levin, "Headlines Cover for Palestinian Violence," *Jerusalem Post*, 17 March 2003.
63. Andrew Beckett, "It's Water on Stone—in the End Stone Wears Out," *The Guardian*, 12 December 2002.
64. Ori Golan, "A Conscientious Objector," *Jerusalem Post Magazine*, 17 January 2003.
65. Press Release, EU Commission, "EU Commissioner for Research Philippe Busquin Replies to Call for Boycott on Scientific and Cultural Relations with Israel," No. D/0050/02 PR4/02, 25 April 2002.
66. Press Release, New York Academy of Sciences, "NY Academy of Sciences Committee on Human Rights Opposes Proposed 'Moratorium' on Research Grants to Israel," 3 May 2002.
67. John D. A. Levy, "The Academic Boycott and Antisemitism," in Paul Iganski and Barry Kosmin, eds., *A New Antisemitism? Debating Judeophobia in 21st-Century Britain* (London: Profile Books, 2002), 254.
68. "More Splits over the Academic Boycott of Israel," *The Guardian*, 17 July 2002.
69. Levy, "Academic Boycott and Antisemitism," 254-55.
70. Edwardes, "Fury as Academics Are Sacked."
71. Eric J. Greenberg, "A Friend for Israeli Academics," *Jewish Week*, 25 April 2002.
72. Geoffrey Alderman, "The Gesture Politics of an Israel Boycott," *The Guardian*, 22 July 2002.
73. Liddle, "Watch Who You Call Nazis."
74. Staff and agencies, "Morris Condemns Israeli Sacking," *The Guardian*, 11 July 2002.
75. Polly Curtis, "UMIST Professor Escapes Disciplinary Action," *The Guardian*, 30 January 2003.

76. Francis Elliott and Catherine Milner, "Blair Vows to End Dons' Boycott of Israeli Scholars," *Daily Telegraph*, 17 November 2002.
77. Ronnie Fraser, "Understanding Trade Union Hostility toward Israel and the Consequences for Anglo Jewry," in Iganski and Kosmin, *A New Antisemitism?* 259.
78. Donald MacLeod, "Israelis under Fire," *The Guardian*, 25 June 2002.
79. Patrick Lawnham, "Academics Split on Israel Sanctions," and www.petitiononline.com/mod_perl/signed.cgi?bin.
80. www.geocities.com/academic_freedom_au/read.html.
81. Editorial, "Academic Boycott like Book Burning," *The Australian*, 23 May 2002.
82. Barney Zwartz and Adam Morton, "An Unholy Alliance," *The Age*, 4 September 2006.
83. Andrew Wallenstein, "Big Matter on Campus," *Hadassah Magazine*, August /September 2002, 29.
84. Abraham H. Foxman, "Jews Target of Hate," *National Law Journal*, www.nlj.com/oped/093002foxman.shtml.
85. Second Herbert Berman symposium, JCPA, Jerusalem, November 2002.
86. Personal communication, Beata Schneyer.
87. John Podhoretz, "Hatefest by the Bay," *New York Post*, 14 May 2002.
88. "A Campus War over Israel," *Time*, 7 October 2002.
89. Charles A. Radin, "Presbyterians Reverse Stance on Israeli Divestment: Policy No Longer Singles Out the Jewish State," *Boston Globe*, 22 June 2006.
90. Earth Rights International, www.earthrights.org/usalead/divestment.html.
91. Student Conference on Palestine, www.divestmentconference.com.
92. *University of Pennsylvania Almanac*, www.upenn.edu/almanac/v49/n09/divestment.html.
93. Lee C. Bollinger, Current Communications, President's Office, 7 November 2002, www.columbia.edu/cu/president/israel.html.
94. *Yale Daily News*, www.yaledailynews.com/article.asp?AID=20843.
95. Anti-Defamation League, www.adl.org/Anti_semitism/divestment.asp.
96. Yonit Golub, "An Analytic Approach to Campus Pro-Israeli Activism: Case Study: Johns Hopkins University," *Jewish Political Studies Review*, Vol. 16, Nos. 3-4 (Fall 2004): 205-13.
97. United States Commission on Civil Rights, "Campus Anti-Semitism," briefing report, Washington, DC, July 2006.
98. Kelly Fraser, "Dearborn Student Gov't Demands Divestment," *Michigan Daily*, 4 October 2006.
99. "Free Speech OK, but WSU Won't Divest," *Detroit Free Press*, 13 October 2006.
100. Braun, "Second-Class Citizens," 48.
101. Associated Press, "Concordia University Admits It Was Unprepared for Violent Anti-Netanyahu Protest," *Jerusalem Post*, 16 January 2003.
102. Melissa Radler, "Concordia University Hillel Banned by Student Union," *Jerusalem Post*, 8 December 2002.
103. Associated Press, "Judge Grants Injunction against Mideast Talk at Canadian University," *Jerusalem Post*, 16 November 2002.
104. Bram Eisenthal, "Pro-Arab Body at Montreal School Shuts Campus Hillel over Israel Flier," *JTA*, 5 December 2002.
105. Bram Eisenthal, "Canadian Jewish Students Scared? Ad in Newspaper Fuels a New Debate," *JTA*, 23 December 2002.
106. Henry Rousso, *Le dossier Lyon III* (Paris: Fayard, 2004). [French]
107. Press Release from Pierre and Marie Curie University.

108. Benjamin Cohen, "UEJF/Paris VI: les coulisses de la mobilization," *Tohu Bohu*, No. 2, 2003 [French].
109. Ibid.
110. X. T., "Claude Lanzmann appelle au 'boycott des boycotteurs,'" *Le Monde*, 6 January 2003. [French]
111. Associated Press, "UNESCO Criticizes French Isolation of Israeli Academics," *Jerusalem Post*, 9 January 2003.
112. Philip Carmel, "Critics, Rally Force Paris School to Back Off Israel Boycott Threat," *JTA*, 9 January 2003.
113. Cohen, "UEJF/Paris VI."
114. Ori Golan, "Same Word, Same Meaning," *Jerusalem Post Magazine*, 17 January 2003.
115. Sharon Sadeh, "Death Threats against Pro-Israel Activists on Brussels Campus," *Haaretz*, 21 December 2002.
116. From a presentation by Laurence Weinbaum at a lecture on 3 April 2002, Herbert Berman series, JCPA.
117. Sara D'Ascenzo, "Boicottiamo I prof israeliani: sostengono Sharon," *Corriere del Veneto*, 8 February 2003. [Italian]
118. Ibid.
119. Ibid.
120. Silvia Grilli, "Venti di antisemitismo a Ca' Foscari," *Panorama*, 13 February 2003. [Italian]
121. See Maurizio Molinari, *La Sinistra E Gli Ebrei In Italia: 1967-1993* (Milan: Corbaccio, 1995), 93-94. [Italian]
122. Personal communication, David Meghnagi.
123. Manfred Gerstenfeld, *European-Israeli Relations: Between Confusion and Change?* (Jerusalem: JCPA, Konrad Adenauer Foundation, 2006), 97.
124. Manfred Gerstenfeld, interview with Rory Miller, "Irish Attitudes toward Israel," *Post-Holocaust and Anti-Semitism*, No. 49, 1 October 2006.
125. "Academics Call for Ban on Israel," *Irish Times*, 16 September 2006.
126. Gema Martín Muñoz, *El País*, 27 January 2003. [Spanish]
127. Gustavo D. Perednik, "Naïve Spanish Judeophobia," *Jewish Political Studies Review*, Vol. 15, Nos. 3-4 (Fall 2003): 87-110.
128. Gerstenfeld, *European-Israeli Relations*, 134.
129. The Conseil Représentatif des Institutions Juives de France (CRIF) prepared a file on the product boycotts of Israel and how to counteract them. See Mark Knobel, publication of CRIF on website: www.crif.org, "Dossier: Le boycott des produits israéliens," 13 November 2002. [French]
130. www.euroisrael.huji.ac.il/original.html.
131. www.geocities.com/academic_freedom_aus/list.html.
132. www.anti-boycott-petition.org.
133. "L'Université Française sous Influence," *Le Monde*, 14 January 2003. [French]
134. Sue Fishkoff, "UK Scientist to Lead 'Anti-Boycott' Mission," *Jerusalem Post*, 5 March 2003.
135. Judy Siegel-Itzkovich, "70 Medical Professors Coming to Protest Divestment," *Jerusalem Post*, 18 November 2002.
136. "What Is IAFI?" International Academic Friends of Israel, www.iafi-israel.org.
137. Will Woodward, "Lecturers Reject Call to Boycott Israel," *The Guardian*, 10 May 2003.
138. Ibid.
139. www.biu.ac.il/rector/academic_freedom/4.htm.

140. Report of the First International Conference on Academic Antisemitism, "Antisemitism in Academia: Sources and Solutions," Magenta Foundation, Amsterdam, 2006, 55.
141. Beckett, "It's Water on Stone."
142. Corrections and Clarifications column, *The Guardian*, 19 December 2002.
143. Douglas Davis, "Fears Voiced that Academic Boycott of Israel Could Endanger Lives," *Jerusalem Post*, 15 December 2002.
144. Paul, "Emergence."
145. Eisenthal, "Pro-Arab Body at Montreal School."
146. Peter Foster, "Academia Split over Boycott of Israel," *Daily Telegraph*, 16 May 2002.
147. Patrick Healy, "Israeli Academics Hit Back against Boycott," *Boston Globe*, 20 February 2003.
148. Associated Press, "Minnesota University Agrees to Pay Nearly \$365,000 to Settle Allegations of Anti-Semitism," *Jerusalem Post*, 4 December 2002.
149. Ruth R. Wisse, "Israel on Campus," *Wall Street Journal*, 16 December 2002.
150. Gary Tobin, Aryeh K. Weinberg, and Jenna Ferer, *The Uncivil University* (San Francisco: Institute for Jewish and Community Research, 2005), 13.
151. Press Release, Institute for Jewish and Community Research, "Survey Shows Pervasive 'Groupthink' on American Campuses," 18 October 2006.
152. Martin Kramer, *Ivory Towers on Sand* (Washington: Washington Institute for Near East Policy, 2001).
153. Michael Whine, "Cyberhate, Antisemitism, and Counterlegislation," *Post-Holocaust and Anti-Semitism*, No. 47, 1 August 2006.
154. Summers, "Address."
155. Claude Cohen-Tannoudji, "J'ai honte!" *Le Monde*, 4 January 2003. [French]
156. Douglas Davis, "2 Nobel Winners Fight Anti-Israel Boycott," *Jerusalem Post*, 21 July 2002.
157. Ibid.
158. Donald Kennedy, "When Science and Politics Don't Mix," *Science*, Vol. 296, 7 June 2002.
159. Editorial, "Don't Boycott Israel's Scientists," *Nature*, Vol. 417, May 2002.
160. Diana Jean Schemo, "Rejecting Boycott, Researchers Gather in Israel," *New York Times*, 6 October 2002.
161. Itamar Marcus and Barbara Crook, "Kill a Jew—Go to Heaven: The Perception of the Jew in Palestinian Society," *Jewish Political Studies Review*, Vol. 17, Nos. 3-4 (Fall 2005), 127.
162. Associated Press, "Gruesome Exhibit Marks Anniversary of Uprising," 24 September 2001.
163. Ibid.
164. Mohammed Daraghme, " Hamas, Fatah Compete over Killing Israelis in Campaign for Student Council Seats," Associated Press, SFGate.com, 10 December 2003, www.sfgate.com/cgi-bin/article.cgi?file=/news/archive/2003/12/10/international1552EST0714.DTL&type=printable.
165. David J. Silverman, "Non-Jewish Pro-Israel Students Steel Selves for a Tough Semester," JTA, 21 August 2006.
166. Daniel Foggo and Josie Clarke, "Boycott of Work by Israeli Scientists 'Could Cost Lives,'" *Daily Telegraph*, 15 December 2002.
167. Toby Axelrod, "Academics Lining Up for and Against," JTA, 9 January 2003.
168. Alan Dershowitz, *The Case for Israel* (Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons, 2003), 207.
169. Jacob Gersham, "Dershowitz Says Faculty Members Work to Encourage Islamic Terrorism," *New York Sun*, 8 February 2005.

170. Jon Boone, "Harvard Legal Expert Vows to Sue Lecturers Boycotting Israel," *Financial Times*, 2 June 2007.
171. Jacob Laksin, "Petition for Genocide," FrontPageMagazine.com, 28 July 2006.
172. Allan Bloom, *The Closing of the American Mind* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1988).
173. Beckett, "It's Water on Stone."
174. Corrections and Clarifications column, *The Guardian*, 15 January 2003.
175. Q&A with Zain Verjee, transcripts of CNN broadcast, 12 July 2002.
176. www.jpost.com/servlet, 12 August 2007.
177. "Report of the All-Party Parliamentary Inquiry into Antisemitism," Stationery Office Ltd., London, 2006, 38-42.
178. See the essay by Noah Liben in this book.
179. Donald Kennedy, *Science*, 7 June 2002.
180. Ibid.
181. Andrea Peyser, "Israeli Researchers Hit by Misguided Backlash," *New York Post*, 25 April 2003.
182. Original errors have been maintained.
183. Peyser, "Israeli Researchers."
184. Tovah Lazaroff, "Far from Academic," *Jerusalem Post*, 2 May 2002.
185. Erez Uriely, "Jew-Hatred in Contemporary Norwegian Caricatures," *Post-Holocaust and Anti-Semitism*, No. 50, 1 November 2006.
186. For a description of the Fonagy case, see Manfred Gerstenfeld, "The Academic Boycott against Israel," *Jewish Political Studies Review*, Vol. 15, Nos. 3-4 (Fall 2003): 53-58.
187. Personal communication, Shmuel Erlich.
188. www.huji.ac.il.
189. Amnon Lord, "Lashon La'akedemia Ha'ivriet," *Makor Rishon*, 22 August 2003. [Hebrew]
190. Ibid.
191. Press Release, Oxford University, 27 June 2003.
192. Ibid.
193. www.admin.ox.ac.uk/eop/eopolicy.shtml.
194. Luke Layfield, "Oxford 'Appalled' as Professor Inflames Boycott Row," *The Guardian*, 4 July 2003.
195. Press Release, Oxford University, 4 July 2003.
196. Oxford University Students Union (OUSU), 7 July 2003.
197. For a description of the Wilkie case, see Gerstenfeld, "Academic Boycott against Israel," 58-61.
198. Alan M. Dershowitz, *Why Terrorism Works: Understanding the Threat, Responding to the Challenge* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2002), 166.
199. www.iafi-israel.org.

ESSAYS

Rebecca Leibowitz

Defeating Anti-Israeli and Anti-Semitic Activity on Campus: A Case Study: Rutgers University¹

Background

Rutgers University (RU), the State University of New Jersey, is located on three campuses in Newark, Camden, and New Brunswick/Piscataway, New Jersey. Established in 1766, Rutgers is attended by more than fifty thousand students. This case study focuses on the New Brunswick/Piscataway campus, which consists of smaller undergraduate and graduate colleges. The overall student population is very diverse, and many students are involved in student groups and tend to be politically liberal.²

Utilizing University Media: A Springboard for Political Awareness

Regarding political activism, Rutgers was a generally quiet campus in the fall semester of 2000, when the Second Intifada, or Palestinian uprising, broke out in the Middle East with a series of terrorist attacks against Israeli citizens. As the violence grew, information about these distant events began to flood the college campus, and students stepped forward with a variety of opinions about this outbreak of aggression. In the spring of 2001, Rutgers was an exception to the strident debates that erupted on college campuses across the country, as editorials on Israeli and Palestinian violence began to be featured in Rutgers's campuswide newspaper the *Daily Targum*. The student-controlled media plays a large part in shaping student political opinion for several reasons, which are discussed in Golub's case study on Johns Hopkins University. Although student media, such as the newspaper, television, or radio station, are closely affiliated with their university, they receive no funding from the academic institution. As Golub notes:

Hence, the independent campus media becomes the voice of the student body, but bears no accountability either to the school or the students (who usually do not pay a subscription fee).³ In other words, this media covers the university but cannot be limited or penalized by it. [In addition,] prospective students often look to the university newspaper to gain better understanding of the

institution, and alumni tend to use the campus media to stay connected. Thus, the campus media acts as a link between many generations of students.⁴

Pro-Israeli activists at Rutgers began to notice that negative student opinion about Israel could have a dangerous effect on the campus after an article that was published in October 2001. Written by an opinion columnist, the article states that “Israel needs to be dismantled, either politically or physically,” and became a major issue on campus for weeks.⁵

Taking Sides: Pro-Israeli vs. Pro-Palestinian

A propaganda war soon erupted on campus. Particular “sides” emerged, where pro-Palestinian activists deemed a supporter of Israel “racist” or “anti-Palestinian,” and a supporter of a Palestinian state was labeled by pro-Israeli activists as “anti-Zionist” and even “anti-Semitic.” Some attempts, however, were made by both sides to bring down the walls that were being erected much too rapidly between students on the campus. This author was part of a group of student leaders that gathered to attempt reconciliation between the more vocal members of both sides of the campus conflict. These attempts did not, however, do much to ease the growing tensions. The majority of students at Rutgers and other American universities care more about missing the latest *Dave Chappell Show* on Comedy Central than about how many Jews or Palestinians were killed in the latest attack. The student activists, however, were very vociferous on the Rutgers campus.

Most pro-Israeli activists were Jewish, and most pro-Palestinian activists were Muslim. There were a few key exceptions, however. Much media attention has been given to Charlotte Kates, a former Rutgers student with unknown religious affiliations. She created a stir as spokesperson of NJ Solidarity, a self-described pro-Palestinian organization that openly calls for the destruction of Israel. According to their mission statement:

We are opposed to the existence of the apartheid colonial settler state of Israel, as it is based on the racist ideology of Zionism and is an expression of colonialism and imperialism, and we stand for the total liberation of all of historic Palestine. As a solidarity movement, we are committed to working fully in support of the Palestinian people’s resistance movement. We unconditionally support Palestinians’ human right to resist occupation and oppression *by any means necessary*.⁶ (emphasis added)

Charlotte Kates has received media attention from papers such as the *New York Times*, which quoted her virulent attitude toward Israel. In October 2003, NJ Solidarity, led by Kates, hosted both an off-campus pro-Palestinian conference four miles from Rutgers and an on-campus rally. According to the Anti-Defamation League:

One of the conference supporters included a local chapter of Al-Awda, a movement that calls for the destruction of Israel, as indicated by its motto, "From the River to the Sea, Palestine will be Free." Other endorsers include the Islamic Association for Palestine, an anti-Semitic organization that, according to the FBI, has coordinated its activities with the terrorist group Hamas.⁷

These events neither attracted the support nor the media coverage that NJ Solidarity had expected, although the emails that were sent out to the NJ Solidarity listserv suggested otherwise.

Another key player in pro-Palestinian activity at Rutgers is a Jewish Rutgers student and former NJ Solidarity member, Abe Greenhouse. He is most renowned as the student activist who threw a kosher strawberry pie in the face of Israeli cabinet minister Natan Sharansky during his speaking engagement at Rutgers on 16 September 2003. Sharansky responded to the assault by nonchalantly wiping the pie from his face, making a small joke, and continuing his lecture to resounding applause from the audience.⁸

Despite his ties to anti-Israeli activity on campus, Greenhouse attended a weekly class given at Rutgers Hillel and was well known to members of the Rutgers Jewish community. Many attempts were made by both Hillel professionals and student leaders to bring him back into the Jewish community, but Greenhouse has not attended any Hillel events since the pie-throwing incident.

Many anti-Israeli events with anti-Semitic overtones that have occurred at Rutgers have been attributed to NJ Solidarity.⁹ The number of members of NJ Solidarity that participated in their events is minuscule. According to Andrew Getraer, executive director of Rutgers Hillel, there may have been thirty-five to forty members of NJ Solidarity at the apex of their activism.

In comparison, there are a large number of pro-Israeli activists at Rutgers University. They belong to several pro-Israeli student organizations, of which the umbrella organization is Students United for Israel.¹⁰

Yet, despite the ratio of members of NJ Solidarity to Students United for Israel, these pro-Palestinian activists were a very vociferous minority during the peak of their anti-Israeli activity. The NJ-Solidarity listserv, which sends out several emails per week, boasts large membership numbers, and claims successful turnouts at events, does not always provide accurate information. For example, an event that was scheduled for 4 December 2003, at the Center for Latino Arts and Culture, never occurred. According to Getraer, he went to the widely advertised event at the Latino center and no one was there except for an older woman, who was also looking for the meeting. He mentioned that to the best of his knowledge, NJ Solidarity advertises all the time for events that do not end up happening, from movies to rallies.

This aforementioned event, the showing of a film called *People and the Land*, announced that the movie

takes viewers into the universe of the occupied people of Palestine, [with] unreeling images of a new form of apartheid based on ethnicity...that highlights the human rights violations against the Palestinian community. “People and the Land” raises and highlights the issue of US aid to Israel. At campuses across the country, including Rutgers, students and faculty are demanding that our universities divest—withdraw investment from—the apartheid state of Israel, in order to cut off that corporate aid to the apartheid regime.¹¹

NJ Solidarity also spearheaded a campaign called RutgersDivest, which:

Calls for the University to apply its human rights ideals where its dollars are invested. That is, we urge the university to use its political and financial influence to encourage the United States government to suspend its aid and arms sales to Israel. We also call upon Rutgers University to divest from Israel, from US companies that sell arms to Israel, and from US companies engaged in business with Israel...¹²

The website boasts a petition signed by 866 members. Interestingly, however, when researching the signatures this author found that some of the signatories listed as students either did not exist or were no longer students.

During all the pro-Palestinian activity on campus, pro-Israeli activists, for the most part, continued to organize Israeli educational, social, and cultural events. Aside from writing responses to anti-Israeli commentaries and advertisements in the *Daily Targum*, anti-Israeli activity was generally ignored in the beginning months of the Palestinian-Israeli conflict.

Anti-Zionism and Anti-Semitism Intermingle

As the conflict in the Middle East increased in violence, however, tension on the campus began to mount. With anti-Israeli commentary no longer limited to the college newspaper, anti-Zionist rhetoric, such as “Zionism = Racism,” “Sharon = Hitler,” and “Zionism = Nazism” quickly made its way into flyers, chalking, banners, and rally signs across the campus.

A series of events at Rutgers in the fall of 2002 exemplify how the line between criticizing Israeli policies and anti-Semitism often becomes blurred on the college campus. This has been noticed and addressed by other university administrations as well, including Harvard University where President Lawrence Summers discussed the positive correlation between anti-Israeli activity and the growth of anti-Semitic incidents in a speech in September 2002.¹³

At an Israeli-Palestinian dialogue cohosted by the Rutgers University Democrats and Republicans, pro-Israeli students listened to the pro-Palestinian side, whereas all pro-Israeli speakers were booed and given an unfair amount of

time to express their view. At the “dialogue,” Palestinian refugee camps were compared to Holocaust concentration camps with disturbing visual images. Israeli prime minister Ariel Sharon was also compared to Hitler. Jewish students were not only intimidated into silence, denied the freedom to express their opinions openly, but were also emotional victims of Holocaust manipulation, a personal issue for many Jewish students in attendance. In another example of Holocaust manipulation and revision, on 4 November 2002 NJ Solidarity sponsored a lecture by Norman Finkelstein who exploits the Holocaust for political purposes with inflammatory material. Daniel Goldhagen, author of *Hitler's Willing Executioners*, describes Finkelstein as “a man who has made a career of attacking Israel’s legitimacy, including likening those who support Israel to the ‘Gestapo.’”¹⁴

Shortly after the Israeli-Palestinian “dialogue,” Hillel students on their way to morning prayer services found chalking on the sidewalk outside of Hillel, permanent marker on a board on Hillel’s lawn, defacement of posters on the fence, and stickers on parking meters. The chalking and stickers contained defamatory language such as “Zionism is racism” and “Hillel is racist.” This vandalism was reported by the Rutgers University police as a “bias incident.”¹⁵ This event clearly blurs the line between anti-Israeli and anti-Semitic sentiment, as Hillel became the target for anti-Israeli attacks. Jewish students who wanted to participate in religious activities hosted by the Center for Jewish Life on Campus could no longer ignore the political conflict.

One day after Hillel was vandalized, a front-page article appeared in the *Daily Targum*. A nonstudent member of NJ Solidarity said about the incident, “We have to understand that what happened is anti-Jewish, not anti-Semitic.” In the same article, the university student senator for the Douglass College Governing Association (DCGA)¹⁶ stated, “An attack on Zionism is by no means an attack on Judaism.”¹⁷ These remarks went unchallenged.

An important note about NJ Solidarity’s claims in this article, aside from the inaccuracies of the definition of “anti-Semitic,” is that the same slogans that were chalking on Hillel property were echoed the very next day at an antiwar rally hosted by the same organization. This rally, held on 24 October 2002, was dominated by anti-Israeli slogans. Many students, who came for an antiwar rally and received a very different message, were dismayed.

As for the vandalism, the police interviewed students whom Hillel identified to them: three female students who were known to be active in NJ Solidarity had publicly uttered phrases that were found written on Hillel property, and had been outspoken against Hillel and Israel at DCGA meetings. Although a Jewish student who witnessed the chalking at Brower Commons, the campus dining hall, could not identify them directly, they matched the general description. When interviewed by the RU police they denied any involvement, and then reported to the student government that Hillel was harassing them.

As attacks against Hillel increased in the form of anti-Israeli activity aimed at the Center, Jewish students were no longer comfortable about expressing their

Jewishness openly. On 20 September 2003, in the heat of the Israeli-Palestinian propaganda war, swastikas were painted on the property of both Rutgers Hillel and the Alpha Epsilon Pi Fraternity House,¹⁸ only a few days after Sharansky spoke on the campus.

Announcement of the Third Palestinian Solidarity Movement Conference

A turning point occurred during the late spring semester of 2003 when it became public knowledge that the Palestinian Solidarity Movement (PSM), the international organization that sponsors NJ Solidarity, planned to hold their third annual conference at Rutgers during the weekend of 10-12 October 2003. It was not long, however, until PSM began to encounter many difficulties with their plan; a large, pro-Palestinian conference on the Rutgers campus was not to be.

A few key factors led to PSM's final decision to move their divestment conference away from Rutgers to Ohio State University. First, the vocal protest among the local Jewish community indicated to PSM that they would not be welcome in the Rutgers area. Second, PSM was discouraged by the difficulty encountered by NJ Solidarity in trying to obtain a permit for the conference from the university.¹⁹ Third, according to the Anti-Defamation League the main reason PSM moved the conference was internal conflict between PSM and NJ Solidarity. The former found this chapter of their organization to be too extreme in their approach to pro-Palestinian activism.²⁰

“Israel Inspires”: A Proactive Response

Some pro-Israeli activists were worried that the PSM conference, which planned to further the already vocal campaign to coerce universities to divest from Israel, would generate even more intimidation and anti-Israeli propaganda at Rutgers. Seeking community support, pro-Israeli activists cited examples from the anti-Semitic incidents that occurred at both UC Berkeley and the University of Michigan, the two previous hosts of the PSM conference.

In April 2003, a group of ten Jewish student leaders and two Rutgers Hillel professionals sat down together to brainstorm a reaction to this conference. The leaders established a new coalition, Students United for Israel, that consisted of representatives from all the pro-Israeli groups on campus.²¹ This coalition worked throughout the summer and the beginning of the fall semester to create a new pro-Israeli agenda. This initiative, afterward known as Israel Inspires, grew beyond countering the pro-Palestinian conference to a proactive series of events that would bring together not only students from the United States, Canada, and other countries but also the local community to stand in solidarity with Israel.

The main events of the October Israel Inspires campaign, which consisted of an Israeli Block Party, a Community Rally, and a Student Weekend Conference, gained international acclaim for their success.²² On 10 October 2003, over a

thousand students flocked to the main student center to celebrate Israeli culture with live bands, Israeli food, Israeli art, and educational displays.

At the Israel Inspires Student Weekend Conference, 10-12 October 2003, which not only coincided with NJ Solidarity's conference date but also with the Jewish holiday of Sukkoth, six hundred students from sixty-eight colleges representing seventeen states, three Canadian provinces, and three countries came to hear a wide political spectrum of speakers and celebrate Israel in a 9,000-square-foot *sukkah*, and to engage in workshops on advocating for Israel on their own campuses. Among the speakers for the weekend were June Walker,²³ David Harris,²⁴ Tom Rose,²⁵ and Ambassador Fereydoun Hoveyda.²⁶

The Israel Inspires Rally on 9 October brought seven thousand people from throughout New Jersey and the New York metropolitan area to hear speakers including New Jersey governor James E. McGreevey, New Jersey senators Frank R. Lautenberg, Jon S. Corzine, and Joseph M. Kyrrilos, as well as Ido Aharoni.²⁷

During all the Israel Inspires events, the presence of anti-Israeli protesters was felt but mostly ignored. The local media, however, gave these protesters enough attention to encourage their own supporters. NJ Solidarity measures the success of their own counterevents by the media coverage they receive. Whereas the Israel Inspires leaders focused on their new proactive initiative, NJ Solidarity consistently worked not only to respond to Israel Inspires but to run their own programs without PSM's support as well.

“Israel Inspires”: The Continuing Effect on College Activism

Given the large attendance, attention, and support of the greater pro-Israeli community, the Israel Inspires campaign was successful from two major standpoints. First, anti-Semitic incidents at Rutgers have virtually disappeared since the advent of the campaign. Second, Israel Inspires was true to its name and inspired many students at Rutgers to become involved in campus activism. The Rutgers Students United for Israel community since then boasts numerous pro-Israeli activities, including the debut of the *Rutgers Student Journal of Israel Affairs*.

When PSM announced Duke University as the location for their fourth conference, the success of the Rutgers Israel Inspires campaign was once again evident as pro-Israeli activists at Duke looked to Rutgers to create their new pro-Israeli initiative in response to the conference:

The Israeli Initiative is loosely based on the yearlong “Israel Inspires” campaign last year at Rutgers University, when the National Student Conference of the Palestine Solidarity Movement held its annual event in New Brunswick, NJ, the Rutgers base.... Jewish students at Duke have planned an anti-terrorism rally and rock concert, followed by a pro-Israeli Shabbaton to coincide with the PSM gathering.²⁸

Although anti-Semitic incidents have virtually disappeared at Rutgers, the campus should continue to be monitored as Middle Eastern events continue to cause concern among both pro-Israeli and pro-Palestinian college activists. Much of NJ Solidarity and other pro-Palestinian organizations' work on the Rutgers campus has turned to forming coalitions with other organizations that have no predetermined political agenda on Middle Eastern issues, such as the gay and lesbian organizations at Rutgers, in which pro-Israeli activists are alarmingly absent. This author suggests that pro-Israeli activists consider reaching out to both left-wing and non-Jewish organizations in seeking to form coalitions. This is an important and necessary step to ensure that colleges will remain free of anti-Israeli rhetoric, which can so easily turn into anti-Semitism and intimidation in supposedly peaceful academic settings.

Appendix

A Summary of Intimidation: Anti-Israeli Incidents at Rutgers University, 2001-2004

- 11 October 2001: Peter Miller, an opinion columnist in the *Daily Targum* (the Rutgers campus paper), writes, "Israel needs to be dismantled, either politically or physically."
- Spring 2002: At a pro-Palestinian rally on the steps of the main dining hall a thirty-foot-long banner is displayed, containing a purported "quote" from Ariel Sharon, dated 1956, exhorting IDF soldiers to rape and humiliate Arab women. Signs equate Zionism with Nazism.
- Fall 2002: At an Israeli-Palestinian dialogue cohosted by the Rutgers University Democrats and Republicans, Jewish students are intimidated by an overwhelming number of Arab and Muslim anti-Israeli students, and are not given an equal chance to speak. Although pro-Israeli students listen to the pro-Palestinian side, all pro-Israeli speakers are booed and given an unfair amount of time to convey their point of view. At the "dialogue," Palestinian refugee camps are compared to Holocaust concentration camps with disturbing visual images. Israeli prime minister Ariel Sharon is also compared to Hitler.
- 23 October 2002: Reported by the Rutgers University Police as a "bias incident," anti-Israeli and anti-Hillel graffiti is found all along College Avenue. On their way to morning prayer services, Hillel students find chalking on the sidewalk outside of Hillel, permanent marker on a board on Hillel's lawn, defacement of posters on the fence, and stickers on parking meters. The chalking and stickers contain defamatory language such as "Zionism is racism" and "Hillel is racist."
- 24 October 2002: A front-page article appears in the *Daily Targum* in which a nonstudent member of NJ Solidarity says about the previous day's vandalism

incident, “We have to understand that what happened is anti-Jewish, not anti-Semitic.” In the same article, the university student senator for the DCGA says, “An attack on Zionism is by no means an attack on Judaism.” These remarks go unchallenged.

- 24 October 2002: In the guise of an antiwar rally, members of NJ Solidarity hold a rally that is quickly dominated by anti-Israeli slogans. Several Palestinian flags are displayed. This dismays many students, who came for an antiwar rally and received a very different message.
- 25 October 2002: An NJ Solidarity member attempts to force his way into an invitation-only Hillel event, a training session on pro-Israeli advocacy on campus. When he is denied entry, he stages photographs of himself, posts them on an activist website, and protests to the vice-president for student affairs that Hillel has violated university policy and is illegitimately using the Rutgers name. Calls and mails from anti-Israeli activists flood Hillel and the administration for several days. All complaints are summarily dismissed.
- 27 October 2002: Protesting the Douglass College Governing Association’s resolution to condemn the vandalism that Hillel underwent on 23 October, members of NJ Solidarity pass out flyers claiming that the statements plastered at Hillel were “NOT defamatory language.” These statements included: “Free Palestine!” “Israel is an Apartheid State!” “Stop US Aid to Israel Now!” “Boycott Israel!” “Hillel is Racist!” “Zionism is Racism!” and “End the Occupation!”
- 4 November 2002: NJ Solidarity sponsors a lecture by Norman Finkelstein. (Daniel Goldhagen, author of *Hitler’s Willing Executioners*, has described Finkelstein as “a man who has made a career of attacking Israel’s legitimacy, including likening those who support Israel to the ‘Gestapo.’”)
- November 2002: A series of pro-Palestinian ads run in the *Daily Targum*. Some show Palestinian children with captions about how their life’s dreams may be thwarted by the occupation; others list purported Israeli massacres of Arabs from 1948-2002.
- 28 January 2003: NJ Solidarity begins their divestment campaign, which calls for public and private institutions to divest from Israel. The campaign is launched with an anti-Israeli rally in which twenty supporters of divestment symbolically “die” to represent Palestinians. One sign reads “Sharon = the future Hitler.”
- 6 February 2003: Former Georgia congresswoman Cynthia McKinney is invited by NJ Solidarity to speak during Black History Month. This disturbs many Jewish students, as in the past McKinney has been accused of making anti-Semitic comments during interviews and speeches.
- 27 February 2003: The Rutgers Association for Middle East Justice, an ad hoc student group directly associated with NJ Solidarity, displays a banner that reads, “From the River to the Sea, Palestine Will Be Free” in both the Rutgers College and Douglass College centers. Implicit in this sentence is the

idea that the state of Israel should be eradicated from the Mediterranean Sea to the Jordan River, in other words, totally. Many extremist groups including Hamas have used this slogan.

- 27 March 2003: Anti-Israeli activists protest a Hillel speaker with a mock Israeli “checkpoint” in front of the Hillel building. They put up flyers around campus implying that the speaker, an Israeli rabbi, is a terrorist because he lives in Bat Ayin, a settlement outside of Jerusalem. Israeli settlers are described as fanatical terrorists. The rabbi’s topic was “Jewish Themes in the Work of Franz Kafka.”
- 28 March 2003: NJ Solidarity places flyers on campus advertising “A Night of Solidarity” with the lead slogan “Globalize Intifada.”
- Spring 2003: An anti-Israeli ad is sponsored by NJ Solidarity in the *Daily Targum*, claiming that Israel is a terrorist state whose track record is worse than Iraq’s.
- 4 April 2002: A demonstration is organized by the student-led Arabs United at Rutgers University to protest alleged Israeli army attacks on Palestinian communities.
- 5 April 2003: In a front-page report in the *Daily Targum*, an Arab student claims that the “Israeli government went into an all-female hospital and randomly selected 30 women, called them terrorists, and executed them.” The *Targum* published this outrageous fabrication as if it was fact, and left it unchallenged.
- 16 April 2003: The campus Muslim Student Association schedules a viewing of the documentary *Jenin, Jenin*, which falsely asserts that Palestinians were massacred in 2002 by the Israel Defense Forces in Jenin.
- July-August 2003: NJ Solidarity, in promoting the International Palestinian Solidarity Conference to be held at Rutgers in October, comes out in support of Palestinian suicide attacks and declares that Israel has no right to exist. The statements are covered in the *New York Times* and all major New York/New Jersey media.
- 16 September 2003: Israeli cabinet minister Natan Sharansky speaks at Rutgers. A well-known pro-Palestinian student activist assaults him with a pie in the face. The incident gains worldwide press coverage. Seven months later the university announces its penalty: the student, who is graduating, will receive his diploma in December rather than in May.
- 20 September 2003: Swastikas are painted on the property of Rutgers Hillel and AEPi, a Jewish chartered fraternity.
- 9 October 2003: Seven thousand people attend the Israel Inspires Rally. Fifty pro-Palestinian activists protest. The *New York Times* and *Star-Ledger* stories on the event lead with photos of and interviews with the protesters.
- 10 October 2003: Pro-Palestinian activists protest the Israel Inspires Block Party, a nonpolitical event attended by over one thousand students. The centerpiece of the protest is a giant banner reading “Zionism is Racism.”

University officials refuse to take it down.

- 11-12 October 2003: The International Palestine Solidarity Conference is held in New Brunswick. For noncompliance with university regulations they are denied access to the Rutgers campus. The conference splits into two groups, and only the most extreme stay at Rutgers while the others go to Ohio State University.
- February 2004: A professor teaching a course on Islam sends a mass email to students promoting NJ Solidarity events. Hillel brings this to the attention of the department chair and the professor is informally reprimanded.
- February 2004: A professor assigns his Advanced Spanish Grammar class an NJ Solidarity anti-Israeli flyer to translate for homework. Hillel meets with the university president to protest.

Notes

1. Prof. Chaim Waxman and Andre Getraer deserve special thanks for their guidance and consultation during the writing of this essay.
2. "About the University," <http://ruweb.rutgers.edu/about-the-university.shtml>.
3. In the case of Rutgers, students are given the choice on their tuition bill to support the *Daily Targum* by agreeing to pay a predetermined, nominal fee to the university.
4. Yonit Golub, "An Analytic Approach to Campus Pro-Israeli Activism—Case Study: Johns Hopkins University," *Jewish Political Studies Review*, Vol. 16, Nos. 3-4 (2004): 205-13.
5. Peter Miller, "God Loves Terrorism," *Daily Targum*, 11 October 2001.
6. www.newjerseysolidarity.org. Note that the original NJ Solidarity website, www.njsolidarity.org, can no longer be accessed because anonymous pro-Israeli activists have since hacked into it and changed it. The pro-Israeli activists have posted on the site extreme anti-Israeli statements, pictures of Palestinian children training to be suicide bombers, as well as links to articles that plead Israel's case.
7. Ibid.
8. Carmen Cusido, "Pie in the Face Prompts Hillel to Improve Security at Events," *Daily Targum*, 23 September 2003.
9. Examples of NJ Solidarity's anti-Israeli activity are listed in the Appendix.
10. Pro-Israeli organizations at Rutgers include: Rutgers Hillel, Israel Action Committee of Rutgers University, Rutgers Israel Public Affairs Committee, Rutgers Chabad, and the Rutgers Israelis Club. Students United for Israel runs a listserv that included over 134 members only a month after its inception. This listserv represents all the membership lists of all the pro-Israeli organizations at Rutgers.
11. "NJ Solidarity: Activists for the Liberation of Palestine," www.newjerseysolidarity.org.
12. "Rutgers University Campaign for Divestment from Israeli Apartheid," www.rutgersdivest.org.
13. Lawrence Summers, "Address at Morning Prayers," Harvard University, www.ajc.org, 17 September 2002.
14. Daniel Goldhagen, "A Comment by Daniel Goldhagen," www.goldhagen.com/csiz2.html.

15. Chris Lang, "Graffiti Concerns Members of Hillel," *Daily Targum*, 24 October 2002.
16. The Rutgers women's college.
17. Carmen Cusido, "Resolution Condemns Attack against Hillel," *Daily Targum*, 31 October 2002.
18. Alpha Epsilon Pi is the Jewish Fraternity of North America, www.aepi.org.
19. Rutgers denied a permit to NJ Solidarity to use campus property for their conference on the ground that they failed to fill out the proper documentation.
20. "Anti-Israel Divestment Campaigns Heating Up on Campus," ADL, 8 October 2003.
21. The very first meeting of Jewish student leaders was attended by only a handful of students. As the activism intensified, the number of students involved grew to include fourteen identified key players in the Israel Inspires Initiative. These student leaders were: Rahel Bayar, Ronn Blitzer, Aviva Cohen, Joel Davidson, Norman Jamal, Danielle Josephs, Michelle Klein, Noam Kutler, Rebecca Leibowitz, Rebecca Markowitz, Shira Pruce, Scott Roland, Marisa Rosner, and Stephanie Schwartz.
22. Articles about the Israel Inspires rally and surrounding events have appeared in many newspapers including the *New York Times* and the *Jerusalem Post*. The rally was also covered by all surrounding New Jersey news stations.
23. President of Hadassah.
24. Executive director of the America Jewish Committee.
25. Publisher and CEO of the *Jerusalem Post*.
26. Iran's ambassador to the United Nations, 1971-1978.
27. Israeli consul for media and public affairs.
28. Gabrielle Birkner, "Campus War Heats Up at Duke," *Jewish Week*, 8 October 2004, www.thejewishweek.com/news/newscontent.php3?artid=9973.

Noah Liben

The Columbia University Report on Its Middle Eastern Department's Problems: A Paradigm for Obscuring Structural Flaws

Columbia University's Middle East and Asian Languages and Cultures department (MEALAC) offers courses on the literature, culture, history, and languages of the area that extends from North Africa to the Himalayas and into the Indian Subcontinent. The department consists of twenty full-time faculty members; of those, two teach Hebrew literature and one, Hebrew language. In contrast, there are four professors of Arabic language, two of Arabic literature, and one of Arab politics.¹

Much publicity has been given to significant structural problems that had developed in MEALAC over the years. On 28 March 2005, the university's administration released a report dealing with some, rather than all aspects of these issues.²

The recurrent problems that had come into the open mainly concerned three matters:

1. The one-sided teaching in MEALAC. A simple indicator of this bias is that 78 percent of the department's faculty signed the anti-Israeli divestment petition, whereas in the university as a whole only a few percent did so.³
2. The intimidation of pro-Israeli students in MEALAC. Dozens of cases were exposed in the documentary *Columbia Unbecoming*,⁴ which was released in October 2004. The film was produced by Columbia students with the assistance of the David Project, a Boston-based grassroots organization dedicated to a fair portrayal of the Middle East conflict.
3. The inadequacy of the university's grievance procedures. Students with complaints about MEALAC professors had tried, over at least a three-year period, to register formal grievances. After first raising their concerns with the teachers themselves, students then tried to convince deans and department chairs, and even higher levels of the administration, to intervene. All these efforts were in vain. Many examples of the administration's inadequate responses are also related in the documentary.⁵

One may wonder how it was possible that frequently recurring discriminatory events at a prestigious university over a number of years had finally to be revealed by a student video. The answer is that an institution, which proclaims

that progress in knowledge is best fostered by academic freedom, had developed substantial skills in hiding unpleasant facts.

Minimizing Damage

Once the matter was in the open the university administration attempted to address it. The steps taken, however, appeared to be more about engaging in damage control rather than solving the underlying issues.

First, the administration created an ad hoc faculty committee comprising five professors from the School of Arts and Sciences. It was charged with looking “into the set of issues and complaints that gave rise to the current controversy,”⁶ though none of its members was unconnected to the matter they had to judge objectively.

Of the five, two had signed the anti-Israeli divestment petition; one was the dissertation adviser for Joseph Massad, the professor most often accused of student abuse; one wrote in the *Financial Times* that America went to war in Iraq for the benefit of Israel and that Israel is responsible for global anti-Semitism;⁷ and one was a university administrator who ignored student complaints for months. The man who handpicked the committee, Vice-President for Arts and Sciences Nicholas Dirks, is married to a professor, Janaki Bakhle, who coteaches a class with Massad. Both Dirks and Bakhle signed the original divestment petition, although Dirks's name is absent from an updated list.⁸

The choice, out of the entire Columbia faculty, of five members who are friendly with or close colleagues of the accused professors, raised questions about its objectivity. As students with complaints against MEALAC professors wrote to President Bollinger in December 2004, “Students fear that speaking to the committee will have real repercussions on their academic and professional advancement.... No assurances of professionalism can convince them that this is a safe environment to come out to.”⁹

Furthermore, the mandate given to the committee was not to address all three related problems mentioned above, but only the issues of intimidation and grievance procedures. According to Dirks, “The committee is specifically not being asked to investigate political or scholarly opinions, curriculum, or departments.”¹⁰ Instead, its focus was to be “the character of interactions between faculty and students occurring within the classroom and the broader pedagogical environment.”¹¹ Thus, the accusation raised by students in *Columbia Unbecoming*—that lies and propaganda were being promulgated in the framework of teaching in MEALAC—was a priori excluded from the committee's investigation.

Finding What Was Sought

The committee's findings were another part of the process of obscuring the truth. The report focused on the one point where Columbia's administration had admitted its fault: handling student grievances. Months before the committee first convened, Provost Alan Brinkley had already acknowledged the "inadequacy of our grievance procedures."¹²

Moreover, the report minimized the number of cases of intimidation investigated, though *Columbia Unbecoming* had mentioned dozens. Despite hearing testimony of tens of instances of professorial misconduct, the committee focused only on the three that had received the most media attention. It was "particularly concerned" with these three incidents because "they challenge in varying degrees our collegium's widespread normative expectations concerning a civil and tolerant learning environment."¹³

In one case, Prof. Massad allegedly ordered a student to leave his classroom if she persisted in "denying Israeli atrocities done to the Palestinians." The second incident again involved Massad, this time at an extracurricular, off-campus lecture where he reportedly refused to take a question from an Israeli student, instead retorting: "How many Palestinians have you killed?" The third instance on which the committee reported involved Prof. George Saliba, who allegedly told a Jewish student that she had no claim to the Land of Israel because she has "green eyes" and is therefore "not a Semite."

The report only admitted that Prof. Massad was at fault in cases where this conclusion was almost unavoidable. Regarding Massad's refusal to permit a student to "deny Israeli atrocities," the committee found "it credible that [he] became angered" at her question, and that "his rhetorical response to her query exceeded commonly accepted bounds by conveying that her question merited harsh public criticism."¹⁴ Nevertheless, no disciplinary measures were proposed.

Similarly, the committee interpreted the evidence against Prof. Saliba in a way that any objective observer would have found impossible to defend. Concerning his remark about a student's eye color, the report found "it credible that this conversation did occur and that a reference to eye color was made near its conclusion.... However regrettable a personal reference might have been, it is a good deal more likely to have been a statement that was integral to an argument about the uses of history and lineage than an act approaching intimidation."¹⁵ Again, the committee refrained from reprimanding the professor; its members must have considered Saliba's correlation between green eyes and lack of Semitic origin to be a scientific argument.

Furthermore, continuing to obfuscate matters, the report "found no evidence of any statements made by the faculty that could reasonably be construed as anti-semitic."¹⁶ This, however, is irrelevant, since none of the students had accused the professors of anti-Semitism in the classrooms. Ariel Beery, leader of the group Columbians for Academic Freedom, called this finding "deeply insulting,"

since complaints were about intimidation, not racism.¹⁷ Harvard professor Alan Dershowitz noted: "The charge was that there was an atmosphere of intimidation toward pro-Israel students. To respond by saying there is no anti-Semitism is to erect and destroy a straw man."¹⁸

Turning the Tables

Lastly, the faculty committee tried to turn the tables on those who had finally brought MEALAC's many flaws into the open by accusing those people more severely than those professors who had abused their position. Referring to pro-Israeli students who dared to challenge anti-Israeli lies and inaccuracies, the report stated, "Their frequent interruptions and hostile asides disturbed many of the students [in the classes]." The committee further mentioned that Massad's teaching style allowed a "small but vociferous group of...students to disrupt lectures by their incessant questions and comments."¹⁹ The document, however, does not cite specific examples of these alleged "interruptions," nor provide evidence that anyone ever complained about the "disruptions."

Along those lines, the report found it "deeply disturbing" that an unnamed pro-Israeli instructor was "apparently prepared to encourage students to report to (him) on a fellow-professor's classroom statements." Likewise, the committee blamed outside organizations, including Campus Watch, for contributing to an atmosphere of intimidation in which Arabist professors felt spied upon. Thus, the main problem allegedly lay not with anti-Israeli professors daunting Jewish students, but with "vociferous" pro-Israeli students, faculty, and outside groups creating an uncivil environment.

The report thus created the infrastructure for the next step in the process of obscuring the facts up the chain of command. The highest levels of the university's administration accepted the report immediately. Dirks, who handpicked the committee, gave praise for "an extraordinarily helpful document" and commended its authors for serving "the principle of faculty self governance with distinction."²⁰ Provost Brinkley "accept[ed] the findings and recommendations of the committee."²¹ President Bollinger stated, "This is a very thoughtful and comprehensive review that deserves our full attention."²²

Did Damage Control Work?

At Columbia both sides were dissatisfied with the report, which was the most negative outcome possible. Deena Shanker, the student whom Massad shouted down and told to leave the classroom if she continued to "deny Israeli atrocities," said the document was "neither surprising nor satisfactory."²³ Freshman Alexandra Polsky said, "It's a whitewash and it's offensive,"²⁴ and Ariel Beery called it "the second strike against Columbia when it comes to students' rights."²⁵

On the other side of the debate, the cover-up emboldened the followers of Massad and the other accused professors to attack whatever little had been uncovered. Issa Mikel, a student who defends the academics, criticized the report for being “deceptively disastrous.”²⁶ A meeting in support of the professors was held on 4 April 2005, under the umbrella of “Stop McCarthyism at Columbia”—a classic reaction of university radicals wishing to silence opponents by calling them names rather than by arguing facts. Speakers at the event condemned the Jewish students’ efforts to foster free discourse and eliminate intimidation from the classrooms, calling their campaign a “right-wing onslaught” led by a “small number of Zionist students.”²⁷

Some of the media covering the story, including CNN.com²⁸ and the *Chronicle of Higher Education*,²⁹ summarized the report without much comment. Others, such as the *New York Sun*,³⁰ the *New York Post*,³¹ and the *American Thinker*,³² were critical of the document. Similarly, a *New York Daily News* article opened with the sentence, “The stacked deck produced a whitewash.”³³ Even a *New York Times* editorial commented that the report was “deeply unsatisfactory because the panel’s mandate was so limited.”³⁴

Of the major Jewish organizations that responded to the controversy, only the American Jewish Committee related positively to the report, calling it “an important step forward” and praising the faculty committee for reaffirming the principles of academic freedom.³⁵ In contrast, the David Project considered the document “disgraceful, beyond our expectation.”³⁶

The American Jewish Congress found fault with the biased composition of the committee members, and stated, “Teachers do not have the right to turn their classrooms or their departments into soapboxes for their pet causes.”³⁷ Abraham Foxman, director of the Anti-Defamation League, asserted, “It’s a sad day at Columbia University. The report by the Ad Hoc Grievance Committee protects the faculty, gives little credibility to the students, and comes up with no solutions at all to deal with the concerns about intimidation.”³⁸

For the New York Board of Rabbis, the Columbia ploy failed completely: “Who would have thought that Columbia would make the U.N. look good?” quipped Joseph Potasnik, their executive vice-president.³⁹ Prof. Dershowitz remarked, “The conclusions lack credibility because of the terrible mistake that a good man, Lee Bollinger, made in selecting the committee.”⁴⁰

Conclusion

Columbia University is a paradigm for a large, prestigious institution that ignored deep-rooted problems and then tried to save face. After disregarding MEALAC’s structural flaws for as long as it could, as well as the inadequacies of the school’s grievance procedures, Columbia adopted a policy of obscuring the issues instead of addressing them. First, the administration appointed a biased faculty committee, compromised by relationships with the accused professors,

and then instructed it to deal only with some of the problems. Next, even within the purview of what it was supposed to investigate, the committee focused on only a fraction of the complaints. Furthermore, it continued to obfuscate matters by absolving the professors of something they were never charged with. Lastly, the committee turned the tables on the students by blaming the victims rather than the perpetrators.

Because it obfuscates more than it clarifies, the Columbia report raises much larger questions than it answers. Some that come to mind are: if a major university's administration is so unwilling to confront obvious, ongoing problems, what other structural issues are being concealed and how many other departments are affected? If, after so many years, Columbia refuses to come clean, is more permanent outside intervention in the school's affairs the sole solution? One question posed by the *New York Sun* is, what is the responsibility of the university trustees?⁴¹

In the aftermath of the faculty committee's report, the message coming through is that many professors teaching with a political bias can continue to do so with impunity at the expense of the truth and their students' knowledge. The problems raised are not specific to Columbia. Many more examples of flawed Middle East and other departments are known throughout the United States,⁴² as are cases of intimidation of students, and not necessarily only Jewish ones. It seems that all the Columbia administration has achieved with its report is an unsatisfactory response to the first of more such campus battles to come.

In retrospect, two years after the events the university has made only half-hearted attempts to change the atmosphere at Columbia. They have not substantially changed the make-up of the MEALAC department, diversified the department's faculty, or engaged in any meaningful review of the one-sided curricula of certain MEALAC courses. The major step taken by the university to address the problems was to implement new grievance procedures, although it is unclear how different the new procedures really are from the old ones. Furthermore, even improved grievance procedures will not help *prevent* future problems, but will merely help students who wish to address such problems. The main MEALAC professors remain in their positions (or have been promoted, as in the case of Massad), free to teach propaganda.

Notes

1. See www.columbia.edu/cu/mealac/faculty/.
2. A transcript of the Ad Hoc Grievance Committee report can be read at: www.columbia.edu/cu/news/05/03/ad_hoc_grievance_committee_report.html.
3. See www.columbiadivest.org/sig_list.html.
4. For a transcript of *Columbia Unbecoming*, see: www.columbiaunbecoming.com/script.htm.
5. Ibid.

6. "Ad Hoc Grievance Committee Guidelines to Procedure," www.columbia.edu/cu/vpas/adhocgrievancecommittee/guidelines_to_procedure.html.
7. Lisa Hirschmann, "Committee Draws Fire, Keeps Investigating MEALAC," *Columbia Daily Spectator*, 27 January 2005.
8. For two complete lists, see "Background and Analysis," www.campus-watch.org/article/id/1638, Appendix A.
9. See *Columbia Unbecoming* transcript.
10. "Charge to Ad Hoc Committee from the Vice President for Arts and Sciences," www.columbia.edu/cu/vpas/adhocgrievancecommittee/charge_to_adhogrievancecommittee.html.
11. "Ad Hoc Grievance Committee Guidelines."
12. Provost Alan Brinkley, Letter to President Lee Bollinger, www.columbia.edu/cu/provost/docs/abletter_bollinger.html, 6 December 2004.
13. Ad Hoc Grievance Committee report.
14. Ibid.
15. Ibid.
16. Ibid.
17. Quoted in David Andreatta, "Columbia Jews Want Outside Probe," *New York Post*, 1 April 2005.
18. Quoted in Jacob Gershman, "Bollinger Criticized for Embracing Report Clearing Faculty," *New York Sun*, 1 April 2005.
19. Ad Hoc Grievance Committee report.
20. Nicholas Dirks, Letter to President Bollinger and Provost Brinkley, www.columbia.edu/cu/news/05/03/response_to_report.html, 31 March 2005.
21. Provost Alan Brinkley, Letter to President Bollinger, www.columbia.edu/cu/news/05/03/response_to_report.html, 31 March 2005.
22. President Lee Bollinger, Letter to the Columbia Community, www.columbia.edu/cu/news/05/03/response_to_report.html, 31 March 2005.
23. Quoted in Lisa Hirshmann, "Students Respond to Ad Hoc Report," *Columbia Daily Spectator*, 1 April 2005.
24. Quoted in Andreatta, "Columbia Jews."
25. Ibid.
26. Quoted in Hirshmann, "Students Respond."
27. Quoted in Jacob Gershman, "Faculty Denounce 'Right-Wing Attack,'" *New York Sun*, 5 April 2005.
28. "Columbia Professors Cleared of Large-Scale Intimidation," CNN.com, <http://edition.cnn.com/2005/EDUCATION/03/31/columbia.intimidation.ap/index.html>, 31 March 2005.
29. Jennifer Jacobsen, "Columbia U. Report Criticizes Professor's Classroom Conduct but Finds No Pattern of Anti-Semitism," *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 1 April 2005.
30. Staff Editorial, "Where Are the Trustees?" *New York Sun*, 1 April 2005.
31. Staff Editorial, "Columbia's Coverup," *New York Post*, 5 April 2005.
32. Richard Baehr, "Columbia Whitewash," *American Thinker*, 1 April 2005.
33. Richard Schwartz, "Columbia's Blind Spot," *New York Daily News*, 3 April 2005.
34. Staff Editorial, "Intimidation at Columbia," *New York Times*, 7 April 2005.
35. American Jewish Committee, "AJC Praises Columbia University," <http://ajc.org/InTheMedia/PressReleases.asp?did=1559>, 31 March 2005.
36. Charles Jacobs, "David Project Responds to Columbia Report on Student Harassment; 'Biased Committee Ignores Facts, Protects Its Own,'" <http://releases.usnewswire.com/GetRelease.asp?id=45143>, 31 March 2005.

102 The Columbia University Report on Its Middle Eastern Department's Problems

37. American Jewish Congress press release, "Congress Issues Statement on Columbia University's Committee Findings on Campus Anti-Semitism and Harassment," www.prnewswire.com/cgi-bin/stories.pl?ACCT=109&STORY=/www/story/03-31-2005/0003295284&EDATE, 31 March 2005.
38. Abraham Foxman, "Report on Student Intimidation at Columbia Inadequate; Findings on Anti-Semitism a 'Red Herring,'" www.adl.org/PresRele/DiRaB_41/46776_41.htm, 31 March 2005.
39. Staff Editorial, "Where Are the Trustees?"
40. Quoted in Javier C. Hernandez, "Columbia Clears Department of Anti-Semitism Charge," *Harvard Crimson*, 5 April 2005.
41. Staff Editorial, "Where Are the Trustees?"
42. See Martin Kramer, *Ivory Towers on Sand: The Failure of Middle East Studies in America* (Washington, D.C.: Washington Institute for Near East Policy, 2001); Martin Kramer, "Is Zionism Colonialism? The Root Lie," *Post Holocaust and Anti-Semitism*, No. 35, 1 August 2005.

Martin Kramer

Columbia University: The Future of Middle Eastern Studies at Stake

Address delivered to a conference on “The Middle East and Academic Integrity on the American Campus,” convened at Columbia University on 6 March 2005.

A Battle in a Larger War

In the midst of claims and counterclaims at Columbia, it is perhaps easy to lose sight of the larger picture. The larger stakes are the future of Middle Eastern studies in America. The Columbia crisis is many things, but it is also a battle in the struggle for the future of a field that is growing, and that has become vital to the well-being of the United States. The Columbia crisis may even be a turning point. Let me explain why.

I won't dwell here on the problems that have plagued Middle Eastern studies over the last twenty-five years. You will find them discussed in some detail in my book *Ivory Towers on Sand*. There I show how Middle Eastern studies became a field where scholarship took a backseat to advocacy, where a few biases became the highest credentials, where dissenting views became thought-crimes.

This transformation I attributed to the influence of the late Prof. Edward Said of Columbia University. For Prof. Said, no understanding of the Middle East had validity unless it was joined at the hip with political sympathy for the cause and the struggle. The cause was the empowerment of Palestinians, Arabs, and Muslims. The struggle was against an axis of evil comprised of Western orientalism, American imperialism, and Israeli Zionism.

The Corruption of Middle Eastern Studies

In the 1980s and 1990s, this new orthodoxy swept through Middle Eastern studies, carried on the shoulders of radicals who made their way through graduate schools and into faculty positions. These radicals, once tenured and vested with academic power, began a systematic purge of Middle Eastern studies. They promoted one another, and they shut out alternative views. Middle Eastern studies, under their domination, became very much like Middle Eastern regimes: full of rhetoric about liberation, but dead-set against all expressions of dissent. And like Prof. Said, the Middle East academics showed less interest in the actual Middle East than in exposing the West's so-called “stereotypes.”

More than any other university, Columbia stood at the very forefront of

this transformation. Each and every department became the target of a takeover attempt, and none more so than the Middle East department, MEALAC. But Columbia was simply the most egregious example of a process that took place in Middle Eastern studies programs across the United States. By the late 1990s, the radicals could look smugly up and down their hallways and see only like-minded colleagues. They understood perfectly how best to play the politics of American academe, to conform to its fashionable orthodoxies.

But while their trendy theories may have won them tenure, they also became ever more detached from the realities of the Middle East. Nowhere was this more so than in regard to the character of Islamism. Prof. Said himself, not long before 9/11, mocked what he called “speculations about the latest conspiracy to blow up buildings, sabotage commercial airliners and poison water supplies.” Such talk, he wrote, was based on “highly exaggerated stereotyping.”

Post-9/11 Opportunism

9/11 should have been the turning point for Middle Eastern studies. Columbia’s Prof. Richard Bulliet, speaking to a student forum in the week after the attack, made this quip: “Does this mean I’m throwing my copy of [Edward Said’s] *Orientalism* out the window? Maybe it does.” Some people in the field may have felt the same doubts in their hearts—that they had been wrong about the Middle East, and that the errors had their origins in the biases that permeated the field.

But they wouldn’t express those doubts openly, and for a reason: thanks to 9/11, they hoped that Washington would lavish new subsidies on them. Despite my book, which appeared only a month after 9/11, there wasn’t sufficient awareness in Washington of the problems in Middle Eastern studies. And so in December 2001, while the ruins of the Trade Center still smoldered, Congress authorized the greatest onetime increase in federal subsidies for area studies in history. The subsidy program is called Title VI, and Congress and the administration of George W. Bush increased it by 26 percent in one swoop, most of it going to Middle Eastern studies.

The Fate of Title VI

That was a setback to the cause of change. But a second chance presented itself a year and a half ago, when the Higher Education Act came up for reauthorization. Title VI is part of that act, and the chair of the House Subcommittee with jurisdiction over Title VI introduced a bill to reform the program. The International Studies in Higher Education Act would have established an International Advisory Board, to advise Congress and the Department of Education on how best to match the priorities of Title VI to the rapidly expanding needs of the United States.

After the bill passed the House and went to the Senate, forces in academe

launched a campaign of disinformation against it, deliberately obscuring both the bill's language and its intent. I speak personally when I say that the nature of this campaign persuaded me, more than anything else, that academics have no more respect for the truth than any other lobby when they perceive the slightest risk to their subsidies and entitlements. Columbia University, as an institution, deployed its own lobbyists in this campaign of deceit.

People often ask me what happened to the Title VI reform bill. It was never defeated. It expired because, for the first time in history, Congress failed to reauthorize the Higher Education Act on time. But there is a new Congress, the reauthorization has begun anew, and the Title VI reform measure is back in play. Nevertheless, passage and implementation are well down the road.

In short, until this past fall, the cause of reform in Middle Eastern studies remained stuck. It was at this moment of impasse that the film *Columbia Unbecoming* cast a spotlight on a dark corner of Middle Eastern studies.

The Case of Columbia and Its Implications

What did *Columbia Unbecoming* achieve? It put a human face on the dysfunction of Middle Eastern studies. I and others had been talking for years about bias, and suggesting that this bias had victims. You cannot establish total control over a field, and you cannot eliminate dissent, without frustrating the careers of countless aspiring scholars. But this is always hard to prove, and it is obscured by layers of bureaucracy, the workings of committees, and the secrecy by which universities make their choices.

Columbia Unbecoming demonstrated how the same mechanisms that had purged the field, were at work in the classroom. And it found victims prepared to speak out. The fact that it happened at Columbia, the birthplace of Saidian doctrine, and the fact that Prof. Said's direct disciples committed the alleged offenses, added to the effect.

Now some will say that the crisis at Columbia has nothing to do with Middle Eastern studies more broadly, but reflects conditions unique to Morningside Heights. This is perhaps why, beyond Columbia, leading figures of Middle Eastern studies have hesitated to come forward and take a stand in defense of MEALAC. With a few exceptions, they have not rallied to MEALAC, and for a good reason: they don't want the Columbia case to be regarded as typical of the field as a whole. Are they right? Is Columbia an exceptional case?

There is no doubt that the Columbia case has unique features. It is so extreme that it is almost a parody. And yet, as any careful student of this field knows, there are dozens of Middle East programs and departments that are potential MEALACs. They developed in the same way at the same time, with similar biases and the same disdain for diversity. Of course, not every biased professor is abusive. Like dysfunctional families, each such program is miserable in its own way. But the potential for similar blowups is ever-present on many other campuses. As the

author of a book on Middle Eastern studies, I get constant reports of MEALACs-in-the-making. Columbia is an extreme case of a general problem.

There is another way in which the Columbia case connects to the very mainstream of Middle Eastern studies. The doyens of Middle Eastern studies are always quick to claim that the field is capable of regulating itself. But two former presidents of the Middle East Studies Association are on the faculty of Columbia. They preside over a Title VI National Resource Center for the Middle East. Yet they have both been complicit in the promotion of the most radical element in MEALAC. Neither came forward before the crisis to provide a check or balance to MEALAC's excesses.

Now they have both been assigned corrective roles: one sits on the ad hoc committee, the other has been detailed to the MEALAC advisory committee. I will not prejudge the outcome of these committees, but where were these leaders of the field before the crisis? The Columbia case is proof positive that the mainstream leaders of Middle Eastern studies are unwilling or incapable of checking the extremists whom they themselves have promoted, and who flourish alongside them.

This isn't a problem unique to Columbia; it is endemic throughout Middle Eastern studies. There are reasonable and thoughtful people in the field, who know intellectual and professional excesses when they see them. But they are too indifferent or timid or intimidated to provide a balance.

Incestuous Academe

And that brings me to another way in which Columbia's crisis exemplifies a larger problem. Middle Eastern studies are a small field. The professional association includes only 2,500 members. Everyone knows everyone else, and there is a serious problem of intellectual inbreeding, compounded by the relentless efforts of radicals to fill every slot with their own protégés and acolytes.

At Columbia, this inbreeding reached unprecedented proportions. The member of MEALAC at the center of the controversy did his PhD at Columbia, had it published by Columbia University Press, and received his tenure-track teaching appointment at Columbia. He is the ultimate Columbia product; to deny him now would throw into question the entire quality control mechanism of the university.

But it is precisely that mechanism that failed at Columbia, just as it has failed across Middle Eastern studies. In small and incestuous fields, higher administration cannot allow Middle East departments to run themselves without close supervision and occasional intervention. Academic freedom does not include the right to bring in one's own allies and friends, and promote them shamelessly without reference to the standards and priorities of the university as a whole.

In a new interview, President Bollinger suggests he intends to restructure and re-form MEALAC, even as he expands the study of the Middle East at Columbia.

This is precisely what is needed in dozens of other departments across the country: expansion, to meet growing demand; and thorough restructuring, to break up monopolies and promote diversity. A university president needs tremendous courage to face down the vested interests of Middle East departments. I believe that President Bollinger's tenure will be judged by his success or failure in doing just that. Other university presidents, whose programs are ticking away, will be watching.

A Student Revolt?

I have made it clear that the Columbia case has tremendous significance beyond the campus, for Middle Eastern studies as a whole. I will go further. I expect the kind of student revolt we have seen at Columbia to spread to other campuses, and to spread beyond Jewish students. In one of the most-quoted instances of intimidation at Columbia, a MEALAC professor allegedly asked an Israeli student: "How many Palestinians did you kill?" Middle Eastern studies programs are going to fill with veterans of American military service in Iraq and Afghanistan. They are going to fill with beneficiaries of new government scholarship programs, offered in return for a service obligation in the military and intelligence agencies.

Given the predilections of the faculty in this field, the danger of widespread intimidation of students by faculty is very real. How long will it be before a student is asked how many Iraqis he killed, or is accused of being a spy in training for the evil American empire? That is why the outcome of the Columbia case, in regard to students' grievances, has a significance that goes way beyond the pro-Israeli community. It is of crucial importance to the U.S. effort to recruit the best intellectual capital, and train it in American universities, both for the war on terror and for the challenges arising from the coming transformation of the Middle East.

I conclude. Up close, this looks like a story about Columbia and Israel. In proper perspective, it is a test case for Middle Eastern studies and American preparation for its enhanced role in the Middle East. It will affect the way all universities manage and regulate their expanding Middle East programs, and it has implications for an entire generation of students who are already streaming to Middle East programs, because they want to serve the nation. My message to the students and supportive faculty of Columbia is this: remain steadfast. You are the turning point for Middle Eastern studies in America, and to that extent, for America in the Middle East.

Jonathan Jaffit

Fighting Sheikh Zayed's Funding of Islamic Studies at Harvard Divinity School¹

“Anti-Semitic in Effect, if Not Intent”

Harvard, one of the world's most prestigious universities, found itself in a pivotal position in the fight to influence public opinion on campus toward the state of Israel. In May 2002, several Harvard faculty members and students began a campaign to divest Harvard endowment funds from Israeli companies and from firms that do business with Israel. This drew a strong reaction from the university's president, Lawrence H. Summers, who called the endeavor “anti-Semitic in effect, if not intent.”²

With the effects of this anti-Israeli activity reverberating through the campus, students at the Harvard graduate schools created a group to facilitate pro-Israeli communication between the schools called HUGFI (Harvard University Graduate-Students Friends of Israel).

In July 2000, a \$2.5 million endowment was made to the Harvard Divinity School by Sheikh Zayed, the then ruler of Abu Dhabi and president of the United Arab Emirates, for the creation of a chair of Islamic studies.³ The stated purpose of the gift was “to promote a better understanding of Islam among the non-Muslim peoples of the world and to foster dialogue among the world's great religions.”⁴ When faced with the Sheikh Zayed donation to the Divinity School, graduate student Rachel Fish, a founding member of HUGFI, utilized this group to increase awareness of the issue on campus.

Exacerbating the situation was the autonomous nature of the graduate schools, which made each one responsible for its own funding. Although the Harvard Divinity School (HDS) is the oldest Harvard graduate school, it has the smallest endowment of any Harvard institution thus making the \$2.5 million donation a substantial contribution.

Sheikh Zayed bin Sultan al-Nahyan (1918-2004)

Sheikh Zayed bin Sultan al Nahyan became the ruler of Abu Dhabi in 1966 when he succeeded his brother who was deposed in a bloodless palace coup. He was subsequently elected president of the newly formed United Arab Emirates (UAE) in 1971 by the six other ruling sheikhs who sat with him on the UAE Supreme Council.⁵ During his thirty-three-year rule of the UAE, Sheikh Zayed

was condemned countless times by human rights organizations such as Amnesty International for abuses such as corporal punishment of prisoners⁶ and conducting a slave ring of Bangladeshi children whom he would have kidnapped, starved, and then force to compete as jockeys in the country's popular camel races.⁷

As absolute ruler of the country, the wealth from controlling its oil supply had placed Sheikh Zayed among the world's ten richest men with an estimated personal fortune of \$23 billion.⁸ The Sheikh created a think tank called the Zayed Center of Coordination and Follow-up. Based in Abu Dhabi, the Zayed Center was headed by the deputy prime minister, Sheikh Zayed's son. It was established in 1999 as the official think tank of the Arab League, an association of twenty-two Arab nations, and it represented, according to its website, "the fulfillment of the vision of the President of U.A.E. His Highness, Sheikh Zayed Bin Sultan al-Nahyan."

Since its inception, the Zayed Center has promoted Holocaust denial, anti-Semitism, anti-American conspiracy theories, as well as hate speech in its lectures, symposia, and publications. The *Los Angeles Times* quoted the Center's director as saying: "Jews are the enemies of all nations."⁹

On 9 April 2003, the Zayed Center hosted Dr. Umayma Jalahma, an Islamic-studies professor at King Faysal University in Saudi Arabia. Briefing the Center on the U.S. war in Iraq, she asserted that it was specifically timed to coincide with the Jewish holiday of Purim, "which symbolizes the Jewish victory of Haman in Babylon."¹⁰

On 11 March 2003, the Zayed Center gave a platform to Michael Collins Piper, a political author and writer for the American Free Press. His speech was laced with references to "Jewish control" of the U.S. government and media. Piper also said that *The Protocols of the Elders of Zion* was "not a theory but a real fact."¹¹

On 6 April 2003, Saleh al-Qallab, a former Jordanian information minister, spoke at the Zayed Center and claimed that influential "rabbis" in the Washington administration sought to "reshape the world" through U.S. military intervention.¹²

Furthermore, in 1998, Zayed's wife donated \$50,000 to the defense of Holocaust denier Roger Garaudy in a French court. In his book, *The Founding Myths of Modern Israel*, Garaudy maintained that there was no Nazi program of genocide during World War II and that Jews had fabricated the Holocaust.¹³

Rachel Fish's Activism¹⁴

The controversy over the Zayed endowment began in December 2002 when Rachel Fish, then a graduate student at HDS, organized a panel to discuss the rise of global anti-Semitism.

Among the speakers was Dr. Charles Jacobs, cofounder of the American Anti-Slavery Group and president of the David Project, an organization that

educates students and the Jewish community at large about Israel. At the panel, Jacobs informed the audience that the "Harvard Divinity School [had] accepted funds from the president of UAE who was promoting anti-Americanism and anti-Semitism." After the panel had concluded, Fish asked Jacobs for more information regarding who it was that gave the money. "This is all I know," he replied. Fish then began investigating the details of the endowment.

Fish researched the matter from December 2002 to March 2003. In early March, Fish, accompanied by two other HDS students, met with William A. Graham, dean of HDS. They presented him with a seventy-page indicting dossier that Fish had compiled on the Sheikh and requested that the administration seek funding for this important position from credible sources that did not promote hatred of Jews.

Perhaps the most troubling piece of information presented by Fish and the other students was the endowment's "Terms of Agreement." When they questioned Dean Graham as to his knowledge of these terms, he stated that he did not know of their existence or if they were accurate. Fish immediately gave him a copy of the terms. Several aspects troubled her, most of all the lines about the appointment of a "liaison officer." This position would "advise the U.A.E. on procedures relating to application and admission to the University" as well as "encourage relations in other areas of research and development."¹⁵ The first part seemed to provide the Sheikh with inappropriate knowledge of who was entering the program. Furthermore, it seemed that "relations in other areas of research" might include academic exchanges with the Zayed Center as it was the primary think tank in the region.

Dean Graham, who in September 2000 hailed the donation as "a most welcome gift,"¹⁶ assured the students that he would have an independent researcher look into the matter and that he would respond to them in four to six weeks. "It should be noted," wrote Fish, "that Mr. Graham has not been afraid to take a public stand on Harvard's ties to the Middle East—last year he signed a petition calling for the university to disinvest from Israel."¹⁷ Immediately after her confrontation with Dean Graham, Fish proceeded to President Summers's office and gave his assistant the same material.

Subsequently, Fish began to raise awareness among Jewish and non-Jewish students, faculty, and alumni. She founded the Students for an Ethical Divinity School and, with the aid of the David Project, created a website titled "Morality Not Money" to track the efforts to freeze Zayed's donation and to expose the Zayed Center.

Eight weeks later, having received no response from Dean Graham and serving his office with written warning stating that she would take this matter to the press if he did not respond, Fish gave her first press interview on the subject to the *Boston Globe*. From March to the end of July 2004, she worked to raise awareness of the donation by writing letters to newspapers, giving numerous media interviews, and sharing her research with the general community.

In the early stages of the issue's development, Dean Graham responded to concerned individuals who had learned of the matter from Fish by simply stating that the "UAE is the most moderate voice in Middle East." When contacted by the JCPA in 2005 to comment on what had transpired on his campus, Dean Graham refused to give a statement, referring this author to Harvard's official response website. There it was stated that HDS was "pleased to announce that we are going forward with this important appointment in Islamic religious studies, so that we can advance our mission at HDS to provide teaching and scholarship about the world's religions with the greater aim of promoting understanding and dialogue among them."¹⁸

Given Harvard's lack of action, Fish weighed whether she would accept her diploma from the university despite her two years of hard work. After much consideration, she decided to attend her graduation and use it as a means to send a clear message to the administration. With the help of the David Project, Fish recruited students from the local Jewish high schools to hand out hundreds of flyers in Harvard Yard on graduation day so that everyone attending the ceremony would be aware of the situation at HDS.

In a bold public statement, Fish accepted her diploma from Dean Graham with one hand and with the other gave him a 130-page indictment of documented evidence against Sheikh Zayed, an open letter asking him to publicly denounce anti-Semitism in the Arab world, and a petition with 1,500 signatures expressing concern to the Harvard administration. Immediately after graduation, Fish presented the same material to President Summers's office and during the next year and a half continued to raise awareness of the Zayed endowment.

Reactions

One important aspect of this story was the reaction of members of the campus community to the Sheikh's donation. Aside from the various students and teachers who were brave enough to sign Fish's petition, few people actually gave her any material support for her efforts.

Fish sought support from the Muslim student population at HDS, many of whom she knew from her classes. Approaching them, she informed them of the problems with the donation, clarifying that she strongly favored creating an Islamic-studies chair but felt the funding for it must come from reputable sources.

Although many of the Muslim students agreed with Fish that the money was from a tainted source, they virtually unanimously favored accepting the donation as they felt establishing the position was desperately necessary. "We can do good things with bad money," they said according to Fish, to which she responded that it is a prestigious honor to be associated with Harvard, and at a place such as HDS one cannot separate the means from the ends. Some Muslim students even claimed that the hate propaganda disseminated by the Zayed Center was "just

words over there [in the UAE],” to which Fish responded that, as a Jew, she knew that words have consequences.

The response from the Jewish student body at Harvard was also disappointing. Although many expressed support for Fish's cause, no one would assist with her research or advocacy campaign. The vast majority of the students felt they were too busy preparing for final exams, graduation, and postgraduate positions to get involved with the issue. Even HUGFI, which Fish notified of this situation, did little groundwork to further the cause.

Hillel, the Jewish students' association, told Fish that they did not want to deal with confrontation and at best, they offered her an opportunity to bring in a speaker. When the Hillel administration told Fish that it was an apolitical organization, she replied that she had not known Holocaust denial was political. Although Hillel did become more involved behind the scenes after Fish's graduation, the apathetic response of the Harvard Jewish students led her to realize that cases similar to the Zayed endowment must be occurring on other campuses across America.

The HDS faculty was generally unhelpful to Fish's cause. The sympathetic faculty members whom Fish approached were usually afraid to take a vocal stance. Tenured professors who agreed with her refused to condemn the donation publicly for fear of professional risk. Nontenured faculty members were all the more timorous. Although one senior faculty member wrote privately to President Summers, and some nontenured ones privately expressed agreement with the petition, there was a general reluctance to go public.

Although it appeared that no one would assist Fish in her endeavor, one professor, Jon Levenson, came to her aid in the spring of 2003. Levenson, whose field is Jewish studies, was one of the academics who initially suggested that Jacobs speak at Fish's panel on anti-Semitism, but had been unaware of the Zayed donation at the time. He informed the associate dean for development and then the dean of HDS about the situation. In March 2003, he brought the issue to the entire faculty's attention at a discussion after a presentation about the then impending search for a chair in Islamic religious studies.

Levenson addressed the issue again at the HDS faculty retreat that spring. He continued assisting in a consultative capacity, discussing the issue with people involved and also addressing a meeting of interested faculty at Harvard Hillel in June 2003. Levenson was also interviewed by several newspapers that summer.

Levenson said generally that he heard both defenses of the Sheikh and attacks on Fish from the faculty. Those who defended the Sheikh mostly claimed that he had no connection with the Center. They also asserted that the chair was not named after him but after his grandfather, who, given the custom of *papponomy*, had the same name. In one instance, when Levenson pointed out that the Sheikh's wife had funded a French Holocaust denier, one feminist professor sardonically asked, “Which wife?”¹⁹

Others also came to the defense of Sheikh Zayed and the Zayed Center. James Zogby, founder and president of the Arab American Institute, generated a

negative campaign against Fish's efforts. Abdullah Saboosi, a spokesman at the UAE's embassy in Washington, claimed Zayed had nothing to do with the Center. "It's like Reagan National Airport. What does it have to do with the late President Reagan, God rest his soul?"²⁰

The Closure of the Zayed Center

In August 2003 the UAE announced its decision to close the Zayed Center, citing activities by the Center that "starkly contradicted the principles of interfaith tolerance."²¹ Harvard, in turn, announced that it would put the funds on hold during the current academic year and would then assess whether circumstances enabled fulfilling the gift as originally intended. HDS, meanwhile, affirmed its intention to pursue an appointment in Islamic studies, funded by other means.

Under intense media pressure, Sheikh Zayed decided to save face. Realizing that Harvard would likely return the donation, after eleven months of the endowment's suspension, he requested the funds be sent back.

On 26 July 2004, HDS issued an official statement on its decision regarding Sheikh Zayed's donation:

Recently, representatives of the U.A.E. informed Harvard of the donor's desire to withdraw the gift for the Zayed Professorship, in advance of the University's scheduled consideration of the matter later this summer. Harvard has agreed to honor this request and to return the funds. Harvard remains strongly committed to advancing the understanding of Islam, and the Divinity School is actively pursuing two faculty appointments, one senior, and one junior, in this important field.²²

Thus, this particular controversy regarding hate speech ended. Fish, in a widely published article, wrote: "It's sad and a little frightening to experience the indifference toward Jewish concerns and Jewish students that so many Harvard professors...exhibited. Equally frustrating and disappointing is to see the reluctance of some Jewish professors and students to speak out against the institutional insensitivity of the Harvard divinity school."²³ Overall, Fish said she was pleased with the outcome of her efforts, having fulfilled both her goals of increasing awareness and stopping Harvard from accepting the donation.

Columbia University, however, has decided to keep an estimated \$200,000 donation from the UAE toward the creation of the Edward Said Chair of Middle East Studies, in which the former PLO spokesman Rashid Khalidi now sits.²⁴

Notes

1. Gratitude is extended to Dr. Manfred Gerstenfeld, Elisabeth Mayman, and former research intern Rebecca Leibowitz of the JCPA for their assistance, and to Rachel Fish for providing documentary support for this case study.
2. Scott Kennedy, "Divestment Campaign Not Anti-Semitic," *Harvard Crimson*, 23 September 2002.
3. Rachel Lea Fish, "A Troubling Gift: Will Harvard Take \$2.5 Million from a Man Tied to Holocaust Denial?" *Opinion Journal, Wall Street Journal*, 6 June 2003.
4. Harvard Divinity School Statement on Zayed Gift, 26 July 2004, www.hds.harvard.edu/news/zayed_update.html.
5. http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Zayed_bin_Sultan_Al_Nahayan.
6. <http://web.amnesty.org/report2004/are-summary-eng>.
7. www.iabolish.com/update/by-country.php?code=AE.
8. www.forbes.com/forbes/2000/0703/6515256a.html.
9. Rachel Lea Fish, "Losing Veritas," *Harvard Crimson*, 23 May 2003, www.thecrimson.com/article.aspx?ref=348172.
10. "Author of Saudi Blood Libel and Professor at King Faysal University Lectures at Arab League Think Tank: 'U.S. War on Iraq Timed to Coincide with Jewish Holiday Purim,'" MEMRI, No. 494, 11 April 2003.
11. www.militantislammonitor.org/article/id/399.
12. Ibid.
13. www.adl.org/holocaust/denial_ME/western_deniers.asp.
14. The following information, unless otherwise noted, is from an interview with Rachel Fish conducted on 28 June 2005 at the JCPA.
15. Terms: The Sheikh Zayed Al Nahyan Professorship in Islamic Religious Studies at Harvard Divinity School.
16. Wendy S. McDowell, "Divinity School Establishes New Islamic Studies Chair," *Harvard Gazette*, 28 September 2000.
17. Fish, "A Troubling Gift."
18. www.hds.harvard.edu/news/article_archive/zayed.html.
19. From Prof. Jon Levenson's email correspondence with the JCPA, 7 and 10 July 2005.
20. Alan Cooperman, "Harvard Will Refund Sheik's \$2.5 Million Gift," *Washington Post*, 28 July 2004.
21. www.harvard-magazine.com/on-line/110406.html.
22. Harvard Divinity School Statement.
23. Fish, "A Troubling Gift."
24. "Farrakhan for Columbia," Editorial, *New York Sun*, 10 January 2005.

Leila Beckwith

Anti-Zionism/Anti-Semitism at the University of California-Irvine¹

The University of California-Irvine

The University of California-Irvine (UCI)—founded in 1965—with twenty-four thousand students, is one of the ten universities of the University of California. UC-Irvine prides itself on being a major research university, with three of its faculty having won Nobel Prizes. The campus is noteworthy for its very high proportion of Muslim students, approximately two thousand making up about 8 percent of the student population, compared to about one thousand Jewish students. The percentage of Muslim students represents more than eight times the proportion of Muslims in the United States,² whereas the percentage of Jewish students is closer to the proportion of Jews in the country.

Anti-Israeli/Anti-Zionist/Anti-Semitic Events at UCI

From 2001 to the present, the Muslim Student Union (MSU), and sometimes the Society of Arab Students (SAS), have sponsored virulently anti-Zionist/anti-Semitic events on campus. The speakers used classic anti-Semitic themes, and demonized Israel and Jews with Nazi comparisons. Some Jewish students were harassed and intimidated. When they asked for help from the administration, it was not given.³

In February 2001, and again on 26 May 2004, MSU and SAS brought to UCI Muhammad al-Asi, imam of the Islamic Center of Washington, DC, who proclaimed that American Jews are all-powerful and cannot live with others. “The Zionist-Israeli lobby...is taking the United States government and the United States people to the abyss. We have a psychosis in the Jewish community that is unable to coexist equally and brotherly with other human beings.”⁴ During “Zionist Awareness Week,” beginning on 14 May 2002, and again in 2003, students had to walk through mock body bags emblazoned with the names of victims of “Israeli genocide,” placed on the campus by Muslim students and their supporters.⁵

On 26 February 2004 and again during the week of 17 May 2004, Amir Abdel Malik Ali gave lectures at UCI. He is an imam from Oakland whom the MSU invited for its “Anti-Oppression Week” and again for its “Tragedy in the

Holy Land Week.” Malik Ali made his speeches from a lectern carrying the UCI emblem.

In one talk, “America under Siege: The Zionist Hidden Agenda,” he reiterated the classic anti-Semitic canards that Jews control the media and cause international conflict to serve their own ends. He claimed that Zionists had “Congress, the media and the FBI in their back pocket” and that “Israelis knew about and were in control of 9-11.” Malik Ali also said that 9/11 “was staged to give an excuse to wage war against Muslims around the world.” He asserted that “the bad Jews were going to assassinate President Gore to allow Vice President Lieberman to assume the Presidency” and “we all know that the Mossad [Israeli security service] destroyed the Twin Towers.”⁶

As part of “Tragedy in the Holy Land Week/Zionist Awareness Week” in May 2004, students were forced to cross mock checkpoints. At one of them, a student dressed as a pregnant Palestinian woman was beaten by another student dressed as an Israeli soldier. Muslim students and their supporters carried signs equating the Star of David with the swastika. SAS erected a wall made of cardboard boxes, representing the Israeli security fence, labeled the “Apartheid Wall.”⁷

Also in May 2004, Muslim students announced their intention to attend graduation ceremonies wearing green scarfs bearing the *shahada* (Muslim creed). Jewish student and community organizations protested, since *shahada* can be translated as martyrdom and is used by Hamas and other terrorist organizations in glorifying suicide bombers. The Muslim students claimed their religious rights and said the *shahada* signified only the statement, “There is no god but Allah and Muhammad is his prophet.”⁸

On 10 June 2004, MSU and SAS again brought Amir Abdel Malik Ali to speak about “Zionism: America’s Disease.” He said that Zionism combines “chosen peopleness with white supremacy” and that Zionists have “Congress, the media, and the FBI in their back pocket.”⁹ He was again invited for 2 February 2005, this time slightly changing his phrasing to say “Zionism is a fusion of the concept of white supremacy and the chosen people” in a speech titled “Desperation of the Zionist Lobby.”¹⁰ On 25 January 2006, Malik Ali again compared Zionists to Nazis and said “Hamas, them’s my boys,” tapping his heart with his fist.¹¹

“Zionist Awareness Week” in June 2005, now relabeled “Israel Awareness Week,” again demonized Israel and Judaism and hosted lectures titled “The World without Israel” and “Zionism Infects Judaism.”

For 15-18 May 2006, the MSU anti-Semitic theme was “Holocaust in the Holy Land.”¹² A mock twenty-five-foot-long “Israel apartheid wall” stood in the central plaza of the campus, and speeches included “Israel the Fourth Reich” by Amir Abdel Malik Ali and “Hamas: The People’s Choice” by Imam Mohammed al-Asi. The keynote speaker was Norman Finkelstein, then of DePaul University, well known for his inflammatory writings about the Holocaust.¹³

Response of the UC Administration

Jewish student and community organizations repeatedly requested that the administration exercise its free speech by publicly condemning anti-Semitic hate speech at UC-Irvine.¹⁴ The administration until the present has refused, and at times sanctioned intolerance toward Jews.¹⁵ The vice-chancellor of student affairs, Manuel Gomez, said he does not denounce “controversial speech” on campus “because he would have to spend an inordinate amount of time doing so if he responded to every real or perceived slight.”¹⁶

In 2002, Visiting Prof. James P. Sterba of the University of Notre Dame spent his allotted time as a panelist, at a forum attended by Chancellor Ralph Cicerone and Vice-Chancellor Gomez, justifying suicide bombings against civilians. Neither Cicerone nor Gomez distanced himself from such a view either then or later.¹⁷ When Chancellor Robert Berdahl of UC-Berkeley, together with some three hundred university leaders, signed a letter published in the *New York Times* on 7 October 2002 warning against extreme anti-Zionist and anti-Jewish activity on campus,¹⁸ Chancellor Cicerone refused to sign. As noted, at a Malik Ali event demonizing Jews, the administration, even after being warned in advance, allowed the UCI emblem to be displayed on the podium. In contrast, the administration removed the emblem when the Danish-cartoon controversy was discussed.¹⁹

Chancellor Cicerone used the UCI website to publicly condemn the destruction by arson of the SAS representation of the Israeli security fence in May 2004. The university, however, issued no public statement on the UCI official website after a Holocaust memorial exhibit on campus was damaged in 2003. In response to the arson, SAS sponsored an “antihate rally” to which it invited all student groups except Jewish ones. Vice-Chancellor Gomez spoke at the rally, thus endorsing an event that deliberately excluded Jews. His explanation was that rally organizers had the right to invite whomever they wanted.²⁰ When, as mentioned, Jewish groups protested the Muslim students’ decision to wear *shahada* scarfs at the 2004 graduation, Gomez disregarded Jewish concerns, even calling them “hysterical” in an inadvertently publicly released email to an administrative colleague.²¹

Although by September 2004 the administration’s strategy was to encourage interreligious dialogue,²² to this day it has continued to tolerate anti-Semitic rhetoric. In April 2006, the UCI Alumni Association and Vice-Chancellor Jorge Ancona honored Vanessa Zuabi Zuabi for making “the campus...a better place because of the achievements of our honorees.”²³ She was the vice-president of SAS when they excluded Jewish groups from the “antihate rally” and carried posters of the Star of David defaced by the swastika.

When the administration refused the request of StandWithUs to record the speakers whom MSU and SAS brought to the university, StandWithUs did. The recordings are part of a documentary film, titled *Tolerating Intolerance: Hate Speech on Campus*, that premiered on 29 September 2005 and has had public showings across the country.

Muslim Organizations Protest Pro-Israeli Event

After years of silence about the incitement of hatred against Jews by MSU and SAS, the Council of American-Islamic Relations (CAIR) of Southern California went into action along with other organizations, including the Islamic Shura Council of Southern California that comprises sixty Islamic centers, mosques, and Muslim organizations. Together these groups protested a pro-Israeli event,²⁴ organized by Jewish students and community groups, by writing an “Open Letter to the Jewish Leaders and Community in Orange County.”²⁵ They denounced Daniel Pipes, one of the panelists, as a hatemongering Islamophobe, and expressed concern that his speaking would “increase animosity and incite hatred against the American Muslim and Arab communities.”²⁶

College Republicans Sponsor Event about Islamic Terrorism and Danish Cartoons

Four years of virulent anti-Israeli/anti-Zionist/anti-Semitic events on campus were tolerated by the UCI administration as demonstrations of free speech. Finally, the College Republicans, a student group, and the United American Committee, a community organization, held a discussion at UCI on 28 February 2006 about Islamic terrorism and free speech in which three of the “Danish” cartoons of Mohammed and three anti-Semitic cartoons from Arab publications were displayed.

Hypocritically disregarding their own actions in organizing events that incited hatred against Jews, and ignoring Arab anti-Semitic cartoons, MSU protested displaying the cartoons at UCI as inciting hatred against and deeply hurting the Muslim community. Using an illogical double standard, MSU board member Marye Bangee stated: “This is diametrically opposed to the spirit of a university campus, a place for intellectual debate that fosters mutual understanding and respect.”²⁷ The closest the event did come to hate speech was when one of the speakers, the Rev. Jesse Lee Peterson, president of the Brotherhood Organization of a New Destiny, called Islam an “evil religion,” although he said that Muslims were not evil.²⁸

After years of the UCI administration tolerating virulently anti-Semitic rhetoric in the name of free speech, the dean of students, Sally Peterson, asked the College Republicans to compromise their free speech by not showing the cartoons; they refused.²⁹ In a similar action in 2004, she indeed suppressed the College Republicans’ freedom of expression to protest “affirmative action” when she banned their suggested price list for a bake sale in which the same cookies had different prices depending on the buyer’s ethnic status.³⁰

The Zionist Organization of America Sues UCI

In October 2004, after other efforts to address the hostility and intimidation on campus had failed, the Zionist Organization of America (ZOA) sued UC-Irvine under Title VI of the federal 1964 Civil Rights Law. Title VI prohibits organizations that receive federal funds from allowing harassment, intimidation, or discrimination based on race, color, or national origin. This suit is the first Title VI complaint of university anti-Semitism that the Office for Civil Rights of the U.S. Education Department has agreed to investigate, and is underway.³¹

It took forty years after the passage of the Civil Rights Law to clarify that Title VI covers students of Jewish heritage. Only in 2004 did the Office for Civil Rights officially state that Title VI protects Jews.³² Furthermore, in a major decision on 3 April 2006, the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, after hearing testimony from Susan Tuchman, ZOA, Sarah Stern, American Jewish Congress, and Gary Tobin, Institute for Jewish and Community Research, determined that: anti-Semitism on college campuses throughout the United States is a serious problem; anti-Israeli and anti-Zionist rhetoric can be an expression of anti-Semitism; and colleges and universities should ensure that students are not subjected to a hostile environment engendered by anti-Semitism.³³

Conclusion

The University of California states on its official website that: “The University’s fundamental missions are teaching, research and public service.” This clearly does not include political advocacy, and the university’s own policies state that the Regents “are responsible to see that the University remain aloof from politics and never function as an instrument for the advance of partisan interest.”³⁴ Yet UCI must reconcile its fundamental missions, including its forswearing of politics, with the First Amendment to the U.S. Constitution, which protects rights of free expression, speech, and assembly.³⁵

With regard to anti-Israeli/anti-Semitic agitation on campus, the UCI administration and faculty clearly have not reconciled these opposing demands. They failed in their fundamental mission of teaching by not educating students about the basic distinction between demagoguery and critical inquiry, and by not sponsoring events that demonstrated to students the difference between racism that denies Jews the right to self-determination and legitimate criticism of Israeli policies.

They also failed as moral leaders by not exercising their own right of free speech to condemn bigotry, disregarding the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights’ recommendation of 3 April 2006 that university leadership should “set a moral example by denouncing anti-Semitic and other hate speech.”³⁶ They allowed students to be bombarded with hatred, even at times sanctioning it. The

administration did not protect students from being involuntary audiences to anti-Zionist propaganda, or even from reasonable fear for their personal safety.³⁷

Universities promote the freedom to examine unpopular ideas, but only in the context of the rules of meaningful academic scholarship and civil discourse. “Universities cannot pretend that calling for the destruction of Israel with the use of Nazi images is part of normal academic discourse.”³⁸ The de facto tolerance by the UC-Irvine administration and faculty of bigoted, reckless charges against Jews and the Jewish nation, disseminated to students by those who were unconcerned for truth, contradicts the basic responsibility to provide an environment conducive to critically examining knowledge and furthering the search for wisdom.

Notes

1. The information and insights provided by Amihai Glazer of the University of California-Irvine, Allyson Taylor of the American Jewish Congress, Roz Rothstein of StandWithUs, and Roberta Seid of StandWithUs are gratefully acknowledged.
2. www.en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Demographics_of_the_United_States.
3. www.jewishresearch.org/v2/2005/articles/security/12_2_05.htm.
4. www.frontpagemag.com/Articles/ReadArticle.asp?ID=15138.
5. www.standwithus.com/news_post.asp?NPI=95.
6. www.adl.org/Israel/campus_antiisrael/campus_radical.asp?m_flipmode=4.
7. www.standwithus.com/news_post.asp?NPI=95.
8. www.ocregister.com/ocr/2004/06/18/sections/local/local/article_139066.php.
9. www.standwithus.com/news_post.asp?NPI=95.
10. www.jewishjournal.com/home/preview.php?id=13779.
11. Personal videotape.
12. Kimi Yoshino, “Fresh Muslim-Jewish Discord on Campus,” *Los Angeles Times*, 12 May 2006, www.latimes.com/news/local/la-me-holocaust12may12,0,3027401.story?coll=la-home-local; Ashraf Khalil, “Mideast Debate Takes Root at UC Irvine,” *Los Angeles Times*, 27 May 2006, www.latimes.com/news/politics/la-me-muslim27may27,1,7374694.story?coll=la-headlines-politics; Aaron Hanscom, “Investigating Terror at UC Irvine,” *FrontPageMagazine.com*, 31 May 2006, www.frontpagemag.com/Articles/ReadArticle.asp?ID=22694; Allyson Taylor, “Impressions of the Anti-Zionist Hate Fest at UC Irvine,” *Zionation.com*, 25 May 2006, www.zionism-israel.com/log/archives/00000072.html.
13. Aaron Hanscom, “Anti-Israel Hatefest at UC Irvine,” *FrontPageMagazine.com*, 22 May 2006, www.frontpagemagazine.com/Articles/ReadArticle.asp?ID=22558.
14. StandWithUs, American Jewish Congress, Anti-Defamation League, Hillel, Israel on Campus Coalition.
15. Rebecca Spence, “College Chief Hit over Anti-Israel Event,” *Forward*, 26 May 2006, www.forward.com/articles/7851.
16. www.jewishjournal.com/home/preview.php?id=13779.
17. <http://concerneducistudent.blogspot.com/2006/05/letter-sent-to-then-chancellor.html>.
18. www.ajc.org/site/c.ijITI2PHKoG/b.934377/k.84D5/Publications_Students.htm.
19. Personal communication from Amihai Glazer, professor of economics, UC Irvine.
20. www.jewishjournal.com/home/preview.php?id=13779.
21. Personal communication from Allyson Taylor, American Jewish Congress.
22. Personal communication from Amihai Glazer, professor of economics, UC Irvine. One meeting was scheduled for Shabbat and one for Rosh Hashanah.

23. www.ics.uci.edu/community/news/press/view_press?id=39.
24. "Making the Case for Israel: Presenting an Accurate Picture of Middle East Realities," 3-4 April 2005, at the University of California-Irvine and at the Merage Jewish Community Center of Orange County, presented by the Orange County Israel on Campus Coalition, StandWithUs, and the Hillel Foundation of Orange County together with Caravan for Democracy.
25. www.cair-california.org/?cls=News&id=41.
26. Ibid.
27. www.cair-net.org/default.asp?Page=articleView&id=392&theType=AA.
28. www.standwithus.com/news_post.asp?NPI=695.
29. www.mererhetoric.com/archives/11272140.html.
30. www.frontpagemag.com/Articles/ReadArticle.asp?ID=10091.
31. www.newu.uci.edu/article.php?id=4003cite.
32. Kenneth L. Marcus, deputy assistant, U.S. Department of Education, Office for Civil Rights, letter of 13 September 2004, about Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and Title IX of the Education Amendments Act of 1972.
33. Mary Beth Marklein, "Anti-Israel Bias at Colleges Scrutinized," *USA Today*, 3 April 2006, www.usatoday.com/news/education/2006-04-03-colleges-jewish_x.htm.
34. www.universityofcalifornia.edu/regents/policies/6065.html.
35. www.ucop.edu/ucophome/coordrev/ucpolicies/aos/uc30.html.
36. "Findings and Recommendations of the United States Commission on Civil Rights Regarding Campus Anti-Semitism." www.usccr.gov.
37. www.jewishjournal.com/home/preview.php?id=13779.
38. Gary A. Tobin, Aryeh K. Weinberg, and Jenna Ferer, *The Uncivil University* (San Francisco: Institute for Jewish and Community Research, 2005), 11.

Leila Beckwith, Tammi Rossman-Benjamin,
and Ilan Benjamin

Faculty Efforts to Combat Anti-Semitism and Anti-Israeli Bias at the University of California-Santa Cruz

The Uniqueness of the University of California-Santa Cruz

The University of California-Santa Cruz (UCSC), founded in 1965, is one of the ten campuses of the University of California, a public institution. The attractive campus is situated on two thousand acres of hills and redwood forests overlooking Monterey Bay. Fifteen thousand students attend, of whom about 20 percent are Jewish, the highest proportion of Jewish students among all the UC campuses.¹

Nevertheless, UCSC is home to a great deal of virulent anti-Israeli rhetoric, which creates an intimidating environment for many Jews on campus. Although such hostility can be found at many other universities, what is unique at UCSC is that the animus is not directed by the usual sources, such as well-funded Muslim student groups² or faculty in a Middle East studies program.³ The UCSC Muslim Student Alliance is not very active; nor are other pro-Palestinian/anti-Israeli student groups such as the Committee for Justice in Palestine. And while there is a Jewish studies program, there is none for Middle East studies, and no known Arab/Muslim funding of university faculty or activities. Instead, at UCSC the anti-Israeli sentiment is primarily generated by a leftist faculty scattered throughout the university's academic units.

UCSC has many liberal faculty, including a contingent of radical leftists. For example, Angela Davis, a professor in the History of Consciousness Department and chair of women's studies, is a former Black Panther and member of the Communist Party until 1991, who received the Lenin Peace Prize from the state of East Germany. She now is a leader in a movement to abolish all prisons.^{4,5} Bettina Aptheker, professor of women's studies, was a Communist Party member until 1991. She was one of the leaders of the Free Speech movement at UC-Berkeley, which in 1964 executed the first takeover of a university building in order to protest a regulation forbidding recruitment for political organizations on campus. The success of the Free Speech movement marked the beginning of the politicization of campus life and of university curricula, which continues to this day.⁶ David Horowitz selected Aptheker as one of the 101 "worst" professors in

the United States and cites both her and Davis for books that are little more than political tracts.⁷

The political ideology of the relatively numerous leftist faculty is augmented by the goals of many of the university's academic units. Their mission statements emphasize a concern for social justice, being an agent of social change, and inculcating respect for diverse cultures, often more than they emphasize scholarly, critical thinking.⁸ Moreover, these values are promoted, in general, only as they apply to minorities seen as oppressed with regard to social class, skin color, or sexual orientation. Other cultural/ethnic groups not defined in these terms, such as Jews, are either ignored or are themselves seen as sources of social injustice and racist behavior.⁹ The end result is that many of the colleges and departments of the humanities and social science divisions have consistently sponsored events critical of Israel's treatment of the Palestinians, without acknowledging the existential threats Israel faces.

Twenty-two of the university's faculty members, including two department heads and a divisional dean, have signed the UC divestment petition, which calls on the U.S. government to cut off military aid to Israel and demands that the University of California divest from Israel and from all U.S. companies that sell military equipment to it.¹⁰ Nine faculty members have signed an open letter from American Jews urging the United States to end all aid to Israel,¹¹ and four have signed a petition to boycott Israeli academics and research.¹²

The political attitudes of UCSC are reinforced by its location in the town of Santa Cruz (population 55,633), which itself has a reputation for the extreme leftist bias of its city government. For example, the city government declared Santa Cruz a nuclear- and hate-free zone,¹³ voted to request the U.S. Judiciary Committee to start impeachment proceedings against President George W. Bush,¹⁴ and issued an executive order proclaiming Rachel Corrie Day.¹⁵ (Rachel Corrie, an American member of the International Solidarity Movement, was killed in Gaza attempting to obstruct an Israel Defense Forces bulldozer working in an area designated by the IDF as a security zone.) Scott Kennedy, longtime city council member and former mayor, as the cofounder and Middle East director of the Santa Cruz Resource Center for Nonviolence, has adopted the Palestinian cause. Although the stated mission of the Resource Center is "peace and social justice dedicated to promoting the principle of nonviolent social change,"¹⁶ under Kennedy's leadership it has become a key player in sponsoring many virulently anti-Israeli events both in the community and on campus.

History of Anti-Israeli Activities on Campus since 2000

Whereas the personal political opinions of faculty need not affect how students are educated at the university, and political indoctrination was in fact prohibited under the University of California academic-freedom rules from 1934 to 2003,¹⁷ there is nonetheless a high correlation between the faculty's political biases and

many aspects of academic life. These include which speakers are invited to the campus, the nature and content of courses, classroom discourse, and the focus of research in the social sciences and the humanities. The almost monolithic leftist posture of the faculty at UCSC, supported by elements of the left-leaning city, has created a campus environment lacking the diversity of thought and balance of ideas that are crucial to the mission of a public university.

This is nowhere more apparent than in the consistent anti-Israeli agenda that has been promoted at the university since the beginning of the major wave of violence against Israel in September 2000. Moreover, there has been a significant rise in activities that spill over into various forms of hate-speech demonizing both Israelis and Jews. Recent rallies and public lectures sponsored by student organizations and academic units have routinely pilloried Israel as “colonialist,” “racist,” “imperialist,” and even “Nazi.” Examples include:

- Imam Abdel Malik, invited to speak at UCSC by the Muslim Student Association and the local community group headed by former mayor Kennedy, publicly accused Jews of perpetrating the 9/11 attack.¹⁸
- Hedy Epstein, an eighty-year-old woman, who had been on the Kinder Transport and whose parents were murdered in the Holocaust, and member of the International Solidarity Movement speaking at the invitation of the Women’s Studies Department at UCSC, compared Israel to a Nazi state and Israeli soldiers to Nazis.¹⁹
- A panel discussion, in which ancient anti-Semitic blood-libel accusations about supposed Israeli atrocities went unchallenged by any of the panelists, was cosponsored by ten different research groups, departments, and colleges on campus.

The anti-Israeli bias among faculty and students that drives these events is not openly displayed but is nevertheless evident in course curricula, lectures, and classroom discussions. Jewish students report frequent expressions of profound antipathy toward Israel and its supporters inside the classroom; some voice concerns that their grades might be harmed by taking a pro-Israeli position in written or verbal discussions.

For example, a Jewish freshman taking a required course was distressed by an assigned book, *Palestine* by Joe Sacco, a comic-strip account of day-to-day Palestinian life written from an unabashedly anti-Israeli perspective. Noting the one-sided classroom discussion generated by the book, the student acknowledged that she was afraid to express her feelings for fear of being publicly ostracized and penalized on her course grade. Another recounted that a sympathetic professor advised him to give up his idea of a senior thesis on the topic of terrorism in Israel because the “taboo” subject might earn him a failing grade.

Outside the classroom, Jewish students encounter many peers who are openly hostile to Jewish concerns. For example, members of a student group sponsoring

speakers on the topic of global anti-Semitism often found that flyers they posted were torn down, occluded, or defaced.

In general, the UCSC faculty has been silent on the issue of anti-Israeli bias on campus. Until 2003, there were few organized efforts by any campus or community groups to combat the growing anti-Israeli sentiment. The authors, when publicly addressing the issue, found themselves ignored or rebuked. In one case, when Rossman-Benjamin protested by email to the heads of the ten cosponsoring academic units about their flyer depicting fighter jets marked with the Star of David bombing innocent Arab civilians, she received not one response. In another case, Benjamin, after writing a letter of complaint to a divisional dean about an extremely biased, anti-Israeli panel discussion, was accused by the chair of the Academic Senate Committee on Academic Freedom of violating the academic freedom of one of the panelists, who was the director of the research group that had sponsored the event.

Aims, Efforts, Challenges

In the fall of 2003, a few faculty members including one of the authors, students, and Hillel staff members met with the chancellor in order to alert her to the rising incidence of anti-Semitism on campus directly linked to the anti-Israeli bias of the university-sponsored talks on the Middle East. When the chancellor suggested that interested faculty and student groups might consider initiating their own efforts at promoting a greater diversity of views about Israel, a decision was made to pursue the idea.

As faculty members, our strategy for addressing the anti-Israeli bias on campus differed from the efforts of student activists to gain control over student media and government, as discussed in Golub's case study on Johns Hopkins University,²⁰ and also differed from the decision of Scholars for Peace in the Middle East to work collegially through individual professorial contacts.²¹ Our strategy had four goals: (1) repairing the imbalance of ideas and information about Israel; (2) educating the campus and local communities about the existential threat to Israel and Jews from the new anti-Semitism; (3) exposing the anti-Israeli bias at the university; and (4) empowering students, faculty, and community members to fight anti-Semitism on the campus and in the community.

1. Repairing the Imbalance of Ideas

To bring balance to the one-sided, anti-Israeli discourse on campus, a lecture series of pro-Israeli speakers was instituted. We sought noted individuals who would present in an intellectually accurate and compelling way a different perspective about Israel than was being heard. We also hoped to add academic legitimacy to these speakers by soliciting the cooperation of departments, colleges, and research groups that had previously sponsored talks and events vilifying Israel.

Utilizing personal contacts and speaker bureaus,²² and operating on a limited budget consisting of private donations, we were able to find several outstanding pro-Israeli writers and academics willing to lecture at UCSC for a modest honorarium. Once the first few speakers were scheduled, we contacted the heads of ten academic units, explaining our desire to bring balance to campus discussions about Israel and the Middle East, and inviting them, in the name of academic integrity and a diversity of ideas, to join with us in sponsoring these speakers. None agreed to do so, and some even cosponsored competing anti-Israeli events during a few of our lectures.

We also sought support for our series from local Jewish organizations. Our funding came mainly from two organizations with which we had personal connections: the synagogue to which the authors belonged and a local pro-Israeli philanthropy. Additionally, contributions were received for specific talks from Jewish organizations in the local community. However, funding of the series was a constant challenge. Financial contributions within the Jewish community varied from speaker to speaker, and in general reflected the political perspectives of the leadership of the various organizations. For example, some Jewish organizations refused sponsorship of certain speakers whom they regarded as promoting a negative portrayal of Islam or an overly conservative perspective on the Arab-Israeli conflict.

Our advertising targeted both the campus and local communities, as well as the Jewish communities in the greater Bay Area. Although we attracted from eighty to four hundred listeners for the various lectures, most came from the Jewish community. Few students and even fewer faculty attended, not even as a courtesy to visiting scholars.

2. Educating about the Threat from the New Anti-Semitism

The anti-Israeli bias at UCSC has effectively denied members of the campus community access to information about the threats facing Israel and world Jewry from the rise in global anti-Semitism. Therefore, one of our goals has been to provide access to this information.

The speakers we chose for our series all addressed the existential threat to Israel and the Jews emanating from the “new anti-Semitism.” Four of them dealt with aspects of anti-Semitism in the Arab world. Khaleel Mohammed, imam and assistant professor of religious studies at San Diego State University, discussed the religious roots of Islamist Jew-hatred. Nonie Darwish, a journalist and translator who grew up in Egypt and Gaza, addressed the sociological and cultural aspects of Muslim anti-Semitism. Richard Landes, professor of history at Boston University, director of the Millennial Institute, and an authority on apocalyptic movements, explored the historical roots of modern jihadism as an Islamic apocalyptic movement whose goals include the destruction of Israel

and the murder of Jews. Itamar Marcus, director of Palestinian Media Watch, described how mass media and school textbooks in the Palestinian Authority are used to indoctrinate children to become suicide bombers.

In addition, Gerald Steinberg, professor of political studies at Israel's Bar-Ilan University and director of NGO Monitor, detailed how human rights organizations exploit human rights norms and international law to demonize Israel. Khaled Abu Toameh, an Israeli Arab journalist, reflected on the import of the Hamas victory in the 2006 Palestinian elections.

Two additional speakers in the series addressed how the new anti-Semitism has manifested itself on college campuses. Dennis Prager, author and radio talk-show host, spoke of how anti-Israeli leftist academics have distorted the picture of Israel and the Middle East presented at universities. Rachel Fish, New York regional director of the David Project and producer of the documentary *Columbia Unbecoming*, described her efforts to expose and combat anti-Semitism and anti-Israeli bias at Harvard and Columbia universities.

Although these speakers presented important information about the new anti-Semitism, our efforts to educate the campus community in this way met considerable resistance from both students and faculty. Flyers for many of the talks were pulled down, occluded, or defaced with statements such as "Zionism is racism" and "Occupation is murder." One UCSC professor was even caught in the act of tearing down a flyer advertising Itamar Marcus. As noted, few students and even fewer faculty members attended these talks.

Rossman-Benjamin, beginning in 2005 and continuing in 2006, has instituted undergraduate independent-study classes in contemporary global anti-Semitism.

3. Exposing Anti-Semitism and Anti-Israeli Bias at UCSC

Another important goal has been to constrain faculty/administration anti-Israeli bias through public exposure, and encourage parents, donors, alumni, and interested citizens to pressure the University of California Board of Regents and the UCSC administration to address these problems.

Our efforts in this direction began after Imam Malik's virulently anti-Semitic talk in May 2002. Two of the authors wrote a letter to the editor of one of the student newspapers, protesting that such a speaker would appear at UCSC and detailing the anti-Semitic aspects of the talk. Although the newspaper printed the letter, the then editor in chief, himself a member of the student organization that had invited Malik, abridged the letter and deleted the description of the anti-Semitic aspects. Only after Benjamin and Rossman-Benjamin threatened the editor and newspaper with a lawsuit was the letter printed in full. However, the editor also wrote an editorial in the same issue asserting that we had stifled journalistic free speech.

After the Dennis Prager lecture, we published an opinion piece in the local newspaper documenting the anti-Israeli bias of many academic units in refusing

to cosponsor an alternative view to their consistent support for Israel bashing.²³ In another article in that paper, we used the lecture by Khaleel Mohammed to expose the refusal of the same academic units to examine dangerous Islamic anti-Semitism.²⁴ An opinion piece in the *Los Angeles Jewish Journal* used the sponsorship of Hedy Epstein, contrasted to the refusal to sponsor Nonie Darwish, to document the anti-Israeli bias of the Faculty of Women's Studies at UCSC.²⁵ The lecture by Itamar Marcus, the academic units' refusal to sponsor it, and the removal of flyers publicizing it were used to expose the anti-Semitic effects of the anti-Israeli bias at UCSC.²⁶

Our efforts at exposure were bolstered by community media. A local radio station invited us to discuss anti-Israeli bias at UCSC with an administrator from the university; a reporter from the local newspaper wrote about the defacement and removal of the lecture flyers while withholding the information that a professor had been involved;²⁷ the local newspaper published letters to the editor by supportive community members. The audience for our articles was also expanded nationally and internationally by being reprinted on the Internet.²⁸

4. Empowering Students, Faculty, and Community Members to Fight the Bias

One of the authors' essential tasks has been to form faculty, student, and community groups. In January 2004, we set up a chapter of the international organization Scholars for Peace in the Middle East (SPME).²⁹ Although few UCSC faculty joined the group, SPME played an important role in giving our efforts legitimacy and support that extended beyond the university. At the same time, we formed the Santa Cruz Middle East Information Coalition (SCMEIC) made up of activist members of the community who collectively held affiliations with almost every Jewish organization in Santa Cruz and the surrounding area. Consequently, SCMEIC proved an important means to communicate our concerns and efforts to the larger Jewish community, both to raise awareness and garner support.

In November 2004, a few students who had volunteered to help with SPME's speaker series started an official group, Students for Peace in the Middle East, whose stated mission was identical to that of the associated faculty group. As a student group registered with the university, the students had university sanction to post flyers, set up tables for distributing information, and book university facilities for talks and events. These students hosted talks and movie nights, organized counterdemonstrations to anti-Israeli events on campus, and helped advertise our speaker series.

To fortify the efforts of these faculty, student, and community groups, in February 2005 an Israel advocacy workshop was organized in conjunction with people at Stanford University and UC Berkeley. Featuring Roz Rothstein of StandWithUs and Avi Goldwasser of the David Project, the workshop's goal was

to educate participants about the scope and nature of the problem on college campuses and provide strategies for addressing it, including information about other advocacy workshops, trainings, and conferences taking place locally, nationally, and internationally.

In 2006, the increasingly active local Jewish community protested the sponsorship by the Resource Center for Nonviolence of a lecture by Norman G. Finkelstein, assistant professor of political science at DePaul University. They focused on Finkelstein's denunciation of Jews for what he claims to be exploitation of the Holocaust for political and financial gain. In contrast to previous Resource Center events, the venue was not on campus, no UCSC academic units cosponsored, and the local newspaper supported the Jewish protest, publishing an editorial that censured the liberal community of Santa Cruz for not recognizing that Jews like gays are minority victims of discrimination.³⁰ Additionally, because they inaccurately claimed that the lecture was a UCSC event, the Resource Center had to apologize to the UCSC administration for the misuse of their imprimatur.

The independent-study classes on anti-Semitism organized by Rossman-Benjamin have also been a source of student support for our efforts. Learning about the threat of anti-Semitism globally and locally has motivated students in these classes to join the activities of Students for Peace in the Middle East and to participate in advocacy training workshops organized by the authors' group and others.

The most challenging aspect of forming these groups has been recruiting new members. Most notably, the UCSC chapter of SPME has not grown in number beyond the authors. Even faculty members who have expressed some sympathy with our cause are unwilling to join our efforts. The student and community groups are also small in number, about ten in each, though they have shown steady growth.

Moving Forward

A degree of success has been tempered by having to operate as a marginal group almost entirely outside the formal framework of the university. This effectively means the authors' voices have not been given the same legitimacy as those of faculty members with an anti-Israeli perspective. Recently we have begun to address this weakness, both by attempting to make our efforts a more integral part of the university's academic programming and by seeking to effect broad changes in the campus discourse, at the level of university policy.

In May, 2005, Rossman-Benjamin wrote a proposal in response to a Ford Foundation grant initiative. The grant was established to support programs in undergraduate education promoting "constructive dialogue around difficult political, religious, racial, and cultural issues" and to encourage, among others, projects on understanding and combating the problem of contemporary anti-Semitism.³¹ Rossman-Benjamin's proposal included a plan for offering

undergraduate classes, bringing guest scholars, and presenting events and activities for promoting dialogue among students, faculty, and administrators about the problem of local and global anti-Semitism. She continues to seek other sources of funding for the project in order to establish the study of contemporary anti-Semitism as part of the formal academic programming at UCSC.

We have also, as noted, sought to effect change in the university discourse at the level of university policy. This has involved a process that began by educating ourselves about the relevant UC and federal government regulations on academic freedom,³² hate speech,³³ and anti-Semitism.³⁴

Understanding these regulations has enabled us to see and respond to cases where their nonenforcement has resulted in anti-Israeli bias on the campus. For example, in response to the professor removing flyers advertising the Itamar Marcus lecture, both the Students and the Scholars for Peace in the Middle East sent formal letters of complaint to the administration at the highest levels, and posted a description of the event on the Internet.³⁵ Through combined pressure from us and the administrator of the Internet organization, who sent the posting to the chancellor and the Board of Regents, the university brought accusations against the professor to the Charge Committee, advisory to the Academic Senate.

The Charge Committee, however, dismissed all charges. The university administration refused to make public the committee's report to the executive chancellor even when requested to do so under the California Public Records Act. The students' complaint and their eyewitness testimony were not included in the material reviewed by the committee, an omission that was only inadvertently revealed after the dismissal.

In 2005, the authors and Scholars for Peace in the Middle East organized a petition posted online³⁶ that asks the governor of California and the officials of the University of California and California State University to address the growing problem of hostility toward Jewish students that is a direct result of the anti-Israeli bias on college campuses. The petition asks for implementation of responsibilities stipulated by California law and by the policies of the University of California to guard against the use of the universities for political indoctrination, intimidation, and hate. In addition to the approximately three thousand faculty, students, and community members from across the world who have signed the petition, letters of support were requested and received from organizations that are knowledgeable about the Middle East and monitor academic bias.

In 2006, the governor began to gather information about anti-Semitism on California campuses through a meeting of Jewish organizations to which one of the authors was invited.

University policies and actions that do not promote a true diversity of ideas are now being challenged. For example, few California citizens are aware that the academic-freedom rules that governed all ten UC campuses from 1934 to 2003 required the faculty to critically and dispassionately examine any contentious political or social issue, and proscribed one-sided indoctrination of students.³⁷

In 2003, the rules were changed at the request of the president of the University of California, in order, as he specifically stated, to address “issues of academic freedom and academic responsibility” raised by a course, “The Politics and Poetics of Palestinian Resistance”, that was entirely dedicated to the Palestinian perspective in the Israeli-Arab conflict, and taught without any alternative views or facts. Under the existing academic freedom rules, the course was proscribed. But the rules were changed, after the fact, to allow such pro-Palestinian polemics.^{38,39} The authors, in collaboration with the Los Angeles American Jewish Congress, are working to restore some semblance of the original rules by writing about the change, lobbying the Board of Regents, and supporting the passage of academic-freedom rules for students.⁴⁰

Moreover, Rossman-Benjamin requested appointment to the UCSC Academic Senate Committee on Academic Freedom and was accepted in 2005. She has emphasized in committee discussions the belief that academic freedom must be tempered by academic integrity that allows for a free exchange and diversity of ideas, rather than the promotion of some ideas and the suppression of others.

Notes

1. www.santacruzhillel.org/hillel-faq.
2. Yonit Golub, “An Analytic Approach to Campus Pro-Israeli Activism—Case Study: Johns Hopkins University,” *Jewish Political Studies Review*, Vol. 16, Nos. 3-4 (Fall 2004): 205-13, www.jcpa.org/phas/phas-golub-f04.htm; see the essay by Rebecca Leibowitz in this book.
3. Lee Kaplan, “The Saudi Fifth Column on Our Nation’s Campuses,” *FrontPageMagazine.com*, 5 April 2005.
4. www.bookrags.com/biography-angela-davis/
5. www.hno.harvard.edu/gazette/2003/03.13/09-davis.html
6. www.discoverthenetworks.org.
7. David Horowitz, *The Professors: The 101 Most Dangerous Academics in America* (Washington, DC: Regnery, 2006).
8. For example, the Principles of Community, developed in June 2001, state that the university strives to be: “Diverse, Open, Purposeful, Caring, Just, Disciplined, and Celebrative,” www.ucsc.edu/about/principles-community.asp. The mission of Community Studies is “to examine theory and practice in a variety of social justice domains,” http://communitystudies.ucsc.edu/about_us/. Merrill College explains its “ethos: Exploring cultural identities and raising global consciousness,” www.ucsc.edu/about/colleges.asp. College 9 “emphasizes the importance of both diversity and unity in understanding individuals and societies.” College 10 states: “Our goal is to foster students’ concerns for social justice and their respect for diversity. We try to understand the roots of social problems such as prejudice, ethnic hatreds, poverty, and political oppression.” The Research Center for Justice, Tolerance, and the Community states that it is a “progressive research institute tackling issues of social justice, diversity and tolerance, and the building of collaborative relationships between the university and local community,” <http://cjtc.ucsc.edu/>.
9. “Jewish Studies and the Elusive E Credit: Why Doesn’t UCSC See Jews as an Ethnicity?” www.powazek.com/home/old/words/E.html.

132 Faculty Efforts to Combat Anti-Semitism and Anti-Israeli Bias at UC-Santa Cruz

10. www.ucdivest.org (no longer online).
11. Letter from American Jews, www.diak.org/an%20open%20letter%20from%20american%20jews.htm.
12. www.boycottisraeligoods.org/index61751.php.
13. www.santacruzpl.org/history/gov/freezone.shtml; www.ci.santa-cruz.ca.us/cc/archives/00/2-22a.html.
14. Ken McLaughlin, "Santa Cruz Urges Probe into Bush Impeachment," *Mercury News*, 10 September 2003, www.mercurynews.com/mld/mercurynews/news/6733319.htm.
15. Pacifica Radio Flashpoints.net, www.pacifica.org/programs/flashpoints/flashpoints_040316.html.
16. Santa Cruz Resource Center for Nonviolence, www.rcnv.org/.
17. University of California Regulation Academic Personnel Manual APM-10, www.ucop.edu/acadadv/acadpers/apm/welcome.html.
18. www.jewishsf.com/content/2-0-/module/displaystory/story_id/19199/edition_id/388/format/html/displaystory.html.
19. Personal communication, T. Rossman-Benjamin.
20. www.jcpa.org/phas/phas-golub-F04.htm.
21. "Fighting Anti-Israelism and Anti-Semitism on the American University Campus: Faculty Grassroots Efforts," www.jcpa.org/phas/phas-28.htm.
22. StandWithUs, www.standwithus.com; Hasbara Fellowships, www.israelactivism.com/campaigns/speakers.asp.
23. Leila Beckwith, "Marketplace of Ideas Has Gone Sour at UCSC," *Santa Cruz Sentinel*, 7 March 2004, www.santacruzsentinel.com/archive/2004/March/07/edit/stories/05edit.htm.
24. Ilan Benjamin and Tammi Rossman-Benjamin, "Moderate Islam Should Not Be Ignored," *Santa Cruz Sentinel*, 23 May 2004, www.santacruzsentinel.com/archive/2004/May/23/edit/stories/06edit.htm.
25. Leila Beckwith, "Bias Colors UC Santa Cruz Department," *Jewish Journal of Greater Los Angeles*, 4 February 2005, www.jewishjournal.com/home/searchview.php?id=13601.
26. Tammi Rossman-Benjamin, "Anti-Semitism at UCSC," www.standwithus.com.
27. Jondi Gumz, "Pro-Israel Speaker Hot Topic at UCSC; Some Deface Fliers Advertising Lecture," *Santa Cruz Sentinel*, 10 March 2005, www.santacruzsentinel.com/archive/2005/March/10/local/stories/10local.htm.
28. FrontPageMagazine, Campus-Watch, Daily Alert, StandWithUs, Scholars for Peace in the Middle East, NoIndoctrination.org, Constudents.com.
29. www.spme.net.
30. "As We See It: Protest Backlash," *Santa Cruz Sentinel Opinion*, 22 March 2006, www.santacruzsentinel.com/archive/2006/March/22/edit/stories/01edit.htm.
31. www.fordfound.org/news/more/dialogues/index.cfm.
32. University of California Regulation Academic Personnel Manual APM-10, www.ucop.edu/acadadv/acadpers/apm/welcome.html.
33. *Student Policies and Regulations Handbook: Appendix M, UCSC Hate/Bias Incident Policy*, www.speechcodes.org/policy.php?id=8632.
34. Kenneth L. Marcus, deputy assistant, United States Department of Education, Office for Civil Rights, letter of 13 September 2004, about Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and Title IX of the Education Amendments Act of 1972.

United States Commission on Civil Rights, 3 April, 2006, stated that anti-Semitism on college campuses is a serious problem, and recommended that the United States Department of Education run a campaign to inform Jewish students of their right to be free of harassment.

35. NoIndoctrination.org, www.noindoctrination.org/cgi-bin/display_record.cgi?uid=466.
36. www.petitiononline.com/SPMEDoc/petition.html.
37. University of California Regulation Academic Personnel Manual APM-10, www.ucop.edu/acadadv/acadpers/apm/welcome.html. See also Martin Trow, "Reflections on Proposed Changes in the University Regulations Bearing on Academic Freedom in the University of California," NoIndoctrination.org, 24 July 2003, www.noindoctrination.org/uc_cas.shtml; Cathy Cockrell, "UC Academic-Freedom Policy, Crafted during Depression, Revisited," *UCBerkeleyNews*, 20 August 2003, www.berkeley.edu/news/berkeleyan/2003/08/20_edu.shtml.
38. President Atkinson's letter to the Regents of the University of California, 14 August 2002. www.ucop.edu/pres/comments/palcourse.pdf.
39. <http://cshe.berkeley.edu/publications/docs/ROP.Trow.AcademicFreedom.3.05.pdf>.
40. Leila Beckwith, "One Side Fits All," *Los Angeles Times*, 28 August 2005, www.latimes.com/news/opinion/commentary/la-op-academicfreedom28aug28,0,694861.story?coll=la-news-comment-opinions.

Edward S. Beck

Scholars for Peace in the Middle East (SPME): Fighting Anti-Israelism and Anti-Semitism on the University Campuses Worldwide¹

Many new mutations of anti-Semitism, and in particular as anti-Israelism, originate on the campus. Part of the battle against this is undertaken by the classic Jewish advocacy organizations. However, Israel advocacy is also increasingly being carried out by grassroots faculty who have organized as academic colleagues.²

Scholars for Peace in the Middle East³ was founded in 2002 to address the growing number of anti-Israeli and anti-Semitic incidents in classrooms and on campus. The founding of SPME was to some extent a reaction to the anti-Semitic events at San Francisco State University (SFSU) and other campuses where stories of anti-Israeli fabrications were being recorded not just in the quad but in classrooms and curriculum as well.^{4,5}

Realizing that there was no grassroots network of faculty to address these troublesome academic breaches and reacting to the convergence of events on campus with the start of the Second Intifada, this author, a former nineteen-year Penn State faculty member searched for like-minded colleagues on the Internet. He developed a correspondence with Laurie Zoloth, a bioethicist and then head of Jewish studies at SFSU. Her Internet description of events there captured the attention and confirmed the fears of many that campuses were not friendly places toward Jews or Israel.

The author also met Judith Jacobson, who teaches at Columbia University's Mailman School of Public Health, while monitoring anti-Israeli propaganda on a "Professors for Peace" listserv. In this context SPME was born, and Dr. Jacobson would become its vice-president.

Prevailing Academic Mantras

SPME was formed with the goal of addressing campus distortions about Israel. These are expressed in mantras such as:

There is no legal basis for the state of Israel. Israel is a colonial project and no colonial project has a basis for existence. (Ibrahim Aoude, University of Hawaii)⁶

Joseph Massad at Columbia University, following in the footsteps of his mentor Edward Said, was making strong links among "Zionism...racism

and...colonial policies...South African apartheid...white supremacy.” He teaches that Israelis have perpetuated “racist colonial violence for the last century against the Palestinian people in a status they refuse to recognize...” In a twisted diabolic statement of disinformation, fabrication, and falsification, he asserts, “...the ultimate achievement of Israel [is the] transformation of the Jew into the anti-Semite, and the Palestinian into the Jew.”⁷

The Holocaust Industry, is...institutions, organizations and individuals who have put to use Jewish suffering for political and financial gain. Throughout the little book, I am not at all shy of naming names, so large numbers of organizations and individuals are cited for their activities in the exploitation of the Nazi holocaust. It is hard to say the main ones, but the mainstream Jewish organizations and individuals such as Elie Wiesel, they feature prominently in the book. (Norman Finkelstein, recently denied tenure from DePaul University)⁸

Judaism and the Jewish Identity are offensive to most human beings and will always cause trouble with the rest of the human race. (Hellen Cullen, University of Massachusetts)⁹

The heritage of the Holocaust belongs to the Palestinian people. The state of Israel has no claim to the heritage of the Holocaust.... (Nicholas De Genova, Columbia University)¹⁰

The Palestinians are comparable to the Jews in the Warsaw Ghetto, awaiting annihilation.... (Marc Ellis, Baylor University)¹¹

Israel is engaged in a low-grade war of genocide against the Palestinians. (Joshua Schreier, Vassar College)¹²

The state of Israel is based upon “mythology.” (term used by Joseph Levine, Ohio State University)¹³

The SPME Membership

SPME is modeled after the effective but now defunct organization American Professors for Peace in the Middle East (APPME), some of whose veterans have joined it. As of this writing, SPME has grown from a minor listserv to an international academic community of over nineteen thousand scholars from many nations at over one thousand institutions. They come from many faiths and political convictions under SPME’s “big tent” orientation to attract scholars interested in raising the level of discourse about the Arab-Israeli issue on campus

and in the disciplines. Developments in 2007 concerning the British boycott against Israeli academics have created sizable network growth in the UK, with now over seven hundred subscribers, as well as growing numbers in Austria, Germany, France, and Italy. There is also an increase in network subscribers from Australia, the Middle East, Asia, and Latin America. Network members include college and university presidents as well as Nobel Laureates.

SPME has over twenty chapters at colleges and universities throughout the United States and is developing chapters in Austria, France, and Germany, with discussions in other countries such as the UK, Italy, and Australia. Among the institutions with chapters or developing chapters are: Columbia University, Stanford University, McGill University, University of California-Santa Cruz, Davis, Irvine, and Los Angeles, San Jose State University, State University of New York at Buffalo, Rutgers University, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, California Polytechnic Institute, Franklin and Marshall College, Haverford College, and others. SPME will focus on developing new chapters in other schools and countries, with the hope of having thirty-five to fifty chapters by the end of 2007.

Addressing the Issues in Academic Terms

A number of faculty members across academic disciplines routinely make comments on the Middle East conflict. Many community organizations use academics for advocacy and sometimes polemics. Numerous academics, however, do not care to be known as polemicists for community groups and worry that such work is seen as having little or no value in the academic community, although it is important for the general community. As a consequence, SPME has provided an academic-community refuge for scholars to network and provide access to collegial support and discipline-specific academic information they need when Israel-related subjects come up in their classrooms, textbooks, journals, and conferences. SPME has become an independent academic community with scholars from many disciplines.

SPME receives and investigates all academically related concerns brought to its attention. It analyzes these incidents, then mobilizes faculty to address the issues.

Recently this author, president of SPME, has been working closely with Penn State faculty, Hillel professionals, and the Penn State Hillel Foundation Board as a member of the latter, to deal with incidents involving faculty censorship of a student art exhibit on the effects of terrorism at that institution. As of this writing, both administration and faculty have made apologies to the student in question. SPME has worked quietly with all concerned to effect a reversal of an overtly anti-Semitic action.

An important SPME achievement was its October 2005 conference on "Postcolonial Theory and the Middle East" at Case Western Reserve University's

Samuel Rosenthal Center for Judaic Studies. Twenty-five leading scholars, including Ilan Troen, Gerald Steinberg, Philip Carl Salzman, Donna Robinson Divine, Peter Haas, Gideon Shimoni, Efraim Karsh, Irfan Khawaja, David Cook, Laurie Zoloth, Ronald Niezen, Jonathan Adelman, Richard Landes, and others, presented critical analysis of the integrity and influence of postcolonial theory as espoused by Edward Said and others over the past twenty-five years. The proceedings, *Postcolonial Theory and the Arab-Israeli Conflict*, will be published in *Israel Affairs* and by Routledge Press, in 2007.

A Variety of Activities

SPME is also planning an academic response to “The Israel Lobby and U.S. Foreign Policy,” the Working Paper by John J. Mearsheimer and Stephen Walt published by Harvard University’s Kennedy School of Government.¹⁴ SPME is tapping its network of scholars and others to formally and academically critique Mearsheimer and Walt’s work, and to provide accurate data to reshape the paradigm to reflect it. The effort is headed by Mark Lichbach, chair of Government and Politics at the University of Maryland.

A planned conference is currently titled “Professors and Presidents with Jewish Problems: Power in America.” This conference is meant to provide a formal academic response to counterbalance the polemics and community responses of Walt and Mearsheimer, Jimmy Carter, and others that have seeped into the academic discussion. Such critiques help students and faculty better understand Israel’s historical and political situation.

SPME is particularly supportive of the work of Ilan Troen at the Goodman Institute of Brandeis University, which seeks to develop greater competence in professors teaching Israel-related courses.

SPME has also played an important role in countering the boycott efforts of the British UCU, AUT, and NATFHE unions. As of mid-September 2007, over eleven thousand academics from over one thousand institutions worldwide, including thirty-three Nobel Laureates and fifty-eight college and university presidents signed a statement written by Prof. Alan Dershowitz, Nobel Laureate Steven Weinberg, and this author in solidarity with Israeli academics. In essence it says, “if one boycotts Israeli academics and professionals, one boycotts us.”¹⁵

In 2005, SPME initiated and presented a petition to the AUT union’s leadership protesting its actions on grounds of the violation of academic freedom, which was signed by over five thousand scholars worldwide.

SPME has participated in the “Bar-Ilan Conference on Academic Freedom: Lessons Learned from the AUT Boycott of Israeli Scholars.” In January 2006, it played an important part in establishing the affiliate faculty appointments at both Haifa and Bar-Ilan universities. SPME recruited several hundred academics to seek these appointments in solidarity with these universities.

SPME also consulted with the invited participants to the Bellagio Conference of the American Association of University Professors (AAUP). Having been postponed and then canceled, the conference appears, as of this writing, to be seeking to publish (with commentary) papers submitted by some of the invitees. The conference was an attempt by AAUP to have a “difficult discussion” in Bellagio, Italy, between leaders of the British boycott movement and prominent British and Israeli academics who have been victimized by it. Israeli scholars were, however, put in an untenable position of having to defend themselves against further, unclear agendas of victimization by those who chose to castigate them simply because they were members of Israeli institutions.¹⁶

AAUP has a strong record of protecting academic freedom. It appears, however, that anti-Israeli forces within it were pressing for papers from a conference that would never take place in an effort to give some credence to those who tried and continue to engineer the boycott.¹⁷ SPME continues to work with the principal Israeli and British faculty members as this matter evolves.

SPME is also seeking funding resources for an academic conference on “Anti-Semitism and anti-Israelism in Academia,” tentatively to be offered at a major U.S. west-coast university, where noted scholars in the field will examine and publish work and research about the various historical and current manifestations of anti-Semitism and anti-Israelism in academia.

SPME has encountered difficulty in funding an important multidisciplinary conference that could help change what is done in the classroom by academics. In this conference, SPME hopes to invite important scholars who will inform colleagues from many disciplines about the issues that can be introduced in discussions of Israel in scholarly work, the classroom, and the campus. SPME could thereby begin providing the basis for a multidisciplinary academic society to deal with Middle East issues in various fields and raise the level of teaching and scholarship on the Middle East. Such a conference is necessary and also different from what is currently offered in terms of training professors to teach Israel studies, for which there is a very limited market. This training is designed to help professors who teach wider-reaching student populations.

Petitions

Another SPME project has been to circulate as a petition, to academic colleagues around the world, statements of the International Association of Genocide Studies and the Center for Genocide Prevention of the Hadassah-Hebrew University School of Public Health. These organizations call on the United Nations, governments, and organizations to sanction Iran and its leaders as war criminals for “incitement to commit genocide.”

SPME is also circulating a petition calling on DePaul University officials to reinstate and compensate Prof. Thomas Klocek, a Roman Catholic adjunct

professor for over fifteen years, without penalty or prejudice. Prof. Klocek was summarily dismissed because of allegations by Muslim students when he challenged their anti-Israeli materials at a student gathering on the quad at DePaul University.¹⁸ This petition has received overwhelming support from fulltime faculty from around the world.

SPME also acknowledges other faculty initiatives and collaborates with many of them. SPME has worked closely with the International Advisory Board on Academic Freedom, which was formed originally by Bar-Ilan University and Haifa University in response to the AUT boycott. It now has grown to a consortium of all Israeli university faculties. SPME consults regularly with Ronnie Fraser, executive director of Academic Friends of Israel-UK. SPME also considers Academic Friends of Israel, founded by Andrew Marks, MD, of Columbia University, which sponsors medical and scientific symposia in Israel, as an important and valuable substantive expression of academic support for Israel. SPME remains open to cooperate with other academic groups as well and seeks ways to engage such groups in a collegial and coordinated manner.

Although not a member of the Israel on Campus Coalition, SPME has been invited, through its “cooperative venture” agreement with the Jewish National Fund, to participate in a number of ICC meetings and conferences to give faculty input into this primarily student-focused group. At the “Hillel Summit: The University and the Jewish Community” in Washington, DC, in May 2007, it was announced that the ICC and Hillel were making faculty engagement a high priority.

Where SPME believes there is a mutual interest and collaboration possibility in academic matters with community and advocacy groups, it seeks consultation, collaboration, and cooperation. To this end, SPME worked collaboratively on various projects with Caravan for Democracy of the Jewish National Fund, local Hillel chapters, Jewish Federations and Jewish Community Relations Councils, local chapters of the American Jewish Committee, StandWithUs, CAMERA, the American Jewish Congress, the Anti-Defamation League, and regional chapters of the Israel on Campus Coalition.

SPME is often asked what its position is on academic freedom, and sometimes is invited to take a stance on various initiatives to address issues of the Middle East conflict. SPME has endorsed the statements on academic freedom of the American Association of University Professors, which essentially are well protected by constitutional law.¹⁹

SPME believes that faculty should be free to teach as they wish with all of the appropriate accountability and peer mechanisms that are currently in place. Each discipline and institution has procedures and sanctions for poor scholarship, acts of moral turpitude, and violations of institutional rules. If these are enforced, justice can prevail and the level of discourse can remain civil and improve.

Although hate speech may be protected, there are university codes of conduct relating to civil rights, respect for multicultural difference, and freedom from

intimidation that may be operative when assessing the effects of hate speech, for which there should be sanctions.

A Tedious and Often Misunderstood Task

SPME believes that academic and institutional changes are best achieved through collegial professorial contact. SPME does not seek to embarrass any institution or particular professor personally. Ideas and processes are challenged. Peer contact is quiet, respectful, and often effective. In many cases, the offending academic is approached by another resident scholar from the same academic area. They exchange views on the curriculum, chapter, paper, or wherever the offense has been committed, always with the goal of arriving at resolution and clarity. In this way textbook narratives have been changed and colleagues have been educated who were receptive to peer feedback.

Such a peer-to-peer approach can be tedious, but has long-lasting effects. Peer review is essential for academics. It means far more to them and their institution when the responses come from within academia than from outside political pressure, although SPME acknowledges that both types are essential for institutional change. However, SPME's task is to educate a generation of scholars who will be more sensitive to facts and scholarship than to propaganda and rhetoric. Simple analysis of the relevant facts leads to certain conclusions:

1. Israel has a legitimate right to exist within secure borders, at peace with its neighbors.
2. The legitimate peaceful aspirations of Palestinians and other displaced persons can be negotiated.
3. There are legitimate concerns on both sides, and these have to be discussed civilly and resolved through negotiations.

SPME welcomes scholars from all disciplines, faith groups, and nationalities who share the desire for peace and the commitment to academic integrity and honest debate.

Currently, being a progressive and academically respected supporter of Israel on campus is not an easy task. Many progressives find themselves ostracized by colleagues (non-Jewish and Jewish) who continue to demonize Israel and minimize the actions, calls for genocide, and agenda of the Palestinian Authority and Israel's avowed enemies, such as Iran.

Euphoria and Reality

SPME believes that many academics sustain an unrealistic euphoria about peace. Academics were caught unaware by the outbreak of the Second Intifada and the rejection of all previous peace attempts. They were similarly taken aback by the election of Hamas to rule the Palestinian Authority.

Many academics supported Shimon Peres, Yitzhak Rabin, and Ehud Barak's negotiating far beyond what many, even progressives and moderates, thought was reasonable. Although many scholars blamed Ariel Sharon for the Second Intifada, it appears that the Palestinians had been planning it for some time. It could reasonably be assumed that Sharon's election resulted from the breakdown of negotiations, the absence of a negotiating partner in the Palestinian Authority, and the increased level of incitement and violence.

With the start of the Second Intifada, many academics came to understand that large amounts of money had been poured into American Middle East studies programs by forces hostile to Israel. Many well-established, anti-Israeli, Arab and Palestinian professors at American universities kept one-sidedly accusing Israel of brutality against the Palestinians.

Talking to All

SPME's approach is to work jointly with whoever is open to doing so and to support the efforts of faculty members within their institutions and disciplines. This is the only way to effect permanent change in academic institutions. Although pressure can come from outside bodies, academic institutions are, as noted, more responsive to their own faculty. Students and administrations come and go, but faculty members are permanent residents of these institutions and must be organized and encouraged to exert pressure from within.

SPME issues challenges to patently anti-Israeli or anti-Semitic academics and invites them to express their views on the SPME Faculty Forum and to present them at SPME conferences. They always decline. When SPME invited the best-known of them, Noam Chomsky, to write for the Faculty Forum, he refused.

Pro-Israeli Advocacy: Politically Incorrect

Pro-Israeli advocacy on campus has often become politically incorrect. At the University of Pennsylvania, Prof. Francisco Gil-White's work was acceptable to the faculty as long as he was a pro-Palestinian advocate. It was no longer so when his research led to different conclusions and he had a genuine conversion of views.²⁰

When that happened, according to Gil-White, his Jewish department head, Prof. Ian Lustick, told him he would not get tenure because of his activism—that is, a reexamination of his own previously held beliefs that he was sharing publicly on his website and elsewhere. In addition to providing Gil-White with collegial support, SPME helped him obtain legal advice and offered to peer-review his work and write on his behalf to his promotion and tenure committee.²¹

Free Speech or Act of Moral Turpitude?

When SPME was still in its embryonic stage, it became aware of Gordon Brubacher, professor of theology at Messiah College in Grantham, Pennsylvania, a small but influential Christian-fundamentalist institution that annually hosts Messianic Jewish festivals for students. Brubacher, who belongs to a group of pro-Palestinian, anti-Israeli activists called Christian Peacekeepers, claimed in lectures and elsewhere that he had been part of Israeli prime minister Benjamin Netanyahu's negotiating team at Wye Plantation in 1998.

In lectures to church groups and on campuses, Brubacher made extravagant inventions about his purported role as a negotiator and the agreements that were reached. Any reasonably educated person should have known that his story was concocted and mainly self-promoting. SPME contacted Netanyahu about the professor. He replied that he had never heard of him.

A Psychiatry-Journal Case

SPME also addresses anti-Israeli fabrications published by respectable journals. The *Canadian Journal of Psychiatry* printed an article by Tanya L. Zakrison, Amira Shahan, Shaban Mortaja, and Paul Hamel on the "Prevalence of Psychological Morbidity in West Bank Palestinian Children."²² The article appeared to use science to further a specifically political, scientifically undefined, and unjustified explanation for such morbidity—namely, blaming it on the Israeli occupation.

SPME investigated the article and the authors' backgrounds. It found repeated assertions not supported by the authors' own references, a lack of attention to available data that can explain the phenomenon, a failure to properly define terms, and conclusions based on unsubstantiated conjecture. The authors also seem to have used a nonstandardized scale, despite claiming the opposite, whose appropriateness for the population concerned is questionable. None of the authors appears to have the appropriate academic background in mental health disciplines, and the recurrent use of references that do not support their statements puts their credibility in question.

In the article, the authors did not discuss the Palestinian education system. They should have inquired into the high-risk morbidity effect of youngsters' religious education by Islamic-fundamentalist clergy. A child growing up to be a *shaheed* (suicide bomber), inculcated with the idea of dying for a goal, contributes to high-risk morbidity. None of this was mentioned by the authors.

Several SPME members reacted. Led by psychologist Irwin Mansdorf, formerly at Columbia University and now living in Israel, these academics exposed the article's flaws with Mansdorf preparing a comprehensive rebuttal. In his reaction to the article he stated:

Although the study in question involved research on the mental health of children, none of the authors seem to have any background or training in psychiatry, psychology or mental health. The lead author, Tanya L. Zakrison, is a junior surgery resident at the University of Toronto. The corresponding author is a microbiologist at the same university. The two junior authors from the Palestinian Al-Quds University are listed as research associates in public health and do not appear to have any previously published scientific papers. There is no mention of any expert in psychology, psychiatry, social work or mental health who was consulted with on this study. Both Tanya Zakrison and Paul Hamel are politically active, often working together, and are associated with movements that are typically hostile to Israel....²³

Q. Rae Grant, editor in chief of the *Canadian Journal of Psychiatry*, refused to publish Mansdorf's reaction. SPME then wrote to the executive director of the Canadian Psychiatric Association, requesting a thorough investigation of its concerns. He responded with a counterproposal to submit a five-hundred-word letter to the editor. The letter to the editor was finally published in October 2005.²⁴

Yet this academic journal is widely respected. A past president of the American Psychiatric Association and member of SPME, Paul Appelbaum, MD, then at University of Massachusetts Medical School and now at Columbia University College of Physicians and Surgeons, suggested that the article's quality was so poor it should never have been published in the first place, and reflected the bias of the editors, who teach psychiatry in significant venues.²⁵

It is important that such articles in academic journals be brought to SPME's attention. Leading pro-Israeli media watch organizations, such as CAMERA and HonestReporting, deal with general media but not with professional journals where attacks on Israel are becoming more and more blatant.

Another case began on 16 October 2004 when the weekly *British Medical Journal* published an opinion article by psychiatry professor Derek Summerfield called "Palestine: The Assault on Health and Other War Crimes."²⁶ SPME's Task Force on Medical and Public Health Issues, led by Prof. Steven Albert of the University of Pittsburgh School of Public Health, Prof. Gerald Steinberg of Bar-Ilan University, Mansdorf, and others, has prepared responses to that article as well.

The Problem of Too Few Mentors

Although SPME's membership is growing and there are increased funding opportunities to support its work, until recently too few university teachers have been willing to take the professional risks of pro-Israeli activity. This causes problems not only in generating the scholarship that is needed, but in sufficiently helping Jewish students who seek support. The 2006 boycott actions of NATFHE,

however, appear to have roused many academics, prompting a rise in the SPME Faculty Forum's readership from 800 to 6,100.

Wherever possible, SPME links students with sympathetic faculty members. Graduate students, or those doing doctoral work, need material that meets the quality of the research they are conducting.

One much-publicized issue concerned the meetings of the Palestinian Solidarity Movement and the corresponding Joint Israel Initiative at Duke University in October 2004. At the students' invitation, this author discussed what students and faculty could do within the academic system to address issues of anti-Israeli and anti-Semitic teaching and activity. The author explained that those violating the rules of academic free speech, which frequently crosses over into hate speech, could be held accountable, and this could be cause for dismissal.

In the ICC publication "Fighting Back" by Mitchell Bard, SPME discussed ways in which campus communities can resolve academic problems when they arise.²⁷

An Integral Part of the Campus

The essential difference between SPME and many other Jewish or pro-Israeli organizations is that it is an integral part of the campus. Many other organizations enter the campus, do effective high-impact work, then leave. They are not part of academic life, which is a world in itself.

Hillel has a strong presence on many campuses and its student professionals help students, faculty, and the community on Israel-related issues. Although they may be familiar with academic policies and governance, and can provide emotional and procedural advice to students, they frequently have no authority within faculty and academic-governance procedures. To this end, SPME faculty are frequently at the forefront of working directly with students and colleagues in challenging academic and institutional policies from within the internal governance. Moreover, Hillel reaches only a small segment of the Jewish campus community, whereas faculty affect many more students and colleagues. That is why there should be identifiable faculty chapters on campus to work within academic circles that are not always open to nonfaculty.

Rarely have Hillel professionals undergone the academic procedures of peer review for publications, promotion, and tenure. Hence, often they are not familiar with the university system and its rules on the local or national level. They frequently have less ability to provide counsel and support in academic procedural issues than a mentoring faculty member.

SPME welcomes interaction with the larger and more established community-advocacy organizations, including those non-Jewish organizations that support its goals.

Some larger groups now realize that the problems of anti-Israelism and anti-Semitism cannot be solved just through community and student advocacy, and

have become more interested in working with SPME. SPME is encouraged by its cooperative venture with the Jewish National Fund and hopes soon to find an administrative home on a major college campus. It also hopes to publish more conference proceedings that will be available to grassroots faculty. As mentioned earlier, SPME's mailing list has recently grown substantially.

SPME's work with faculty on campus is an essential part of improving Israel's standing in the educational arena. SPME's work can only be done by faculty, with faculty, for faculty, benefiting the entire academic community. SPME's work with faculty must be supported with the same level of enthusiasm that goes into supporting students, with the understanding that investing in scholarship is an investment in the entire academic community, not just in Jewish students, thereby promoting academic integrity and honest discussion about Israel.

Notes

1. The author wishes to acknowledge Mag. Dr. Ruth Contreras, Vienna Natural History Museum (retired), University of Vienna and SPME board secretary for her help with researching this paper.
2. Manfred Gerstenfeld, interview with Ed Beck, "Fighting Anti-Israelism and Anti-Semitism on the American College University Campus: Faculty Grassroots Efforts," *Post-Holocaust and Anti-Semitism*, No. 28, 2 January 2005, www.jcpa.org/phas/phas-28.htm.
3. SPME, www.spme.net.
4. http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Universities_and_antisemitism#France.
5. Laurie Zoloth, "Fear and Loathing at San Francisco State," in Ron Rosenbaum, ed., *Those Who Forget the Past* (New York: Random House, 2004), 1-3.
6. Lisa Huynh Ka Leo, "Mideast Stirs Up Feelings at UH: UH Professor Says There Is No Legal Basis for Israel," 27 June 2002, www.kaleo.org/vnews/display.v/ART/2002/06/27/3d1a6efdc42e2.
7. "The Legacy of Jean Paul Sartre," <http://weekly.ahram.org.eg/2003/623/op33.htm>4.
8. Don Atapattu, "A Conversation with Professor Norman Finkelstein: How to Lose Friends and Alienate People," *Counterpunch*, 13 December 2001, www.counterpunch.org/finkelstein1.html.
9. Letter to the editor, *Daily Collegian* (University of Massachusetts), 1995, cited in Shayndi Raice, "Government Groups Debate Meaning of Civil Rights Language," *Jewish Advocate Online*, 4 April 2006, www.thejewishadvocate.com/this_weeks_issue/news/?content_id=1091.
10. Letters to the editor, *Columbia Spectator*, [www.columbiaspectator.com/vnews/displ .../23/3cc51e18ef8b7?in_archive=1](http://www.columbiaspectator.com/vnews/displ.../23/3cc51e18ef8b7?in_archive=1).
11. Remarks attributed to Marc Ellis at various Sabeel conferences by StandWithUs.com.
12. Personal communications, 2003.
13. "In Ohio, Jews Take Leading Role in Organizing Anti-Israel Conference," *Jewish News of Northern California*, 2 November 2003, www.jewishsf.com/content/2-0-/module/displaystory/story_id/1184/edition_id/11/format/html/displaystory.html.
14. John Mearsheimer and Steven Walt, "The Israel Lobby," *London Review of Books*, 23 March 2006, www.lrb.co.uk/v28/n06/mear01_.html.
15. www.spme.net/cgi-bin/display_petitions.cgi?ID=9.

16. www.bioch.ox.ac.uk/aspsite/whatsnew/the_conference_that_never_happened.pdf; Michael Yudkin, "Academic Boycotts—The Conference That Never Happened," www.bioch.ox.ac.uk/aspsite/whatsnew/the_conference_that_never_happened.pdf; Stanley Dubinsky, "Academic Freedom of Boycotters of Israel: A Response to the AAUP Report in Academe," www.spme.net/cgi-bin/articles.cgi?ID=1118.
17. AAUP, "On Academic Boycotts," www.aaup.org/AAUP/pubsres/academe/2006/SO/Boycott/OnAcademicBoycotts.htm.
18. "DePaul Professor Suspended without a Hearing after Arguing with Students on Middle East Issues," www.thefire.org/index.php/article/5671.html?PHPSESSID=2d96f7ba735e15a94eb622d22a844fd8; "DePaul University: Professor Suspended for Expression without Due Process Case Materials," www.thefire.org/index.php/case/678.html; Letter from DePaul President Dennis H. Holtschneider to FIRE, 8 April 2005, www.thefire.org/pdfs/5670_3860.pdf; A Petition to Reinstate Professor Thomas Klocek to DePaul University with No Prejudice or Penalty, www.spme.net/cgi-bin/display_petitions.cgi?ID=3.
19. www.aaup.org/Com-a/index.htm.
20. "How Historical and Investigative Research (HIR) Came to Be," www.hirhome.com/bio.htm.
21. Personal communications (Francisco Gil-White), 2004.
22. Tanya L. Zakrison, Amira Shahan, Shaban Mortaja, and Paul Hamel, "Prevalence of Psychological Morbidity in West Bank Palestinian Children," *Canadian Journal of Psychiatry*, January 2004, www.cpa-apc.org/publications/archives/CJP/2004/January/zakrison.asp.
23. Irwin Mansdorf, "Biased Politics Masquerading as Science: Complicity of the *Canadian Journal of Psychiatry*," www.spme.net/cgi-bin/articles.cgi?ID=352.
24. *Canadian Journal of Psychiatry*, October 2005, www.cpa-apc.org/Publications/Archives/CJP/2005/october/cjp-oct-05-letters-july.pdf.
25. Personal communication, 2004.
26. Derek Summerfield, "Palestine: The Assault on Health and Other War Crimes," *British Medical Journal*, 16 October 2004.
27. Mitchell Bard, "Fighting Back," Israel on Campus Coalition.

Roz Rothstein

StandWithUs: A Grassroots Advocacy Organization Also on Campus

StandWithUs (SWU) is a registered nonprofit U.S. educational organization founded in 2001. It has a main office in Los Angeles and satellite offices in New York, Detroit, Michigan, and Jerusalem.¹

SWU's mission is to ensure balance and accuracy in coverage of the Arab-Israeli conflict and to combat the anti-Semitism that often flows from anti-Israeli presentations. SWU employs a staff to:

- Create educational materials including pamphlets, email alerts, weekly online bulletins, and informational websites
- Organize and host conferences and speakers at universities, high schools, libraries, churches, and communities
- Provide support and assistance to pro-Israeli groups in communities and on campuses

SWU's supporters all over the world receive regular email alerts and other online information about Israel from its global mailing list. Beyond the United States, the organization has created partnerships with pro-Israeli activists and Jewish student organizations at universities in the UK and other European countries, Canada, and Australia.

History of StandWithUs

The catalyst for establishing SWU was the 8 May 2001 murder of two Israeli teens, Koby Mandell and Yosef Ishran, by Palestinian terrorists. On 21 May, Jewish leaders met in Los Angeles to discuss their frustration over the local Jewish community's failure to respond to the crisis in Israel and to anti-Israeli bias in the media. Religious and lay leaders from all Jewish denominations were invited. Attendees included community professionals, lay leaders, and representatives from the Jewish Federation of Greater Los Angeles, the Pacific Southwest regional office of the Anti-Defamation League, Jews for Judaism, the Southern California Board of Rabbis, the Bureau of Jewish Education, and others.

There was wide-ranging debate at this initial meeting, but everyone strongly agreed on the need for a forceful Diaspora response against terrorism and in support of the people of Israel. Thus the idea of StandWithUs was

born. Originally named the Israel Emergency Alliance, it started as a volunteer educational organization.

SWU immediately began using the Internet to create a network of people who wanted to help disseminate accurate information about Israel. The initial website at StandWithUs.com invited readers to sign up for weekly alerts and advocacy guidance.

Community leaders worldwide were encouraged to bring educational-speaker programs to their cities, and Los Angeles quickly became a role model. SWU encouraged people to correct media errors and bias through letter-writing campaigns. Members wrote a detailed study documenting the pro-Palestinian slant in the *Los Angeles Times*, which it sent with a letter of protest to the paper's editorial board. SWU sent out weekly news alerts advising people how they could actively support Israel and Israelis and make sure that Israel's voice was represented in the media.

As SWU became better known, it began receiving a growing number of phone calls from Jewish university students concerned about anti-Israeli professors and radical student groups who were using the intifada as a springboard for one-sided attacks against Israel on campus. These students wanted help and guidance. SWU saw this as a priority and mobilized to respond. The organization developed a full array of educational materials, programs, and activist tools for campuses.

StandWithUs remained a volunteer organization until it received its federal U.S. tax-exempt status as a nonprofit educational organization in June 2002.

The Current Situation

Over the past few years, SWU has expanded its programs, activism, and outreach. Through weekly email alerts, SWU keeps its base of thousands abreast of developments in Israel and in the anti-Israeli campaigns. SWU often sends its "Action of the Week" dispatch to its members, which includes petitions and letter-writing campaigns.

All SWU's efforts are dedicated to ensuring that Israel's side of the story is heard and to countering misinformation and anti-Israeli defamation and propaganda. As part of its work the organization deconstructs accusations and documents the facts. Although SWU has been at the forefront in countering anti-Israeli bias and campaigns on college campuses, it has also intensified its efforts in the community, churches, libraries, and in elementary and high schools.

As a nonpartisan organization, SWU maintains relations with both Democrats and Republicans. It does not take a stand on Israeli politics or on solutions to the Arab-Israeli conflict. Its central messages explain the history of Zionism and Israel, and underscore that Israel is a democracy that has sought peace but needs to defend itself in an ongoing existential war with terrorists and historically hostile neighboring countries.

Ongoing funding has enabled the organization to hire graphic designers who develop printed materials, researchers who explore and write about current and historical facts, and a broad range of speakers who lecture at campuses in Europe and the United States. SWU speakers have included journalist Yossi Klein Halevi, author Michael Oren, former U.S. ambassador Alan Keyes, Egyptian American Nonie Darwish, Israeli Arab journalist Khaled Abu Toameh, Itamar Marcus of Palestinian Media Watch, Middle East expert Yossi Olmert, Prof. Alan Dershowitz, investigative journalist Steven Emerson, journalist David Gilbert, Muslim journalist Tashbih Sayeed, and others.

Funding has also enabled SWU to host conferences, make documentaries, hire full-time professionals who network with and assist students on campus, and to develop a range of online websites and resources, including www.StandWithUs.com, www.StandWithUsCampus.com, www.Stand4Facts, www.united4freedom.org, and www.learnIsrael.com.

In the last five years, SWU has partnered with many organizations such as the Simon Wiesenthal Center, American Jewish Congress, Jewish Federation of Greater Los Angeles, Jewish Community Foundation of Los Angeles, Campaign for Accurate Middle East Reporting in America (CAMERA), AIPAC, ZOA, Palestinian Media Watch (PMW), and the Consulate General of Israel in Los Angeles and other cities. SWU has also collaborated with Hasbara Fellowships, Hillel, Eagle's Wings, the David Project, Jewish Community Relations councils, Yavneh Olami, Natan Sharansky's Back to the Campus program, the World Union of Jewish Students, the Israel Project, the Israel Christian Nexus, and Caravan for Democracy to bring educational programs to campuses and communities or to combat anti-Israeli rhetoric.

As it grew, SWU opened chapters in New York, San Francisco, Detroit, and Jerusalem. The Jerusalem chapter has developed partnerships with organizations in Israel and pro-Israeli organizations across Europe, including Tribe in the UK, which deals with Jewish student life in British high schools and universities. These worldwide activities are coordinated with SWU's director of Israel and European operations, who heads the Jerusalem office, in partnership with the SWU leadership in Los Angeles.

Publications and Printed Materials

SWU has produced a "black brochure," which is a brief but comprehensive explanation of the prominent topics about Israel. Five hundred thousand brochures have been circulated and they are available in English, Hebrew, French, and Spanish. SWU will issue a new forty-page brochure that will address Israel's founding and history up to the present, elaborating the black brochure. This new booklet, with pictures, maps, timelines, and questions and answers, is designed for high school teachers, college students, and community activists.

SWU also produces informational flyers and pamphlets that counter specific

accusations that have been leveled against Israel, from the purported Jenin massacre to the security barrier and the false charge of apartheid to anti-Israeli activists' efforts to turn Rachel Corrie into a martyr while ignoring all the Israeli victims of terrorist attacks.

The flyers and pamphlets, which can be downloaded and used by activists worldwide, address more general issues such as:

- Israel's record on human rights including how women are treated in Israel compared to Arab countries
- General political and civil rights in Israel compared to rights of citizens of Arab countries
- The protections and rights afforded Israeli gays and lesbians and Palestinian homosexuals who seek refuge in Israel from homophobic persecution in the Palestinian Authority
- Maps comparing Israel's size with the rest of the Arab world to counter the effort to turn Israel into a Goliath
- Israel's global outreach and humanitarian impact through its biomedical and technological innovations
- Photographs documenting incitement and indoctrination of Palestinian children, such as children dressed in military garb and in terrorist training camps
- The Black September massacre at the 1972 Olympics to correct misconceptions spawned by Steven Spielberg's *Munich*

Public Opinion on the Arab-Israeli Conflict

The public relations campaign against Israel has taken many forms and erupted in many places. The divestment and boycott movements are especially troublesome because even when institutions do not accept divestment policy, the campaigns work to spread anti-Israeli defamations, particularly that Israel is an "apartheid state." SWU has actively countered these efforts to malign Israel.

SWU has addressed such campaigns in mainline Christian churches and in the American Library Association. It has countered the Campaign to Persuade Caterpillar to Boycott Israel. It has participated in the petition asking that the anti-Israeli film *Paradise Now* be removed from the Academy Award's Best Foreign Film Category. It also took part in the demonstrations against the International Court of Justice and against terrorism near the Peace Palace in The Hague. In 2004, 2005, and 2006, SWU representatives attended the Palestine Solidarity Movement's annual conferences and wrote detailed reports about the group's agenda for the coming year and its extremism.

SWU formed a new department and program to counter this trend, www.LearnIsrael.org, whose mission is to ensure that Israel's viewpoint is represented fairly in U.S. libraries through books, periodicals, audiovisuals, and online

resources. This new effort enhances library collections with moderate materials, and has distributed free pro-Israeli items to more than 1,500 U.S. libraries since January 2005. SWU has distributed DVDs and books such as Natan Sharansky's *The Case for Democracy*, Alan Dershowitz's *The Case for Israel*, and the photo book *Israel in the World*. For children, SWU has disseminated free CDs of *Israel 4 Kids*, which offers a virtual tour of Israel with the popular Israeli cartoon character Srulik. Also available through Learn Israel are lesson plans developed by SWU for teachers (K-12) on Israel's history and contributions to the world.

SWU also has a group of skilled writers who send letters to the media about misinformation or lack of balance in their coverage of Israel-related occurrences. Additionally, SWU has bilingual activists who monitor the Spanish-language press and write op-eds and letters to the editor.

Anti-Israeli Extremism at Universities

SWU has focused especially on university campuses where anti-Israeli extremism erupted in 2000 and intensified in the following years. Anti-Israeli groups such as Students for Justice in Palestine, the Palestine Solidarity Movement, and the Muslim Student Union joined forces to invite anti-Israeli speakers, hold demonstrations, and plan anti-Israeli events at universities such as the University of California, where there was a program called "Holocaust in the Holy Land" in May 2006.

Anti-Israeli faculty are also an issue. Imbued with post-Zionist scholarship and Edward Said's ideology, they spread anti-Israeli bias in the classroom and in their writings, leaving many Jewish students feeling intimidated. Often, university administrations remain silent and refuse to set standards about hate speech though doing so would not violate free-speech protections.

To combat these problems in the United States and abroad, SWU developed a multipronged approach.

- *Educational materials.* The SWU literature, black brochure, pamphlets, and flyers give students facts and arguments to shore up their own understanding, educate their peers, and to distribute at anti-Israeli events. SWU also developed a password-protected website, www.Stand4Facts.org, that profiles anti-Israeli speakers and professors, provides downloadable flyers, questions, and facts to counter their main points, and supplies materials exposing their extremism or falsehoods.
- *Pro-Israeli speakers and events.* SWU started a speakers' bureau, www.United4Freedom.com, and helps plan and fund speaking events where students learn facts and a more balanced approach to the conflict. SWU has brought over a hundred speakers to campuses in North America, and dozens of speaker programs to students from various countries in Israel and Europe.

- *Advocacy and leadership training.* SWU holds annual and semiannual weekend conferences for students to learn writing and speaking skills and facts. Professional historians and experts lead the workshops. In the past few years, these conferences have attracted Jewish and non-Jewish student leaders from all over the United States, Canada, Australia, and Britain.
- *Writing to university administrators.* SWU has never asked that anti-Israeli speakers not be allowed to lecture. However, it has appealed to administrators to condemn hate speech and to ensure that moderate speakers are also invited to campus who will present the other side of the issues.
- *Supporting pro-Israeli activists on campus.* Through its campus professionals, SWU maintains communication with pro-Israeli students, offering advice, possible speaker events, general support, and educational materials.

Informing the Public

SWU turned to documentary filmmaking and produced *Tolerating Intolerance: Hate Speech on Campus*. It showcases anti-Israeli speakers and their toxic language against Israel specifically and Jews worldwide. The documentary also includes comments from well-known Israeli American Judea Pearl, father of Daniel Pearl who was murdered in Pakistan; author Michael Oren; investigative journalist Steve Emerson; and other professionals from organizations such as Hillel and ADL. The film premiered at the Writers Guild Theater in Beverly Hills in September 2005 and is regularly screened to student and community groups all over the United States and Israel.

SWU continues to document extensively, through video, audio, and photos, a range of anti-Israeli speakers who claim that Jews control the media, suggest that students purge themselves of the “Zionists” among their social and political group, and so on.

The organization has also sponsored events to remind the Jewish community and the public about terrorism and the campaign against Israel. In January 2005, SWU brought Bus 19—boarded by a suicide bomber in Jerusalem in January 2004, killing eleven people—to various cities in California so that people could see its skeletal remains. The bus attracted attention—and also condemnation from anti-Israeli activists—when it was displayed at the University of California-Irvine. Bus 19 was also displayed outside the Museum of Tolerance in Los Angeles in a joint program with the Simon Wiesenthal Center before a crowd of over a thousand, which included families of victims of terrorism as well as twenty-five diplomats representing countries all over the world.

SWU has also led annual trips to Israel where activists meet with top government officials, think tanks, journalists, and victims of terrorism.

Conclusion

Like all nations of the world, Israel can be legitimately criticized. Anti-Israeli propagandists, however, work constantly to misinform people who often are naive about Israel's history and security requirements. When criticism of Israel becomes obsessive and toxic, it veers into anti-Semitism. Often issues such as divestment or anti-Zionism are cloaks for demonizing Israel and, in many cases, Jews in general.

SWU believes it is essential to educate people by correcting hateful exaggerations and half-truths advanced in communities, campuses, churches, and media. Education is the key to creating understanding, promoting peaceful solutions, and restoring balance and reason to discussions about the Palestinian-Israeli conflict.

Notes

1. For security reasons, office addresses are not listed publicly.

Alain Goldschläger

The Canadian Campus Scene

A number of North American and European universities have been far from innocent bystanders in a politically motivated, disingenuous debate taking place on campus that denies the authenticity of the Holocaust. A hesitation to act is also evident when openly anti-Semitic material is disseminated on campus grounds, or flyers are posted describing the Middle East conflict in the most repugnant anti-Israeli terms.

In one particularly egregious example, the Solidarity for Palestinian Human Rights (SPHR) student group at York University in Toronto in March 2003 included on its display table a yellow Star of David inscribed with slogans referring to ethnic cleansing. The desecration of the Jewish star, a Jewish religious symbol, in and of itself an act of anti-Semitism, was made even more abhorrent by the deliberate painting of the star yellow, a reference to the forced ghettoization of Jews during the Holocaust. Campus officials and security passively allowed the display, with city police standing by in an effort to keep the peace.¹

Universities do not object when the very legitimacy of the existence of the Jewish state is rejected, as has been the case during Israel Apartheid Week events held in 2006 on campuses in Toronto, Kitchener-Waterloo, and Montreal. No universities have protested when speakers have blamed the creation of Israel on what they present as the “false news of the Shoah” or the “Holocaust hoax.”² That was the case when Holocaust denier Lenni Brenner was allowed to address a student group at the University of Waterloo in 2005.³

Bowing to internal and social pressure, the Canadian higher educational system generally stays silent when campus-based campaigns brand Israel as the international scapegoat, in much the same way as the medieval imagery of “traditional” anti-Semitism used the Jew as the scapegoat for all evil.

A Stage for Disgraceful Events

Canada has been the stage for disgraceful events on campus, such as when former Israeli prime minister Benjamin Netanyahu was prevented by violent rioters from speaking at Concordia University in Montreal on 9 September 2002. Ehud Barak, also a former Israeli prime minister, was subsequently prevented from speaking at Concordia based on the university’s assessment that threats of further violence by anti-Israeli protesters would materialize.⁴ Attempts were then made in late 2002, with the complicity of the Concordia Student Union (CSU), to shut down Hillel, the only officially recognized Jewish body on campus.⁵ The charge was

that Hillel was allegedly distributing materials on campus recruiting overseas volunteers for the Israeli military, which the CSU claimed violated Canada's Foreign Enlistment Act.⁶

In 2004, tensions were high at the University of British Columbia when Israel's ambassador to Canada, and later the Middle East scholar Daniel Pipes, came to speak.⁷ Its student newspaper noted that a public appearance by Noam Chomsky in Vancouver, while not on the campus itself, was widely attended by students and also supported by the Alma Mater Society of the university. This was despite protests by Jewish groups that Chomsky's rhetoric contained Holocaust denial and anti-Semitic references.⁸

Daniel Pipes's appearance at York University in 2004 sparked protest. The faculty association of the university joined in objecting to his presence, yet remained silent when a visiting academic called Jews "little Hitlers" in the same period.⁹ Similarly, the visiting Israeli consul-general was prevented by protesters from speaking at Simon Fraser University in British Columbia in 2004.¹⁰

Thus, Jewish students have been forced to accept an atmosphere in which they cannot openly express or explore religious or national dimensions of Jewish identity. At the same time, they are daily exposed to the open hostility of anti-Zionist groups. They have responded by lying low, limiting their programming to social and cultural events rather than political discussion, and in some cases ceasing to wear distinctively Jewish items such as kippas or Star of David jewelry.¹¹ This may have led to fewer overtly anti-Semitic incidents reported on campus, but at the price of a Jewish student body intimidated into silence.

Other hostile actions are less publicly visible but no less effective. Groups on Canadian campuses are currently promoting the idea that it is inappropriate for "Israeli soldiers" to lecture to Canadian students. This has a sweeping significance since almost all Israeli visiting professors are still in the reserves.

Applying Double Standards to Free Speech

It is always claimed that universities must remain an open forum for discussing the most diverse and provocative ideas when the issue is anti-Zionist discourse. Yet, in today's climate on Canadian campuses, the principle of free speech is applied differently when it comes to allowing Jewish students to host pro-Israeli speakers.

For example, in 2004 Concordia University—where, as mentioned, lectures by two former Israeli prime ministers were prevented—allowed Michael Tarazi, lawyer for the Palestine Liberation Organization, to speak in the heart of the campus.¹² Similarly, Holocaust-distorter Norman Finkelstein was allowed to speak there at another event that year sponsored by Palestinian student groups.¹³

The message of the Arab propaganda machine on campus changes very little, regardless of developments in the Middle East. All events and circumstances are described from the sole perspective of condemning Israel. There is little promotion

of dialogue except with Jewish groups that are avowedly anti-Israeli such as the Jewish Women's Committee to End the Occupation.

There is no effort to balance the analysis of key issues, as seen in the single focus of the abovementioned Israel Apartheid Week events. The titles used for the lectures during these events speak for themselves: "Apartheid: North America, South Africa, and the Israeli Connection," "Palestinian Refugees and Apartheid in 1948 Occupied Palestine," "Apartheid in 1967 Occupied Palestine," "Boycott, Divestment, Sanctions: Building an Anti-Apartheid Movement in Canada," "Resisting Apartheid: A Global Struggle," "Demonstration against Canadian Support for Israeli Apartheid," "Poetry Slam for a Global Intifada (Uprising)."¹⁴

Ultimately, the "final solution" offered, whether openly or by implication, is the destruction of Israel as a Jewish state. This view was asserted by a number of speakers at the 2005 Apartheid Week at the University of Toronto. One speaker responded to a question by asserting: "Terrorism will end when apartheid ends."¹⁵

Those attitudes, contravening as they do the spirit and purpose of university education, which should require analysis of all aspects of an issue, have become an impediment to any clear understanding of Middle Eastern politics. Yet most administrations have sought to minimize any possible confrontation, preferring to quietly accept the situation rather than take a stand to defend a minority.¹⁶

Jewish Students under Siege

Jewish students feel more and more under siege, distressed not only by the constant anti-Israeli images plastering the corridors but also by the prevailing tone of campus discourse. As one group noted, "An increasing number of students in universities and colleges say that they fear reprisals if they challenge prevailing pro-Palestinian, anti-Israel views. If they argue that Israel has the right to exist, they are often greeted with threats, even physical assault."¹⁷

A case at York University involved a harassment complaint by a Jewish student against a professor. The case illustrates that it is in classroom settings that Jewish students often face the most pervasive intimidation, whether subtle or more blatant. This complaint was based initially on an exam question worded in such a way that students had no option but to accept a premise demonizing Israel.

The student also complained that on raising concerns directly with the professor, the latter dismissed the claim using offensive words and anti-Semitic remarks. The report by the university ombudsman's office found that the procedure followed by administrators in investigating the student's complaint was so unclear and ineffective that the student's rights had been prejudiced. In addition, ombudsman personnel in explaining delays and difficulties they were experiencing in pursuing the matter, indicated that the process may have been obstructed by the teachers union and by university officials.¹⁸

A staff member of the ombudsman's office acknowledged that very few students (Jewish or not) have the persistence to press their complaints given the obstacles of the system. Cases on campuses elsewhere confirm that this is not a unique problem. Currently there is no adequate, protective framework for complaints of this nature; instead, students are subjected to intimidation and the stress of repeated delays.

A case from the University of Victoria's Department of Social Work is also illustrative of the harassment faced by Jewish students. In 2003, a professor of social work posted anti-Israeli material to the department's official website. On receiving complaints, the director of the department moved quickly to address the situation by ensuring that the posting was taken down and issuing an apology to all students. The open letter of apology noted that: "It was not the intention of School Council to offend anyone or to contribute to a chilly climate for Jewish students, staff or academics at UVic."¹⁹

Anti-Zionism Not a Ground for Complaint

A related problem is that the inherent racism of anti-Zionism is not recognized, and anti-Zionism is not treated as a legitimate ground for complaint. In the above-cited harassment case at York University, the focus of the investigation was whether the professor had expressed overt anti-Semitism in responding to the student.²⁰

Few Canadian campuses are immune to a barrage of anti-Israeli propaganda that inevitably seeps into the classroom. Although Concordia University has attracted the lion's share of media attention following the riots there in 2002, it is only the tip of the iceberg. York University and the University of Toronto, which have rather large and organized Jewish student groups or organizations, are regularly arenas of confrontation and intimidation, and at other campuses across the country defending the Jewish state is unwelcome. B'nai Brith Canada's League for Human Rights has received complaints about specific professors at York University who silence students in class for defending Israel. The League's *2003 Audit of Antisemitic Incidents*, for example, reported anti-Semitic canards by York University faculty members.²¹

In 2003, Michael Neumann, professor of philosophy at Trent University in Ontario, published an article in the online magazine *CounterPunch* in which he wrote: "We should almost never take anti-Semitism seriously, and maybe we should have some fun with it." He also asserted that all Jews around the world who do not explicitly condemn Israel are "complicit in its crimes."²²

This same professor, in an email conversation that followed this incident, wrote that his sole concern was to "help the Palestinians." He continued:

I am not interested in the truth, or justice, or understanding, or anything else, except so far as it serves that purpose.... If an effective strategy means that

some truths about the Jews don't come to light, I don't care. If an effective strategy means encouraging reasonable anti-Semitism, or reasonable hostility to Jews, I also don't care. If it means encouraging vicious racist anti-Semitism, or the destruction of the State of Israel, I still don't care.²³

Such views are expressed in the classroom as well. A professor teaching a course on critical thinking at the University of Toronto initiated a discussion on the theory that the 9/11 attacks were a "Jewish-perpetrated plot." Many students agreed with this viewpoint, and it appears that the teacher also endorsed it.²⁴

Another University of Toronto professor told her students that the Jews use the Holocaust as a trumped-up excuse to avoid criticism. Such incidents go largely unreported for fear of reprisals affecting academic standing.²⁵

Many Jewish students are experiencing today the exclusionary situation of their ancestors and have to make the same choice: to remain silent in exchange for relative peace and the assurance of academic standing, or to incur social disapproval, harassment in and outside the classroom, and in some cases sanctions by the student union or campus authorities. Both nationally and on an institutional basis, many Jewish professors share the same feelings of isolation and powerlessness. They may be few in number at certain universities, separated from each other by departmental barriers, and concerned over such issues as tenure and avoiding confrontation in the work environment.

The contract of an academic at a Canadian university was not renewed following complaints by Arab students that he had been too "pro-Israel."²⁶ Yet this author is not aware of any cases of anti-Zionist professors who have been in any way sanctioned, let alone dismissed, for engaging in or allowing the expression of virulently anti-Israeli views, sometimes in classes having no connection to Middle Eastern politics.

Support Groups for Academics

In reaction to the pressures on Jewish faculty members, there have been renewed attempts to create a support group for academics along the lines of the now-defunct Canadian Professors for Peace in the Middle East (CPPME) or the Canada-Israel Foundation for Academic Exchange (CIFA). These organizations enjoyed considerable success in the past, and reviving them has become even more important in today's campus environment.

The present situation on the Canadian campus largely stems from the attitudes of most faculty members. As in all situations of conflict, there are three parties: the perpetrators, the victims, and the bystanders. Most faculty members tend to stay safely on the sidelines, allowing the extremists to take center stage and often seeking ways to appease them.

Numerical Imbalance between Muslims and Jews

The numerical imbalance between the Jewish groups on the one hand and the multiple pro-Palestinian and Arab-Muslim groups on the other means the latter have almost a totally free hand. All courses dealing with the Middle East or with social, cultural, or religious subjects require the strictest application of political correctness—in other words, not offending Arab-Muslim sensibilities.

For example, a professor at the University of Western Ontario accepted a map of the Middle East presented by a student that excluded Israel. He explained that he was “willing to accept a map not describing disputed lands so as not to offend any party.”²⁷

In another case, a professor at St. Mary’s University in Halifax wanted to display the controversial Danish cartoons to initiate a debate on free speech. The university, however, demanded the removal of the cartoons because “there are concerns that people may see them and might be offended by them and may be terribly upset by them, and given that we thought that was a good enough reason to ask him to take them down.”²⁸ This type of reaction was repeated on other campuses. For example, administrators at the University of Prince Edward Island ordered the university student paper to be taken out of circulation after it published the cartoons.²⁹

It is indeed inappropriate to publish cartoons that hurt the sensibilities of any religious or other minority group. Yet universities have often been lax about material that offends Jewish students.

Holocaust Denial

In 2004, the University of Ottawa deemed the website of one its professors acceptable even though it included material on conspiracy theories against Jews and Holocaust denial and was upsetting to Jewish students.³⁰ Although some of the most gratuitously offensive material was subsequently removed after a complaint by the League for Human Rights, the university itself in its letter of response to the League refused to intervene.

Although few professors directly take revisionist positions, some do not hesitate to introduce revisionist arguments in class or to entertain such arguments from their students. Such revisionist arguments include statements such as: “the number of dead is grossly exaggerated,” “the rumor is that only few Jews died,” “sickness is the major reason for these deaths,” “let’s look at the Jews’ responsibility for their own demise,” “what are the reasons the Nazis had to take action against the Jews?”³¹

Teachers, using innuendo or even dismissive shrugs and skeptical facial expressions, can exploit their standing as educators and supposed guardians of truth and history to instill doubts on the veracity of the Holocaust.

Other Holocaust Manipulations

Professors may also subtly encourage a pernicious, retrospective rereading of the Holocaust so that World War II events are viewed from the standpoint of the current Arab-Israeli conflict. Accepting more or less openly the view that Israel's establishment was the consequence of a European struggle, they promote false parallels between mass atrocities against Jews during the Holocaust and Israel's actions toward the Palestinians.

This leads to portraying the Palestinians as the new "Auschwitz victims." Professors go on to characterize all violence coming from the Arab side as legitimate and excusable, and all Israeli actions as aggressive and intended to inflict maximum suffering and humiliation. For example, as mentioned above, in 2003 a University of Victoria social-work professor published one-sided distortions of Middle East politics on the department's website.³²

Indeed, the new standard for demonstrating tolerance of minorities in Canadian society is to accord legitimacy to all Arab claims and promote unquestioning acceptance of all forms of Islam while ignoring the most reactionary aspects. At the same time, the fashionable approach is to condemn the Jewish state in all its facets while ignoring even its most obviously positive features.

Islamophilia and Betraying the University's Mission

Expediency, willful blindness, and self-righteousness are all too often the reality in today's Canadian universities when it comes to Israel, Jewish issues, and the treatment of Judaic traditions. These attitudes filter into the classroom in subtle and less subtle ways, poisoning the intellectual atmosphere. As noted, the attitudes are particularly damaging because they penetrate various fields of study including those totally unconnected to Middle Eastern politics.

A profound Islamophilia has taken root in the academic world. Total acceptance becomes the path to redemption for the past errors of the West, which are seen as colonialism, commercial exploitation, Canada's part in the war against terrorism, and even the acts of the Crusaders.

Racism in the Name of Tolerance

Some use these positions to justify a form of Judeophobia disguised as anti-Zionism. For instance, even the most extreme expressions of anti-Semitism emanating from the Arab world are not denounced as racist but are accepted as part of the outcry of an oppressed people. As pointed out by Pierre-André Taguieff, the French expert on racism: "Intolerance has learned a new language of tolerance and shows itself even more efficient when it is not recognized as such."

Thus, in the name of tolerance, understanding, and concern for the weak, many intellectuals defend racist and anti-Semitic statements, and even acts of violence and terror. Often, scholars critical of Jewish and Christian religious texts are reluctant to question the content of sacred Islamic texts, which extremists manipulate to justify appalling statements and actions. Criticism of the misapplication of principles is invariably seen as manifesting racism and xenophobia.

Some professors are uneasy in general about discussing matters pertaining to religion in the classroom. They avoid questioning politically dominant positions and end up accepting everything in the name of tolerance.

Essentially, a virulently anti-Israeli discourse incorporating strong anti-Semitic elements has infiltrated the far-Left-leaning world of Canadian academia, beginning to rival the longstanding far-Right fringe. As in Europe, denunciation of Israel has become an acceptable expression of Jew-hatred in Canada.

It is important to understand how the “oldest hatred” of anti-Semitism is mutating in this context, and how it is permeating beyond the campus into every aspect of society.

Notes

1. League for Human Rights of B'nai Brith Canada, *2003 Audit of Antisemitic Incidents*, 11.
2. For further explanation of how Holocaust deniers claim that the myth of the Holocaust was created to achieve certain gains, see the Nizkor website: http://64.233.167.104/search?q=cache:doXwftel_UYJ:www.nizkor.org/faqs/leuchter/leuchter-faq-21.html+israel+created+holocaust+hoax&hl=en&ct=clnk&cd=1&gl=ca.
3. For explanation of the term Holocaust denier/denial, see www.jewishvirtuallibrary.org/jsource/Holocaust/denialbrief.html.
4. See the statement by the Concordia administration, <http://news.concordia.ca/administration/002791.shtml>.
5. www.cbc.ca/stories/2002/12/05/concordia021205.
6. Sheryl Elias, “A New Challenge for Jewish College Students Facing Both Brazen and Subtle Attacks,” *Emunah Magazine*, 23 June 2004, www.emunah.org/magazine_comments.php?id=P79_0_4_0_C.
7. www.ubyssey.bc.ca/article.shtml?/20040407/newsReview.htmlf.
8. Ibid.
9. www.campus-watch.org/article/id/533.
10. “‘There’s no doubt that the situation at SFU is dire in the sense of both anti-Israel and anti-Semitic perceptions,’ said Eyal Lichtmann, director of Hillel Vancouver. ‘The situation that occurred with Ya’acov Brosh, the Israeli consul-general, was a perfect example of that, where anti-Israel groups were capable of shutting him down.’” Pat Johnson, “Refuge for Jews at SFU,” *Jewish Western Bulletin*, 27 August 2004.
11. Cases of such evasive behavior were reported to B'nai Brith Canada and documented in its annual audits of anti-Semitic incidents as far back as 2001. On an Internet forum, a student reports that two Jewish students from the University of Montreal said that: “The ‘myth’ of the Holocaust was created solely for the financial benefit of Israel.”

“The Quebecois unquestionably accept, in large numbers, the well greased slogans of Palestians [*sic*] and other Arab activists.” Jewish students are a minority on these campuses and the fear factor leads Jewish students to remain mute, to fellow students, teachers, or administrators, of their concerns of racism, and anti-semitism veiled behind anti-israel positions presented in class and with-in [*sic*] this institute of higher learning.

www.danielpipes.org/comments/11325.

12. Michael Tarazi was welcomed at the University of Toronto, Concordia University, and the University of Western Ontario that year, www.masses.tao.ca/pipermail/act-mtl/2004-October/000764.html.
13. www.normanfinkelstein.com/content.php?pg=9.
14. “Even if you wanted to claim that the Holocaust was the worst suffering ever endured [by a people], you would be hard-pressed to make a moral argument for the state of Israel,” <http://oat.tao.ca/israeliapartheid>.
15. Lisa Anthony, “Ostracized on My Own Campus,” *Jewish Tribune*, February 2005.
16. Vice-Provost David Farrar of the University of Toronto, when asked to recognize the hatred at the root of Apartheid Week, responded:

“The very fact that the Arab Students’ Collective and other campus groups exist speaks to a central value of the U of T,” he said. “As an academic community we have a fundamental commitment to the principles of freedom of inquiry, freedom of speech and freedom of association.” As well, he added, “the fact that the university creates an environment where a recognized student group can express a view on a controversial subject does not mean that the university itself has expressed any view whatsoever.”

“Arab Events Draw Ire—B’nai Brith: It’s Almost ‘Hate Fest’—Free Speech Vital, Says U of T Official,” *Toronto Star*, 22 January 2005.

17. *Globe and Mail*, 17 December 2002, ad placed by activist group called Solidarity with Jews at Risk and supported by one hundred prominent Canadians.
18. As documented in the archives of the League for Human Rights of B’nai Brith Canada.
19. League for Human Rights of B’nai Brith Canada, *2003 Audit*, as further documented in the league’s archives.
20. Ibid.
21. League for Human Rights of B’nai Brith Canada, *2003 Audit*, www.bnaibrith.ca/publications/audit2003/audit2003-00.html.
22. Michael Neumann, “What Is Anti-Semitism?” *CounterPunch*, 4 June 2002, www.counterpunch.org/neumann0604.html. See also “Criticism of Israel Is Not Anti-Semitism,” *CounterPunch*, 30 December 2003, www.counterpunch.org/neumann12302003.html.
23. As documented in the archives of the League for Human Rights of B’nai Brith Canada.
24. Ibid.
25. Ibid.
26. Ibid. Details were provided under an undertaking of confidentiality.
27. This comment was reported to the author by a Jewish student in the class who spoke on condition of anonymity for fear of reprisals affecting his academic standing.
28. University vice-president Chuck Bridges, CBC, 8 February 2006.
29. www.cbc.ca/story/canada/national/2006/02/08/cartoons-smu-prof.html.
30. League for Human Rights of B’nai Brith Canada, *2005 Audit of Antisemitic Incidents*. See also www.jewishtribune.ca/tribune/jt-050825-05.html.
31. As documented in the archives of the League for Human Rights of B’nai Brith Canada.
32. See note 19.

Corinne Berzon

Anti-Israeli Activity at Concordia University 2000-2003

Concordia: A History

Concordia University came into existence in 1974 with the merger of the originally Jesuit-run Loyola College and the YMCA-based Sir George Williams University. The two schools came together under the name Concordia, which was borrowed from the motto of the city of Montreal, *Concordia salus* (wellbeing through harmony).¹ To this day the separate campuses are maintained with a free shuttle bus transporting students and staff back and forth between the two. Concordia is one of two English-language universities in Montreal, the other being McGill.

Concordia's motto, "A real education for the real world," is apt; it is home to more than 3,500 international students and over eleven thousand part-time students in a student body of thirty thousand.² This accessible education is what originally drew many Jews to attend Concordia at a time when most North American universities, including McGill, had quotas for Jews. Nowadays, with a contingent of approximately four thousand Arab students outnumbering the Jewish population by more than four to one,³ the tensions between pro-Israeli and pro-Palestinian groups have come to reflect the conflict that Israel faces among its numerous Arab neighbors.

Student Activism at Concordia

Concordia has long been considered the Anglophone working man's university, and has also become a politically aware and active campus. Contributing to its activist tendencies is the larger backdrop of the Quebec Federation of University Students, which is a subsidiary of a national federation representing more than 450,000 students. Student unions in Canada, including Concordia's, are accredited and possess the same power and independence as any labor union. In Quebec the student unions are especially active; the most notable recent case was a provincewide strike that drew more than two hundred thousand students at its peak, in protest against funding cuts and tuition hikes. In this wider environment, Concordia gradually developed into a radical, extreme-Left campus.

The first incidence of student violence at Concordia came well before its 1974 merger. It was the largest student riot in Canadian history, superseded only by the more recent one at Concordia in 2002. Beginning on 29 January 1969,

over two hundred students occupied the university's computer lab at Sir George Williams University. The sit-in was in protest at the university administration's inaction on allegations of racism against a professor. The students stormed the computer lab on the eighth floor of the downtown Montreal campus, throwing thousands of punch cards from the windows.

In light of the university's history, the events targeting Israel and often Jews are characterized by many as straightforward antiracist, leftist activism in defense of an oppressed indigenous minority persecuted by "Zionist apartheid." The pro-Palestinian faction has often crossed the line into anti-Semitic rhetoric. For many the university became a paradigm of anti-Jewish and anti-Israeli campus activity. This was a gradual process at Concordia, climaxing in September 2002 with a riot protesting Hillel's attempt to bring former Israeli prime minister Benjamin Netanyahu to speak. The ongoing battle between pro- and anti-Israeli factions at Concordia was not diffused by this violence, nor by the involvement of the Jewish community at large. Indeed, the confrontation continues.

Tensions Rise on Campus

Concordia University announced its entrance into Middle East politics in November 2000. The student union, in conjunction with the student group Solidarity for Palestinian Human Rights (SPHR), called for a general assembly to support UN motions against Israel and demand Israel's immediate withdrawal from the territories. At this time SPHR was also handing out copies of an article from the *Journal of Historical Review*, known for Holocaust denial, alleging that Israel was developing an ethnic bomb to kill Arabs.⁴

Throughout the 2000-2001 school year, the leftist student union attempted to rally support for the Palestinian cause. In the subsequent elections another left-wing student government prevailed, vowing to "continue the fight for Palestine."⁵ As in many other campuses throughout the Western world, the Palestinian cause appealed to left-wing student groups and activists.

By September 2001, the pro- and anti-Israeli camps became visible and active when the leftist student organization ACCESS released the student calendar titled "Uprising."⁶ The first page prominently displayed a poem called "Intifada" that called for violent revolution against any form of authority, and throughout the calendar, days were marked by radical statements. Canada Day called for students to burn the national flag; Thanksgiving demanded action against imperialist symbols in Canada. There were also many articles encouraging theft, intravenous drug use, vandalism, and the destruction of churches.⁷

Most relevant to the future violence against Jews at Concordia was the agenda's unequivocal denial of Israel's right to exist. On Israel's Independence Day the word Al-Naqbah ("the catastrophe" in Arabic) was written together with an inflammatory article titled "What It Means to Be a Palestinian" that made numerous accusations against Israel.⁸

Widespread outrage over the handbook throughout the university community went unanswered by the Concordia Student Union (CSU). Most shocking was a page depicting airplanes crashing through the windows of an office building; the handbook was distributed just before 9/11.⁹ After condemnations by Hillel and the university administration, and a request by Rector Frederick Lowy to launch an independent inquiry into the CSU, the elected president of the student union, Sabrina Stea, resigned amid a hail of accusations that the union was being repressed.¹⁰

Earlier in the year, on 21 August, two student activists named Tom Keefer and Laith Marouf were banned from campus for spray-painting anti-Semitic slogans on school property and threatening the security guards who tried to stop them. Both students were members of the elected student union, and Marouf, the son of a Syrian diplomat, claimed immunity when security guards attempted to detain him. Keefer and Marouf were formally expelled and subsequently faced criminal charges by the Montreal Urban Police. They were eventually permitted back on campus after an appeal to the Board of Governors. Both had remained active in the anti-Israeli campaign despite their suspensions, and continued their anti-Israeli activities long thereafter.¹¹ In a written statement at the time of her resignation, Stea condemned the university for “the arbitrary expulsion and banning from campus of two duly elected union representatives, Tom Keefer and Laith Marouf.”¹²

Throughout the 2001-2002 school year, numerous incidences contributed to a rise in tensions between pro-Israeli and pro-Palestinian groups on campus. On 18 October 2001, former Israeli prime minister Ehud Barak spoke to an audience of two thousand at a synagogue in the Montreal suburb of Cote-St-Luc. Subsequently two Concordia students filed a suit with the Canadian Commission for Human Rights claiming that the lecture organizers and security had discriminated against them by detaining them and preventing them from attending the event. The students, Hashem Yassif and Nidal al-Aloul, were members of SPHR on campus.

Al-Aloul, a native of Nablus from a prominent family with official ties to the Palestinian Authority, accused Hillel members of instructing security to single out the SPHR members. However, no evidence of this was ever ascertained and Hillel never accepted responsibility. One community leader, Rabbi Reuven Poupko, stated that nobody was singled out; every attendee underwent a rigorous security check, and hundreds of people were placed in a separate room because of limited seating capacity inside the hall. Furthermore, while al-Aloul claimed Israeli soldiers abused him and confiscated his passport, no evidence for this charge ever surfaced. Only two Israeli security guards were present, Barak’s private bodyguards.¹³

In January 2002, Dr. Alan Baker of the Israeli Foreign Ministry, who in 2004 became Israel’s ambassador to Canada, lectured on the incitement of Palestinian

children to commit acts of terror. Many SPHR members attended solely to heckle and interrupt, and later condemned Hillel for bringing Baker to speak at all.¹⁴

Further Disruptions

Throughout 2002 there were constant disruptions during Hillel-sponsored events both on and off campus along with attempts to discredit speakers and Hillel as a viable campus group. In March, SPHR staged an event called "Concordia under Occupation." Palestinian supporters set up mock checkpoints and demanded that students show identification before being allowed through. They also built a fake tank that was stationed in the center of the campus's public area, and from there the activists harassed students passing by.¹⁵

The following day SPHR set up a mock cemetery. Members donned keffiyehs and wore black as they spoke to students about the numerous Palestinians who had died in the Second Intifada.¹⁶ Careful in their use of language, SPHR cited people who had died, and not been killed in conflict. Any militants or rioters who were in fact killed by Israeli forces were praised for dying "in defense of their human rights" or "resisting occupation." This semantic distortion was characteristic of SPHR activities on campus.

In response to the mock occupation and cemetery, Hillel staged a sit-in where people were invited to join in a peaceful music circle with drums, guitars, and refreshments. There was no attempt to accuse or propagandize; students simply sang peacefully and demonstrated support for Israel with Hebrew songs and Israeli flags.¹⁷ This tactic of nonconfrontation became central to Hillel's activities on campus, expressing the idea of Israel-awareness as being separate from the conflict. Nevertheless, tensions on campus remained high.

One month later, SPHR members from Concordia occupied the Montreal offices of Liberal Party MP Irwin Cotler. A well-known human rights lawyer and activist, Cotler became Canada's justice minister in 2003. His wife, Ariela Cotler, was president of the board of Montreal Hillel in 2001 during the most heated period at Concordia and played a major role in the pro-Israeli activity.

Despite Cotler's reputation for defending human rights unconditionally, the protesting students claimed that he and the Canadian government as a whole were insufficiently speaking out for the Palestinians regarding the alleged massacre in Jenin. With sensationalist, largely fictitious statements to the press about war crimes being committed by the Israel Defense Forces (IDF) in Jenin, the students stormed the offices and demanded the staff to vacate the premises. The student newspaper reported that: "Elatrash [a prominent SPHR spokesperson] claims that mass graves are being dug to dispose of the hundreds of casualties from the battle in Jenin and that over 9000 Palestinians have been detained, many of whom face unlawful confinement and torture by their captors."¹⁸

Two hours later police entered the building and arrested seven students for assault and trespassing. These same students continued to instigate both on and

off campus against Israel and Jewish groups—especially Samer Elatrash, who became one of the main agitators of the September riot.

The 9 September Riot

The most infamous events at Concordia began at the outset of the following semester in September 2002. Hillel invited former Israeli prime minister Benjamin Netanyahu to speak on campus during his cross-Canada tour.¹⁹ One week before his engagement, numerous articles, flyers, and posters called on students, and Montrealers at large, to convene on the day of the lecture and demonstrate against Netanhayu, whom the pro-Palestinians accused of being a warmonger and murderer.²⁰ The activists drafted a mock arrest warrant demanding that the Royal Canadian Mounted Police and the Canadian government place Netanyahu in custody for purported war crimes and crimes against humanity, including ethnic cleansing.²¹

In light of the numerous threats, the police arrived several hours before the lecture to secure the university and create a safe passage for both attendees and Netanyahu himself. The police presence included municipal, provincial, federal as well as Israeli consulate security, private Israeli security, and a local security company hired for the occasion. Although the second-floor entrances were open to students attending classes in the morning, all first-floor entrances and access were blocked off for security reasons.²²

The protesters, most of whom were not students, also arrived early, positioning themselves at every entrance to the university and harassing the 650 ticket-holders arriving to attend the lecture.²³ Numerous incidents of violence against Jewish students and community members attempting to enter the university were reported, some of which were captured on tape. Thomas Hecht, former president of the Canada-Israel Committee, was kicked violently as he entered the building. Rabbi Howard Joseph and his wife Norma, a Concordia professor, were hit and spat on. Many others were shoved, sprayed with ketchup, and verbally assaulted as they made their way into the Hall Building and several men reported having their skullcaps knocked off their heads by the protesters.²⁴

Although the most vocal protesters were well-known Concordia students who were elected leaders of the student union or activists for SPHR, the majority were nonstudents. By the time the lecture was scheduled to begin, an estimated one to two thousand demonstrators had convened outside the university, burning Israeli flags and chanting anti-Israeli or anti-Jewish slogans in English, French, and Arabic.²⁵ Many even threw pennies and other projectiles at those trying to get to the lecture.

Netanyahu's security decided not to bring him into the university, and he remained instead at the Ritz-Carlton Hotel.²⁶ Yet the protesters continued demonstrating, becoming increasingly agitated by the police presence and clashing repeatedly with riot police. Several hundred protesters forced their way

into the building by a back entrance through the university café and pushed their way down the escalators into the lobby where the conference hall was located. Police kept them at bay as they started throwing chairs and other objects down at those in the lobby. Several rioters attempted to get past the police and were arrested or pushed back up the escalators.

Just before 1 p.m. rioters stormed the building, smashing its front windows and trying to force themselves past police who had formed a barrier between them and the conference hall where Netanyahu's audience remained barricaded with no way out.²⁷ Faced with rioters on all sides, riot police used tear gas to dispel the crowd and prevent escalating violence within the building. Ultimately the university charged eleven students with violating its code of conduct and the police arrested five participants.²⁸

In the days following the riot, participants sought any possible excuse for their behavior, from gross exaggerations of police conduct during the riot to accusations that the disturbance was instigated by an exclusively Jewish audience entering the building. The demonstrators denied any responsibility for their actions and claimed they had exercised their right to free speech and assembly. Many charges against the university administration and Hillel were unfounded, including the claim that the audience was handpicked and racially screened.

In reality the protests were a suppression of free speech, a tyrannical and violent initiative for censorship of Jewish and Israeli expression. In an interview with journalist Mark Himmel in the documentary *Confrontation at Concordia* for Global Television, Netanyahu said: "If the real solution to this fanaticism is ventilation, the aeration of various ideas, then you got a whiff of the underlying root cause of terrorism in Concordia. That is the unwillingness to have a free exchange of ideas. The root cause of terrorism is totalitarianism."²⁹

The Palestinian lobby showed their inability to acknowledge or even permit opposing perspectives to be voiced. As Israel Asper, executive chairman of CanWest Global Corporation and cosponsor of Netanyahu's speaking tour put it: "The minority of a rabble, the rioting group of essentially thugs, lawbreakers, employed a technique known only—introduced, really—70 years ago by Adolf Hitler and his brownshirts.... The shouting down, the closing down, the trampling on the right of free assembly and the physical restraint through violence of freedom of speech; it was a most unfortunate scene for Canada."³⁰

The media tumult that ensued led to donors threatening to withdraw funds from Concordia and influenced the reaction of the university administration. The media impact was compounded by the abovementioned *Confrontation at Concordia* documentary. The film portrayed the riots and ensuing events in a largely negative light that angered the Arab community and the CSU to the point of taking legal action against the broadcaster. Another documentary titled *Discordia*, produced independently and released the following year, focused more intimately on three main players in the conflict—Aaron Mate, Noah Sarnah, and Samer Elatrash—and received positive reactions from all sides of the debate.

As a result of the violence and the harm to Concordia's image, Rector Lowy and the university administration imposed a schoolwide moratorium on all issues pertaining to the Middle East. Despite a popular outcry from all sides to the dispute, including students, professors, and politicians, severe action was promised against anyone violating the moratorium. Hillel, though disagreeing with the measure, abided by it. The CSU and SPHR, however, took every opportunity to disobey.³¹

The moratorium was subsequently lifted at the end of November following in-depth inquiries into the situation on campus, the cancellation of numerous lectures, and a demonstration by several Canadian MPs outside the Hall Building to protest the gag order.³² The few students who were arrested or suspended for their participation in the riots were not adequately penalized by the university, and eventually were permitted back on campus where they continued their anti-Israeli activities.

The Hillel Suspension

Within several weeks of the moratorium being lifted, the CSU struck a blow against free speech regarding Israel and Judaism when they suspended Hillel Concordia from campus in a late-night, clandestine caucus on the last day of the semester. Hillel had had information flyers for Mahal programs—foreign volunteers for the Israeli army—present at their booth for several hours during the day. These had been placed there by a student who had been a Hillel staff member but was no longer affiliated with the Hillel executive, which generally approves materials for the booth. Hillel was suspended for supposedly violating Canada's Foreign Enlistment Act, which states:

Any person who, being a Canadian national, within or outside Canada, voluntarily accepts or agrees to accept any commission or engagement in the armed forces of any foreign state at war with any friendly foreign state or, whether a Canadian national or not, within Canada, induces any other person to accept or agree to accept any commission or engagement in any such armed forces is guilty of an offence.³³

Of the CSU's political body of twenty-seven members, only nine were in attendance.³⁴ Eight of these voted in favor of the suspension; one representative of Hillel, Noah Joseph, who was also a member of the student council opposition, was present and attempted to contest the action and voted against it. The vote violated the CSU's own guidelines requiring a quorum of ten council members to ratify motions, and to provide notice to all council members before voting.³⁵

The council chair, Omar Badawi, ruled that the action could not proceed because of the lack of due process. The council members, however, including Samer Elatrash who was present though at the time he was forbidden from being on campus property for any purpose apart from attending classes, ignored him and continued with the suspension.³⁶ If the CSU's support for SPHR had not been

made clear enough at the 9 September riot, by the Friday afternoon following the Hillel suspension it was made undeniable when the two groups held a joint press conference to defend the suspension. Once again, Hillel was not invited.³⁷

Hillel demanded immediate reinstatement and a public apology from the CSU. The response was an offer of conditional reinstatement, permitting Hillel to hold events but not to receive any funding, pending a formal public apology and the signing of a contract committing all groups to an antiwar stance.³⁸ Hillel Montreal president Ariela Cotler stated:

We cannot let this go on, and Concordia cannot let this go on either. I have no doubt this is an attempt to shut down Israel's voice in this community, starting with Hillel and expanding from there. The CSU's bylaws state that the board must be advised at least five days in advance. They also have an obligation to have a quorum on hand for a vote. There was an obvious agenda to disrupt the activities of Hillel on campus. Their only concept of freedom of expression here is when the Society for Palestinian Human Rights is involved, with the support of the CSU.³⁹

Dissatisfied with the CSU's response, Hillel decided to bring a civil suit against it demanding an apology and \$100,000 in punitive damages. Hillel cited the lack of due process in the suspension proceedings and the fallacious nature of the claims against Hillel. Montreal Hillel, the Canadian Jewish Congress, and B'nai Brith Canada lent their support to Hillel Concordia, and the latter two sought intervenor status in the court case.⁴⁰

The accusation that the pamphlets on the information table were breaking Canadian law was demonstrated to be entirely false both by a lawyer and a military historian. First, the act had not been cited since the 1937 ban on Canadian recruits to the Spanish Civil War; second, the flyers could not be considered active recruitment.⁴¹ On 4 December 2002, Hillel further protested its suspension by sponsoring a communitywide Chanukah celebration on campus.

Throughout North America, Hillel student groups called on Jewish university students to light a candle in support of the Concordia chapter. Hillel president and international director Richard M. Joel stated:

Hillel: The Foundation for Jewish Campus Life condemns in the strongest terms the outrageous decision of the Concordia Student Union to exclude Hillel from campus and to deny it CSU funds. Hillel urges the CSU to rescind its decision. We support Montreal Hillel's efforts to pursue legal action against the CSU. We call upon the university to denounce this action which flies in the face of freedom of speech, freedom of religion, and freedom of association.⁴²

In Montreal, more than three hundred students from Concordia and McGill University as well as community members, including Ariela Cotler, attended the Chanukah event. Anti-Israeli protesters from the CSU and SPHR attempted

to interrupt the celebration; Samer Elatrash was arrested for violating his bail conditions from the September riots. In February, he was expelled from Concordia.⁴³

Although the case was eventually dropped after appeals, Hillel's legal action and confrontation of the CSU did much to foster greater awareness of the anti-Semitism faced by Jewish students on campus. By the following school year, Concordia students voted overwhelmingly to oust the left-leaning, pro-Palestinian lobby from power and instead elected a politically neutral party called Evolution, not Revolution, which vowed not to become involved in rabble-rousing.⁴⁴

Conclusion

Although the years since the 2002 events have been relatively quiet, tensions at Concordia between the pro-Palestinian and pro-Israeli camps have continued. Hillel has focused on projects not dealing with Middle Eastern politics, including founding a photography club and sponsoring events on global social justice.⁴⁵ It has formed new ties through joint activities with other groups on campus, including the Queer Union.⁴⁶

The CSU, for its part, has remained moderate and uninvolved in the Israel debate. SPHR, however, has remained actively hostile to Israel and its supporters. It often attacks Israel, Jews, and their campus supporters on the university newspaper's editorial pages, and demonstrations against Hillel speakers shadow every event. These activities are mirrored on campuses across North America and Europe, where Israel supporters continue to find themselves on the defensive against virulent anti-Israeli agitation.

Nevertheless, the shift in student politics at Concordia has been significant because of the continued success of the moderate Evolution party and Hillel's many attempts to avoid battles over Israel on campus. Thus, despite several notable incidents, a relative calm has come over Concordia. This is mainly due to the changing of the guard in the Student Union, but also reflects a growing understanding of the situation by community groups and the university administration, and an ability to deal more effectively with student agitation.

Notes

1. www.concordia.ca/about/history.
2. <http://supportservices.concordia.ca/iso/>.
3. Sheldon Gordon, "Campus Bans Activism after Anti-Bibi Riot," *Forward News*, 20 September 2002, www.forward.com/issues/2002/02.09.20/news3.html.
4. Janice Arnold, "Anti-Israel Vote Fails at Concordia U: Motion May Now Go before Entire University Population," *Canadian Jewish News*, 7 December 2000.
5. Steve Faguy, "Welcome to Concordia: A Colourful History of a Notorious Institution," *The Link*, 2 September 2003, <http://thelink.concordia.ca/article.pl?sid=03/09/02/0136235>.
6. Christopher Adam and Catherine Letendre, "CSU Agenda Hateful," *The Link*, 16 October 2001, <http://thelink.concordia.ca/article.pl?sid=01/10/16/1428238>.

7. Ibid.
8. Bram Eisenthal, "Canadian School Comes under Fire for Revolutionary," JTA, 14 October 2002, www.jta.org/page_print_story.asp?intarticleid=102101.
9. David Sax, "From the Campus to the Courtroom," *Jerusalem Post*, 31 January 2003, www.davidsax.ca/content/view/147/79/.
10. Sabrina Stea, "CSU President's Resignation Letter," *The Link*, 23 October 2001, <http://thelink.concordia.ca/article.pl?sid=01/10/22/2347226>.
11. Sheli Teitelbaum, "Jihad at 'Gaza U,'" *Jerusalem Report*, 21 October 2002, www.campus-watch.org/article/id/311.
12. Sabrina Stea, "CSU President's Resignation Letter."
13. Sara Collin, "Two SPHR Members File Lawsuit," *The Link*, 30 October 2001, <http://thelink.concordia.ca/article.pl?sid=01/10/30/1614226>; Nidal al-Aloul, "Treatment at Barak's Lecture like Israeli Checkpoint," *The Link*, 23 October 2001, <http://thelink.concordia.ca/article.pl?sid=01/10/22/2335248>.
14. Marwan Sefian, "Lecturer Failed to Address Facts of Middle East Conflict," *The Link*, 29 January 2002, <http://thelink.concordia.ca/article.pl?sid=02/01/28/2215202>.
15. Ingrid Peritz and Tu Thanh Ha, "Tensions between Arab, Jewish Students Poison Atmosphere at Montreal University," *Globe and Mail*, 14 September, 2002, <http://spme.net/cgi-bin/facultyforum.cgi?ID=577>.
16. Janet Forest, "SPHR 'Graveyard' Exposes Students to War," *The Link*, 26 March 2002.
17. Steve Faguy, "Hillel Members Respond to SPHR Mock Gravesite," *The Link*, 9 April 2002, <http://thelink.concordia.ca/article.pl?sid=02/04/09/0231227>.
18. Giancarlo La Giorgia, "Concordia Students Take Over MP's Office," *The Link*, 23 April 2002, <http://thelink.concordia.ca/article.pl?sid=02/04/23/0525222>.
19. "Netanyahu Speaks despite Toronto Protests," CTV, 10 September 2002, www.ctv.ca/servlet/ArticleNews/story/CTVNews/20020910/netanyahu_montreal_020910/Canada/story/.
20. Samer Elatrash, "Netanyahu Not Welcome at Concordia," *The Link*, 3 September 2002, <http://thelink.concordia.ca/article.pl?sid=02/09/02/1642255>.
21. Jaggi Singh, "Riot Police Attack Pro-Palestinian Demonstrators at Concordia University—Netanyahu Speech Cancelled," 9 September 2002, www.columbia.edu/cu/cssn/cssn-list/2002/09/00039.html.
22. David Abner and James Grohsgal, "Violence Silences Netanyahu," *McGill Tribune*, 10 September 2002, <http://mcgilltribune.com/media.paper234/news/2002/09/10/News/Violence.Silences.Netanyahu>.
23. Sara Aronheim, "9/11/2002: Concordia Riot Eyewitness Account," 11 September 2002, www.littlegreenfootballs.com/weblog/?entry=4076.
24. Mike Cohen, "Concordia Cancels Netanyahu Speech amid Violence," 12 September 2002, www.bnaibrith.ca/ & tribune/jt-020912-06.html.
25. An inability to pinpoint the number of demonstrators emerges in two separate accounts by prominent activist Jaggi Singh, who contradicts himself in statements about the crowd. "At least two thousand..." Singh wrote in "Riot Police Attack." Just four days later, 13 September 2002, he stated: "I was one of more than 1,000 people who gathered to protest..." in his article "Day of Broken Glass" in the *Globe and Mail*, www.theglobeandmail.com/servlet/ArticleNews/PEstory/TGAM/20020913/COSI. Disagreement about the precise number of rioters emerges in all media regarding the incident.
26. Abner and Grohsgal, "Violence Silences Netanyahu."
27. Steve Faguy, "Netanyahu Speech Cancelled: Hall Building Evacuated as Police Pepper-

- Spray Protesters,” *The Link*, 9 September 2002, <http://thelink.concordia.ca/article.pl?sid=02/09/09/1740218>.
28. Jon Elmer, “A Riot Is the Language of the Unheard: Netanyahu Talk Shut Down at Concordia,” *Dalhousie Gazette*, 11 September 2002, www.fromoccupiedpalestine.org/node.php?id=9; “Timeline of Key Events,” CBC Roughcuts: Discordia, www.cbc.ca/roughcuts/discordia/timeline_printer.html.
 29. www.cbcs.ca/english/decisions/decisions/2004/040511.htm.
 30. Lee Parsons and Keith Jones, “Canada: Right-Wing Furor over Student Protest against Netanyahu,” 25 September 2002, www.wsws.org/articles/2002/sep2002/neta-s25.shtml.
 31. “Bias on Montreal's Concordia University Campus,” 15 December 2002, www.camera.org/index.asp?x_context=22&x_article=38.1
 32. Ibid.
 33. Foreign Enlistment Act (CHAPTER F-28), <http://laws.justice.gc.ca/en/F-28/61434.html>.
 34. Sara Russo, “Concordia U. Suspends Campus Hillel for Israeli Defense Flyer,” *Accuracy in Academia*, 1 January 2003, www.academia.org/campus_reports/2003/january_2003_1.html.
 35. Bram Eisenthal, “Hillel Muffled at Montreal School,” *JTA*, 5 December 2002, www.juf.org/news_public_affairs/article.asp?key=3744.
 36. Lou Marano, “Jewish Group Fights Suspension in Montreal,” *UPI*, 8 December 2002, www.upi.com/inc/view.php?StoryID=20021207-111920-2126r.
 37. Ibid.
 38. Sara Russo, “Concordia U. Suspends Campus Hillel for Israeli Defense Flyer,” www.academia.org/campus_reports/2003/january_2003_1.html.
 39. Bram Eisenthal, “Pro-Arab Body at Montreal School Shuts Campus Hillel over Israel Flier,” *JTA*, 5 December 2002, www.tampabayprimer.org/index.cfm?action=articles&drill=viewArt&art=0.
 40. Fariha Naqvi, “Hillel Back in Spotlight,” *The Link*, 7 January 2003, <http://thelink.concordia.ca/article.pl?sid=03/01/07/0825247>.
 41. Russo, “Concordia U. Suspends Campus Hillel.”
 42. “Light the Seventh Candle for Concordia Hillel,” 5 December 2002, www.hillel.org/Hillel/NewHille.nsf/B187DF656681F7E5852568E004A382C.
 43. “Concordia Hillel Celebrates, Protest on Campus,” www.hillel.org/Hillel/NewHille.nsf/FCB8259CA861AE57852567D30043BA26/B88B7D8A27078CE285256C8B0073F45E?OpenDocument.
 44. “Confrontation @ Concordia” (2003), produced and directed by Martin Himel.
 45. Dan Aviad, “Pleased by Hillel’s Pluralism,” *The Link*, 3 February 2004, <http://thelink.concordia.ca/article.pl?sid=04/02/03/0436242>.
 46. J. Marmor, “Thanks for Hillel/Queer Union Event,” *The Link*, 2 December 2003, <http://thelink.concordia.ca/article.pl?sid=03/12/02/0215217>.

Aryeh Green

European Universities and the New Anti-Semitism: Issues, Examples, Prescriptions

Primary Issues Concerning Jews and Israel

Anti-Semitism in European Universities

The situation at many universities in Europe is extremely challenging for Israel and for Jewish students. Anti-Semitism and anti-Semitic acts are proliferating there—and not only among the Muslim minority population.¹ Virtually throughout Europe, including Russia and the rest of the former Soviet Union (FSU), anti-Israeli attitudes are accepted as unassailable among a large number of academics and political pundits alike, across disciplines.²

These attitudes in academia are both supported by, and contribute to perpetuating, a general environment that is hostile to Israel and not friendly to Jews. This often makes it difficult—or extremely costly in terms of relationships, prestige, or advancement—for students and faculty to identify with Israel or Judaism. This “new anti-Semitism”³—applying traditional anti-Semitic themes that delegitimize and demonize Jews and Judaism to the Jewish state and its leaders—threatens not only the support Israel receives from European elites and governments but also the strength of Jewish identity among students and faculty as well as European values of tolerance and liberty.

Low Numbers, Few Institutions

This situation is exacerbated by two aspects of European Jewish communities little recognized by Israeli decision-makers or Jewish leaders from outside the region. First, universities throughout Western Europe, while often boasting large numbers of Muslim students as well as visiting students from Arab countries, count very few Jewish or pro-Israeli students among their population. For instance, whereas 15-20 percent of young people matriculating in America’s top universities are Jewish, in Western Europe only a few universities can claim even a tenth of that figure, Jews being thinly dispersed throughout the continent.

Second, weak or nonexistent Jewish community infrastructures provide little or no support to Jewish students in their efforts to identify with their Judaism or defend Israel in the university environment. The same can be said for Jewish or pro-Israeli faculty.

Again, the contrast with the United States is illuminating. There, a myriad of establishment institutions⁴ have divisions exclusively dedicated to supporting Jewish students or promoting Judaism or Israel across North America, and numerous local and national organizations do the same.⁵ According to the European Union of Jewish Students, there are about two hundred thousand Jews in Europe aged eighteen to thirty; the European Jewish Information Centre reports less than fifty professionals working specifically for students throughout Europe to serve this community.⁶

Although recent efforts by Hillel in Eastern Europe and the FSU are not insignificant, the sum total of institutional resources even peripherally dealing with these issues in Europe is particularly small. These resources, such as they are, come from the B'nai Brith International and B'nai Brith Europe, European Jewish Congress, European Council of Jewish Communities, International Academic Friends of Israel, European Center for Jewish Students, and a new American Jewish Committee office in Berlin, along with various offices of the Joint Distribution Committee, among others.

Local Jewish leadership makes an effort, with limited numbers and means, to support Jewish university students and defend Israel in academia. The impact is negligible. The European Union of Jewish Students, though supported through the World Union of Jewish Students by the Jewish Agency and World Jewish Congress among others, is significantly underfunded and functions primarily, as it always has, as a student-run grassroots movement.

The Need for Coordination

There are exceptions, notably in the UK and France, where a relatively strong Jewish community has galvanized institutional and financial support for students and organized efforts to be active in academia.⁷ But these efforts remain focused on the local Union of Jewish Students and are still relatively limited. Israel is defamed regularly even in those countries, and Jewish students there, as across Europe, are intimidated and distanced from Judaism and Israel. There is no coordinating mechanism or even regular communications forum across Europe through which Jewish leadership could more effectively devise strategies.

It is at European universities that tomorrow's opinion molders, and the next decades' decision-makers, are being groomed. Europe and Russia are taking an increasing role in Middle Eastern affairs. This is a critical time and place for coordinated action. In light of expanding trade ties, Europe's growing political strength, and Russia and Europe's strong connections with the Arab world, one of the main battlegrounds for Israel's future is Europe.

Examples of the Challenge

The examples below occurred in the past few years. All are substantiated by eyewitness accounts; each is representative of numerous similar occurrences in other universities and other countries throughout Europe.

*Multiple Incidents at the School of Oriental and African Studies (SOAS),
University of London, UK*

“Resisting Israeli Apartheid: Strategies and Principles,” full-day conference at the Brunei Gallery Lecture Theatre, SOAS, 5 December 2004: Over the course of eight hours some twenty-five speakers, mainly academics, lectured in various sessions. In addition to comparisons with South Africa, two speakers (both academics) compared Israeli actions to those of the Nazis. One talk was titled “Settler Colonialism as Genocide.” The phrase “the occupation started in 1948” was used repeatedly to claim that Israel has no right to exist.⁸

Islamist extremist film—*Jerusalem, the Promise of Heaven*—shown in the Student Union, 21 February 2005: In this film, repeated images of religious Jews praying at the Western Wall or in synagogue are accompanied by a voiceover commentary about Jews, including statements such as:

- Jewish prayer rituals are “satanic.”
- Jews have no values or ethics.
- Jewish graves on the Mount of Olives are bogus, rich overseas Jews paying to have fictitious names written on them.
- Jews have no significant historical connection to Israel or Jerusalem.⁹

SOAS Students’ Union tries to ban the appearance of Roey Gilad, political counselor at the Israeli embassy in London, 22 February 2005: The administration overturned the ban after pressure by pro-Israeli students and others. On the night of the talk, a false fire alarm was triggered and the talk was delayed by forty minutes.¹⁰

“Zionism is racism” policy of SOAS Students’ Union: The Union’s policy statement defines Zionism as racism. Clause 10 of the Union’s motion opposing all forms of racism, posted on its website, declares: “This Union believes...that peace requires...the elimination of...Zionism and racial discrimination in all its forms...” In the same policy statement, in the last section, Clause 1 states, “This Union condemns...any form of racism, Islamophobia, anti-Semitism, Zionism or other forms of discrimination on campus.”¹¹ This Union policy was cited when the abovementioned Israeli embassy official was banned from appearing.

Note that in the same sentence in Clause 10 calling for the elimination of Zionism, the policy recognizes “the dignity of peoples and their right to self-determination.” In other words, all people are entitled to self-determination except Jews.

"Apartheid Israel" Week at Oxford University, UK

In mid-February 2006, the Palestinian Society student organization at Oxford University hosted a series of events to commemorate, as stated in its flyers, the "30th anniversary of the international convention on the suppression and punishment of the crime of apartheid."

The flyers presented a caricature of two Israeli soldiers beating a Palestinian man with clubs depicted as maps of Israel, one labeled "Palestine," the other "South Africa." The conference centered on themes of apartheid and Zionism, divestment and resistance. Ilan Pappé, a professor from Haifa University and advocate of a one-state solution and boycott of Israeli institutions, spoke on "Resisting Apartheid: Divestment and Solidarity" in a meeting chaired by Prof. Steven Rose, a leading advocate of the academic and cultural boycott of Israel. Another speaker was Prof. Gabi Piterberg of the University of California-Los Angeles, who spoke on "Zionism and Apartheid." In 2003 Piterberg, an Israeli anti-Zionist, signed a petition calling for divestment from Israel.

Jewish students wrote to the university's vice-chancellor and attended some of the events, handing out literature and trying to engage with other attendees. According to the *Jerusalem Post*, in a meeting with the university proctor at the disciplinary office of the university, Jewish students were told that while their concerns were understood, there was insufficient evidence for intervention as "there needs to be a high level of provocation."¹² This was the case even though the Palestinian Society was not officially registered with the university and was acting improperly in using the university's name.

Mitch Simmons, campaign director of the Union of Jewish Students, told the *Jerusalem Post*, "We were pleased that the proctor took the time to meet with us and recognized our concerns. But how uncomfortable do Israeli and Jewish students have to feel before they take action?"

The media spokesman for the Palestinian Society, Abdel Razzaq Takriti, told the *Jerusalem Post*, "We are simply stating our belief and explaining that Israel is an apartheid state, to encourage people to take a stance and increase public pressure on Israel to change its apartheid policies."

Adrienne Rivlin, ex-president of the Oxford University Jewish Society and current graduate chair, offered perhaps the most succinct conclusion: "Israeli and Jewish students on campus unfortunately can only feel intimidated by [these] actions."

"Zionism is a danger to the Jewish people" Vote at University of Cambridge, UK

In the same week that Oxford held its "Apartheid Israel" week in February 2006, Cambridge University's Union hosted a debate on whether Zionism is a danger to the Jews. Cambridge students attending voted 125 to 121, with 71 abstentions, that indeed "Zionism is a danger to the Jewish people."¹³

In an analysis of the event, Melanie Phillips suggests that losing the vote itself was only the tip of the iceberg. Aside from the fact that Cambridge Union felt it appropriate to hold such an event, Phillips notes that the response to the vote by Jewish student leaders reflects their level of insecurity.

As Phillips points out, the motion passed by a majority of four. One member of the debating team that spoke in opposition to the motion, who was recruited at the last minute following sudden cancellations by original team members, seemed satisfied with the result. He said he felt his side had persuaded a number of moderate and undecided people; anti-Zionist activists had brought many students to the event, and the Jewish or pro-Zionist contingent was small.

He writes, "I was reassured by the fact that the majority of intelligent, neutral Union members who go to debates to think and learn all seemed to vote for us." As Phillips notes, taking into account the additional seventy-one people who evidently remained uncertain, it seems clear that the overwhelming majority of these students (176-121) were not convinced that Zionism is not a danger to the Jews.¹⁴

Intimidation at the School of Journalism, Utrecht University, the Netherlands

A journalism student at Utrecht University in the Netherlands, who frequently contributes to online publications, was attacked in articles on the white-nationalist website www.stormfront.org in Dutch. The articles, published in early 2006, included the student's name and photograph and the name of her university.

"The story about me (written in Dutch) was terrible," the student writes. "I was shocked obviously, especially because I never experienced any anti-Semitism before during my life in the Netherlands."

One of the articles, without a byline, concluded with the sentence: "We're probably going to hear more of this little mediajew in the future."¹⁵

The student is so frightened by this experience that she refused to be identified for this article. "I don't want them to find anything else about me that they can again use for their terrible website," she said.

Institutional Anti-Zionism and Anti-Semitism at MAUP, Ukraine

The above events represent trends at universities across Europe. Similar incidents have been reported in virtually every European university. They manifest, however, a cultural and societal bias that is not necessarily shared or supported, at least not officially or frequently, by administrative or academic officers at the universities.

On a different level, some institutions of higher learning display a structural anti-Israeli and anti-Semitic bias. Especially in the newly independent states of Eastern Europe, this organizational support for anti-Israel and anti-Semitic

attitudes is of special concern to those working to promote Israel, freedom and democracy in these transitional societies.

There is a particularly alarming example of this trend in the Ukraine. According to the Anti-Defamation League (ADL) and other organizations, MAUP (the Interregional Academy of Personnel Management) is one of the primary sources of Ukrainian anti-Semitism and anti-Zionism.¹⁶ It organizes anti-Semitic conferences and frequently publishes statements and widely read periodicals containing anti-Semitic articles.

According to Josef Zissels, leader of Ukraine's oldest secular-Jewish umbrella group, the Va'ad: "some 70 percent of all anti-Semitic publications that appear in Ukraine are produced by MAUP and its affiliates." In September 2005 it was reported that "among other things, MAUP recently published a blacklist of media and organizations distributing or supporting 'Jewish racism, Judeo-Nazism and Jewish organized crime in Ukraine.'" ¹⁷

A small selection of their activities:¹⁸

- On 22 November 2005, MAUP's president, Georgy Tschokin, who according to the ADL is responsible for the virulent anti-Semitism and anti-Israeli activities at the university, issued a statement of solidarity with Iranian president Ahmadinejad's threat to destroy Israel. The statement blended traditional Christian anti-Semitism with anti-Zionism:

We'd like to remind that the Living God Jesus Christ said to Jews two thousand years ago: "Your father is a devil!"... Israel, as known, means "Theologian," and Zionism in 1975 was acknowledged by General Assembly of UN as the form of racism and race discrimination, that, in the opinion of the absolute majority of modern Europeans, makes the most threat to modern civilization. Israel is the artificially created state (classic totalitarian type) which appeared on the political Earth map only in 1948, thanks to good will of UN.... Their end is known, and only the God's true will rescue all of us. We are not afraid, as God always together with his children!¹⁹

- MAUP's June 2005 conference on "Zionism: Threat to World Peace" was cochaired by U.S. white supremacist David Duke and attended by various people known for anti-Semitic opinions. These included French Holocaust denier Serge Thion²⁰ and Israel Shamir,²¹ who apparently was a Jew in Russia and converted to Christianity, and is known for publishing anti-Semitic essays on the Internet. The Palestinian Authority representative in Ukraine, Walid Zakut, was also reported to have attended.
- David Duke teaches a course on history and international relations at MAUP and was awarded a PhD for a thesis on Zionism.
- MAUP's leading figures have been at the root of attempts to restrict Jewish organizations in Ukraine and, more recently, a call to ban the *Tanya*, a classic

work of Hassidic Jewish literature, on the ground that it promotes racism against non-Jews.²²

On 1 December 2005, MAUP held a conference titled “The Jewish-Bolshevik Revolution of 1917: The Source of the Red Terrorism and the Starvation of Ukraine.”²³ And in the March 2006 issue of *Personnel Plus*, one of MAUP’s leading publications, an article called “Murder Is Unveiled, the Murderer Is Unknown?” by Yaroslav Oros revives false ritual-murder accusations from the 1911 Beilis trial.²⁴ A week earlier, MAUP leaders visited the grave of Andrei Yuschinsky, a Christian boy allegedly “murdered by Jews with ritual purpose.”²⁵

Ukrainian president Viktor Yushchenko sat for years on the board of MAUP, and only resigned a few years ago. Foreign Minister Borys Tarasyuk was honorary director of one of MAUP’s subdivisions until 2005.²⁶ However, in late January 2006, Tarasyuk called MAUP’s actions “unlawful” and proclaimed that “there is no place for any form of anti-Semitism or xenophobia in Ukraine.” Jewish groups welcomed these statements, along with indications from the Ukrainian Education Ministry about planned investigations of MAUP “activities inconsistent with higher education.”²⁷

Supporting Jewish Students, Faculty, and Israel in Europe: The Need for a Coordinating Forum

The above are merely representative instances of a wide consensus throughout European society and particularly in the university environment. Although there are exceptions, especially among individual faculty members or political leaders, the overriding trend is acknowledged by national, regional, and international observers. The differences that do exist are a matter of degree: attitudes are distinguished according to the magnitude of condemnation of Israel, or the blatancy with which a speaker or writer will distort the reality of Israel’s struggle to survive.

The Jewish world, with its wide array of organizations and philanthropies, has been gravely negligent in allowing this situation to fester. A strategic effort to expand support for Jewish students and to combat anti-Semitism and anti-Israelism at European universities is a critical need—no less than the need that in North America gave birth to the ICC (Israel on Campus Coalition).

Whether led by Israel or by global Jewish figures, such an effort should aim to form an umbrella association to coordinate and ensure communications and responsiveness on university issues throughout Europe, not unlike the Global Forum to Combat Anti-Semitism established by Natan Sharansky as Israel’s minister for Diaspora affairs in 2003.

An organizing consortium of this sort would ensure cooperation between student groups, community leaders, international organizations, and others, while promoting more effective use of local and global Jewish resources. Students and

faculty throughout Europe have explicitly called for support and, when asked, identified certain critical needs. Among many specific projects to be pursued, the following are indispensable:

- Translation and distribution of relevant materials
- An Internet-based network for sharing materials
- Coordination of visiting lecturers and groups to ensure wide exposure
- Periodic conferences of students, faculty, or community leaders
- A central mechanism for information flow and quick response to crises
- Strengthening individual countries' Jewish student unions with funding, facilities, and staffing

Such a forum—with an appropriately constructive name such as the European Jewish Public Affairs Forum—can be created by holding a founding conference in Europe including all the relevant individuals and organizations.²⁸ The cooperation of the EU can be solicited for the conference, for help with facilities, translations, special projects, and general activities. Funds can be raised from individual European governments, the United States, and perhaps various restitution funds as well as private philanthropists.

Conclusion

If working to establish and settle a Jewish state was the expression of Zionism in the early twentieth century, in the latter part of the century Zionism meant supporting that state in its efforts to survive, develop, and thrive. Zionism in the twenty-first century will be defined by the struggle against those who question Israel's legitimacy to exist as a Jewish state. Nowhere is this more apparent than in Europe, which on the whole is about two decades "ahead" of America in accepting the anti-Semitic argument that Israel is a colonialist, illegitimate oppressor. This belief crosses social, economic, religious, and political boundaries and is not limited to the disputed territories of Judea and Samaria (the "West Bank").

With these attitudes now accepted among European youth, in ten years, or twenty at most, there may be no question among Europe's political and business elite as to Israel's original sin in its founding. This development would pose as much a strategic threat to Israel, the Jewish world, and the entire free world as Iranian missiles and the ascendancy of Hamas, Hizbullah, and other Islamofascist movements.

Notes

1. See, e.g., articles in *Jewish Political Studies Review*, Vols. 15-17.
2. See, e.g., Natan Sharansky, "On Hating the Jews," *Commentary*, November 2003.
3. Natan Sharansky, "Anti-Semitism in 3D," *Forward*, 21 January 2005, and in the *Jerusalem Post*, www.jpost.com/servlet/Satellite?pagename=JPost/JPArticle/ShowFull&cid=1077532078469.
4. A short list of such organizations would include, among others: Hillel, AIPAC (American Israel Political Action Committee), ADL (Anti-Defamation League), AJC (American Jewish Congress), American Jewish Committee, JNF (Jewish National Fund), ZOA (Zionist Organization of America), B'nai Brith, URJ (Union of Reform Judaism), USCJ (United Synagogue of Conservative Judaism), OU (Orthodox Union), and the Conference of Presidents.
5. These include StandWithUs, Scholars for Peace in the Middle East, the David Project, NAJSA, Hasbara Fellowships, Upstart Activist, and others.
6. Gidon van Emden, "Redefine the Idea of Jewish Continuity," *Jerusalem Post*, 5 April 2006.
7. Many of the examples below are taken from the UK, not necessarily because of a higher incidence of events there but rather because of the relatively significant resources devoted there to monitoring and responding to such events.
8. "Israel Boycott Row Hits College," *The Guardian*, www.education.guardian.co.uk/higher/worldwide/story/0,9959,1366286,00.html.
9. "Boycott Threat to Israeli Colleges," *The Observer*, www.observer.guardian.co.uk/uk_news/story/0,6903,1461699,00.html.
10. See, e.g., "College Tells Students to Reverse Israeli Ban," *The Guardian*, www.guardian.co.uk/uk_news/story/0,,1406301,00.html; Melanie Phillips, "A Candle for Freedom," www.melaniephillips.com/diary/archives/001064.html.
11. www.soasunion.org/system/systempages/file/32/file/opposing_all_racist_manifestations.pdf.
12. All quotations are from "Oxford Holds 'Apartheid Israel' Week," *Jerusalem Post*, 16 February 2006.
13. www.jpost.com/servlet/Satellite?apage=1&cid=1139395460108&pagename=JPost%2FJPArticle%2FShowFull.
14. See "The Closing of (Some) University Minds," www.melaniephillips.com/diary/?p=1145.
15. Rendered from Dutch.
16. www.adl.org/main_Anti_Semitism_International/maup_ukraine.htm.
17. www.jewishreview.org/Archives/Article.php?Article=2005-09-01-1597.
18. www.adl.org/main_Anti_Semitism_International/maup_ukraine.htm.
19. Ibid.
20. See Dr. Harold Brackman and Aaron Breitbart, "Holocaust Denial's Assault on Memory: Precursor to Twenty-First Century Genocide?" Simon Wiesenthal Center, April 2007, 40.
21. See www.nigelparry.com/issues/shamir/originalletter.html.
22. Ibid.
23. www.antisemitism.org.il/eng/events/16286/Ukraine_%E2%80%93_An_Antisemitic_Conference_at_the_MAUP_Academy.
24. www.personal-plus.net/article.php?ida=453.
25. www.jta.org/page_view_breaking_story.asp?intid=1573.
26. www.en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Interregional_Academy_of_Personnel_Management.
27. www.ncsj.org/AuxPages/012506MAUP.shtml.

28. Main actors in or for the European university environment include (in no particular order): World/European Union of Jewish Students; ECJS (European Center for Jewish Students); Hillel International; ECJC (European Council of Jewish Communities); World/European Jewish Congress; European Jewish Information Centre; Israeli Foreign Ministry; B'nai Brith International, B'nai Brith Europe; Joint Distribution Committee; Jewish Agency Education Department; national/local Jewish leadership; Jewish Agency emissaries; youth movements, Keren Hayesod.

Ruth Contreras

On the Situation in Austrian Universities

Historical Background: The Change in Austria's Self-Perception

Austria's postwar history is characterized by its self-perception as the first victim of the National Socialists. The fact that the majority of Austrian society had supported the Nazis or at least obeyed the Nazi regime was assiduously ignored. This self-perception lasted until the late 1980s, when it was critically reviewed and altered under the impact of the Waldheim affair (discussed below). The latter showed that not only the Social Democrats (SPÖ) but also the Conservatives (ÖVP) had a problematic relationship with the past.

The narrative of Austria as victim influenced many areas of Austrian politics. One result was that the rehabilitation of former Nazis started very soon after the end of the war.

Already in 1947, the Austrian government under its Conservative chancellor Leopold Figl established a law distinguishing between a higher or lower extent of collaboration with the Nazis. In 1948, less implicated ex-Nazis were rehabilitated and recovered their full rights as citizens. Already for the 1949 elections, both parties, the Social Democrats and the Conservatives, courted the votes of ex-Nazis.

Only in 2005 did the Association of Social Democratic Academics (Bund Sozialdemokratischer Akademiker, BSA) issue a study by Wolfgang Neugebauer and Peter Schwarz (both from the Documentation Center of Austrian Resistance) on the role of the BSA in reintegrating former Nazis into society.¹

Kreisky and the Middle East

Bruno Kreisky was a Jewish Social Democrat who served as Austrian chancellor from 1970 to 1983. He has been criticized for his ambivalence toward his Jewish identity and the effects this had on his approach to the Middle East. As Manfred Gerstenfeld notes, "Kreisky provides an example of a Jewish initiator of anti-Israel actions. He played a crucial role in making Yasser Arafat acceptable to the Socialist International."²

Kreisky came from an assimilated Jewish family that originated in Bohemia. Although his autobiography³ tells little about his Jewish roots, he mentions a cousin, Victor Much, whom he met in his youth and was an adherent of Vladimir

Jabotinsky and his Revisionist Zionist movement. Kreisky says Much failed to persuade him of these views.⁴

The political scientist and expert on anti-Semitism, Anton Pelinka, pointed out, “For the National Socialists, Kreisky was a Jew. To save his life he had to go into Swedish exile. Vis-à-vis his environment, Kreisky had accepted his Jewish identity—but not in the sense of drawing religious or political implications. Kreisky was a Jew because others saw him as a Jew.”⁵ He was committed to his Social Democratic ideas rather than to his Jewish identity.

When speaking about the Palestinians, Kreisky compared their situation to that of occupied Austria after 1938. His memoirs refer to an incident in Sweden in 1941: he identified himself to a Swedish policeman as Austrian even though the policeman insisted that Austria did not exist anymore. Kreisky relates that he mentioned this story once in a discussion with Golda Meir when she opposed using the term Palestinians at a meeting of the Socialist International.⁶

As president of the Austrian Social Democratic Party since 1967, Kreisky had major influence in the Socialist International. When Willy Brandt was elected president of the Socialist International in 1976, Kreisky became one of its vice-presidents.

After World War II, the Socialist International took a pro-Israeli stance. It admired Israeli socialism with its kibbutzim and moshavim, viewing this as the only path to a prosperous Jewish homeland.⁷ After the 1973 Yom Kippur War, however, these perceptions changed.

At its thirteenth congress in Geneva in 1976, the Socialist International passed a resolution supporting the “right of all peoples to self-determination and a life in peace with secure and recognized borders.” It did not mention the Palestinians or the PLO in particular.⁸

In a *Jerusalem Post* interview in 1978, Kreisky called Israeli prime minister Menachem Begin a “political grocer,” a “Polish lawyer from Warsaw,” and also sharply attacked Israel as being culpable for the Middle East conflict.⁹ In 1979, Kreisky and Brandt invited Arafat to Vienna, and the latter became the first European capital to receive him as a future prime minister.

In March 1980, Austria formally recognized the PLO. The Conservative opposition charged Kreisky with “condoning terrorism and deviating from the diplomatic tradition of recognizing only states.”¹⁰ As Harry Delfiner noted,

Kreisky apparently never seriously examined whether in helping Arafat he was also helping to advance a new form of warfare that would eventually threaten many of the very values in which he and his fellow socialists believed. When confronted with the facts of Arafat’s engagement in terrorism, he would downplay or deny it altogether, while concentrating his attention on what he saw as advancing the wronged people and on the need to bring peace to the Middle East.¹¹

Kreisky continued his involvement with Middle Eastern politics after he left the government in 1983.

The Waldheim Affair

In 1986 Kurt Waldheim, having previously been secretary-general of the United Nations, was the Conservative candidate for the Austrian presidency. During the period of his candidacy it became known that he had kept silent about serving as an officer of the German army in the Balkans during the war.

The populist newspaper *Kronenzeitung* and the conservative *Kurier* received a flood of anti-Semitic letters blaming the Jews for impugning Waldheim's integrity.¹² There was also, however, a positive effect as for the first time Austria critically scrutinized its Nazi past and questioned its presumed role as victim.¹³

Franz Vranitzky

Franz Vranitzky was Austrian chancellor from 1986 to 1997. He stated officially that Austria's self-perception as Nazi Germany's initial victim was mistaken.

In a speech to the Austrian parliament commemorating the Shoah on 6 May 2005, Stuart E. Eizenstat observed:

Chancellor Franz Vranitzky made dramatic statements at the 50th anniversary of the Anschluss in 1988 and again in the Austrian Parliament, this Parliament, in 1991, that "many"—and I am quoting him—"Austrians welcomed the so-called Anschluss, supported the National Socialist Regime," and "participated in the machinery of suppression and persecution of the Third Reich, some of them at the forefront," and thus, in his words, bore "moral co-responsibility." In 1994, Federal President the late Dr. Thomas Klestil bowed his head to the victims and declared to the Israeli Knesset that Austria "mustn't be spared from encountering the historical truth, the whole truth" and that, in his words, "too often one has spoken only about how Austria has been the first nation to lose its liberty and independence to National Socialism and way too seldom we have also spoken about the fact that some of the worst henchmen...had been in fact Austrian."¹⁴

In 1993, Vranitzky received an honorary doctorate from the Hebrew University of Jerusalem in recognition of his efforts to improve Austrian-Israeli relations and his forthright statements on Austria's role during the Nazi period. Speaking to the Knesset, he referred to Austria's "collective responsibility" rather than "collective guilt"; the former entailed a possibility of critically examining Austria's past.

Misconceptions and Anti-Israelism among Austrian Intellectuals

John Bunzl and the Narrative of "Zionist Colonization"

The Jewish scholar John Bunzl teaches political science at the University of Vienna and is an associate of the Austrian Institute for International Affairs. Bunzl views the founding of the state of Israel as an act of "Zionist colonization." According to him, the core of the conflict is this colonization and the resistance of the native population, the Palestinians. He also describes Muslim anti-Semitism as a relatively recent trend, consistently ignoring that Egypt's Muslim Brotherhood already established Islamism as a mass movement in the late 1920s.¹⁵

In its 2002-2003 report on Austria,¹⁶ Tel Aviv University's Stephen Roth Institute for the Study of Contemporary Anti-Semitism and Racism mentions an open letter by Bunzl in response to an analysis of the extreme left-wing Anti-Imperialist Camp (Antiimperialistische Koordination—AIK) issued by the Documentation Center of Austrian Resistance (DOEW).¹⁷ This letter was posted on the AIK's website.¹⁸ In it Bunzl accuses the DOEW of superficial analysis and unjustified accusation of leftist organizations as being anti-Semitic.

Bunzl asserts in the letter that the DOEW defines the "resistance of Palestinians, Arabs, Muslims, and leftists as being an extension of the German anti-Semitism that led to the annihilation of the Jews, implying that Israel's violence against the Palestinians has to be defined as a continuation of the antifascist Resistance." According to Bunzl, the DOEW thereby joins leftists who enjoy the psychological effect of making charges of anti-Semitism against other leftists who criticize Israel. Bunzl also accuses the Anti-Defamation League (ADL) and the IKG (Israelitische Kultusgemeinde, the umbrella body of the Austrian Jewish community) of making dubious analyses of statements by those critical of Israel.

Bunzl, who repeatedly calls himself a Middle East expert, recently made inconsistent statements. In December 2005, in a letter to the editor of the Austrian newspaper *The Standard*, he belittled Iranian president Ahmadinejad's threat to destroy Israel.¹⁹ Yet in a February 2006 article in the Israeli daily *Haaretz*, he refers to such threats and also to Holocaust denial as "infamous statements by Iranian President Ahmadinejad and similar utterances by other Arab or Muslim spokespeople." He also notes the contradiction between Muslim Holocaust denial "and demanding that the price for the Holocaust should be paid by those who committed it."²⁰

The Extreme Left's Influence on Austrian Academia

In March 2002, several Austrian professors supported with their signatures a "Congress against War and Embargo in Iraq" that was to be held on 28-29 March 2003 at the Technical University in Vienna. The conference was organized by

a group called Students and Faculty against the War and was announced on the AIK's website,²¹ which also posted the supporters' signatures.²² When contacted individually, it turned out that several of the professors who signed had not been informed of the AIK's backing of the conference. However, others clearly did know.

- **Dr. Yvonne Schmidt**, assistant lecturer at the Institute for International Law and International Relations of Karl Franzens University in Graz, was one of the signatories. In December 2005, the Vienna-based Society of Austro-Arab Relations (SAAR) organized a panel discussion at Karl Franzens University called "Palestine: Autonomous State or Israel's Colony?" The invited speakers were Schmidt and the German journalist Dr. Ludwig Watzal, a frequent contributor to the AIK's website.²³ The panel was to be moderated by Fritz Edlinger, general secretary of the SAAR and editor of the German edition of Israel Shamir's anti-Semitic book, *Blumen aus Galiläa* (Flowers of Galilee).²⁴

This discussion was originally scheduled for November 2005. However, massive protests by the public, faculty, and a local organization called MayDay Graz, consisting mainly of students and young intellectuals, led the rector of the university to withdraw his authorization to hold this event at Karl Franzens University. The protests were directed mainly at Edlinger's participation, and were also backed by the historian Prof. Dr. Helmut Konrad, former rector of the university and specialist in contemporary history.

Eventually, though, the event was rescheduled and, thanks to Schmidt's involvement in organizing it, was held on 16 December 2005 at the Institute for International Law and International Relations, which coorganized it. Watzal did not take part for health reasons, and Schmidt was the main speaker. According to Edlinger's report,²⁵ she dealt with aspects of Israel's "politics of occupation." Most likely as a result of the protests, the organizers also invited Konrad to give a statement at the opening of the event.

In an interview in the February 2006 issue of the periodical *law@graz*, Schmidt attributes full responsibility for the Israeli-Palestinian conflict to Israel as the oppressive power, and the United States.²⁶

Yvonne Schmidt is also associated expert of the Centre for Islam in Europe (CIE) at Gent University, Belgium, which propagates the boycott of Israeli academics.²⁷ The second revised edition of her thesis (Vienna, 2001), *Foundations of Civil and Political Rights in Israel and the Occupied Territories*, was published in 2006 as an e-book on the university website.²⁸ In this book she claims that political Zionism is responsible for the Arab-Israeli conflict because of its "reducing the political status and the chances for self-determination of the native Arab inhabitants."²⁹

On the occasion of the Second Lebanon War in 2006, Schmidt initiated an open letter to "call for investigation and possible prosecution of war crimes"

by the International Criminal Court. The letter was published by CIE.³⁰

During the summer terms in 2006 and 2007, Schmidt gave lectures on “Völkerrechtliche Fragen im Kontext der gegenwärtigen Krise im Nahen und Mittleren Osten” (Questions of International Law in the Context of the Present Crisis in the Near and Middle East). A Near and Middle East database on her website³¹ is constantly updated and contains, among others, articles that justify the Iranian nuclear policy as well as the Islamic Republic of Iran’s official position on the UN General Assembly resolution on “Holocaust Denial” (26 January 2007).³²

- **The AIK’s attempts to gain influence in Austrian universities.** On 1 January 2006, in the aftermath of the event in Graz, the AIK posted on its website an open letter of protest addressed to Prof. Konrad from a local pro-Palestinian organization (Verein Palästina-Steiermark). The letter accuses Konrad of insufficiently favoring pro-Palestinian events at the university. It states: “We are missing the presence of Arab history and especially Palestinian history at the Institute for Contemporary History in Graz.”³³ The implication is that these subjects are intentionally excluded.

AIK activists have also repeatedly tried to occupy lecture rooms at the University of Vienna so as to advance their views.³⁴ The AIK is also trying to increase its influence on the Council of Austrian Students (Österreichische Hochschülerschaft).³⁵

- **The Society of Austro-Arab Relations (SAAR) and Fritz Edlinger.** As demonstrated by the example at Karl Franzens University, the SAAR is trying to gain influence in Austrian academia. Although Bunzl describes the SAAR as an exclusively humanitarian organization,³⁶ its bulletins³⁷ contain much anti-Israeli bias. As noted, the organization’s general secretary is Fritz Edlinger, who meanwhile has officially regretted being the editor of *Blumen aus Galiläa*. Yet his interview on 18 September 2005 to Muslim-Markt, a website for German-speaking Muslims, is still available on the SAAR’s website.³⁸

In this interview, Edlinger consistently downplays Shamir’s attacks on Zionism, Israel, and the Jews. He calls the criticism of the book a “hysterical campaign” by Zionist writers. He is probably referring to the Austrian journalist Karl Pfeifer, winner of the Samuel Bloch Award for his struggle against anti-Semitism in 2003. Edlinger also mentions the Austrian online review *Die Juedische* (www.juedische.at), disrespectfully calling it “Zionistische Internetpostille” (“the Zionist internet-leaflet”).

Edlinger also denies being anti-Semitic, referring to his political past. Yet, in 1982, he already attacked the IKG, asking “if it was acceptable for them to receive financial support from official institutions from a country [Austria] whose chancellor [Kreisky] is vilified as an enemy of Israel.”³⁹

- **Andrea Komlosy.** Professor of history at the University of Vienna, Komlosy

is a former Maoist⁴⁰ and also supported with her signature the 2003 “Congress against War and Embargo in Iraq.”

In a recent statement, the AIK supported Ahmadinejad’s suggestion to set up a Jewish state in Austrian and German territory. As the AIK put it: “the countries that are responsible for the Holocaust should see to the establishment of a Jewish state in their own territory instead of supporting the rape of territory of the Palestinian people.”⁴¹ They also refer to Komlosy, who propounded similar ideas in 2002 in an article in the conservative newspaper *Presse*.⁴²

According to Komlosy in this article, the recognition of Israel entailed transferring responsibility for the Holocaust to a part of the world that played no role in it. She also criticizes Israel for being based on the Jewish religion. Komlosy states that the fact that every Jew in the world is a potential citizen of Israel causes structural problems of space. These lead to Israeli expansion and create conflicts with the Arabs who live in territories that Israel claims.

Also in the same article, Komlosy describes Israel as the bridgehead for the victors in World War II. The only solution, she maintains, is to create a Jewish state in an “exclusive settlement area” in Germany. She claims that Israel is falsely likened to David whereas the Palestinians are demonized as Goliath. Palestinian attacks, she suggests, are wrongly defined as terrorism and are actually “acts of defense against an unjustified occupation.”

The historian Wolfgang Neugebauer, former head of the DOEW, refers to Komlosy’s harsh condemnation of Zionism and the Jewish state in the latter’s *Presse* article.⁴³

- **Hans Köchler.** Professor of philosophical anthropology, phenomenology, existential philosophy, cultural hermeneutics, human rights, philosophy of law, international relations, and political philosophy at the University of Innsbruck, Köchler heads the Institute for Philosophy there. He, too, was a supporter of the “Congress against War and Embargo in Iraq” and also a speaker at the gathering. In April 2000, UN secretary-general Kofi Annan appointed Köchler as an international observer at the Lockerbie trial.⁴⁴

Köchler often supports AIK activities. He is president of a Vienna-based NGO, the International Progress Organization (IPO), which claims to promote tolerance toward all nationalities and cultures but displays a strong anti-Israeli bias in its publications and in statements by Köchler himself.⁴⁵

In his publications, Köchler repeatedly defines Israel as the “occupying power in Palestine.”⁴⁶ One of his more recent documents is a “Statement on Behalf of the Network of Non-Governmental Organizations on the Question of Palestine,” issued on the occasion of the International Day of Solidarity with the Palestinian People on 29 November 2005.⁴⁷

Köchler is not only associated with the extreme Left but also with the extreme Right. On 25 November 1995, he gave a lecture at a “Symposium on Europe and the Third World” of the Freiheitliche Akademie, an institution

of the far-Right Freedom Party.⁴⁸ Köchler appears in a document the IPO issued on 1 February 2000 as a defender of the coalition the Conservatives formed with the Freedom Party to resist the sanctions against Austria. In this document he opposes “demonizing the Freedom Party, Austria’s second biggest party.”⁴⁹

In February 1988, the *International Herald Tribune* reported that in the preceding year Köchler had nominated Waldheim as a candidate for the Nobel Peace Prize.⁵⁰

As Karl Pfeifer notes, Köchler also has contacts with the far-Right LaRouche movement.⁵¹ In 1998, Köchler appeared as a supporter of a press release published by the German branch of the LaRouche movement, Bürgerrechtsbewegung Solidarität (Civil Rights Movement Solidarity), in their magazine *Neue Solidarität*. This German branch of the movement is managed by Lyndon LaRouche’s wife, Helga Zepp LaRouche. The press release claims that President Clinton should appoint LaRouche, an American extremist, as his economic adviser.⁵²

In January 2003, Köchler presented a paper at a seminar sponsored by the *Executive Intelligence Review* (a LaRouche publication) on “International Rule of Law and the United Nations.” He stated: “I agree with Mr. LaRouche in that the main motivation for the United States to undertake the invasion of Iraq was to effectively ruin the political order of that country [and] facilitate the implementation of an essentially non-Arab and non-Muslim agenda for the greater Middle East.”⁵³

The Extreme Right’s Influence on Austrian Academia

At present, leftist anti-Semitism is manifest in the anti-imperialist and antiglobalization movement. However, traditional anti-Semitism that usually is associated with right-wing groups and neo-Nazis remains an active force. As demonstrated by the case of Köchler, it is sometimes difficult to distinguish between the extreme Right and Left. There are interconnections, and the boundaries are often blurred.

The DOEW cites the Palästinensische Gemeinde Österreich (Palestinian Community of Austria) as a right-wing organization. Their former vice-president and current honorary president, the physician Dr. Georg Nicola, participated in 2003 in a panel discussion together with Gerhard Zeihsel—former deputy of the Freedom Party in Vienna and president of the Holocaust-revisionist Sudetendeutsche Landsmannschaft in Österreich (Sudeten German Compatriots)⁵⁴—and the attorney Eva Maria Barki. The discussion was titled “From Benes to Sharon: Sudeten Germans and Palestinians—Oppressed and Driven Out” (“Von Benes zu Sharon: Sudetendeutsche und Palästinenser—

Entrechtet und vertrieben”).⁵⁵ The Stephen Roth Institute, in its report on Austria for 2003-2004, noted:

An advertisement for the event printed in *Der Eckartbote*, read, *inter alia*: “Both ethnic groups were deported, both are deprived of their right to a home country.... The brutal and bloody strategy employed by the Israeli army borders on ethnic cleansing and genocide. Some say that the Israeli military works like the local SS aid divisions in Eastern Europe.”⁵⁶

The same report mentions several right-wing organizations of students and intellectuals.

In February 2006, the British anti-Semitic historian David Irving was sentenced in Austria for Holocaust denial. Heribert Schiedel noted that the far-Right Freiheitliche Akademikerverband (Liberal Academics Association), an organization of academics affiliated to the Freedom Party, were the first to invite Irving to Austria in 1989. Last fall the Olympia Fraternity, an organization of far-Right academics and students that includes a considerable number of leading Freedom Party members, had invited Irving before he was arrested.⁵⁷

On 6 April 2003, Olympia’s website published a press release condemning the American and British intervention in Iraq and announcing a new organization called Fraternities against Imperialism. The press release also claims a correlation between “Anglo-American” warfare and Arab reactions such as suicide bombings and guerrilla tactics.⁵⁸

On 25 May 2005, Olympia held a panel discussion called “Pulverfaß Nahost!: Explodiert Europa mit?” (Powder-Keg Middle East: Does Europe Explode as Well?). One of the speakers was Richard Melisch, a Beirut businessman and frequent contributor to *Aula*, the organ of the Freiheitliche Akademikerverband and the nationalist student organizations, about whom the Stephen Roth Institute reports:

In March 2002 *Zur Zeit* [the Freedom Party’s weekly paper] commissioned an article by Richard Melisch on the Middle East conflict which according to Melisch has already been won by the Arabs. In the future, he sees no place for Jews (“a people that claims special rights based on their self-proclaimed chosenness”) in the region and foresees “a new exodus, this time in the other direction [which] should not pose a problem since most Israelis have more than one passport anyway.”⁵⁹

In 2002, the Austrian Organization against Racism (ZARA) reported on a local organization of the Freedom Party that distributed a pamphlet by Melisch called “Middle East Crisis Area” (“Krisengebiet Nahost”). In it he spoke, on the one hand, of “globally organised Zionism that cannot be understood in territorial terms with connections to (Jewish) high finance in New York.”⁶⁰ On the other hand, he referred to the Arab peoples as “always [having been] our friends.”

Melisch also called “Arab liberation organisations” a “legitimate resistance movement against the Zionist occupiers.”

Aula dedicated its entire September 2004 issue to the question of anti-Semitism and anti-Zionism. It asserted that the two are not the same, in effect sanctioning the replacement of Jews by Israel and Ariel Sharon as targets for vilification.⁶¹

Univ. Doz. Dr. Friedrich Romig teaches at the Vienna University of Economics and Business Administration. He contributes to *Aula* and is considered a link between Catholic and extreme-Right circles. In a recent article posted at the ill-famed Zundelsite, he quotes Norman Finkelstein’s *The Holocaust Industry* and says that not only a new branch of industry has arisen but also a new “Holocaust religion” that, he claims, replaces Christianity. “The relationship between the United States and Israel leads, therefore, to NATO becoming a ‘Greater Israel Alliance’ that can establish this Holocaust religion worldwide.”⁶²

According to Romig and others, the boycott of Austria after the 1999 elections was due to “the same clique involved in the anti-Waldheim conspiracy, namely, an international conspiracy of Jews [that] had revived its activities against Austria.”⁶³

The right-wing website Wiener Nachrichten Online, which is affiliated with the Freedom Party, published an interview with Noam Chomsky⁶⁴ and a review of the German translation of his book *No Chance for Peace*,⁶⁵ which is full of anti-Israeli and anti-American demagoguery. This is another example of the convergence of right- and left-wing anti-Israelism.

Prospects

In the winter term for 2005, Univ. Doz. Dr. Brigitte Bailer-Galanda, director of the DOEW, held a seminar at the University of Vienna’s Institute for Political Science titled “Anti-Semitism, Racism, and Xenophobia in Austria after 1945.” One lecture given on 23 November 2005 was titled “Feindbild Israel” (Concept of the Enemy: Israel) and dealt with the history of Zionism and Israel, the Shoah and world politics, the history of Islamism as a means of understanding the Middle East conflict, and the difficult borderline between anti-Semitism and anti-Zionism. Dr. Bailer-Galanda noted a general positive feedback from the students.⁶⁶

There is an active group of students, the Council of Political Science Students at the University of Vienna, that works against anti-Semitism and anti-Israeli bias. Together with the Café Critique, a Vienna-based group of political scientists that advocates for Israel among other endeavors, they organize events on the Middle East with speakers such as Matthias Küntzel, a German political scientist; Thomas von der Osten-Sacken, a German human rights activist focusing on the situation in Iraq; and Ulrich Sahn, a German journalist covering the Middle East. MayDay Graz has been mentioned previously.

In conclusion, although anti-Israelism and anti-Semitism are not mainstream at Austrian universities, it is necessary to remain alert.

Notes

1. Wolfgang Neugebauer and Peter Schwarz, *Der Wille zum aufrechten Gang: Offenlegung der Rolle des BSA bei der gesellschaftlichen Reintegration ehemaliger Nationalsozialisten* (Wien: Czernin Verlag, 2005). [German]
2. Manfred Gerstenfeld, "Jews against Israel," *Nativ Online*, Vol. 8 (October 2005), www.acpr.org.il/english-nativ/08-issue/gerstenfeld-8.htm [2 April 2006].
3. Bruno Kreisky, *Zwischen den Zeiten: Erinnerungen aus fünf Jahrzehnten* (Berlin: Siedler Verlag, 1986). [German]
4. *Ibid.*, 64.
5. Anton Pelinka, "Nicht die Judenfrage, der Antisemitismus ist das Problem," in Max Halhuber, *5 Fragen an 3 Generationen: Der Antisemitismus und wir heute* (Wien: Czernin Verlag), 54. [German]
6. Kreisky, *Zwischen den Zeiten*, 360-61.
7. Julius Braunthal, *Geschichte der Internationale*, Vol. 3 (Hannover: J. H. W. Dietz Nachf. GmbH, 1971), 414. [German]
8. *Socialist Affairs*, Vol. 1 (1977), quoted in John Bunzl, *Between Vienna and Jerusalem: Reflections and Polemics on Austria, Israel and Palestine* (New York: Peter Lang, 1997), 56.
9. Robert Wistrich, "The Strange Case of Bruno Kreisky," *Encounter*, Vol. 52, No. 5 (May 1979), 78.
10. Bunzl, *Between Vienna and Jerusalem*, 58.
11. Harry Delfiner, "The Socialist International and the Rise of Yasir Arafat," *Midstream*, November/December 2002, quoted in Gerstenfeld, "Jews against Israel."
12. Franz Rauscher, "Die Waldheim Affaire: Eine Reminiszenz," *Der Standard*, 5 February 2006. [German]
13. Sonja Niederacher, "Postwar Austria and the Jewish Refugees: The Role of the Exile Studies in Coming to Terms with the Past," www.demokratiezentrum.org/pdfs/niederacher_exile.pdf, 4 [2 April 2006].
14. Speech of Stuart W. Eizenstat to the Austrian parliament on the occasion of Holocaust Memorial Day, 6 May 2005, www.parlinkom.gv.at/portal/page?_pageid=908,873974&_dad=portal&_schema=PORTAL [2 April 2006].
15. Matthias Küntzel, *Djihad und Judenhass* (Freiburg: Ca ira, 2002). [German]
16. Stephen Roth Institute for the Study of Contemporary Anti-Semitism and Racism, *Anti-Semitism Report Austria 2002/03*, www.tau.ac.il/Anti-Semitism/asw2002-3/austria.htm [2 April 2006].
17. Heribert Schiedel (Aktion gegen Antisemitismus), "Die Antiimperialistische Koordination (AIK): Antisemitismus im linken Gewand," www.doew.at/aktuell/aktion/aik.html [2 April 2006]. [German]
18. John Bunzl, "Das DÖW auf dem Leim der 'antideutschen Linken'?" www.antiimperialista.org/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=518&Itemid=0 [2 April 2006]. [German]
19. John Bunzl, "Taktische Rhetorik," letter to the editor, *Der Standard*, 12 December 2005 [German]. A summary of Bunzl's letter together with a response by Ruth Contreras, published in *Der Standard* on 19 December 2005, may be found at Scholars for Peace

- in the Middle East—Faculty Forum, 25 December 2005, www.spme.net/cgi-bin/facultyforum.cgi?ID=2101.
20. John Bunzl, “Islam’s Holocaust Denial Trap,” *Haaretz*, 10 February 2006, www.haaretz.com/hasen/spages/681383.html [20 February 2006]; www.lebanonwire.com/0602MN/06021003HZ.asp [30 May 2007].
 21. “Irak-Kongress: Stoppt Krieg und Embargo!” *Campo Antiimperialista*, www.antiimperialista.org/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=959&Itemid=0 [29 May 2006]. [German]
 22. “Kongress gegen Krieg und Embargo in Wien Proponent/Innen,” *Campo Antiimperialista*, www.antiimperialista.org/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=494&Itemid=0 [29 May 2006]. [German]
 23. John Rosenthal, “Germany’s Terror Apologist,” *TCS Daily*, 23 February 2006, www.tcsdaily.com/article.aspx?id=022306F [2 April 2006].
 24. Israel Shamir, *Blumen aus Galiläa. Schriften gegen die Zerstörung des Heiligen Landes* (Wien: ProMedia Verlag, 2005) [German], English ed.: *Flowers of Galilee* (Tempe, AZ: Dandelion Books, 2004). In its report on Austria for 2005, the Steven Roth Institute for the Study of Contemporary Antisemitism and Racism quotes this book under the section “Propaganda.”
 25. “Stellungnahme von Fritz Edlinger zu den Vorkommnissen im Zusammenhang mit einer Palästinaveranstaltung in Graz,” www.saar.at/pdf/Brief201205.pdf [2 April 2006]. [German]
 26. “Schriftliches Interview von Dr. Yvonne Schmidt für die Februar 2006 Ausgabe der Zeitung,” law@graz, www.uni-graz.at/yvonne.schmidt/WABL%20-%20Interview%20mit%20Dr.%20Schmidt%20-%20kurz-25.1.2006.doc [2 April 2006]. [German]
 27. “Appeal to British Academics by PACBI: Boycott the Israeli Academy Now!” published on the website of CIE, www.flwi.ugent.be/cie/Palestina/palestina381.htm.
 28. Yvonne Schmidt, “Foundations of Civil and Political Rights in Israel and the Occupied Territories,” www.flwi.ugent.be/cie/yschmidt/index.htm.
 29. Ibid., Ch. H, “Summary and Final Conclusions,” www.flwi.ugent.be/cie/yschmidt/17schmidt.htm.
 30. “Destruction of Lebanon July 2006: Call for Investigation and Possible Prosecution of WAR CRIMES by the International Criminal Court,” www.flwi.ugent.be/cie/Palestina/palestina255.htm.
 31. Yvonne Schmidt, Near and Middle East (Naher and Mittlerer Osten) Database, www.uni-graz.at/yvonne.schmidt/NAHOST.html.
 32. Yvonne Schmidt, “Explanation of the Position of the Islamic Republic of Iran on the General Assembly Resolution on ‘Holocaust Denial,’” 26 January 2007, www.un.int/iran/statements/generalassembly/session60/session60/9.htm.
 33. Open letter to Prof. Konrad, “Offener Brief an Prof. Konrad vom Verein Palästina (Steiermark),” 1 January 2006, www.antiimperialista.org/index.php/?option=com_content&task=view&id=4054&Itemid=82 [30 May 2007]. [German]
 34. Personal communication from Stephan Grigat (Basisgruppe Politikwissenschaften, University of Vienna, and Café Critique), April 2004.
 35. Personal communication from Heribert Schiedel (Aktion gegen Antisemitismus), 1 March 2006.
 36. Bunzl, *Between Vienna and Jerusalem*, 47-48.
 37. Society for Austro-Arab Relations, www.saar.at/bulletinf.html [30 May 2007].
 38. “Muslim-Markt interviewt Fritz Edlinger, Generalsekretär der Gesellschaft für Österreichisch-Arabische Beziehungen,” 18 September 2005, www.saar.at/muslimmarkt_interviewt.htm [30 May 2007]. [German]

39. Margit Reiter, *Unter Antisemitismusverdacht: Studienverlag* (Wien, München: Bozen, 2001), 302. [German]
40. Karl Pfeifer, Antiimperialistischen Koordination, "Über einige Proponenten eines Kongresses 'gegen Krieg und Embargo' in Wien," first published in *Hagalil*, 30. März 2003, www.klick-nach-rechts.de/austria/aik-2.htm. [German]
41. Campo Antiimperialista, "Krokodilstränen der Politisch korrekten Elite," www.antiimperialista.org/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=3886&Itemid=82 [2 April 2006]. [German]
42. Andrea Komlosy, "Mit allen Mitteln," originally published in *Die Presse* (Spectrum), 27 July 2002, www.diepresse.at/Artikel.aspx?channel=sp&ressort=S100&id=300399&archiv=false [2 April 2006] [German], www.muslim-markt.de/Palaestina-Spezial/geschichtechronik/pseudostaat_israel.htm [30 May 2007].
43. Wolfgang Neugebauer, "Israelkritik als neuer Antisemitismus?" first published in *Schalom: Zeitschrift der Österreichisch-Israelischen Gesellschaft*, Nr. 3/4, Oktober 2003, 28-30; *Die Jüdische*, 6 April 2005, www.doew.at/aktuell/aktion/wn.html [30 May 2007]. [German]
44. Statement by Dr. Hans Köchler on the agreement between the United States, the United Kingdom and the Libyan Jamahiriya on the remaining issues relating to the fulfilment of all Security Council resolutions resulting from the bombing of Pan Am 103 over Lockerbie, 23 August 2003, www.i-p-o.org/koechler-lockerbie-statement-aug2003.htm [28 March 2006].
45. Aaron Beitman, "International Progress Organization: Analysis," *NGO Monitor*, 30 March 2006, www.ngo-monitor.org/archives/infofile/ipo_300306.html [30 May 2006].
46. Final Resolution of international conference on "Israel as Occupying Power," International Progress Organization, Vienna, 2-3 May 1984, www.i-p-o.org/iop.htm [28 March 2006]; memorandum of the IPO addressed to the President of the General Assembly and to the Secretary-General of the United Nations on the humanitarian emergency and threat to peace resulting from the Security Council's sanctions policy vis-à-vis Iraq, www.embargos.de/irak/statement/memo_iraq_un_ipo_en.htm [28 March 2006].
47. Hans Köchler, "Statement on Behalf of the Network of Non-Governmental Organizations on the Question of Palestine," Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People, 29 November 2005, www.i-p-o.org/Koechler-IPO-Palestine-UN-29Nov2005.pdf [28 March 2006].
48. Hans Köchler, lecture, "123: Eine Weltordnung im Sinne der Herrschaft der Westlichen Werte?" Symposium "Europa und die Dritte Welt," Freiheitliche Akademie, Baden bei Wien, Austria, 25 November 1995, www.hanskoechler.com/koechler-lectures.htm [31 May 2006]. [German]
49. IPO, "Austria-European Union," www.i-p-o.org/austria-eu.htm [31 May 2006].
50. "Waldheim amid Furor Remains Candidate for the Nobel Peace Prize," *International Herald Tribune*, 11 February 1988, www.i-p-o.org/herald-tribune-88.jpg [2 April 2006].
51. Karl Pfeifer, Antiimperialistischen Koordination, "Über einige Proponenten."
52. "Kurznachrichten: Bürgerrechtsbewegung International," *Neue Solidarität*, 44/98, www.solidaritaet.com/neuesol/1998/44/bueso.htm [1 July 2006]. [German]
53. Hans Köchler, "International Rule of Law and the United Nations," www.hanskoechler.com/koechler-IRLUN-Berlin-Jan05.htm [23 July 2006].
54. Markus Ströhlein, "Das Verhältnis deutscher 'Vertriebener' zu Shoah und Israel," *Hagalil*, 27 January 2004, www.hagalil.com/archiv/2004/01/vertriebene.htm. [German]
55. Heribert Schiedel, "Die Antiimperialistische Koordination: Antisemitismus im linken Gewand," www.doew.at/frames.php?/aktuell/aktion/aik.html. [German]

56. Stephen Roth Institute, *Anti-Semitism Worldwide*, Country Reports 2003-2004 Austria, www.tau.ac.il/Anti-Semitism/asw2003-4/austria.htm [31 May 2006].
57. Heribert Schiedel, "Zum Ausgang des Wiener Irving-Prozesses," www.no-racism.net/article/1584/, 7 March 2006 [31 May 2006]. [German]
58. "Presseerklärung der Burschenschaftlichen Gemeinschaft in DB und DBÖ (BG) zum Irak-Krieg," www.olympia.burschenschaft.at/BG_IRAK.html [31 May 2006]. [German]
59. Stephen Roth Institute, *Anti-Semitism Worldwide*, Country Reports 2002-2003 Austria, www.tau.ac.il/Anti-Semitism/asw2002-3/austria.htm [31 May 2006].
60. "Case Report on Racist Incidents and Structures in Austria: Focus: Civil Courage," *ZARA Racism Report 2002*, 17, www.zara.or.at/materialien/rassismus-report/racism-report-2002.pdf [2 April 2006].
61. Karl Pfeifer, "Aula: 'Antizionismus ist nicht Antisemitismus,'" *Hagalil*, 24 September 2004, www.hagalil.com/archiv/2004/09/aula.htm [7 June 2006]. [German]
62. Friedrich Romig, "Der Holocaust, die neue Weltreligion," 16 April 2006, www.zundel.org/zundel_persecuted/april16-06.html [7 June 2006]. [German]
63. Stephen Roth Institute for the Study of Contemporary Anti-Semitism and Racism, *Anti-Semitism Worldwide Country Reports 1999-2000 Austria*, www.tau.ac.il/Anti-Semitism/asw99-2000/austria.htm [7 June 2006].
64. Wiener Nachrichten Online, "Es gibt keinen Krieg gegen den Terror" (interview with Noam Chomsky), www.wienernachrichten.com/newpages/com41e.html [1 April 2006]. [German]
65. Noam Chomsky, *Keine Chance für Frieden: Warum mit Israel und den USA kein Palästinenserstaat zu machen ist* (Hamburg: Europa Verlag, 2005). [German]
66. Personal communication, 2 February 2006.

Ronnie Fraser

The Academic Boycott of Israel: Why Britain?

On 22 April 2005, the Association of University Teachers (AUT) held a council meeting in Eastbourne at which they passed motions to boycott Haifa and Bar-Ilan universities, distribute proboycott literature to the AUT's forty-eight thousand members, and referred back a motion to boycott the Hebrew University of Jerusalem. Just over a month later, in a special meeting of the council on 26 May, these motions were revoked. Instead, the AUT resolved to work with the other academic labor unions—NATFHE (the University and College Lecturers' Union) and the TUC (Trades Union Congress), which is the umbrella body for UK labor unions—in a full review of its international policy, and also to provide solidarity to both Palestinian and Israeli academics.¹

Between these two meetings of the AUT membership, participants began to recognize that their union had been used by Sue Blackwell of Birmingham University and her fellow supporters to further their own political agenda.

The membership voted overwhelmingly to overturn the ban at their local AUT branches before the special council meeting. Some members felt strongly about academic freedom, some thought it was wrong to ostracize Israel at a time of potential peacemaking, and others believed the AUT had now made itself a racist organization.

For Israeli academia and for UK Jewry, these events were a wakeup call. They realized that these issues would not disappear in the foreseeable future.

The Origins of the Academic Boycott

The first campaign anywhere for an academic boycott of Israel was launched in the spring of 2002 at the time of the Israeli offensive against Palestinian terrorist organizations in the West Bank. Two British academics, Steven Rose (who is Jewish) and his wife, Hilary Rose, along with 123 other mostly British academics, published an open letter in *The Guardian* calling for a European Union moratorium on funding for grants and research contracts for Israeli universities.²

Originally this was seen as a spontaneous reaction to events in Israel and the territories. Subsequently, however, it has emerged that the move was part of a well-planned campaign to link enemies of Israel from the political Left, Jewish supporters of the boycott, as well as the Palestinians.

This coalition appears to have waited for an opportunity to launch the boycott at a time when the world was condemning Israel.³

The letter's publication on 6 April 2002 in the Saturday edition ensured that it would be reprinted elsewhere in the following days.

The choice of *The Guardian* was also significant, since this newspaper is well known for its socialist and anti-Israeli views⁴ and is widely read by left-wing academics. Indeed, within days, academics from all over the world had signed the petition and similar ones were launched in France and Australia. Although the letter called for an EU moratorium, it became known within a few weeks as "the academic boycott of Israel."

The letter caught everyone unprepared, and the Israeli and Diaspora responses were not coordinated. Even condemnations from official sources were slow, and it took the EU two weeks to oppose the boycott in a press release. A counterpetition to the call for a European boycott of academic and cultural ties with Israel was published on 15 April.⁵

Dismissal of Two Israeli Academics

The boycott issue was kept in the headlines when two months later on 6 June, Mona Baker, a lecturer at UMIST University in Manchester and signatory to the *Guardian* letter, dismissed two Israeli academics from the editorial board of an academic journal that is published by a company she owns. The two academics were Dr. Miriam Shlesinger of Bar-Ilan University and Prof. Gideon Toury of Tel Aviv University. UMIST, Baker's employers, decided to distance the university from her act and announced that an inquiry would be held.⁶

Six months later, UMIST declared that she had broken no rules because what she had done did not conflict with her teaching duties. Throughout this period, the Roses, Baker, and their supporters used letters and articles in newspapers to keep the boycott issue alive.

For all of 2002 and the first few months of 2003, UK Jewry's response was weak and poorly coordinated. The main reactions came from individual academics in the UK and Israel, though neither country took the boycott threat seriously until 2005.

Sue Blackwell's first attempt to pass a boycott resolution at an AUT conference was made when she proposed the motion from her local Birmingham association at the Scarborough conference in May 2003.⁷ The debate was held late on a Friday afternoon, denying many Jewish members the opportunity to participate since they could not get home in time for the Sabbath. Shalom Lappin, an Israeli academic serving as lecturer at King's College, University of London, led the opposition to the motion, which was defeated by a two-to-one majority.

The following month Andrew Wilkie, professor of pathology at Oxford, rejected an application for a research position in his laboratory by an Israeli student because he had served in the Israeli army and because Wilkie had a "huge problem" with Israel's treatment of Palestinians. Two days later, this author contacted the *Sunday Telegraph* about the story and its publication there sparked

worldwide publicity.⁸ As a result, Wilkie was suspended without pay for two months and had to take equal-opportunity training. Thus he was quickly turned from accuser to accused, an event unparalleled in pro-Israeli activism.⁹

The AUT Boycott

The idea of an academic boycott of Israel has been condemned by bodies as diverse as the UK government,¹⁰ the International Council for Science,¹¹ the scientific journal *Nature*,¹² and *The Independent* newspaper.¹³ They have asserted that academic work should not be obstructed on political grounds, that discriminating on the basis of nationality is pernicious and will likely lead to further discrimination, and that academic discourse is crucial in keeping channels open to possibilities of peace.

The AUT's 2005 motions were based on a demand for a boycott voiced in April 2004 by nearly sixty Palestinian academic labor unions and NGOs, under the umbrella of the Palestinian Campaign for the Academic and Cultural Boycott of Israel (PACBI). PACBI claimed that: "The Israeli academy has contributed, either directly or indirectly, to maintaining, defending or otherwise justifying the military occupation and colonisation of the West Bank and Gaza."¹⁴

In response, Ilan Chet, president of the Weizmann Institute of Science in Israel, stated that: "The Israeli academy is not involved in the occupation and politics. We've worked with Palestinian academics."¹⁵ Many Israeli academics believed that the 2002 boycott call was rendered ineffective by the opposition of academics throughout the world and that any renewed attempts would fail as well.

The Conference at SOAS

The Palestinian boycott demand, however, gave the anti-Israeli academics what they needed: a basis for attempting to impose sanctions at the next year's AUT Council meeting. First, though, came the December 2004 conference on "Resisting Israeli Apartheid: Strategies and Principles" at the University of London's School of Oriental and African Studies (SOAS). Although organized by the SOAS Palestinian student society, it was a well-funded international event that brought together prominent supporters of the boycott such as the Roses and Mona Baker of the UK, Lisa Taraki of the Palestinian Authority, John Docker of Australia, Lawrence Davidson of the United States, and Ilan Pappé of Israel.

Many protests were made to the SOAS authorities that the conference would incite hatred and make life more difficult for Jewish students.¹⁶ The authorities' response was that they could not interfere because the event was organized by a SOAS student society and not by the school itself.

Hilary Rose's statement emphasized the importance of the gathering: "We are here today...to set in train nothing less than an international boycott movement of

historic significance. The size and difficulties of the task we have set ourselves, and the bitterness of our enemies are immense.” She went on to announce the formation of the British Committee for the Universities of Palestine (BRICUP), whose purpose is to work for an academic boycott of Israel.¹⁷

Birmingham AUT’s Boycott Initiative

The culminating step came when Birmingham AUT submitted four boycott motions to the 2005 AUT Council meeting. Blackwell, who proposed them, remarked that this time, instead of a call for a general boycott of Israeli universities as in 2003, the motions were tactical and focused on three institutions, and that “one of the reasons we didn’t win last time was that there was no clear public call from Palestinians for the boycott.”¹⁸ After a short debate, the majority of the 228 AUT Council delegates, as noted earlier, voted to boycott Haifa and Bar-Ilan universities, distribute proboycott literature to the forty-eight thousand AUT members, and refer back a motion to boycott the Hebrew University.

Almost immediately a campaign to reverse the decision was launched by AUT members Jon Pike and David Hirsh, who set up a group called Engage. Although politically left-wing themselves, they reject claims that Israel is illegitimate and are concerned that the Left, by adopting such attitudes, has become anti-Semitic. It was Pike who organized a letter signed by twenty-five AUT Council members requesting the special meeting that was held on 26 May.

The UK Jewish opposition was led by the Academic Friends of Israel (AFI), an organization that campaigns against the boycott and the pro-Palestinian, anti-Israeli policies of the academic labor unions; the Academic Study Group, which educates UK academics about Israel and brings them there on tours; and the Union of Jewish Students. All these worked closely with Pike and encouraged their members to support the Engage campaign. The Board of Deputies of British Jews (BOD), which “expressed its concern at the wider implications of the AUT decision,”¹⁹ formed the Campaign Group for Academic Freedom (CGAF) to coordinate the Jewish response while also striving to overturn the AUT decision.

The Implications of the AUT Decisions

The AUT Executive Committee, which comprises the organization’s elected leaders, was criticized for its mishandling of the debate on two counts. First, it had decided at its committee meeting before the first council session not to support the boycott motions, but to say it wished them to be referred back, a procedure that is a favorite tactic of labor unions when they want to “bury” a subject. The executive argued the case for “reference back” on the three motions, but lost the council vote and the boycott motions were approved. They had underestimated the determination of the proponents who had garnered 30 percent of the vote in 2003 and knew they needed less than twenty additional votes to win this time.

Their second mistake was to impose closure in the debate due to lack of time before the boycott opponents were allowed to present their case; as a result the vote went against the executive.²⁰

The AUT Executive also ignored several requests from the AFI and from Bar-Ilan University to reschedule the debate from Friday to earlier in the week so that Jewish members could take part in it. This time, holding it on a Friday made it even more difficult, as Jewish members needed to get home in time both for the Sabbath and for the Passover festival that started the following night.²¹ This would have been the equivalent of scheduling the debate on Christmas Eve for the general community.

The charges against the Israeli institutions concerned were largely false or misleading. The basis for seeking to boycott the Hebrew University was that it had allegedly confiscated land from an Arab family even though repeated court proceedings had found in favor of the university, and the matter had eventually been settled between the parties. The claim against Haifa University was that it was victimizing and threatening to dismiss Dr. Ilan Pappé, yet the university has repeatedly made clear that it never attempted to dismiss him and his status is secure.

Bar-Ilan University was accused of being “directly involved with the occupation of Palestinian territories” because it supervised 3 percent of the lecture courses at the College of Judea and Samaria in the West Bank, whose student body comprises Israeli Jews, Israeli Arabs, and Palestinians. Bar-Ilan’s connection with the college ended, however, when the last students from courses it had supervised graduated in August 2005. The AFI presented the AUT with the information on all three universities two weeks before the debate, but this did not help.

The AUT Executive’s own motion²² calling for dialogue with both sides in the conflict was only passed in an amended form by the council, which removed the part referring to cooperation with Israeli universities. Blackwell and her colleagues also criticized the motion. Because of sloppy drafting, it called for contact with a nonexistent “Israeli Higher Education Union.” Although the AFI had also previously questioned the AUT about this problem, it proved to be a critical mistake as Blackwell used it against the executive during her speech in the debate.

The executive supported both the motion to distribute proboycott literature and its own motion to pursue dialogue with both sides, apparently failing to see the contradiction. They had mistakenly expected both that Blackwell’s boycott motions would be rejected and that Israeli academics would want to maintain contact with the executive despite its support for distributing the literature.

The AUT boycott was not aimed at building support for the Palestinians or opposing Israeli policy. Although supporters of the AUT boycott may claim it was aimed at building support for the Palestinians or opposing Israeli policy, it appears the initiative was an attempt to delegitimize the right of Jews to self-determination.

Although Blackwell has frequently stated that she is not anti-Semitic, she regards Israel as “illegitimate,”²³ and her actions in support of motions that exclude from the threat of a boycott “conscientious Israeli academics and intellectuals opposed to their state’s colonial and racist policies” could be interpreted as anti-Semitic and racist.

Once the boycott resolutions had been passed, the AUT told the membership that the Executive Committee of the Union would be issuing guidance to members.²⁴ They did so in order to consider all their options before advising members that it was all right to boycott. This author believes that if a member put into practice the boycott motions, any such action could be in breach of UK legislation on equal opportunities and discrimination as well as their university regulations and their contract of employment. In practice, this might mean that both the academics and the AUT itself as a body may be breaking the law.²⁵

If the boycott had been confirmed at the second AUT meeting, there could have been serious financial consequences. The large numbers of American students attending UK institutions would have declined and many American donors to UK universities would have stopped their contributions. Indeed, UK-U.S. academic cooperation would also have been threatened.²⁶

International Reactions to the Boycott Call

International reactions played a major part in overturning the motions. Among the most influential were the twenty-one Nobel Prize winners who wrote that: “mixing science with politics, and limiting academic freedom by boycotts, is wrong,”²⁷ along with statements by nineteen Rhodes Scholars,²⁸ the American Association of University Professors,²⁹ the National Academy of Sciences (NAS),³⁰ and the American Federation of Teachers.³¹

Other reactions included calls for a counterboycott from both the Anti-Defamation League and Bar-Ilan University,³² and opposition to the boycott by left-wing Israeli academics such as David Newman and Baruch Kimmerling.³³ There were also expressions of concern that a boycott call would affect the large number of joint UK-Israeli academic projects, though any boycott action, as mentioned, could contravene UK universities’ rules on equal opportunity and discrimination.

Compared to the boycott call in 2002, the Israeli reaction was totally different. In the first instance, the response was a counterboycott petition organized by academics. Since it garnered fifteen thousand names³⁴ compared to only one thousand on the Roses’ boycott petition, many Israelis believed their side had prevailed. This, however, was mistaken since the issue of boycotting Israel had now spread to universities all over the world.

The success of the boycott campaign was not the number of actions that have succeeded but the fact that academics worldwide are now aware of it. The

2005 boycott campaign pushed the issue from the academic world into the public domain—so that everyone is now aware of it.

In the 2005 case, both Haifa and Hebrew universities threatened to take legal action against the AUT because of the false allegations,³⁵ and Bar-Ilan's Campaign for Academic Freedom published a letter in *The Guardian* stating that: "The open and free exchange of ideas are the foundation of civilization and without them there can be no true advancement of human knowledge."³⁶ The Hebrew University also signed a joint statement with Al-Quds University in East Jerusalem calling for academic cooperation.³⁷

Why Britain?

Why has the boycott won so much support in Britain? To begin with, academics are more organized there than in the United States or Western Europe and the labor unions allow the activists, many of them left-wing, to decide policies.

The role played by Britain's labor unions and the TUC has been crucial to the success of the Palestinian lobby. The situation was different in the past. Both the TUC and the Labour Party, which was established as the political wing of the labor union movement, were supportive of the establishment of a Jewish state from 1917 onward. The TUC and the unions continued to support both Israel and its own labor union movement, the Histadrut.

By the time of the 1982 Lebanon War, however, Palestinian activists within the British unions had sufficient support and influence to pass the first-ever motions at both the TUC and Labour Party conferences condemning Israel—specifically for its invasion of Lebanon—and recognizing Palestinian rights to self-determination. Reasons for the change included the power, particularly, of the Communist Party within the labor union movement at that time, a strategic miscalculation by the Histadrut to move their European office from London to Brussels, and Anglo-Jewry's failure to be proactive in defending Israel especially when it came to maintaining links with labor unions. More generally, labor unions have traditionally been powerful in Britain.

Other reasons why the boycott has so much support in Britain include the identification of Israel with Britain's colonial past, specifically the Balfour Declaration; leftist support for the Palestinians, which began during the 1960s and was complete by the time of the Lebanon War in 1982; an atmosphere of severe criticism of Israel including demonization, double standards, and the implicit denial of its right to defend itself;³⁸ condemnation of Israeli actions by groups such as Jews for Justice for Palestinians;³⁹ and of course, Judeophobia. This atmosphere of acceptability in Britain from 2002 onward helped ensure that there was no anti-Semitic outcry when the boycott motions were announced.

Could It Have Started Elsewhere?

Could the boycott attempt have been launched elsewhere, such as in France or the United States? In France there was support for the first boycott call in 2002 and several universities passed boycott motions. However, there was active opposition by Jewish academics, and the French are more cautious than the British about taking actions that can be interpreted as anti-Semitic. In the United States, the Jewish community is well organized and responds forcefully to anti-Israeli actions. In addition, the labor unions are supportive of Israel.

UK Jewry, however, has been marked by its passivity. It failed to respond to the Palestinian solidarity campaign in Britain brought on by the first Lebanon War and ignored the trend of growing labor union support for the Palestinians and declining sympathy for Israel. Only in the past three years has the community again started to build ties with the unions.

Traditionally, UK Jewry has not wanted to be identified as an ethnic immigrant community, but instead as part of the establishment. In contrast, recent immigrant groups such as the Muslims and the Hindus have sought to maintain their distinct profiles. Indeed, for the past 120 years, UK Jewry's attitude has been to play by the rules, for fear of a possible upsurge in anti-Semitism. Nor has the community used the "Jewish vote" to defend its interests, not even formerly when it was the largest ethnic group in the country. Hence, the Board of Deputies and other leaders often take a low-key, behind-the-scenes approach that is consistent with English reserve.

Jewish Students and Anti-Semitism

Anti-Semitic activity at Britain's universities over the past ten years has mainly been directed at Jewish students. Since the start of the Second Intifada, not only have leaflets, posters, and literature demonizing Israel been distributed on campus, but Jewish students have been physically attacked and abused. During 2002-2003, there was a coordinated campaign at UK universities to link the rights of Jewish students on campus to their support for Israel.

In February 2003, the president of Universities UK, the umbrella organization representing UK universities, wrote to the vice-chancellors of the British universities urging them to be vigilant against the rise in anti-Semitism, stating: "We believe . . . strongly that discrimination based on nationality, race, religion or other grounds is wrong."⁴⁰ In 2005, Universities UK published guidelines for dealing with extremist and intolerant behavior on campus.⁴¹ Universities have a positive duty under the law to deal with that sort of behavior and promote good race relations. This, however, does not always happen and university authorities and staff generally lack understanding about the dangers of anti-Semitism.

Many consider SOAS to be the most hostile campus in Britain toward Jewish students. In 2003, the SOAS student union passed a "Zionism Is Racism"

resolution that is still official union policy.⁴² Events at SOAS in 2005 included a speaker referring to the burning down of synagogues as a “rational act,” articles in the student newspaper supporting suicide bombings,⁴³ and the SOAS student union telling the SOAS Jewish Society that it was not allowed to invite an Israeli-embassy representative to speak at SOAS since this contravened union policy. The ban was lifted only after the union was advised of the legal consequences of maintaining it.⁴⁴ In reaction, the BOD compiled documentation of alleged instances of anti-Semitic behavior that it presented to the SOAS authorities in April 2005.⁴⁵

The 2006 NATFHE Boycott Call

Whereas the 2005 AUT boycott attempt was the work of a determined minority, both the executive of NATFHE and successive conferences over the past ten years have been highly critical of Israel and its policies.⁴⁶ At its 2005 conference, NATFHE debated and almost unanimously passed a motion that related to the failed AUT boycott. Part of the original motion stated that: “to criticize Israel policy or institutions is not anti-Semitic, and . . . anti-Zionism is not anti-Semitism.” The phrase “anti-Zionism is not anti-Semitism” was deleted before the debate began on the basis of legal advice,⁴⁷ but there is little doubt that had the phrase been allowed, the motion would have passed with overwhelming support. Following the debate, the NATFHE general secretary clarified the meaning of “Israel policy” as referring to Israeli government policy and admitted that *some* criticism of Israeli government policy clearly can be anti-Semitic.⁴⁸

Many NATFHE members, then, were obviously willing to pass a motion that would have effectively barred Jewish and Israeli students and academics from support against the most common form of discrimination they face. That the offending phrase was only removed because of legal advice⁴⁹ did not attest to the union’s sensitivity and understanding of discrimination. Many conference delegates, especially those on the Left, appeared reluctant to accept that using demonization and double standards against Israel is anti-Semitic.

A year later on 29 May 2006, the NATFHE conference passed with a 106-71 majority a boycott resolution that criticized “Israeli apartheid policies, including construction of the exclusion wall, and discriminatory educational practices.” It invited members to “consider the appropriateness of a boycott of those that do not publicly dissociate themselves from such policies.”⁵⁰

During the debate, NATFHE general secretary Paul Mackney opposed “the occupation of Palestine” but said boycotts could not be built on conference rhetoric especially as there had been no consultation with the membership.

In 2005, he had warned that the union must consult with the membership over this issue.

The NATFHE executive was determined to conduct the debate by overruling several constitutional challenges. The union’s own regulations outlaw

discrimination on the grounds of religion, ethnicity, and nationality, yet this was not considered sufficient reason to rule the motion out of order. The delegates congratulated themselves that they had stood firm in the face of outside pressure from concerned academic bodies such as the NAS in America, a petition initiated by the International Advisory Board for Academic Freedom (based at Bar-Ilan University) and Scholars for Peace in the Middle East with fifteen thousand names, and sixty-five thousand emails that had been received by the union's officers.⁵¹ British government critics of the motion included Foreign Office minister Lord Triesman and Higher Education Minister Bill Rammell. The latter argued that: "We can best encourage both Israel and the Palestinians to take steps needed to progress through close engagement."⁵²

The merger of the AUT and NATFHE to form the University and College Union (UCU) on 1 June 2006 provided the drafters of the motion with an opportunity to push through the resolution purely on political grounds, calculating that as the policy would only be in force for three days there would be no time to reverse it or mount any legal challenge. However, the UCU confirmed on 10 June that the NATFHE motion had lapsed and that the UCU had no policy to encourage a boycott of Israeli academics or institutions.⁵³

In the NATFHE case, the positive publicity that the boycotters craved was not achieved as several major British papers failed to report the boycott resolution and many editorials condemned both NATFHE and the resolution.⁵⁴

Future Developments

Although both the AUT and NATFHE boycott motions were overturned, their promoters have succeeded overall in generating publicity that has gone beyond academia to the public at large. The rhetoric and demonization continue unabated so that many Jewish academics and students feel isolated and intimidated. In response to complaints about traditional right-wing anti-Semitism, the labor unions will offer support and solidarity. Complaining about left-wing anti-Semitism, however, is almost impossible because they do not recognize it as such, and is likely to prompt charges of attempting to silence critics of Israel. There are also the "silent" boycotters⁵⁵ who secretly discriminate against Israeli academics by refusing to work with them, attend conferences with them, or review their work.

This time UK Jewry reacted more assertively, among other things setting up the CGAF. Indeed, the AUT boycott was a defining moment for the community, which seems to have been influenced by Israeli and American responses. The leadership realized that it could no longer treat the problem as solely a British one, as has been the case for over 350 years.⁵⁶ Battles of this nature can no longer be fought by individual communities; instead they require a coordinated, international, Diaspora-Israeli effort. As for the divestment campaign of Israeli and some related securities—a similar international problem—time will tell whether Jewry has learned the lessons of the AUT boycott attempt.

The academic boycott of Israel is one part of an eight-point program to delegitimize the state of Israel that was launched in Durban at the 2001 United Nations World Conference against Racism.⁵⁷ The long-term aims are the boycott of Israel followed by divestment and the Palestinian right of return.

The UK unions, now amalgamated in the UCU, appear to have learned that they can no longer use phrases like “anti-Zionism is not anti-Semitism,” which, as noted, was deleted from the NATFHE conference motion based on legal advice. Any future actions by the UCU must be consistent with discrimination laws and employment contracts; otherwise its assets may be at risk. Academics must also uphold the requirements of their own institution’s antidiscrimination policies, and its employment and equality laws.

The levels of anti-Semitism toward Jewish students and academics at Britain’s universities, as well as future boycott and divestment activity, depend on the outcome of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. There have also been further calls by Palestinian groups in 2005 and 2006⁵⁸ for a cultural and academic boycott of Israel. The academic boycott is just one part of the worldwide campaign of boycotts, divestments, and sanctions that pro-Palestinian groups are waging against Israel throughout the Western world. The outlook is, therefore, uncertain but not particularly optimistic. In 2004 and 2005⁵⁹ Britain experienced record numbers of anti-Semitic incidents.

Future boycott attempts will require that academics and Jewish communities throughout the world, including Israel, organize and work together to counter the anti-Israeli atmosphere on campus. The campaign against an academic boycott of Israel is now led by Engage, the AFI, the International Advisory Board for Academic Freedom based at Bar-Ilan University, and two American groups, Scholars for Peace in the Middle East as well as International Academic Friends of Israel.

Much will also depend on how seriously the UCU and university administrations take the “Report of the All-Parliamentary Inquiry into Antisemitism.”⁶⁰ The inquiry concluded that calls to boycott contact with academics working in Israel are an assault on academic freedom and intellectual exchange. The report thus recommended that prodemocracy lecturers in the UCU be given every support to combat such selective boycotts and urged the UCU’s executive and leadership to oppose the boycott. The coming months will be critical for both sides in the struggle over academic freedom within the new union.

The Israeli academic community has evolved into one of the most accomplished and creative on the international scene. One consequence is the burgeoning interaction between UK and Israeli academics; over one-third of UK universities now have joint programs or links with Israeli institutions. This reality further underlines the importance of defeating any future boycott attempts.

2007 Postscript

The inaugural congress of the UCU was held in Bournemouth at the end of May 2007. As well as passing the AUT guidelines on how and when to apply future boycotts, delegates also approved, by a 158-99 vote, motion 30 on the boycott of Israeli academic institutions.⁶¹ This instructed the UCU to circulate a Palestinian boycott call to all its local branches, support a speaking tour by Palestinian academics presumably supporting a boycott, encourage members to “consider the moral implications of links with Israeli academic institutions” and to campaign for a “moratorium on research and cultural collaborations with Israel via EU and European Science Foundation funding.” The motion also stated that “criticism of Israel cannot be construed as anti-Semitic.”

By distributing the Palestinian Campaign for an Academic and Cultural Boycott of Israel (PACBI), the UCU will be party to the PACBI’s call for the dismantling of the state of Israel, which clearly states that Israel created the Palestinian refugee problem and demands their right to return while also claiming that Israel is an apartheid state.⁶²

The response from the media both in Britain and abroad was to denounce this boycott call. It has also been condemned by the Russell Group of leading UK universities, several presidents of U.S. and Canadian universities, and leading members of the British government.⁶³ The UCU has decided to organize a series of regional meetings in the autumn of 2007 for its 120,000 members to discuss the boycott resolution, and has asked the general secretary to present a report of the consultation process and meetings to the 2008 congress.⁶⁴

The real significance of the UCU’s decision is that the battleground is now the trade-union movement not only in the UK but worldwide. In April 2007, Britain’s National Union of Journalists (NUJ) voted to boycott Israeli goods. This decision was overturned by the NUJ’s national executive committee, which on July 8 “resolved to ‘take no further action’ over the boycott call.”⁶⁵ On 20 June, UNISON, the UK’s largest trade union representing over 1.3 million members working in the public sector, private contractors, and the utilities, voted at its annual conference in Brighton by approximately a 4-1 majority to support the campaign to boycott Israel. The following week the Transport and General Workers Union (TGWU) voted at its conference to boycott Israeli goods.⁶⁶

When coupled with the recent Canadian and South African unions’ boycott calls, the message is clear: single out one country and one conflict as the focus of your advocacy. There is a real threat that the entire British trade-union movement will be manipulated by an extreme-Left minority set to delegitimize the right of Jews to self-determination.

Notes

1. Please note that all the web addresses relating to the AUT and NATFHE are no longer accessible because of the merger of the unions to form the UCU. These pages will be available on the UCU website at some time in the future. www.aut.org.uk. Staff and agencies, "Academics Vote against Israeli Boycott," *The Guardian*, 26 May 2005, <http://education.guardian.co.uk/higher/news/story/0,9830,1493083,00.html>.
2. Open letter, *The Guardian*, 6 April 2002
3. Manfred Gerstenfeld, "The Academic Boycott against Israel," *Jewish Political Studies Review*, Vol. 15, Nos. 3-4 (Fall 2003), 25: "At the United Nations World Conference Against Racism in Durban 2001, SANGOCO (the South African NGO Committee) promoted the proposal to impose a sports, telecommunications, academic, scientific, and military embargo on Israel and act against Israel in a similar fashion to what was done in the past against South Africa. SANGOCO has a close relationship with the PLO."
4. See Colin Schindler, "Has the *Guardian* Deserted the Angels?" *Jewish Chronicle*, 16 July 2003. He confirms in this article that since 2000 *The Guardian* was well known for its anti-Israeli views.
5. European Union Press Release, "EU Commissioner for Research Philippe Busquin Replies to Call for Boycott on Scientific and Cultural Relations with Israel," No. D/0050/02 PR4/02, 25 April 2002.
6. Liz Lightfoot and Nicole Martin, "University Inquiry into Sacking of Israeli Dons," *Daily Telegraph*, 20 July 2002; Polly Curtis, "UMIST Professor Escapes Disciplinary Action," *The Guardian*, 30 January 2003.
7. Julie Henry, "Lecturers under Fire after Call for Boycott of Israel," *Sunday Telegraph*, 4 May 2003; Will Woodward, "Lecturers Reject Call to Boycott Israel," *The Guardian*, 10 May 2003; see AUT Press Release, 9 May 2003.
8. Julie Henry, "Outrage as Oxford Bans Student for Being Israeli," *Sunday Telegraph*, 29 June 2003.
9. For more information, see Gerstenfeld, "Academic Boycott," 9-70.
10. Francis Elliot and Catherine Milner, "Blair Vows to End Dons' Boycott of Israeli Scholars," *Daily Telegraph*, 17 November 2002.
11. "Israeli Scholars," ICSU/SCFCS statement, 23 August 2002, www.icsu.org/Gestion/img/ICSU_DOC_DOWNLOAD/.
12. "Is a Scientific Boycott Ever Justified?" *Nature*, No. 421, 314, 23 January 2003.
13. Editorial, *The Independent*, 7 April 2005.
14. "Palestinian Call for Boycott," <http://right2edu.birzeit.edu/news/article178>.
15. Sheldon Kirshner, "Academic Boycott against Israel Losing Ground," *Canadian Jewish News*, 11 November 2004.
16. Polly Curtis, "Israel Boycott Row Hits College," *The Guardian*, 4 December 2004.
17. Hilary Rose, "Building the Academic Boycott in Britain: SOAS Conference Report," www.bricup.org.uk/downloads/hilaryrosepaper.doc.
18. Polly Curtis, "Boycott Call Resurfaces," *The Guardian*, 5 April 2005.
19. www.bod.org.uk.
20. Polly Curtis, "Lecturers Vote for Israeli Boycott," *The Guardian*, 22 April 2005.
21. Julie Henry, "Anger as Union Bars Israeli Academic," *Sunday Telegraph*, 24 April 2005.
22. For a full list of motions, see www.aut.org.uk or www.academics-for-israel.org/aut_motions.htm.
23. Phil Baty, "I've No Regrets. We've Touched a Raw Nerve," *Times Higher Educational Supplement*, 20 May 2005.

24. AUT Press Release, 23 February 2006, www.aut.org.uk/index.cfm?articleid=1201.
25. Both Haifa and the Hebrew University threatened the AUT with legal action. See Phil Baty, "Haifa Threatens AUT with Legal Action," *Times Higher Educational Supplement*, 13 May 2005. A situation could have arisen where a union member followed the AUT boycott resolutions and his university vice-chancellor had issued a condemnation of the boycott. That is why the AUT asked its members to wait before putting the motions into practice. The legal situation has yet to be tested in law.
26. The author was told by a fundraiser for one of the Russell Group of universities that if the boycott call was not overturned the level of U.S. funding and donations to his university would be severely reduced.
27. Open letter, *The Guardian*, 24 May 2005.
28. "AJ Congress Condemns AUT Boycott of Israeli Academics," <http://releases.usnewswire.com/GetRelease.asp?id=4778>, viewed 23 February 2006.
29. Statement of the American Association of University Professors, www.aaup.org/newsroom/press/2005/AUT.htm.
30. Statement of the NAS Council on International Cooperation in Science, www4.nas.edu/nas/nashome.nsf/urllinks/NAS-6CBKR9?OpenDocument, viewed 23 February 2006.
31. Statement of the American Association of University Professors, www.aaup.org/newsroom/press/2005/AUT.htm, viewed 23 February 2006.
32. Stewart Ain and Michele Chabin, "Pressure Building against British Academic Boycott," *Jewish Week*, 29 April 2005.
33. David Newman and Benjamin Pogrund, "A Boycott Will Only Strengthen the Israeli Right," *The Guardian*, 25 May 2005; Baruch Kimmerling, "Boycotts Will Do Nothing to Change Israeli Policy," *Times Higher Education Supplement*, 29 April 2005.
34. www.euroisrael.huji.ac.il/original/html, viewed 23 February 2006.
35. Phil Baty, "Haifa Threatens AUT with Legal Action," *Times Higher Educational Supplement*, 13 May 2005.
36. For a copy of the IAB open letter, see: www.biu.ac.il/rector/academic_freedom/files/IAB%20Advert%20final.pdf, viewed 23 February 2006.
37. Tamara Traubman and Arnon Regular, "Nusseibeh Denounces Boycott of Israeli Academia," *Haaretz*, 22 May 2005.
38. Robert Wistrich, "Cruel Britannia," *Azure*, Summer 2005.
39. www.jfjfp.org/abhout.htm, viewed 27 September 2002.
40. BOD Press Release, 18 February 2003.
41. Polly Curtis, "SOAS Faces Action over Alleged Anti-Semitism," *The Guardian*, 12 May 2005.
42. The SOAS student union's policy dated October 2003 was amended as follows: "... That peace requires the achievement of national liberation and independence" but then singles out Jewish national aspirations and calls for "the elimination of ... Zionism and racial discrimination" and "condemns ... Zionism or other forms of discrimination on campus. . . ." www.soasunion.org/download/attachments/39095/opposing_all_racist_manifestations.pdf?version=1, viewed 22 April 2005.
43. Sean O'Neill and Yaakov Lappin, "Tide of Extremism Is Rising against Us Say Jewish Students," *Timesonline*, 12 March 2005.
44. Polly Curtis, "College Tells Students to Reverse Israeli Ban," *The Guardian*, 5 February 2005.
45. Cathy Newman, "Drive to Root Out Extremists," *Financial Times*, 16 July 2005.
46. During 2000-2003, NATFHE issued several statements criticizing Israeli policies and actions. An example is "Palestine and Israel: Some Questions That Need Answering," 13 May 2002, see: www.natfhe.ac.uk.

47. The president of NATFHE announced to the conference on 30 May 2005, before the debate on emergency motion 25, that this phrase had been removed from the motion on legal advice. A copy of the original motion is in the possession of this author and details were sent to members of the Academic Friends of Israel on 27 May 2005. This author was a conference delegate and took part in the debate.
48. NATFHE conference, 30 May 2005, www.natfhe.org.uk/index.php?id=901, viewed 1 June 2005.
49. Emergency motion 25 in its modified form was passed almost unanimously with only two delegates voting against, one of whom was this author, who was the only speaker against the motion. The proposer of the motion, Tom Hickey, refused to accept in the debate the author's definition of the "new" anti-Semitism as either the demonization of Israel, the use of religious hate themes against Israel, demanding international double standards against Israel, or calling for its delegitimization.
50. NATFHE Conference Motion 198C: Academic Responsibility, www.natfhe.org.uk/index.php?entityType=HTML&id=1184, viewed 30 May 2006.
51. Tamara Traubmann and Benjamin Joffe-Walt, "Israeli University Boycott: How a Campaign Backfired," *The Guardian*, 20 June 2006.
52. Rachel Fletcher and Daniella Peled, "Academics Back 'Racist' Boycott Plan," *Jewish Chronicle*, 31 May 2006.
53. www.engageonline.org.uk/blog/article.php?id=471.
54. E.g., "Academic Arrogance," *International Herald Tribune*, 2 June 2006; "No Boycott and No Bullying, Please," *The Independent*, 1 June 2006.
55. Rachel Fletcher, "Students Slate 'Boycott' Don," *Jewish Chronicle*, 25 May 2006.
56. H. Grunwald, "Why Must One Shout, when a Whisper Can Be Heard?" *Jerusalem Post*, 7 June 2005.
57. Gerstenfeld, "Academic Boycott," 25-26.
58. "Palestinian Civil Society Calls for Boycott, Divestment and Sanctions against Israel," 9 July 2005, www.pacbi.org/boycott_news_more.php?id=66_0_1_10_M11; "Palestinian Filmmakers, Artists and Cultural Workers Call for a Cultural Boycott of Israel," 4 August 2006, www.pacbi.org/boycott_news_more.php?id=315_0_1_0_C.
59. Community Security Trust, Annual Report, 2005.
60. "Report of the All-Party Parliamentary Inquiry into Antisemitism," September 2006, <http://thepeca.org/Report.pdf>.
61. UCU Circular UCU/31, 4 July 2007, Congress resolution on Israel/Palestine: arrangements for implementation, www.ucu.org.uk/circ/rtf/ucu31.rtf.
62. "The Palestinian Civil Society Calls for Boycott, Divestment and Sanctions against Israel until It Complies with International Law and Universal Principles of Human Rights," 9 July 2005, www.pacbi.org/boycott_news_more.php?id=66_0_1_10_M11.
63. The *Financial Times*, *The Independent*, *The Observer*, the *Sunday Times*, and the *Times* have all published antiboycott editorials. *The Guardian* published one called "Boycott Plan Puts Our Reputation at Risk," 12 June 2007, <http://education.guardian.co.uk/higher/worldwide/story/0,,2100847,00.html>.

The then prime minister Tony Blair was quoted in *The Guardian*: "Blair Tells Lecturers to Call Off Israeli Boycott," <http://education.guardian.co.uk/higher/news/story/0,,2096819,00.html?gusrc=rss&feed=11>.

Many academic institutions and groups have come out against the UCU boycott including Universities UK, Russell Group, London School of Economics, University College London, Oxford University, Open University, University of British Columbia, McGill University, Université de Montreal, New York University, University of California at Berkeley, and Columbia University. The statement by the president of

Columbia University can be found at: www.columbia.edu/cu/news/07/06/boycott. The Russell Group's statement can be found at: www.russellgroup.ac.uk/2007/boycott.html. Professional associations that have rejected the boycott include the American Association of University Professors, American Association for the Advancement of Science, American Federation of Teachers, British Academy, and the Royal Society.

64. UCU Circular UCU/31, 4 July 2007, Congress resolution on Israel/Palestine: arrangements for implementation, www.ucu.org.uk/circ/rtf/ucu31.rtf.
65. For the NUJ's 8 July statement, see: www.nuj.org.uk/inner.php?docid=1790.
66. UNISON motion 53 can be found at: <http://cms.unison.co.uk/MotionText.asp?DocumentID=997416>. For T&G, see Bernard Josephs, "T&G Urges a Ban on Israeli Goods," *Jewish Chronicle*, 29 June 2007, www.thejc.com/home.aspx?ParentId=m11s18&AId=53530&ATypeId=1&secid=18.

Manfred Gerstenfeld

The UCU May 2007 Boycott Resolution and Its Aftermath¹

At the end of September 2007 the University and College Union (UCU) in the UK announced that it would end its involvement with plans for an academic boycott of Israel. It mentioned that it had been advised that such an action would be illegal under British law. With that a five-year battle seemingly came to an end.

The anti-Israeli boycott campaign on campus in the twenty-first century has its origins in the United Kingdom. It can be traced back to an open letter by academics in *The Guardian* on 6 April 2002. It called for a moratorium on all cultural and research links with Israel at European or national levels until the Israeli government abided by UN resolutions and opened “serious peace negotiations with the Palestinians, along the lines proposed in many peace plans including most recently that sponsored by the Saudis and the Arab League.”²

Since then there have been many efforts to organize anti-Israeli actions both on campuses and in broader academic frameworks in several countries. In some universities these have led to outbursts of anti-Semitism accompanied by violence.³

During recent years members of UK academia have continued to play a key role in anti-Israeli boycott efforts.⁴ In 2005, the Association of University Teachers (AUT) passed a motion boycotting Haifa and Bar-Ilan universities, which was revoked after a month. In May 2006, NATFHE, another UK academic teachers union, voted in favor of boycotting Israeli academics. The motion was ineffective as a few days later NATHFE merged with AUT into the UCU. This union now comprises about 120,000 teachers at universities, colleges, and higher-education organizations in the UK.

The Boycott at the UCU Conference

The anti-Israeli boycott issue was raised again at the first conference of the UCU at the end of May 2007 in Bournemouth. A motion was passed there calling for a debate on a comprehensive and consistent boycott of Israeli academic institutions. Some 158 delegates voted in favor and 99 against.⁵

The resolution condemned Israeli academia’s involvement with the occupation of the territories. It called for lecturers to refuse to collaborate on research with Israeli academics, including refusal to work with Israeli academic journals.

Sally Hunt, the UCU’s secretary-general, asserted during the conference that

most UCU members would not support such a boycott and it would not be a priority for them. She stressed that the motion was a call for discussion and not an actual decision to implement a boycott.⁶ Hunt did not mention at any time whether she herself supported the boycott or not.

Earlier, at its annual delegates meeting in April, the National Union of Journalists (NUJ) had passed a call for a boycott of Israeli products by a 66-54 majority. Groups of journalists at the BBC, Reuters, *The Guardian*, and elsewhere issued strong condemnations.⁷ In early July, the NUJ succumbed to the opposition and issued a statement by its executive that amounted to a decision to ignore the boycott resolution.⁸

The UCU boycott call was followed by several anti-Israeli resolutions by other British unions. UNISON, the largest UK trade union, voted on 19 June for an economic, cultural, academic, and sports boycott of Israel.⁹ In the last week of June another large union, the Transport and General Workers Union (TGWU), passed a resolution to ban the import of all Israeli products.¹⁰ That same week a Northern Ireland union, the Public Service Alliance (NIPSA), unanimously passed five pro-Palestinian motions including one in support of boycotting Israeli products and services.¹¹

Reactions

Protests against the UCU resolution built up slowly. Most of the initial ones came from Jewish organizations and individuals. Already before the UCU boycott, American Nobel Laureate Steven Weinberg decided not to travel to Britain for a lecture at Imperial College in London in view of the severe anti-Israeli sentiment emerging throughout the United Kingdom.¹²

Israeli education minister Yuli Tamir and foreign minister Tzipi Livni condemned the UCU motion.¹³ The Anti-Defamation League (ADL) published ads in the *New York Times* and other publications against the proposed boycott. They pointed out the British academics' unfair isolation of Israel in their purported desire to achieve justice. As ADL national director Abe Foxman noted, "If British journalists and university professors and doctors want to make a point for justice, there are 20 countries they could deal with.... If the only country [that is subject to criticism] in the whole world is Israel, I call it anti-Semitism."¹⁴

In early June, Scholars for Peace in the Middle East (SPME), an independent international group of faculty members, started a petition of academics denouncing the academic boycott against Israel. By mid-September 2007 eleven thousand academics had signed it, including thirty-three Nobel Prize winners and fifty-eight college and university heads.¹⁵

The Goldhirsh Foundation, an American \$150 million research sponsor, reacted to the boycott developments by stating that it would not fund British research anymore.¹⁶

Before, during, and after the boycott resolution, an important role in the fight

against the boycott was played by the Israel-based International Advisory Board for Academic Freedom (IAB), which supported UK lobbying efforts, accumulated databases, organized media coverage, and informed Israeli academics and the press about the boycott.¹⁷

The Anti-Semitic Character of the Boycott

Harvard law professor Alan Dershowitz announced that he would sue UK universities and British academics who supported the boycott, using a variety of legislative tactics. Among them he cited an American law that bans discrimination on the basis of nationality, to be used against universities in the UK with research ties to U.S. institutions.¹⁸

In an article in the *Times* a British lawyer, Anthony Julius, and Dershowitz wrote that the boycotters, in excluding “from consideration the many nations with far worse human rights records than Israel, . . . are merely practicing sophistry in defence of their own double standards.”¹⁹ Julius and Dershowitz went on to cite two reasons to regard the boycotters’ position as an anti-Semitic one. First, it resonated with earlier boycotts of Jews that were all based on a “principle of exclusion: Jews and/or the Jewish State, are to be excluded from public life, from the community of nations, because they are dangerous and malign.”²⁰

Second, the boycott was “predicated on the defamation of Jews.” Julius and Dershowitz provided several arguments for this point, concluding that: “Boycotters may have Jewish friends, some may be Jews themselves—but in supporting a boycott they have put themselves in anti-Semitism’s camp.”²¹

British Governmental and Political Reactions

The British government has expressed its disapproval of the boycott in various ways. The British ambassador to Israel, Tom Phillips, declared that the boycott motion would have no impact on British-Israeli relations.²² British education minister Bill Rammell said in a visit to Israel that the UK supported academic freedom and firmly opposed any boycott of Israel. Rammell expressed disappointment that the UCU had passed the boycott motion and said it was “fundamentally wrong.”²³

On 6 June, the then prime minister Tony Blair called on the UCU to put an end to the boycott, saying he hoped “very much that decision is overturned because it does absolutely no good for the peace process or for relations in that part of the world.”²⁴

One of the strongest British reactions against the boycott came from Conservative Party leader David Cameron, who affirmed his solidarity with Israel saying, “If by Zionist you mean that the Jews have the right to a homeland in Israel and the right to a country then I am a Zionist.”²⁵

Labour MP Andrew Dismore was among several British parliamentarians

who expressed opposition to the boycott. He noted that it severely undermined the principle of academic freedom in addition to being unproductive and possibly even impedimentary to peace efforts.²⁶

At the Liberal Democrats' annual conference in mid-September a motion was adopted with overwhelming support. It called on UCU members to reject the boycott proposal. Several MPs, among them Lembit Opik, spoke in favor of the proposed motion. The only parliamentarian to speak against the motion was the anti-Israeli Lady Jenny Tonge.²⁷ The motion listed many reasons against the boycott, among which that "it is perverse for academics to boycott only Israel, if other countries with far worse records of academic freedom are not also to be boycotted."²⁸

U.S. Academic Reactions

Many of the strongest condemnations of the boycott came from U.S. academia. On 13 June, Columbia University president Lee Bollinger was the first American university president to denounce the boycott as being "antithetical to the fundamental values of the academy."²⁹ This was gradually followed by many others including the entire University of California system,³⁰ Yeshiva University,³¹ the University of Pennsylvania,³² Brandeis University, the University of Miami, Tufts University, Northwestern University, Penn State University,³³ Tulane University,³⁴ and Dillard University.³⁵

Canadian universities also came out in numbers against the boycott including the University of Toronto,³⁶ York University,³⁷ the University of Montreal, McGill University,³⁸ Ryerson University,³⁹ and Carleton University.⁴⁰

Two hundred fifty British academics published an ad in the *London Times* against the boycott. Oxford University announced that it would not join the boycott, and 95 percent of Oxford UCU members supported their university's stance.⁴¹ The Russell Group of universities, which represents the twenty leading research universities in the UK, condemned the boycott. The great majority of their members, however, remained silent on the issue and so did other British universities.

Ronnie Fraser, director of the UK organization Academic Friends of Israel, noted that he knew "of only three out of 105 UK universities who have issued a statement on a boycott."⁴² Fraser's statement confirms the insufficient nature of British opposition compared to the United States and Canada.

Also coming out against the boycott were Nobel Prize winners and Rhodes Scholars, each issuing petitions signed by a number of them.

Many medical professionals—both individuals as well as professional groups such as the American Physiological Society—expressed opposition to the boycott. Similar to statements by university professors that the boycott constitutes a breach of academic freedom, scientific and medical organizations invoked the principles of free research and the "universality of science."⁴³

UNESCO (the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization) also came out against the boycott. It expressed concern about the negative implications of stemming the “free flow of ideas and knowledge” for creating stable democratized societies.⁴⁴

Already in 2002 when an anti-Israeli boycott motion had been passed at Paris 6 University (also known as Jussieu), the then UNESCO director-general Koichiro Matsuura had criticized that university’s attempts to isolate Israeli academics, stating: “We must do everything possible to preserve the conditions for dialogue between the various scientific and academic communities throughout the world, as this dialogue is sometimes the last link between people divided by war and the first step toward reconciliation.”⁴⁵

One major success of the boycott opponents came in early August when a full-page ad, sponsored by the American Jewish Committee, was published in the *New York Times* in which close to three hundred American university and college presidents stated that they would not work with institutions that were boycotting Israeli academics. The ad said: “Boycott Israeli Universities? Boycott Ours, Too.”⁴⁶ By 12 September 2007 the number had risen to 415.⁴⁷

A British academic, Prof. Mark Pepys, head of the University of London’s Department of Medicine, thereupon mentioned the problems this could cause for British academics and said British universities should take “an equally rigorous and unequivocal public stand so that they are not tainted by association with those individuals who propose a boycott.”⁴⁸

The Polls

A number of polls were taken to gauge the feelings of academics, businesspeople, doctors, and public citizens about the boycott, all of which yielded results in keeping with the backlash against it. A poll by Populus of nearly one thousand political, cultural, and business leaders in Britain found 86 percent opposing an academic boycott and only 14 percent supporting it. Varied reasons were given for this stance; many thought it was a bad way to express disapproval (80%), others thought it was bad for Britain’s image and economy (70%).⁴⁹

Polls of reader and generalized populations came up with similar results. The *New Statesman*’s reader poll showed 66 percent of respondents opposing a boycott and 34 percent in favor.⁵⁰ In a poll by the *British Medical Journal* of both scientific professionals and the general public, 77 percent of respondents opposed an academic boycott and 23 percent supported it.⁵¹

The Proboycotters

Public supporters of the boycott remained mainly within the original Palestinian and pro-Palestinian categories. The arguments of these proboycotters differ.

One group comes from the Palestinian universities. Lisa Taraki, dean of

graduate studies at Bir Zeit University in Ramallah, expressed her support for the boycott in an article in *The Guardian*: “Where have these [Israeli university] presidents been for the last three decades when our academic freedom has been trampled on every day?”⁵² The Israeli academics’ lack of outrage at the government’s treatment of their Palestinian counterparts, she claimed, warranted a boycott such as the UCU’s.

A second group consists of British Muslim organizations such as the Muslim Public Affairs Committee UK (MPACUK). They claim the boycott will serve four main purposes:

Good for Britain, as this boycott confirms and underlines Britain’s honorable, long-standing commitment to support the oppressed and disadvantaged. Good for academic freedom, because one cannot have true academic freedom at the expense of another group of people. Good for Palestinians as it demonstrated that we support their struggle for academic freedom and will give strength to their cause. Good for peace and there can be no peace without equality and justice.⁵³

The Israeli daily *Haaretz* gave space to two enemies of Israel in its op-ed section. Ghada Karmi, a Palestinian-born academic, argues in her article “Weapon of the Weak” that a boycott alone is a useless tool, and “Only when Israel is made a pariah state, as happened with South Africa, will its people understand that they cannot trample on another people’s rights without penalty.”⁵⁴ In another article published that same day, Mark Klusener, a journalist living in Ramallah, echoed Karmi’s sentiments that the boycott was ineffective on its own and said it had to be buttressed by economic and social sanctions in order to “achieve its goal.”⁵⁵

Anti-Semitism in British Universities

The boycott once again revealed that there is substantial anti-Semitism in British universities. This had been addressed in 2006 by the British All-Party Parliamentary Group against Antisemitism, whose report cited testimony from the Union of Jewish Students “that the current situation in the Middle East is causing tensions between student bodies on some campuses and, in the worst cases, Jewish students are being intimidated or harassed.”⁵⁶

The Parliamentary Group also mentioned, among many other issues, that it had received evidence “regarding the attitudes of a small number of academics whose critical views of Israel have adversely affected their relations with Jewish students. Particular tension has been caused by rare cases of academics who have crossed the line between personal interest or activism, and academic abuse of power.”⁵⁷

The Parliamentary Group’s report also referred to the singling out of Israel for boycott while none had been proposed against other countries. It concluded that

calls to boycott contact with academics working in Israel are an assault on academic freedom and intellectual exchange. We recommend that lecturers in the new University and College Lecturers Union are given every support to combat such selective boycotts that are anti-Jewish in practice. We would urge the new union's executive and leadership to oppose the boycott.⁵⁸

The developments at the UCU in 2007, however, showed that this recommendation was to no avail.

The Boycott: Not About the Palestinians

The battle around the UCU motion showed many recurring elements from earlier boycott attempts. Yet a number of new ones also came to the fore.

The boycotters have undoubtedly become more sophisticated in their approach. Fraser considers that the initial boycotters such as Steven Rose and Sue Blackwell have been superseded as the dominant figures and that the boycott campaign of the various trade unions is centrally orchestrated by extreme left-wing bodies. Furthermore, Fraser contends that the boycott organizers are first and foremost looking for publicity and demonizing Israel's image. In his view they care much less whether the boycott has any real effect.⁵⁹

This confirms earlier assessments about the extreme Left's interest in the Middle East issue. It does not derive from a genuine concern about Palestinians. One can gauge this from the lack of reaction when Palestinians murder each other or when hundreds of them are killed in Iraq by other Arabs.

For the extreme Left the boycott action is primarily a tool to regain a place on the British public stage. The Left, part of which belongs to the Old Labour socialist segments of the Labour Party, while others are to the left of that party, dramatically lost influence in the years of Tony Blair's premiership.

Academia under Threat

There is an increasing awareness that the attacks on Israel, if not countered, might presage much larger problems for the academic world. Boycott actions are unlikely to remain limited to one target. Recent years have seen issues of discrimination raised particularly at American universities and involving Republicans and evangelicals, as pointed out, for instance, in many articles in FrontPageMagazine.com.

Some of the antiboycotters probably do not act out of sympathy for Israel. Otherwise they would have condemned the boycott on earlier occasions. They started realizing to various degrees that this boycott is a dangerous precedent and will make academia more vulnerable to other attacks.

For many of the pro- as well as antiboycotters, then, issues are at stake that go far beyond both the Palestinian-Israeli conflict and academic boycotts.

As the debate between pro- and antiboycotters continued, it became clear that if Israeli academia was harmed, British academia would also incur substantial damage.

Already at the end of June 2007, Dershowitz wrote: “It is fair to say...that the British boycott appears to be backfiring. British academics are on notice that if they try to isolate Israeli academics, it is they—the British academics—who will end up being isolated from some of the world’s most prominent academics and scientists.”⁶⁰ At a later stage, Dershowitz was even clearer in an official SPME announcement: “If the union goes ahead with this immoral petition, it will destroy British academia. We will isolate them from the rest of the world.”⁶¹

That the UCU, a few months after its conference, decided to abandon the boycott attempt does not mean, however, that the numerous diehard enemies of Israel on UK campuses will stop their attacks on the country. Most probably they will only change their approach.

Notes

1. Many thanks are due to Ariel Pollock who was the research assistant for this article.
2. “Protest against Call for European Boycott of Academic and Cultural Ties with Israel,” *The Guardian*, Original Press Release, 6 April 2002, www.euroisrael.huji.ac.il/original.html.
3. Manfred Gerstenfeld, “The Academic Boycott against Israel,” *Jewish Political Studies Review*, Vol. 15, Nos. 3-4 (Fall 2003).
4. See the essay by Ronnie Fraser in this book.
5. James Meikle, “Lecturers Back Boycott of Israel,” *The Guardian*, 30 May 2007.
6. Ibid.
7. “Broadcasters Call to End NUJ Israel Boycott,” *Press Gazette*, 7 June 2007.
8. Jonny Paul, “UK Journalists’ Union Calls Off Boycott,” *Jerusalem Post*, 11 July 2007.
9. Jonny Paul, “UNISON Approves Watered-Down Boycott of Israel,” *Jerusalem Post*, 20 June 2007.
10. Bernard Josephs, “T&G Urges a Ban on Israeli Goods,” *Jewish Chronicle*, 28 June 2007.
11. “Boycott and Divestment Gains Ground in Northern Ireland,” NIPSA Press Release, 27 June 2007.
12. Charlotte Halle, “Nobel Laureate Cancels Trip to ‘Anti-Israel’ U.K.,” *Haaretz*, 25 May 2007.
13. Hagit Klaiman, “Livni Protests UK Academic Boycott of Israel,” *Ynetnews.com*, 1 June 2007.
14. Haviv Rettig, “ADL Launches Anti-Boycott Campaign,” *Jerusalem Post*, 11 June 2007.
15. See the essay by Edward Beck in this book.
16. www.ynetnews.com/Ext/Comp/ArticleLayout/CdaArticlePrintPreview/1,2506,L-3407111,00.html, 31 May 2007.
17. www.biu.ac.il/academic_freedom/.
18. Jon Boone, “Harvard Legal Expert Vows to Sue Lecturers Boycotting Israel,” *Financial Times*, 2 June 2007.
19. Anthony Julius and Alan Dershowitz, “The Contemporary Fight against Anti-Semitism,” *TimesOnline.com*, 13 June 2007.

20. Ibid.
21. Ibid.
22. Barak Ravid, "U.K. Envoy to Israel: British Lecturers' Boycott Unlikely to Affect Bilateral Ties," *Haaretz*, 1 June 2007.
23. Jeremy Last, "UK Education Minister Slams Academic Boycott of Israel," *European Jewish Press*, 11 June 2007.
24. Yaakov Lappin, "Blair: End Israel Boycott," Ynetnews.com, 6 June 2007.
25. Amiram Barkat and Assaf Uni, "Tory Leader Calls Himself 'Zionist': U.K. Jews Campaign against Boycott," *Haaretz*, 13 June 2007.
26. Ibid.
27. Jonny Paul, "Liberal Democrat Party Calls Boycott 'Utterly Misguided,'" *Jerusalem Post*, 17 September 2007.
28. www.libdems.org.uk/news/academic-boycott-of-israel-condemned-by-liberal-democrats.13160.html.
29. "British Academics Condemn Colleagues," *Jerusalem Post*, 13 June 2007.
30. Robert Dynes, "Statement by UC President Robert C. Dynes in Response to British Faculty Union's Proposed Action against Israeli Universities," University of California Office of the President News Office, 18 June 2007.
31. "President Joel Adds YU's Name to List of Israeli Universities Boycotted by Britain's University and College Union," *Yeshiva University News*, 15 June 2007.
32. Amy Gutmann, "Opposing Boycott of Israeli Academics," *University of Pennsylvania Almanac*, 17 July 2007.
33. "Poly's President Joins Other Academic Leaders in Opposing Call for Boycott," *Polytechnic University News*, 19 July 2007.
34. Scott Cowen, "A Message from Scott Cowen," Tulane University, 27 June 2007.
35. Shlomo Shamir, "President of Black University Slams British Boycott of Israeli Academe," *Haaretz*, 19 July 2007.
36. David Naylor, "Letter to Sally Hunt," University of Toronto Office of the President, 20 June 2007.
37. Lorna Marsden, "On the Autonomy of Universities," *File: York's Daily Bulletin*, 21 June 2007.
38. "B'nai Brith Canada Applauds Canadian Universities for Denouncing Boycott of Israel—Challenges Other Universities to Follow Example," B'nai Brith Canada News Release, 28 June 2007.
39. Sheldon Levy, "President Sheldon Levy's Statement on Britain's University and College Union Proposed Academic Boycott of Israeli Universities," Canadian Newswire, 9 July 2007.
40. Haviv Rettig, "Canadian University Urges UCU to Reconsider Boycott," *Jerusalem Post*, 31 July 2007.
41. Anthea Lipsett, "Oxford Academics Voice Hostility on Boycott," *The Guardian*, 2 July 2007.
42. "British Universities Silent on Boycott," Jewish Telegraphic Agency, 1 July 2007.
43. "American Physiological Society Objects to Proposed Boycott of Israeli Academics," APA Policy Action Center, 16 July 2007.
44. "UNESCO Chief Voices Concern over Potential Boycott of Israeli Academic Institutions," *UN News Service*, 22 June 2007.
45. Associated Press, "UNESCO Criticizes French Isolation of Israeli Academics," *Jerusalem Post*, 9 January 2003.
46. www.jpost.com/servlet, 12 August 2007.

47. www.ajc.org/site/c.ijITI2PHKoG/b.2818295/apps/nl/content2.asp?content_id={3F240389-C5AB-4A3F-9667-58562C9D01A0}¬oc=1.
48. Ibid.
49. "Poll: British Elite against Boycott," Jewish Telegraphic Agency, 27 June 2007.
50. "Are You in Favour of an Academic Boycott of Israel?" *New Statesman*, 26 June 2007.
51. BMJ Poll, surveyMK.com, 30 July 2007.
52. Conal Urquhart, "'We Are under Siege,'" *The Guardian*, 20 June 2007.
53. "MPACUK Supports the Boycott of Israeli Academia," www.mpacuk.org, 26 June 2007.
54. Ghada Karmi, "Weapon of the Weak," *Haaretz*, 13 July 2007.
55. Mark Klusener, "Academic Boycotts Are Not Enough," *Haaretz*, 13 July 2007.
56. *Report of the British All-Party Parliamentary Inquiry into Antisemitism* (London: Stationery Office Ltd, September 2006), para. 191.
57. Ibid., para. 206.
58. Ibid., para. 213.
59. Ronnie Fraser, lecture at JCPA Seminar, 19 July 2007.
60. Alan Dershowitz, "An Academic Hijacking," *Wall Street Journal* online, 28 June 2007.
61. Traubmann, "Over 10,000 Academics."

Gavin Gross

Anti-Israeli Activity at the School of Oriental and African Studies: How Jewish Students Started to Fight Back

The School of Oriental and African Studies, one of twenty self-governing colleges that make up the University of London, is better known by its acronym SOAS. It boasts of being “the leading centre in Europe for the study of Asia, Africa and the Middle East,” with an ethnically diverse student population of 3,700 representing 110 different countries.¹ However, in recent years, SOAS has probably attracted greater attention for its history of radical, anti-Zionist student politics.

For this reason, the Anglo-Jewish community has long viewed SOAS as an unpleasant and unwelcoming place for Jewish students. Columnist and author Melanie Phillips branded it “The School of Orchestrated Anti-Semitism.”² Although the situation may appear deplorable to those outside, it is inaccurate to portray SOAS, its faculty and students, as institutionally anti-Jewish. However, a platform has routinely been provided for “extreme anti-Israel hostility which has spilled over into acts of anti-Jewish hatred.”³

A History of Anti-Zionist Student Activities

Radical student politics is a consistent feature of SOAS campus life, and a summary of incidents shows why the school is seen as an intimidating place for Jewish students. After the United Nations equated Zionism with racism in 1975, the SOAS Student Union banned the Jewish Society student organization; when one was subsequently formed in 1979, the Student Union withdrew its funding. By contrast, in 1994 the Student Union opposed the expulsion from British campuses of the radical Islamic group Hizb ut Tahrir. The expulsion was instituted by the National Union of Students, which accused the group of being anti-Hindu, anti-Semitic, and homophobic.

In May 2002, the SOAS Islamic Society and Students for Justice in Palestine held a discussion titled “Sharon: A New Hitler for a New Age.” Featuring British MP George Galloway, Dr. Azzam Tamimi of the Muslim Association of Britain, and a rabbi from the anti-Zionist sect Neturei Karta, the discussion compared Zionism to Nazism and Israel to Nazi Germany.⁴

Later that month, the SOAS Student Union and the Campaign for Palestinian Rights presented a talk by Leila Khaled, the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine (PFLP) hijacker jailed by the British in 1970 for attacking an El Al

flight. Khaled was advertised as an “internationally acclaimed Palestinian activist” and told her packed SOAS audience that “there were no suicide bombers, only freedom fighters.”⁵

In November 2002, Jewish students were prevented by the SOAS Student Union from putting up posters bearing the logo of the Union of Jewish Students (UJS), the national organization for Jewish students in Britain. The SOAS Student Union’s black students’ officer told *The Guardian* that “any posters promoting Zionist organisations needed to be cleared by the student union to ensure they fit in with its [anti-Zionist] policy.”⁶

In February 2003, the head of the SOAS Jewish Society, Cassie Williams, was called a “fascist” and a “terrorist” when she identified herself as a Zionist and opposed an anti-Israeli motion at a Union meeting. The motion, opposing “the genocidal crimes faced by Palestinians,” passed by a clear majority.⁷

On 14 November 2003, students approved a motion, “Opposing All Forms of Racist Manifestations.” It equated Zionism with racism, called for the elimination of Zionism, and condemned the expression of Zionism on campus, stating:

This Union believes that peace requires the achievement of national liberation and independence, the elimination of colonialism and neo-colonialism, foreign occupation, apartheid, Zionism and racial discrimination in all its forms, as well as the recognition of the dignity of peoples and their right to self-determination.... This Union condemns any form of racism, Islamophobia, anti-Semitism, Zionism or other forms of discrimination on campus.⁸

This student policy, as will be seen below, was used to try to ban an Israeli official from speaking on campus. In addition, by championing the cause of self-determination for all peoples while simultaneously calling for the elimination of Zionism—the national movement for the self-determination of the Jewish people—the Union held that self-determination was applicable to everyone except Jews.

A Conference on “Israeli Apartheid”

On 5 December 2004, the SOAS Palestine Society, joined by other organizations including the Palestine Solidarity Campaign, held a one-day conference at SOAS called “Resisting Israeli Apartheid: Strategies and Principles.”⁹ Session titles included “Settler Colonialism as Genocide” and “Organising the Academics: Our Duty to Expose Israel, the Extra-Judicial Pariah State.” Hilary Rose, a British sociology professor, announced the creation of the British Committee for the Universities of Palestine (BRICUP),¹⁰ saying: “We are here today...to set in train nothing less than an international boycott movement of historic significance,” the goal being an academic boycott of Israel.¹¹

Many of the anti-Israeli speakers were Jewish or Israeli academics, including

Steven Rose (Open University, UK), Lawrence Davidson (West Chester University, U.S.), John Docker (Australian National University), Ilan Pappé (University of Haifa), Ur Shlonsky (University of Geneva), and Haim Bresheeth (University of East London). This feature was not surprising and has been noted elsewhere.¹² The *Jerusalem Post* quoted Bresheeth as claiming that “the occupation started in 1948” and that “there is no valid comparison between South Africa and Israel; Israel is much worse. South Africa exploited its native population while Israel expelled and committed genocide against its native population.”

Palestinian academic Omar Barghouti was quoted as arguing that “IDF [Israel Defense Forces] actions are similar to, though certainly not on the same scale as, the Nazis.”¹³ Mona Baker of the Institute of Science and Technology (University of Manchester), known for having fired two Israeli scholars from academic journals she owns,¹⁴ also addressed the conference and has listed many of the papers on her website.¹⁵

Although the event had the façade of an academic meeting, this author told *The Guardian* that it was instead “an out-and-out hate conference which is solely there to delegitimise Israel and its people.” But one of the conference organizers, Awad Joumaa of the Palestine Society, said: “We are promoting peace and equality for the Palestinian people. We are not the ones inciting hatred here.”¹⁶

Support for Anti-Jewish Racism on Campus

On 21 February 2005, an Islamist video called “Jerusalem, the Promise of Heaven” was shown in the SOAS Student Union’s lounge. A copy of this same video was found in the possession of Saajid Badat, a young British Muslim convicted of plotting to blow up an airliner, as shown in a photograph of Badat’s suitcase that appeared in *The Times*.¹⁷

The film, ostensibly about the struggle for Jerusalem between Israelis and Palestinians, shows bearded Orthodox Jews praying at the Western Wall and holding Torah scrolls in synagogue while the narrator states that “these people have no values or ethics”¹⁸ and refers to Jewish prayers as “satanic rustles and whispers.” While the camera pans over the Jewish cemetery on the Mount of Olives, a voiceover claims that Jews “pay thousands of dollars to have the names of their false ancestors written on these graves.” A Jewish undergraduate, horrified and almost in tears, persuaded the Union’s manager to turn off the film.

On 4 March 2005, students held an Emergency Union General Meeting to elect London mayor Ken Livingstone as honorary president of the SOAS Student Union. This “emergency” meeting came less than a month after the mayor had asked Oliver Finegold, a Jewish reporter for London’s *Evening Standard*, whether he was a “German war criminal” and accused him of being “just like a concentration camp guard.”¹⁹ Opposed to honoring Livingstone, this author nominated Nelson Mandela for the honor instead. This drew accusations against

“apartheid Israel,” the “Zionist press,” and the “Mossad conspiracy” against the mayor, to the cheers of the audience.

Later, a Student Union officer sent the author an extremely abusive email.²⁰ When the email was shown to *The Times Higher Education Supplement (THES)*, it ran a front-page story titled “Ministers Keep Eye on Bitter Soas Row” that claimed the Home Office was monitoring events amid concern about the mounting conflict. Yet a SOAS spokeswoman told *THES*: “Soas is rightly proud of its long tradition of vigorous debate, tolerance and openness.”²¹

Later in March 2005, an article by the student Nasser Amin appeared in the SOAS Student Union’s *Spirit* magazine. The article, titled “When Only Violence Will Do,” was a response to a previous story in *Spirit* by Islamic scholar Sheikh Hamza Yusuf, who called for “reflection by Muslims and non-Muslims on the moral status of violence, and its compatibility with religious teaching.”

Amin disagreed with Sheikh Yusuf, asserting:

The oft repeated view that Israeli victims of Palestinian violence are mainly “innocents,” as Sheikh Yusuf implies, faces the easy objection that those who benefit from the immoral actions of a colonial state in which they have chosen to reside cannot be considered as innocent. They are personally complicit in national wrongdoing, exacerbated by the fact that all Israeli adults, including the women, serve in what is indubitably an imperialist-terrorist organisation, the IDF.²²

Amin is currently involved with Islamic organizations in a harsh campaign against critics of his article.²³

On 23 March 2005, the SOAS Palestine Society invited Gilad Atzmon, a UK-based jazz musician and writer who was born a Jew and raised in Israel, to address students.²⁴ Atzmon has been quoted as making statements such as referring to the “Jewnited state of Jewmerica” as part of his assertion that America is controlled by Jews, a phrase he also used in an April 2005 interview.²⁵ Similarly, Atzmon had earlier written of the “new Jewmerica dominated world.”²⁶

Atzmon regularly offers his thoughts about Jews on his website, one example being: “The J’s are the ultimate chameleons, they can be whatever they like as long as it serves as some expedient... when it was right to be a Socialist they were right there in the forefront of the Bolshevik revolution, now when it is hard capitalism that sets the tone, you read about them in the Wall Street Journal...”²⁷

The steady stream of such incidents at SOAS led *The Times* to publish an article on 12 March 2005 titled “Tide of Extremism Is Rising against Us, Say Jewish Students,” which included comments from an Israeli student. The article noted how Jews and Israelis were being “targeted by radical Muslim students in an increasingly isolating and intimidating atmosphere,” and claimed that a government minister had ordered her department to prepare a report on SOAS.²⁸

Over the course of these incidents, the SOAS administration generally argued that they were primarily student matters, since the university’s Governing Body

and the campus Student Union are two separate legal entities, with the Union operating under its own constitution and not under SOAS management. This setup is the norm in England. The university does have oversight responsibilities but is generally reluctant to intervene in Student Union affairs, though it did in certain instances.

Anti-Israeli Sentiments in the Faculty

The above incidents involved the Student Union and its student societies, which are distinct from the faculty itself. Generally, SOAS academics refrain from taking part in fiercely partisan student activities, instead concentrating on their academic work, and in courses taken by this author the Israeli-Palestinian conflict was addressed in a fair and scholarly manner.

However, several SOAS academics have publicly associated themselves with anti-Israeli activities, and they are involved in Middle Eastern studies. Dr. Graham Dyer, lecturer in Middle East economics,²⁹ spoke harshly in 1999 at a lunch given by SOAS's Centre for Near and Middle East Studies for Uri Lubrani, Israel's then coordinator for Lebanese affairs. Dyer accused Lubrani of being "politically responsible for ethnic cleansing, and the 'concentration camp' at Al-Khiam"—a detention camp in south Lebanon. After his comments, Dyer resigned from the Centre and left the building. Student groups joined him in protesting Lubrani's appearance, holding placards stating: "Lubrani is a war criminal and is not welcome at SOAS."³⁰

Recently Dr. Laleh Khalili, lecturer in Middle East politics,³¹ decided to chair a SOAS Palestine Society meeting in November 2005 featuring controversial Columbia University academic Joseph Massad, who was praised in the publicity flyer as "academic enemy #1 of Israel and its U.S. lobby." In his lecture, Massad branded Israel as a white European colonial entity, asserted that it was created via terrorism and ethnic cleansing, and claimed that certain post-1948 laws show it to be an entirely racist endeavor. Khalili, who received her PhD at Columbia, had referred to Massad in her introduction as one of the most brilliant academic minds of his generation.

Both Dyer and Khalili supported the Association of University Teachers' (AUT) boycott motion in 2005 against Israeli universities, and were the only two SOAS academics to sign a pro-boycott public letter dated 1 June 2005, which accused Israeli academic bodies of "collusion (even if passive, at times) with the state's oppression of the Palestinian people."³² Dyer has served as head of the AUT branch at SOAS.

In addition, an academic centre at SOAS, the Sir Joseph Hotung Programme in Law, Human Rights and Peace Building in the Middle East,³³ appears to lack balance in its coverage of Israeli-Palestinian issues. In October 2004, they cosponsored, along with the SOAS Palestine Society and others, a memorial conference for the Palestinian intellectual Edward Said titled "A Continuing

Legacy.” In November 2004, they invited the Palestinian advocate Dr. Hanan Ashrawi to present the annual Hotung Lecture.

In January 2005, following the International Court of Justice’s (ICJ) ruling against Israel’s security barrier, Prof. Iain Scobbie, head of the Hotung Programme, spoke at three different events at SOAS regarding the alleged illegality of the barrier. One of these events at which Scobbie lectured, along with Arab Member of Knesset and fierce critic of Israeli policy Dr. Azmi Bishara and others, was held at the Brunei Gallery Lecture Theatre, the largest venue on the SOAS campus. The overall event was titled “Sealing Their Fate: The Wall’s Implications for Palestinian life” and was presented by the Friends of Birzeit University, the SOAS Palestine Society, and the London Middle East Institute at SOAS.

In a talk attended by this author on 18 January 2005 at SOAS, titled “The Wall: Material Facts, Legal Arguments and International Court,” Scobbie and Hotung research fellow Stephanie Koury gave lengthy presentations detailing the barrier’s route, the hardship it causes Palestinians, and the illegality of its construction according to the ICJ. However, they made no mention in their prepared remarks of the nine hundred Israelis killed over four years in suicide bombings.

To date, there have been no law seminars about the illegality of suicide bombings targeting Israeli civilians. Later in January 2005, though, the Hotung Programme advertised a meeting with the SOAS Palestine Society titled “The Peace Process and Palestinian Refugee Property Claims.” In November 2005, Dr. Menachem Klein, a board member of the Israeli human rights group B’Tselem, was brought in to speak about Jerusalem. He considers Israeli policy in the city to be one of apartheid.³⁴

In March 2006, the Hotung Programme presented a seminar with Israeli-British lawyer Daniel Machover titled “Practical Problems Prosecuting War Crimes in the English Courts.”³⁵ Machover attempted to have retired Israeli general Doron Almog arrested in Britain for alleged war crimes.³⁶ He is also the lawyer for Ahmed Saadat, the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine leader captured by the Israelis from a Palestinian jail.³⁷ The European Union considers the PFLP a terrorist organization.³⁸

Response by the SOAS Jewish Society

In the 2003-2004 academic year, no Jewish society existed at SOAS, whether due to apathy, fear, or opposition. No Israel society had existed there for almost thirty years since the United Nations’ “Zionism is racism” vote, as the Student Union prevented its formation. This meant that the Palestine Society, the largest and most active such group on campus, held a monopoly on student events concerning Israelis and Palestinians.

This all changed beginning in 2004-2005 when this author led the reconstitution of the SOAS Jewish Society and served as one of its leaders, and a

SOAS Israel Society was created following pressure on the administration and its intervention with the Student Union. Both societies were committed to correcting the imbalance on campus by presenting an active program of Israeli and Jewish events and giving students a different viewpoint on the Middle Eastern situation.

In response to the Palestine Society's "Resisting Israeli Apartheid" conference described above, the SOAS Jewish Society invited Roey Gilad, minister-counselor for political affairs at the Israeli embassy in London, to address students on 22 February 2005. This was to be the first time an Israeli diplomat had ever addressed a student event at SOAS. Ariel Sharon and Mahmoud Abbas had held a summit meeting in Sharm el-Sheikh earlier that month, and thus the talk was titled "New Opportunities for Middle East Peace."

However, the Student Union decided that the invitation must be withdrawn because an appearance by an Israeli government official would breach the Union's anti-Zionist policy. This author received an email stating: "The students voted for the Students' Union to instruct the Jewish Society that allowing a speaker from the Israeli embassy would be against union policy, and as a result a representative from the society should un-invite the respective speaker."

This was a double standard in the wake of the "Resisting Israeli Apartheid" conference, and this attempted censorship was made known to SOAS director Prof. Colin Bundy. The administration intervened and forced the Student Union to reverse their decision. The Union insisted that it would refuse to include the event in its listings, and would take down any publicity flyers found in the Union or student bar. The episode received national attention when *The Guardian* reported that: "College Tells Students to Reverse Israeli Ban."³⁹

The Jewish Society publicized the event via email using the tag "The Talk They Tried to Ban," and the controversy and media coverage ensured heightened anticipation and a large turnout. On the night, the sizable crowd was joined by pro-Palestinian protesters with anti-Israeli placards.

With the lecture hall full five minutes before the talk was to start, a fire alarm sounded that many sensed was deliberately set and fire marshals later said was likely malicious. Everyone in the building was forced to evacuate and to step over a huge pile of broken glass, as the front glass revolving door to SOAS had been smashed to pieces—it being later claimed that this was an accident. After a forty-minute delay, the talk finally began with the 150-seat Khalili Lecture Theatre packed with a standing-room-only crowd, and SOAS security guards turning away another one hundred people who could not fit in.

The mood inside was electric, and Trevor Phillips, chairman of Britain's Commission for Racial Equality (CRE), made a surprise appearance to show his support for the Jewish Society. Roey Gilad offered the Israeli viewpoint in his remarks, which were followed by an extremely open and emphatic discussion that was unusual for a lecture by a diplomat. Gilad answered questions from both friendly and critical members of the audience, including several Arab students from Israel's neighboring countries.

The event was seen as a great success for the Jewish Society. Subsequently Melanie Phillips posted an online account called “A Candle for Freedom,” with a contributor writing: “this positive outcome may well have significant impact at SOAS itself, and possibly beyond.” Phillips herself asserted: “This small but significant victory showed what can be achieved by a courageous and principled refusal to be cowed by the forces of prejudice and suppression.”⁴⁰

The anti-Israeli protesters that evening were clearly unhappy that the event took place. One, Liam Grange, told the *Jewish Chronicle*: “We feel Zionism is implicitly racist. If you want to learn about the BNP [far-Right British National Party], you don’t invite them to your home.”⁴¹

To cement the point that Israeli officials have the same right to speak at SOAS as those of other governments, who often visit, the Jewish Society decided to reinvite Gilad to SOAS. On 15 November 2005, he gave a talk on “After Gaza Disengagement: What Happens Next?” Once again the hall was packed, but unlike the previous year there was no attempted ban, intimidation, protests, fire alarm, broken glass, or disruptions. The event was advertised by the Student Union like all other society events. Whereas the year before the idea of an Israeli diplomat addressing students was so abhorrent to some that it led to the contentious incidents described above, the second visit passed off as a rational, intellectual discussion on the Israeli-Palestinian conflict.

Legitimizing Israel

Since Gilad’s initial appearance, the SOAS Jewish Society has held a number of Israel-related events over the last two academic years. These were well attended not only by Jews but also by European, Asian, Arab, and other students from the wider Muslim world, as well as lecturers.

The Jewish Society’s email list grew to over eight hundred people, students and nonstudents, the majority of them non-Jews who were merely interested in the society’s activities. Lectures presented by the SOAS Jewish Society included those given by Dr. Emanuele Ottolenghi (St. Antony’s College, Oxford), Prof. David Cesarani (Royal Holloway, University of London), Moty Cristal (ex-Israeli negotiator), Tzvi Yehezkeili (Israel’s Channel 10 news), Khaled Abu Toameh (*Jerusalem Post*), Dr. Jonathan Spyer (GLORIA, Interdisciplinary Center), and Natan Sharansky, who spoke at nearby University College London.

In addition to academic events, the Jewish Society and the Israel Society screened popular Israeli films, plus documentaries covering the 1972 Munich Olympics massacre and writer Amos Oz’s memoirs *A Tale of Love and Darkness*. There was also an Israeli Independence Day party and an Israeli music night.

The Jewish Society also held two well-received events about Sephardi Jewish history. One of them, about the Iraqi Jews of Shanghai, was jointly run with the SOAS Chinese Society and attracted Arab, Indian, and Chinese students, many of whom did not know Jews had lived in those countries.

Finally, on 8 March 2006, the SOAS Jewish Society, with the help of the European Center for Jewish Students in Brussels,⁴² held the largest event on campus for many years when it presented Prof. Alan Dershowitz of Harvard Law School. The talk, titled “Zionism Is Not Racism: The Case for Israel,” took place in the three-hundred-seat Brunei Gallery Lecture Theatre, the largest venue on campus. This, however, was hardly adequate as students packed the hall and another two hundred people were turned away, some of whom waited in the foyer and strained to listen through the open doors.

The evening was dramatic and confrontational. Dershowitz, limiting himself to a brief thirty-minute speech, took student questions for the next one and a half hours, it having been decided that only critics of Israel were permitted to ask questions. Hence, the most common arguments against Israel were brought into the open, leaving Dershowitz to address them one-by-one.⁴³

Numerous students and faculty members have thanked the SOAS Jewish Society for bringing Israeli diplomats, academics, and journalists as well as other speakers supportive of Israel to campus, and have credited it with providing a healthier balance of views. Many say it was their first opportunity to hear such a speaker in person, or the first time they had heard particular arguments in favor of Israel.

How to Go Forward?

It is a basic right that Jewish students are able to attend any university or college in Britain and express their religious or political beliefs, such as support for Israel, without fear of discrimination, harassment, and intimidation. In addition, anti-Israeli activities on campus must be conducted within the limits set by university codes of behavior, and cannot be allowed to become platforms for anti-Jewish hatred. However, reactive and defensive work alone is not sufficient. Jewish students must also offer their own events illustrating the complexity of Israeli history, society, and politics, and giving students another point of view to consider.

Despite huge media coverage and campus activity concerning Israel, there is still a lack of basic understanding of the realities of the country. For instance, many students have trouble differentiating between the Arab citizens of Israel who make up 20 percent of Israel’s population and the Palestinians in the West Bank and Gaza. If supporters of Israel do not address the entire student body and offer Israel’s side of the story, it is not surprising that students who continuously hear only the Palestinian viewpoint hold anti-Israeli opinions.

Samuel G. Freedman, professor of journalism at Columbia University, remarked that the response to the prevailing bias against Israel on campus must be to ensure that “the dialogue on campuses will be as wide-ranging as the dialogue in the Middle East itself.” He further asserted: “We should be encouraging Jewish students to see college as a time and place for vigorous debate and intellectual

warfare.... It is their job...to fight advocacy with advocacy, argument with argument.”⁴⁴

The English journalist and author Linda Grant remarked that it appears as if there are two countries of Israel. One is a “virtual” Israel that is routinely portrayed as a “criminal” and “illegitimate” state, and a “cancer” to be eradicated; the other is a “real” country inhabited by “real people, real streets, real houses, real dogs, real cats, real dead tree newspapers.” Grant wonders which one will “win the war of reality.”⁴⁵

It is essential that Jewish students on university campuses all over the world be prepared to fight with advocacy and argument to ensure that the “real” Israel is presented, acknowledged, and understood by other students. In the past two years, the SOAS Jewish Society has effectively demonstrated how this can be done.

Notes

1. SOAS website, “Information for Prospective Students,” www.soas.ac.uk/studying/index.cfm.
2. Melanie Phillips, “The School of Orchestrated Anti-Semitism,” 7 March 2005, www.melaniephillips.com/diary/archives/001082.html.
3. Jamie Glazov, “UK Student Warned to Stop Protesting Jew-Hatred,” interview with Gavin Gross, *FrontPageMagazine.com*, 27 June 2005, www.frontpagemag.com/Articles/ReadArticle.asp?ID=18571.
4. Bernard Josephs, “MP in Clash over Soas Remarks,” *Jewish Chronicle*, 24 May 2002.
5. Theodore Dalrymple, “A Terrorist Returns,” *City Journal*, 31 May 2002, www.city-journal.org/html/eon_5_31_02td.html.
6. Polly Curtis, “Anti-Israel Motion Upsets Jewish Group,” 18 November 2002, www.education.guardian.co.uk/students/story/0,,842766,00.html.
7. Gaby Wine, “SOAS Apology to J-Soc Head over Debate Insults,” *Jewish Chronicle*, 21 February 2003.
8. SOAS Union website, “UGM Motion Opposing All Forms of Racist Manifestations,” www.soasunion.org/system/systempages/file/32/file/opposing_all_racist_manifestations.pdf.
9. Conference flyer, “Resisting Israeli Apartheid: Strategies and Principles,” held on 5 December 2004 at SOAS, www.pngo.net/events/SOAS_Dec_5_conference_on_Palestine.pdf.
10. British Committee for the Universities of Palestine (BRICUP) website, www.bricup.org.uk/.
11. Ronnie Fraser, “The Academic Boycott of Israel: Why Britain?” *Post-Holocaust and Anti-Semitism*, No. 36, 1 September 2005, www.jcpa.org/phas/phas-36.htm.
12. Manfred Gerstenfeld, “Jews against Israel,” *Post-Holocaust and Anti-Semitism*, No. 30, 1 March 2005, www.jcpa.org/phas/phas-30.htm.
13. Atarah Haber, “‘Genocide’ Big Word at London Anti-Israel Academic Conference,” *Jerusalem Post*, 7 December 2004.
14. Donald MacLeod, “Israelis under Fire: Double Sacking Fuels Arguments over Academic Boycott of Israel,” *The Guardian*, 25 June 2002, <http://education.guardian.co.uk/higher/worldwide/story/0,,743096,00.html>.

15. Mona Baker's website containing "Resisting Israeli Apartheid" conference papers, www.monabaker.com.
16. Polly Curtis, "Israel Boycott Row Hits College: University Attacked for 'Anti-Israel' Conference," *The Guardian*, 4 December 2004, www.guardian.co.uk/uk_news/story/0,,1366190,00.html.
17. Stewart Tendler, "Police Success Leaves Muslim Leaders in Shock," *The Times*, 1 March 2005, www.timesonline.co.uk/article/0,,2-1505694,00.html.
18. Jamie Doward and Nico Hines, "Boycott Threat to Israeli Colleges: Campus Anti-Semitism Fears Inflamed by British Tutors' Move over Palestinian Land," *The Observer*, 17 April 2005, http://observer.guardian.co.uk/uk_news/story/0,6903,1461699,00.html.
19. Hugh Muir, "Livingstone Faces Inquiry over Nazi Guard Jibe at Jewish Reporter," *The Guardian*, 12 February 2005, <http://politics.guardian.co.uk/gla/story/0,9061,1411433,00.html>.
20. Phillips, "School of Orchestrated Anti-Semitism."
21. Phil Baty, "Ministers Keep Eye on Bitter Soas Row," *The Times Higher Education Supplement*, 1 April 2005, www.thes.co.uk/search/story.aspx?story_id=2020706.
22. Nasser Amin, "When Only Violence Will Do," *SOAS Spirit*, No. 3, March 2005, 20-21.
23. Muslim Public Affairs Committee UK, "Exclusive Interview: Nasser Amin, the Lone Mujahid," Part 1, 23 January 2006, www.mpacuk.org/content/view/1318/103/, Part 2, 29 January 2006, www.mpacuk.org/content/view/4/1335/103/.
24. Doward and Hines, "Boycott Threat."
25. Gilad Atzmon, interview with Mary Rizzo of Peacepalestine, April 2005, www.gilad.co.uk/html%20files/maryrizzo.html.
26. Gilad Atzmon, "Israeli People's Most Common Mistakes," 22 August 2003, www.gilad.co.uk/html%20files/mistakes.html.
27. Gilad Atzmon, "The J Word, the J People and the J Spot," www.gilad.co.uk/html%20files/jspot.html.
28. Sean O'Neill and Yaakov Lappin, "Tide of Extremism Is Rising against Us, Say Jewish Students," *The Times*, 12 March 2005, www.timesonline.co.uk/printFriendly/0,,1-4646-1522379,00.html.
29. SOAS Staff Profile, Dr. Graham Dyer, <http://mercury.soas.ac.uk/economics/staff/GrahamDyer/GrahamDyer.html>.
30. Lee Levitt and Simon Rucker, "Soas Demo over Israeli Speaker," *Jewish Chronicle*, 12 November 1999.
31. SOAS Staff Profile, Dr. Laleh Khalili, www.soas.ac.uk/staff/staffinfo.cfm?contactid=1271.
32. Socialist Teachers Alliance website, "UK Academics Explain why They Support AUT Boycott," 1 June 2005, www.socialist-teacher.org/campaigns.asp?d=y&id=526.
33. Sir Joseph Hotung Programme in Law, Human Rights and Peace Building in the Middle East, website, www.soas.ac.uk/lawpeacemideast/.
34. Dr. Menachem Klein, "Apartheid' in Jerusalem," www.jerusalemities.org/articles/english/nov2003/20.htm.
35. "Practical Problems Prosecuting War Crimes in the English Courts," lecture presented by Daniel Machover, www.soas.ac.uk/lawpeacemideast/seminar.html#Mr_Daniel_Machover.
36. Vikram Dodd, "UK Considers Curbing Citizens' Right to Arrest Alleged War Criminals," *The Guardian*, 3 February 2006, www.politics.guardian.co.uk/foreignaffairs/story/0,,1701277,00.html.
37. "British Office in Gaza Set Alight," <http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/uk/4805118.stm>.
38. Official Journal of the European Union, Council decision of 21 December 2005, <http://eur-lex.europa.eu>.

- europa.eu.int/eur-ex/lex/LexUriServ/site/en/oj/2005/l_340/l_34020051223en00640066.pdf.
39. Polly Curtis, "College Tells Students to Reverse Israeli Ban," *The Guardian*, 5 February 2005, www.education.guardian.co.uk/higher/news/story/0,,1406348,00.html.
 40. Melanie Phillips, "A Candle for Freedom," 24 February 2005, www.melaniephillips.com/diary/archives/001064.html.
 41. "SOAS Protests over Israel Embassy Speaker," *Jewish Chronicle*, 25 February 2005.
 42. European Center for Jewish Students website, www.ecjs.org/.
 43. A short video of Prof. Dershowitz's trip to Europe, including his SOAS visit, was made by those in charge of his tour. See: www.saz.eu.com/alens8.wmv.
 44. Samuel G. Freedman, "Keeping Things in Perspective," in *American Jewry and the College Campus: Best of Times or Worst of Times?* American Jewish Committee, November 2005, 30-31, www.ajc.org/atf/cf/%7B42D75369-D582-4380-8395-D25925B85EAF%7D/AmericanJewryCollegeCampus2005.pdf.
 45. Linda Grant, "Israel versus the Blogosphere," *The Guardian's* "Comment Is Free" blog, 20 March 2006, http://commentisfree.guardian.co.uk/linda_grant/2006/03/israel_versus_the_blogosphere.html.

Manfred Gerstenfeld

Utrecht University: The Myth of Jewish Cannibalism, Censorship, and Fear of Muslim Intimidation¹

How much censorship concerning Islam is there at universities in the Netherlands? To what extent are Dutch scholars intimidated by Muslims? How much do universities' business interests influence what academic teachers can publish? How does the Dutch quality daily *NRC Handelsblad* manipulate its information on the Middle East? These are a few of the questions raised by a seemingly isolated censorship case at Utrecht University.

There on 16 June 2006, Prof. Pieter van der Horst, an internationally known scholar specializing in early Christian and Jewish studies gave his farewell lecture on the topic of "The Myth of Jewish Cannibalism." In it he drew a line from the more than two-millennia-old, classic pre-Christian Greek anti-Semitism to the popularity of the anti-Jewish blood libel in the contemporary Arab world.

That same day the Dutch Jewish weekly *NIW* claimed that the lecture's text had been severely censored by the university's rector.² Van der Horst later elaborated this claim in an article titled "Tying Down Academic Freedom" in the *Wall Street Journal*.³

The Committee Meeting

There he wrote:

Much of the [contemporary] Islamic vilification of Jews has its roots in German fascism. Hitler's *Mein Kampf* has been on the best-seller lists in many Middle Eastern countries. The sympathy for Nazism goes back to the Führer's days. Palestinian leader Haj Amin al-Huseini, the Grand Mufti of Jerusalem, even closely collaborated with Hitler. He spent the war years in Berlin and visited Auschwitz, a trip that inspired his plans to build a concentration camp in Palestine.

Van der Horst mentioned in his article that the dean of his faculty had asked him to delete this and other passages on modern Islamic anti-Semitism from his lecture. When he refused, the Rector Magnificus, Willem Hendrik Gispen, a pharmacologist, summoned him to appear before a committee that included three other professors.

Van der Horst writes that the committee and Gispen told him the university

had to protect him from himself. If he did not delete the references to Islamic anti-Semitism he might be threatened by violent Muslim groups. He would also damage the university's ability to build bridges between Muslims and non-Muslims. The committee also claimed that the scholarly level of Van der Horst's lecture was poor.

Van der Horst wrote that Gispén told him he had twenty-four hours to decide whether to remove the contested passages; otherwise he would assume his "rectorial responsibility." Although the meaning of this threat was unclear to Van der Horst, he understood the broad message: Utrecht University strives for political correctness rather than academic truth. Initially intimidated, he deleted the contested text from his lecture.⁴

A Correct Text

When this author asked Gispén for a reaction, he refused to be interviewed verbally but answered questions in writing, stating that his views also reflected those of the other committee members. These answers leave much to clarify. Gispén writes that the argument was only about the publication of the text by the university, and that several peers criticized the academic quality of Van der Horst's remarks about Islam. Gispén's answers do not indicate that there were any concrete threats from Muslims. He denies that the issue of negatively impacting the dialogue with Muslim students was mentioned in the discussion with Van der Horst.⁵

Whatever the university authorities may claim, the major facts concerning Islamic anti-Semitism in Van der Horst's uncensored text are, however, correct. The lecture understates rather than exaggerates contemporary Islamic anti-Semitism. It does not even mention by name the world's most powerful extreme anti-Semite, Mahmoud Ahmadinejad, president of Iran and author of frequent genocidal calls. The facts mentioned are widely known and do not need further academic verification. Even if Utrecht University found some scholars who opposed the text, that did not make it unfit for publication, the more so as Van der Horst had deleted an *ad hominem* remark. The university thus still has to prove that this was not a case of censorship of a valid academic text on an inconvenient subject.

Van der Horst was complimented on his text by leading scholars, such as the Dutch Arabist Hans Jansen and a well-known Dutch Protestant theologian also called Hans Jansen. It should also be mentioned that Van der Horst has been a member for more than ten years of the Royal Dutch Academy of Sciences, to which only some of the Netherlands' outstanding scholars are elected.

The Story Develops

After the initial story hit the major Dutch media, it developed its own life. Geert Wilders, a conservative politician frequently threatened with death by Muslims,

raised the issue of Utrecht University's lack of academic freedom in parliament by asking questions of two cabinet ministers. He said that the creeping dhimmitude of Dutch authorities had to end.⁶

Articles and op-eds for and against the Utrecht rector and Van der Horst now appeared in the major Dutch dailies. Van der Horst, previously known mainly in his academic field, now became a well-known scholar everywhere in the Netherlands. Initially the university only reacted with a press release stating that Van der Horst had been "advised" not to include certain passages in his lecture because these were not suitable for a scientific text.⁷ After a few days of public debate, Gispen replied to questions from the *NRC*, which had earlier titled one of its editorials "The Fearful Rector."⁸ An editorial in another national daily, *Volkskrant*, said that if it was true, as Van der Horst claimed, that Gispen had urged censorship out of fear of intimidation by Muslims, then the rector should be rebuked.⁹

Gispen in his *NRC* interview stated that he had not censored the lecture but wanted to prevent its publication in a university series. He also referred to side issues, accusing Van der Horst of being vengeful because the university had severely reduced the number of positions in his department. Gispen also replied to an irrelevant question, saying that his Jewish wife and daughters wore Stars of David and that he would have liked to consult in this affair with his late father-in-law, David de Wied, an internationally known neuropharmacologist.¹⁰

Muslim Threat?

Apart from the unjustified censorship, the interview circumvented the most important issue: was there any factual basis for the Muslim threat that was mentioned? All Gispen said was that he had needed personal protection in another controversy. A few months earlier the university had decided to change the name of an institute called after the prewar Dutch Nobel Prize winner Peter Debye, a chemist, who when working in Nazi Germany had collaborated in anti-Jewish measures and had signed letters with "Heil Hitler." Gispen did not suggest that the threats he received then had anything to do with Muslims.

Unless Utrecht University finally presents proof to the contrary, its behavior can be defined as advance capitulation to an imagined threat. And even assuming that the university had proof of a threat, it should have ensured the security of a threatened professor to exercise his freedom of speech rather than advising him to desist from making his views known.

The issue of intimidation from diverse origins in the Netherlands is an important one. One of the country's leading criminologists, Frank Bovenkerk, in 2005 edited a book on the subject with chapters about threats to public officials, the police, lawyers, judges, prosecutors, journalists, and notaries.¹¹ As a result of threats from major criminals, Amsterdam prosecutor Koos Plooy was moved to another position because the authorities were not sure they could protect him.¹²

The best known among many intimidation attempts by Muslims concern a number of politicians and public personalities whom the authorities have provided with bodyguards since the murder of the media maker Theo van Gogh by the radical Muslim Mohammed Bouyeri on 2 November 2004. One parliamentarian, Ayaan Hirsi Ali, whose life was made almost unbearable, emigrated in spring 2006 to the United States.

Where Do the Dutch Rectors Stand?

The censorship affair developed in many other directions. The *NRC* claimed that five out of seven rectors of Dutch universities supported Gispén's censorship. Arnold Heertje, a recently retired prominent professor of economics, approached these rectors and came to different conclusions. Only two of these five, those heading Radboud University in Nijmegen and the University of Twente, considered that Van der Horst should not have been allowed to speak about Muslim anti-Semitism and the Nazi influence on it. Two others stated that they would not have censored Van der Horst's text on Muslim anti-Semitism.¹³

Heertje wrote that Gispén's behavior was motivated by the fear that Utrecht University would lose market share by discouraging Muslim students and imams from studying there. He said the rector had behaved like a high school manager who wants to maximize its number of students. Such a business-oriented attitude toward academic freedom was damaging universities. The worst aspect was that this mentality had manifested itself at the level of a rector who was even backed by his colleagues at two other universities. Earlier, Heertje had raised the question of whether somebody who treated academic freedom that way could be maintained as rector of a university.¹⁴

Doubts about the way the *NRC* handled the issue also concern another aspect of the discussion. In Van der Horst's uncensored text he had referred to the propagation of anti-Semitism in Iran, Syria, and the Palestinian territories. About the latter he wrote: "the crudeness of the anti-Jewish brainwashing one can find there exceeds the worst expectations. In many Palestinian schoolbooks children are taught year after year that it is a holy duty to destroy the Jewish people because Jews, as children of Satan, rebel against God and conspire against humanity and Islam."

Palestinian Textbooks

Van der Horst footnoted this quotation by referring to a book by the aforementioned Hans Jansen who is a professor of Protestant theology teaching in Brussels.¹⁵ Had the *NRC* wanted to verify this passage, what would have been easier than contacting this fellow Dutchman? Instead they published an article by their correspondent in Israel, Oscar Garschagen, in which he claimed, mainly quoting a Palestinian expert, that there was no anti-Semitism in Palestinian schoolbooks.

The article also quoted an Israeli expert who made some confused remarks about the matter. Reading the *NRC* article, an uninformed reader could only arrive at the conclusion that Van der Horst had misled his audience, raising doubts about his scholarship.¹⁶

Garschagen, who laid the infrastructure for this impression, is a senior Dutch journalist. He is the former editor in chief of the important Dutch socialist weekly *Vrij Nederland*. He has been long enough in Israel to know that many in Palestinian society encourage schoolchildren to become suicide murderers. These facts, much worse than the ones cited by Van der Horst, were not mentioned in his article.

Jansen sent a lengthy refutation of Garschagen's text to the *NRC*. The paper did not publish it, but only a weak reaction of the Dutch pro-Israeli defense organization CIDI.¹⁷ The latter had a few days earlier organized a very successful debate on academic freedom in the Netherlands with the participation of Van der Horst and several well-known personalities such as law professor Paul Cliteur and Frank William, head of the Dutch Muslim radio who told about the threats against him by radical Muslims.¹⁸ CIDI has since published the uncensored version of Van der Horst's lecture as a booklet.¹⁹

Jansen then published his text in another prominent Dutch daily, *Trouw*, which had been supportive of Van der Horst by publishing the deleted passages of his lecture. Jansen wrote that the central themes in the new Palestinian schoolbooks, in which the *NRC* article had claimed there was no anti-Semitism, included: the state of Israel has no right to exist; Israel is obsessed by a demon; the Jews are traitors; the Jews are greedy and materialistic; the Jews are heartless and hard; the Jews conspire against God and all humanity. He pointed out that these books make no reference to the Oslo peace agreements of 1993.

Jansen concluded that the Palestinian schoolbooks reflect a preparation for holy war against Israel, and that they glorify martyrdom and suicide operations. He noted that in 2003, the Education Ministry of the Palestinian Authority had published a schoolbook meant for the top class in Gaza and West Bank high schools. Titled *Islamic Culture*, it called on pupils to fight in a holy war and to die as martyrs.²⁰ Later the *NRC* would claim that they needed time to get Garschagen's reaction to Jansen's critique and in the meantime the latter had already sent his article to *Trouw*.²¹

When the story became known in Israel, the Israeli Academy of Sciences invited Van der Horst to give a lecture there. In an ironic retort to Utrecht University, the invitation said that he could speak about whatever he wanted and no influence would be exerted on the contents of his lecture, "as usual in academic circles."

This Dutch case has proved once again that one of the fastest ways to identify distortions in Western academic systems is to look at matters concerning Jews or Israel. What started as an isolated incident turned into a typical case of how people in power in the academic world censor irrefutable facts that are unpleasant to

Muslim ears. The willingness to conceal and manipulate information for reasons of fear, maintaining social peace, or business interests is widespread in the West and goes far beyond the world of Dutch academics.

Notes

1. This article is part of a JCPA research project on Dutch attitudes toward Jews and Israel, which is sponsored by the Israel Maror Foundation.
2. Ted de Hoog, "Censuur in Holland," *NIW*, 16 June 2006. [Dutch]
3. Pieter W. van der Horst, "Tying Down Academic Freedom," *Wall Street Journal*, 30 June 2006.
4. Ibid.
5. W. H. Gispen, written reply to questions by Manfred Gerstenfeld, 7 August 2006. [Dutch]
6. "Universiteit Utrecht wilde 'griezelpassages' schrappen," *NRC.nl*, 19 June 2006. [Dutch]
7. "Islamitische antisemitisme/Censuur Afscheidsrede Hoogleraar," *Trouw*, 17 June 2006. [Dutch]
8. "De bange rector," *NRC Handelsblad*, 15 June 2006. [Dutch]
9. "Academische vrijheid," *Volkskrant*, 21 June 2006. [Dutch]
10. Jannetje Koelewijn, "Ik ben niet bang en van censuur is geen sprake," *NRC Handelsblad*, 22 June 2006. [Dutch]
11. Frank Bovenkerk, *Bedreigingen in Nederland* (Amsterdam: Augustus, 2005). [Dutch]
12. Paul Vugts, "Plooy trekt de dreiging niet langer," *Het Parool*, 17 February 2004. [Dutch]
13. Arnold Heertje, "De Rector is geen manager: Academische censuur," *Trouw*, 30 June 2006. [Dutch]
14. Arnold Heertje, "Zwijgen over antisemitisme," *Parool*, 21 June 2006. [Dutch]
15. Hans Jansen, *Van jodenhaat naar zelfmoordterrorisme: Islamisering van het Europese antisemitisme in het Midden-Oosten* (Heerenveen: Groen, 2006). [Dutch]
16. Oscar Garschagen, "Geen woord meer over heilige oorlog tegen Israël," *NRC Handelsblad*, 25 June 2006. [Dutch]
17. CIDI, "Palestijnse Autoriteit wel verantwoordelijk voor antisemitische uitlatingen in schoolboeken," *NRC Handelsblad*, 1 July 2006. [Dutch]
18. Saskia Appel, "Politiek correcte gesel," *NIW*, 30 June 2006. [Dutch]
19. Pieter W. van der Horst, "De Mythe van het joodse kannibalisme (De ongecensureerde versie)," CIDI, Den Haag, 2006. [Dutch]
20. Hans Jansen, "Geen woord meer over heilige oorlog tegen Israël in Palestijnse schoolboeken?" *Trouw*, 6 July 2006. [Dutch]
21. Folkert Jensma, "De krant antwoordt," *NRC Handelsblad*, 26-27 August 2006. [Dutch]

Itamar Marcus and Barbara Crook

Anti-Semitism among Palestinian Authority Academics¹

Palestinian Authority Policy

One of the primary objectives of the Palestinian Authority (PA) after its establishment in 1994 was to delegitimize Israel. These efforts were evident throughout Palestinian society and involved various channels including television, schoolbooks, and culture. The delegitimization of Israel incorporated various hate messages, especially the denial of Israel's right to exist.² It also employed myriad libels, including the assertion that Israel intentionally kills Palestinians through shootings³ and even burning in ovens.⁴

The PA also chose to ideologically confront Israel by using its media to promote hatred of Jews in general. The Authority initiated a virulent anti-Semitism designed to delegitimize Jews, Judaism, and Jewish traditions. As a result, anti-Semitism is now endemic to PA society. The academic community was likewise recruited to this undertaking. Professors, religious academics, teachers, and schoolbook authors are all participating in this hate promotion.

Academic anti-Semitism in the PA has numerous components, including the total revision of ancient Middle Eastern history to erase all records of Jewish presence in the Land of Israel. This reinforces the PA's policy of trying to legitimize its denial of Israel's right to exist by presenting it in academic trappings.

Thus, Palestinian academics portray Jews as inherently different from others, possessing innately evil traits. Educators and academics follow the lead of the PA politicians and distort and malign Jewish tradition as inherently evil. They link it directly to the "treacherous behavior" of which they accuse Jews today. Forgeries and fiction masquerading as history are likewise used to "prove" the libel that Judaism is inherently racist and evil. These purported Jewish attributes and traditions are presented not as behavior that can be improved but as the unchangeable nature of Jews.

This chapter does not consider all of PA academia. It focuses, however, on those academics chosen by the PA to indoctrinate the people using such public venues as PA TV and, particularly, educational broadcasting.

Revising Ancient History to Deny Israel's Right to Exist

In 1998, PA historians held a conference in which they devised a policy of historical revisionism. Dr. Yussuf Alzamili, head of the History Department at

the Khan Yunis Government Educational College, presented the approach of the developing PA educational system. The goal would not be to teach historical truth but rather to convey a political history aimed at denying Israel's right to exist in the Land of Israel. Thus, at the conference, "Alzamili called on all universities and colleges to be active in the writing of the history of Palestine and not to enable the defiled and the enemies to distort it...or to enable legitimacy for the existence of Jews on this land."⁵

Historians eager to follow this lead were regularly featured on PA TV's educational programs. They fabricated an entire Palestinian Arab history, packaged it with academic credibility, and erased Jewish history from the land.

The challenge to PA academics was considerable, since much of the Jewish historical record has continuous independent and archeological documentation. Even Islam recognized the Hebrew narrative to a great degree. Hence the Palestinian academics, recognizing the futility of attempting to erase the documented history of the Jews, instead adopted a different solution of literally stealing the identity of the Jews by identifying ancient Hebrews as both Arabs and Muslims and denying their connection to today's Jews of the state of Israel.

One leading historian, Jirar al-Qidwa, chosen by Arafat as an adviser and today chairman of the PA Public Library, has been featured regularly and prominently on educational TV and was a major promoter of this "replacement" ideology. Although historical records confirm that the first presence of Arabs in the Land of Israel was after the Muslim conquest in the seventh century C.E., Al-Qidwa unabashedly and emphatically turned the Hebrews of the Bible into Arabs: "Regarding the Israelites [of the Bible], they were Arab tribes and among the purest.... And believe me, in Allah's name, that my blood has more of the Israelites' blood and the blood of the ancient Hebrews than does the blood of Netanyahu and Sharon."⁶

Prof. Issam Sissalem, chairman of the History Department at the Islamic University of Gaza and host of PA TV educational programs for many years, has also been a driving force of this historical revision:

[Biblical Hebrews] were primitive shepherd tribes. They had no history. Titus slaughtered them, and this land was cleansed of those fools...the ancient Hebrews were destroyed, utterly decimated. Actually, they were foreigners in this land. They were primitive Bedouin from the Arabian desert. This land is ours. Jerusalem and every one of her stones are ours. They [the Jews] are liars. Their allegations are lies and are worthy of scorn and ridicule.⁷

Turning the ancient Hebrews into Arabs was not enough for the PA, and the religion of Islam was attached to all biblical characters with similar fervor. Therefore, even though Islam was first introduced by Mohammed in the seventh century, long after ancient Judaism, the academics denied the existence and legitimacy of ancient Judaism by turning it into Islam. As Al-Qidwa stated:

Judaism is not a religion in the full sense of the word, and is not a nation at all.... Where does this religion come from? The source of Judaism is the Mosaic Law...which is the continuation of Islam of our master Abraham.... Several researchers...have found in the Bible [Torah], when translated correctly, texts that prove that it is the continuation of Islam.⁸

Denying the central place of Jewish worship was likewise critical to this replacement ideology, as was the denial of the Jewish presence in Jerusalem. Sissalem, in his weekly program with children in the TV studio, explained that the tradition of the Temple in Jerusalem was based on “Jewish lies”:

Girl asks Sissalem: “Tell us about the Night Journey and Ascent to Heaven and the Al-Buraq Wall that the Jews falsely claim as the Wailing Wall and hold ceremonies there.”

Sissalem: “That’s the place where Mohammed went to Heaven, and it is part of the Al-Aqsa Mosque. The Zionist enemy falsely claims that this wall is part of the so-called ‘Temple.’ This is a deceitful lie.”

Girl 2: “We hear many claims by the Jews that Solomon’s Temple is located in Jerusalem under the Al-Aqsa Mosque. Is this true?”

Sissalem: “This is the biggest lie in history by those liars.”⁹

This revisionism, initiated in 1998, continues unabated until today. During Ramadan broadcasting in October 2006, Dr. Hassan Khader, founder of the *Al-Quds Encyclopedia* and regular TV host, repeated the claim that the Jews have no ancient historical connection to the Western Wall of the Temple:

The first connection of the Jews to this site began in the sixteenth century.... The Jewish connection to this site is a recent connection, not ancient...like the roots of the Islamic connection.... Who would have believed that the Israelis would arrive 1,400 years [after the beginning of Islam], conquer Jerusalem, and make this wall into their special place of worship, where they worship and pray?¹⁰

The purpose of this revisionism, as expressed by Alzamili in 1998, was not academic accuracy but was inherently political—namely, to deny the “legitimacy for the existence of Jews on this land.”¹¹

Following this lead, many academics did not leave the political conclusions to the TV viewers but stated them explicitly. For example, after repeating his denials of any Jewish connection to the land, Sissalem announced the political implications: “They [Jews-Israelis] are like a parasitic worm that eats a snail and lives in its shell. We will not let anyone live in our shell!”¹²

Denying the Holocaust while Demanding a New One

Another component of the negation of Jewish history is the denial of modern Jewish experience—including the horrors of the Holocaust. As Sissalem stated on a PA TV educational program:

Lies surfaced about Jews being murdered here and there and the Holocaust. And of course these are all lies and unfounded claims. There was no Dachau, no Auschwitz! [They] were cleansing sites.... They began to publicize in their propaganda media that they were persecuted, murdered, and exterminated.... Committees acted here and there to establish this entity [Israel], this foreign entity, implanted as a cancer in our country.... They always portrayed themselves as victims, and they made a Center for Heroism and Holocaust. Whose heroism? What Holocaust? It is our nation that is heroic, the holocaust was against our people.... We were the victims. We will not stay victims forever!¹³

PA anti-Semitism, however, goes beyond denying *Israel's* right to exist.

PA academics have also systematically built a case denying *Jews* the right to exist. As their expert witness, these religious academics bring Allah¹⁴ Himself, who is said to have sent a message through the Prophet Mohammed that killing Jews is a necessary step to achieve world redemption through resurrection.

Dr. Muhammad Mustafa Najem, a lecturer in Koranic interpretation at Gaza's Al-Azhar University, taught in a televised PA sermon that Allah described the Jews as “characterized by conceit, pride, arrogance, savagery, disloyalty, and treachery ... [and] deceit and cunning.”¹⁵ Just a month later the same academic again appeared on the PA's official station, saying: “The Jews are Jews, and we are forbidden to forget their character traits even for a moment, even for a blink of an eye.”¹⁶

Dr. Khader Abas, a lecturer in psychology at Gaza's Al-Aqsa University, taught the origins of Jewish evil from a different perspective: “From the moment the [Jewish] child is born, he nurses hatred against others, nurses seclusion, nurses superiority....”¹⁷

As part of this delineation of Jewish evil, the PA presents fictitious libels as authentic Jewish documents. Prominent among these is *The Protocols of the Elders of Zion*, which the PA routinely treats as the Jewish plan for world domination.

Dr. Riad al-Astal, a lecturer in history at Al-Azhar University in Gaza, brought up the *Protocols* when discussing the rise of political Zionism in Europe. “What is known as the Zionist Renaissance,” he asserted, “grew and the seeds of what is called *The Protocols of the Elders of Zion* appeared at the end of the eighteenth century [*sic*]. They are the protocols that were presented in Basel [at the First Zionist Congress].”¹⁸

A new Palestinian schoolbook, written by senior Palestinian academics,

likewise taught children to view the *Protocols* as authentic: “There is a group of confidential resolutions adopted by the [First Zionist] Congress and known by the name *The Protocols of the Elders of Zion*, the goal of which was world domination.”¹⁹ After worldwide condemnation it was removed from the new edition of the book.

Academic discussions on educational TV routinely refer to the *Protocols* as authentic. Sheikh Attiyeh Sahar, chairman of the Department of Islamic Research at Al-Azhar University in Gaza, stated:

It must be known that this nation, the Jews, are willing to alter their religion in order to attain their demands.... in order to attain their goals, they are willing to turn away from their God and His Singularity, which was introduced to the world by their prophets. We also know that they changed the Bible and replaced it, because it does not serve their purposes, and they drafted the Talmud, as it is known, and came up, finally, with the *Protocols of the Elders of Zion*.²⁰

Dr. Attallah Abu al-Farah, calling in to a talk show hosted by Sissalem, queried: “Can there be coexistence on Palestinian land between ourselves and the Jews, in light of their mentality that stems from the *Protocols of the Elders of Zion*, Dr. Issam?” Sissalem responded to A-Farah, who presented the *Protocols* as authentic, by calling him “My beloved friend...who is a learned expert...”²¹

Painting Jews as Evil

Inherent to the purported Jewish program of domination is the planning and execution of massive crimes that endanger all humanity. Senior Palestinian academics regularly portray Jews as a threat to stable society and as responsible for all civil strife, financial crises, conflicts, and wars. They present Zionism, the movement to reestablish the Jewish national home in Israel, as a European colonialist plot to rid Europe of Jews and thus attempt to solve their own “Jewish problem.” The aforementioned Dr. Riad al-Astal asserted: “Britain’s first aim [in promoting Zionism] was to be rid of the Jews, who were known to provoke disputes and disturbances and financial crises in Germany, France, and other European states.”²²

The PA augments the picture of the evil nature of Jews by defining Jewish traditions and sources as evil. Judaism is said to be a racist, murder-promoting religion. In an educational broadcast, Al-Qidwa taught: “The commandments of their Hebrew Bible or their Talmud say that we are goyim—that is, non-Jews. [They] view all non-Jews as barbarians or as their servants, devoid of any human rights, and [one] may destroy them and kill them.”²³

Completing this picture, worldwide outbreaks of anti-Semitism are described as the nations of the world acting legitimately to protect themselves from the threat

posed by the Jews—or to take revenge. Psychologist Khader Abas expounded on this point on PA TV:

The Israelis brought it on themselves, I emphasize, brought it on themselves in every society they lived, disasters and massacres. First, they concentrated money in their hands, denying it to others. Second, they spied against the nations where they lived. And the third important and basic aspect: they were condescending.... Thus the people of the societies they were in took revenge against them, or tried to punish them.²⁴

The Pact of Omar, which in 637 CE prohibited Jews from living in Jerusalem, was defended on PA TV by *Al Quds Encyclopedia* founder Hassan al-Khater: “If we presented this before a judge [today] he would renew this condition.... The solution is that no Jew should live there.... The prosperity of that city [Jerusalem] and of this land necessitates that no Jew should ever live there.”²⁵

The call to fight Jews solely because of their ethnicity is widespread. Dr. Ismail Radwan, professor at the Islamic University in Gaza, justifies the ongoing battle: “It is no coincidence that the Noble Koran mentions the story of Mohammed’s heavenly ascent while talking of the Israelites—as though Allah was preparing the Islamic nation that Jews will be in this land and as if He was addressing the Muslims: ‘O Muslims, prepare yourselves for the struggle with world Jewry.’”²⁶

Many academics have gone beyond the theoretical “struggle.” According to Dr. Ahmad Abu Halabiyah, rector of advanced studies at the Islamic University, on PA TV, the Jews are a threat and for that reason Allah demands they be killed:

The Jews are the Jews.... They do not have any moderates or any advocates of peace. They are all liars. They must be butchered and must be killed.... The Jews are like a spring—as long as you step on it with your foot it doesn’t move. But if you lift your foot from the spring, it hurts you and punishes you....

It is forbidden to have mercy in your hearts for the Jews in any place and in any land. Make war on them any place that you find yourself. Any place that you meet them, kill them.²⁷

PA academics teach that the killing of Jews by Muslims is a precondition of world redemption. The PA promotes this belief by repeatedly propounding in its print and television media the following Hadith, a tradition attributed to Mohammed: “The Hour [Resurrection] will not take place until the Muslims fight the Jews, and kill them. And the Jews will hide behind the rock and tree, and the rock and tree will say: ‘O Muslim, O servant of Allah, there is a Jew behind me, come and kill him!’”²⁸

On 10 January 2005, Dr. Khater cited this Hadith mandating the killing of all Jews everywhere. This came just two weeks after he devoted an entire TV lecture to analyzing this Hadith and concluded that its demand for committing

genocide was specifically directed at the Palestinians: “Allah meant our land and our people and meant our trees and our stones.”²⁹

Muhammad Abd al-Hadi La’afi, responsible for religious instruction in the Office of the PA Wakf,³⁰ likewise wrote of the impending extermination of the Jews: “The battle with the Jews will surely come.... The Prophet spoke about it in more than one Hadith, and the Resurrection will not come without the victory of the believers over the descendants of the monkeys and pigs and with their annihilation.”³¹

Conclusion

The Palestinian Authority’s academic anti-Semitism has built an extensive case against Jewish existence, which starts with denying the authenticity and legitimacy of both the Jewish nation and religion. Through libels, lies, and stereotyping, this endeavor in anti-Semitism portrays Jews as a genuine threat to humanity. Because Jews are inherently evil and an existential danger, their annihilation is justified self-defense, a service to humanity, and an enactment of God’s will.

Although the PA is not reticent about its anti-Semitic ideology and plans, the world remains mostly apathetic except for an occasional criticism of what is called “incitement.” Indeed, the world finds this ideology so repugnant that many simply choose to deny the existence of PA anti-Semitism and repackage it as anti-Zionism, an ideology they find more palatable and even legitimate.

This indifference is directly reminiscent of the world’s response to Hitler’s open calls for genocide against the Jews. As Justice Robert H. Jackson, chief U.S. counsel to the Nuremberg Trials, wrote: “We must not forget that when the Nazi plans were boldly proclaimed, they were so extravagant that the world refused to take them seriously.”³²

Notes

1. The authors thank Palestinian Media Watch researchers Zachy Ben Hamo, Amiram Degani, Gidi Dorevitch, Dina Lisniansky, Dror Malelis, Ron Pickehkhadze, and Hadass Ben-Ari.
2. *Arabic Language, Analysis, Literature and Criticism*, Grade 12, 104; Mohammad Dahlan, Palestinian Authority Television, 23 August 2006.
3. Video clips, Palestinian Authority Television, January 2000–2006.
4. Palestinian Authority Television, 25 March 2004.
5. *Al-Ayaam*, 4 December 1998.
6. J. al-Qidwa, PA TV, 5 June 1997.
7. I. Sissalem, PA TV, 8 October 2001.
8. J. al-Qidwa, PA TV, 3 November 1998.
9. PA TV, 8 October 2001.
10. Hassan Khader, PA TV, 13 October 2006.
11. *Al-Ayaam*, 4 December 1998.
12. I. Sissalem, *Jerusalem through the Generations*, PA TV, 17 April 2001, 21 November 2004, 21 December 2004.

13. I. Sissalem, PA TV, 29 November 2000.
14. In Arabic, "Allah" is the equivalent of the English "God." When an Arabic writer or speaker refers to the god worshiped by Muslims, it has been rendered here as Allah. When the reference is to the god worshiped by Jews, it has been rendered as God.
15. M. Najem, *Friday Sermon*, PA TV, 1 November 2002.
16. *Ibid.*, 6 December 2002.
17. K. Abas, *Media and Issue*, PA TV, 14 April 2002.
18. R. al-Astal, *People's Journey*, PA TV, 28 December 2003. An official PA magazine reviewed a "scholarly" article about the *Protocols*: "The sixty-fifth issue of *The Shahids* was recently published by the Political Guidance...there is a chapter about a research paper titled 'The Jewish Danger: The Protocols of the Elders of Zion,'" *Al-Hayat Al-Jadida*, 1 December 2003.
19. *History of the Modern and Contemporary World*, Grade 10, 2004, 60-61.
20. PA TV, 10 September 2000.
21. PA TV, 14 May 1999.
22. Al-Astal, *People's Journey*, 28 December 2003.
23. J. al-Kidwa, *Open Day Broadcast*, PA TV, 2 March 2001.
24. Abas, *Media and Issue*, 14 April 2002. As far back as 1998, the PA was teaching that Jews are responsible for anti-Semitism:

Corruption is in the nature of the Jews all over the world, to the point where only rarely do you find corruption that Jews are not behind.... If we take a look at history, we discover to what degree the Jews were exposed to loss and expulsion all over the world as a result of their ugly deeds and their wickedness. This is after their actions were discovered and their responsibility for the destruction of the land and its people caused the [local] people to start a war of annihilation against them. (*Al-Hayat al-Jadida*, 11 July 1998)

25. H. al-Khater, *Meeting with Jerusalem*, PA TV, 14 December 2004.
26. I. Radwan, *Friday Sermon*, PA TV, 11 February 2002.
27. A. A. Halabiyah, *Friday Sermon*, PA TV, 13 October 2000.
28. Sahih Muslim, vol. 4, 2238-39; Sahih Bukhari, Vol. 3, 1070, No. 276, 1316, No. 3398; Sahih Ibn Hibban, Vol. 15, 217, No. 6806, and others.
29. Al-Khater, *Meeting with Jerusalem*, 27 December 2004.
30. The Wakf, literally "Islamic endowment," is headed by the PA religious establishment.
31. M. A. al-Hadi La'afi, *Al-Hayat al-Jadida*, 18 May 2001.
32. R. H. Jackson, *Report of Robert H. Jackson, United States Representative to the International Conference on Military Trials, London, 1945* (New York: AMS Press, 1971).

Ted Lapkin

Academic Anti-Zionism in Australia

When it comes to radical trends including anti-Zionism, Australian campuses are like most other Western universities, only even more extreme. The ubiquity of left-wing politics in Australian academia means that writing about campus Israel-phobia requires discrimination since the range of subjects is so large. The focus here will be on just a few of Australia's most egregious academic anti-Zionists.

Evan Jones

The most virulent is the University of Sydney's Evan Jones. Although his field is economics, he maintains a political web-log called *Alert and Alarmed*.¹ Its name is a play on the slogan of an Australian government public awareness campaign on terrorism—"alert, but not alarmed."

Jones detests the Bush administration and the Australian government of John Howard. His hostility toward Israel runs so deep as apparently to render him unaware of the anti-Semitic overtones of his rhetoric.

For example, Jones often claims that the Jews dominate press coverage on issues relating to Israel. In a blog posting called "The Wall and 'topographical considerations,'" he asserted: "All university programs in politics should have a compulsory unit on propaganda, and all such units should include a compulsory component on Israeli propaganda. The Israeli propaganda machine makes the Nazi apparatus under Geobels [*sic*] look like amateur hour."²

The Israelis are not very skilled at public relations. The opinion pages of Australia's newspapers regularly feature leftist critics of Israel. ABC, the country's main publicly funded broadcast network, models itself on the BBC, with predictable results in its Middle East coverage.

Nevertheless, Prof. Jones upholds the idea that pro-Israeli Jews dominate journalism. He refers to the "reactionary war-mongering Zionist *Wall Street Journal*."³ The British writer of a pro-Israeli letter to the editor of *The Independent* is nothing more than a "lobotomised Zionist."⁴

A further example concerns the Cronulla Beach disturbances of December 2005, which received considerable attention from the world media. These riots were the culmination of longstanding ethnic tensions between the Anglo-Australian residents of the seaside area and Australians of Lebanese Muslim extraction who were from the southwest Sydney suburbs.

Concentrated some twenty kilometers north of this area, the Sydney Jewish

community was not a factor in the interethnic violence that erupted in Cronulla. Evan Jones, however, seized on a handful of letters to the editor by Jews that highlighted the genuine problem of jihadist radicalism in the Australian Muslim community. He wrote: "The respectable press is at the centre of respectable racism. Our friends of Israel are at the centre of the raw material for the respectable press. Zionists have carte blanche to display their gut prejudices in public...."⁵

Jones further declared: "Some differences are irreconcilable. And Australian Jewry's belligerent support of the unsupportable Israel is a depravity that attracts perennial support, even admiration."⁶

Jones also constantly equates Zionism with Nazism. In his view, Israel was established through conscious collaboration with Hitler's Germany. In support, Jones cites an assertion by the radical Israeli anti-Zionist Uri Davis: "Zionist leaders made themselves accomplices by default, and sometimes by deliberate design, to the mass murder of Jews by the Nazi annihilation machinery."⁷

When Melbourne's left-leaning daily *The Age* found an editorial cartoon comparing Israel and Auschwitz too objectionable, Jones protested. He lauded cartoonist Michael Leunig for having "juxtaposed the hypocrisy erected on the degradation that was Auschwitz and its gas chambers with the hypocrisy of contemporary Israel."⁸ Jones went on to ask: "are Leunig's representations anti-semitic as claimed? No. Are they anti-Israel? Yes certainly. As is appropriate."⁹

Amin Saikal

Other academics cloak their animus toward Israel in a pseudosophistication that facilitates their access to the media as commentators. One such anti-Zionist op-ed contributor is Amin Saikal, who heads the Centre for Arab and Islamic Studies (CAIS) at the Australian National University (ANU) in Canberra.

Founded in 1994 as the Centre for Middle East and Central Asian Studies, CAIS assumed its current name six years later. This reflected a radical shift in orientation that stemmed from an influx of funding from various Middle Eastern sources.

In December 2000, the Centre announced the receipt of an A\$2.5 million donation from Sheik Hamdan bin Rashid al-Maktoum, the Emir of Dubai and brother of the prime minister of the United Arab Emirates.¹⁰ This sum not only purchased the name change but also the creation of a Chair of Arab and Islamic Studies that was eponymous with the Centre's new title. The government of Iran contributed another US\$350,000,¹¹ which underwrote the establishment of the Centre's perpetual foundation in Persian Language and Iranian Studies. In both these cases, the ANU's Endowment in Excellence provided matching funds for these foreign donations, bringing the total amount generated in support of the CAIS to almost A\$6 million.¹²

Centre director Amin Saikal's view of both U.S. and Israeli policies is

profoundly negative. But if the Americans can at times be excused for their folly because of naïveté, Israel receives no such leniency.

Saikal takes a “less is more” approach that is more pernicious because it seems reasonable on the surface. At first glance he appears simply to be deploring the violence that plagues the Middle East. But a closer look reveals that his regrets are selectively applied to serve his anti-Zionist views.

Saikal’s crafty polemical strategy sins more by omission than commission. He argues, for instance, that Israeli strikes against terrorist targets should be condemned on both moral and practical grounds, since they only make things worse.

Thus, when Israel assassinated Hamas leader Ahmed Yassin, Saikal responded in Brisbane’s daily, the *Courier Mail*, that this “will most likely drive more Muslims to identify with the positions of extremists such as Osama bin Laden.” He went on to warn: “Israel and its international backers may find this assassination returns to haunt them.”¹³ He had nothing to say, however, about Yassin’s role in inspiring and orchestrating suicide bombings against Israeli civilians.

This reticence to condemn Palestinian violence against Israelis is so deeply ingrained in Saikal’s worldview that it infuses his vocabulary. Writing in the *Sydney Morning Herald*, he accused Israel of using disproportionate force “to contain what it calls terrorism, including suicide bombing.”¹⁴

Saikal demonstrates ignorance of simple geostrategic matters. Again in the *Sydney Morning Herald*, he asserted that the Israeli navy has deployed “nuclear-powered submarines” to launch preemptive strikes against Iran.¹⁵ The Israeli submarine fleet, however, consists of three German-built Dolphin-class diesel boats. Although the Germans’ submarines are world-class, their own navy does not possess nuclear vessels.

Saikal also praises the Islamic Republic of Iran as “a sort of democracy which may not accord with Western ideals, but provides for a degree of mass participation, political pluralism and assurance of certain human rights and freedoms which do not exist in most of the Middle East.”¹⁶ He has nothing to say about the reign of terror that is inflicted on political opponents, and the many other human rights abuses.

Instead, he further lauds Iran as a buttress against American imperialist designs in the Middle East, and goes so far as to defend its quest for nuclear weapons. “[D]espite insisting on the peaceful nature of its nuclear program,” he remarks, “ultimately Teheran may not be averse to the idea of acquiring a nuclear deterrent.”¹⁷ This, however, is understandable since “Teheran lives under a perceived serious US and Israeli threat.”¹⁸

Moreover, Saikal referred in the *Sydney Morning Herald* to the “neo-conservatives who dominate the [Bush] Administration.”¹⁹ Eight months later in that newspaper, he placed the onus for the war in Iraq on “a small group of neo-conservatives in the Bush administration who wanted to reshape the Muslim

Middle East and radical political Islam according to their vision and geopolitical preferences.”²⁰

The term neoconservative has recently inspired controversy, some arguing that it has become a politically correct euphemism for Jew.²¹ As Saikal stated in a column in the *International Herald Tribune*: “The efforts of the neoconservatives dovetail all too effectively with the aims of the radical Zionists who push for more and more Jewish settlements on Palestinian land.”²²

Saikal’s views largely echo the recent controversial thesis of American academics John Mearsheimer and Stephen Walt,²³ characterized as anti-Semitic by Eliot Cohen in the *Washington Post*.²⁴

During a telephone conversation with this author to solicit Saikal’s response to the points made in this chapter, he explicitly praised Mearsheimer and Walt’s essay but denied having an ideological agenda. He defended his description of Iranian “democracy” by asserting that the Teheran regime was “pluralistic within an Islamic context.”

Scott Burchill

In Melbourne, as in other venues of Australian academia, there are many anti-Zionist academics. A notable example is Scott Burchill, who teaches international relations theory at Deakin University.

In the wake of 9/11, Burchill argued in the *Sydney Morning Herald* that any American military reaction would constitute a “myopic and undemocratic” exercise of extrajudicial injustice.²⁵ Moreover, he claimed in the *Australian Financial Review* that these were “not irrational, cowardly or random attacks”; instead, “the rational logic of cause and effect” made 9/11 an understandable response to “US aggression.”²⁶

In October 2003, *The Age* published Burchill’s thoughts on the first anniversary of the Bali bombing, which killed eighty-eight Australian tourists among others. It was, he wrote, an inevitable reaction to “Washington’s support for Israel’s brutal occupation of Palestine,” and to a “Western collective of terror whose leaders had bombed Islamic states such as Afghanistan and Iraq.”²⁷

Yet, however profound Burchill’s hostility toward the United States, he does not challenge the legitimacy of its existence. He does, however, in the case of Israel. Burchill describes the Palestinians as a “looted people” who justly refuse to “reconcile themselves to occupation and humiliation, regardless of the odds stacked against them.”²⁸ Israel, then, is a “thief” who must return the “stolen property” of Palestine to its rightful Arab owners.²⁹

This raises the question of whether Burchill’s demand applies only to the West Bank and Gaza or to the Jewish state as a whole. He refers contemptuously to any offer of Israeli territorial concessions.

Burchill summarily dismissed the Clinton-Barak offer in January 2001 that would have established a Palestinian state in 97 percent of the West Bank and all

of Gaza. He contended that Arafat was right to reject this because it represented “a mere 12 percent of the land from which the Palestinians were driven in 1948”; the actual figure is 22 percent of the territory west of the Jordan. It is not surprising, Burchill continues, that “the Palestinians have resented being told how much of their land Israel was generously prepared to return to them.”³⁰ The implication seems to be that all of Israel exists on Palestinian land.

Although Burchill occasionally makes allowances for the American and Australian victims of al-Qaeda terror, describing the 9/11 and Bali attacks as atrocities, he makes no such concession to the Israeli victims of Palestinian terror.

Burchill did assert in *The Australian* that: “UN Security Council Resolution 242 (1967) ‘land for peace’ requires a ‘full Israeli withdrawal behind pre-June 1967 borders.’”³¹ In fact, neither of the phrases in quotation marks appears in the text of that UN resolution. Its authors, including former British UN ambassador Lord Caradon, remarked that it was carefully crafted to avoid any such demand for a complete Israeli withdrawal.³² Burchill’s tendentious presentation of 242 also ignores its requirement that the Arabs must grant Israel the “right to live in peace within secure and recognized boundaries free from threats or acts of force.”³³

Burchill responded to the author’s request for comment with an email declaring he would ignore the “gross characterisation [*sic*] of my position.” He then denied that he was hostile to either the United States or Israel.

Andrew Vincent

A final example is Prof. Andrew Vincent, who heads the Centre for Middle East and North African Studies at Sydney’s Macquarie University. Last year in the *Macquarie University News*, he put forward a viewpoint that: “the Israelis quite possibly murdered Yasser Arafat.”

Typically, in the wake of Saddam Hussein’s invasion of Kuwait in 1990, Vincent wrote an apology for this aggression in Melbourne’s *Herald* newspaper. Citing Iraq’s small coastline and Kuwait’s historic association with Baghdad, Vincent argued that Saddam’s expansionism was legitimate.³⁴

More recently, Vincent invited blogger Antony Loewenstein—a far-Left freelance writer—to join the board of the Centre that he heads.

Antony Loewenstein

It was “bigotry, hatred and intolerance,” Loewenstein suggested, that motivated Jewish opposition to Palestinian spokeswoman Hanan Ashrawi’s receipt of the Sydney Peace Prize in 2003.³⁵ He apparently could not conceive of honest opposition based on Ashrawi’s statements and deeds.

In Loewenstein’s view, Israel is a nation of “apartheid-like policies.”³⁶

This author, after publishing an article in *The Australian* on the impact of Ariel Sharon's stroke, was characterized by Loewenstein as one of the "dutiful Zionists who are already lining up to praise the unindicted war criminal."³⁷

Loewenstein's superficial knowledge of the Middle East was evident last December when he referred to a senior female Israeli cabinet minister as a man. In an article for the leftist online magazine *New Matilda*, he wrote:

Yet more evidence of Israel speaking the language of "peace" but acting entirely differently came from a senior ally of Sharon, Justice Minister Tzipi Livni. He [*sic*] told a legal conference in early December that, despite years of Israeli denials, Sharon himself imagines the 425-mile separation barrier as the future border between Israel and a potential Palestinian state.

One does not have to be a genius to see that the fence will have implications on the future border, he [*sic*] said.³⁸

As one commentator on his blog pointed out: "if Loewenstein can't even get the gender of an Israeli cabinet minister right, then what does it say about the quality of his analysis of the Israeli political scene? Nothing good." When confronted with evidence of his gaffe, Loewenstein pleaded that he was "rushed" and that "mistakes do happen."³⁹

Loewenstein's position with Prof. Vincent's Centre seems to stem from a combination of ethnic tokenism and political conformism. As Vincent told the *Australian Jewish News*: "We wanted a Jewish person on the board. We didn't have any Jews on the board and it seemed to be an absence."⁴⁰ But with the great majority of Australian Jewry being pro-Zionist, Vincent managed to find a Jew who fit his own ideological preferences.⁴¹

Conclusion

In their anti-Zionism, Evan Jones, Amin Saikal, Scott Burchill, and Andrew Vincent⁴² are some examples among many in Australian academia where radical Leftist ideology is monolithically predominant. A core element of the far-Left doctrine is a relentless hostility to Jewish national self-determination. With Australia's youth being exposed to this outlook during their university years, it remains to be seen how this will affect the next generation of Australian leaders.

Notes

1. www.alertandalarmed.blogspot.com.
2. Evan Jones, *AlertandAlarmed*, "The Wall and 'Topographical Considerations,'" 23 July 2005.
3. *Ibid.*, "Cartoons and Context," 9 February 2006.
4. *Ibid.*, "Israel Reaps the Wind," 28 January 2006.
5. *Ibid.*, "It's Get Muslims Month," 21 December 2005.
6. *Ibid.*

7. Uri Davis, *Apartheid Israel: Possibilities for the Struggle Within* (London: Zed Books, 2004).
8. Evan Jones, *Alert and Alarmed*, "Leunig Holds a Mirror to Israel," 14 February 2006.
9. Ibid.
10. ANU Press Release, 12 December 2000, www.info.anu.edu.au/mac/Media/Media_Releases/_2000/5milcais.html (viewed 10 May 2006).
11. ANU, "Endowment for Excellence 2000 Annual Report," 6, www.info.anu.edu.au/mac/Donations_and_Bequests/Annual_Report/_PDF/_annualrpt00.pdf (viewed 10 May 2006).
12. Ibid.
13. Amin Saikal, "A Killing That May Haunt Israel's Future," *Courier Mail*, 24 March 2004.
14. Amin Saikal, "Voting Alone Cannot Bring Peace to the Palestinians," *Sydney Morning Herald*, 10 January 2005.
15. Amin Saikal, "A Regime of Parity for the Region Is the Only Way Iran Will Disarm," *Sydney Morning Herald*, 13 October 2004.
16. Amin Saikal, "Try Again George—'Axis of Evil' Is Definitely on the Turn," *Sydney Morning Herald*, 15 January 2003.
17. Ibid.
18. Ibid.
19. Amin Saikal, "US Policy Has Isolated Only One Extremist Group: Its Own," *Sydney Morning Herald*, 31 October 2003.
20. Amin Saikal, "Futility of War Set to Haunt US for Years," *Sydney Morning Herald*, 29 June 2004.
21. Julia Gorin, "Blame It on Neo: Don't Call Me a 'Neocon' Unless You Are a Friend," *Wall Street Journal*, 23 September 2004, www.opinionjournal.com/extra/?id=110005656 (viewed 10 May 2006).
22. Amin Saikal, "How Three Threats Interlock: A Mission for Moderates," *International Herald Tribune*, 29 December 2003.
23. John Mearsheimer and Stephen Walt, "The Israeli Lobby," *London Review of Books*, 28 March 2006, www.www.lrb.co.uk/v28/n06/mear01_.html (viewed 11 May 2006).
24. Eliot A. Cohen, "Yes It's Anti-Semitic," *Washington Post*, 5 April 2006.
25. Scott Burchill, "Asking Why Is Not to Excuse the Terrorists' Actions," *Sydney Morning Herald*, 6 October 2001.
26. Scott Burchill, "What Matters Is Why," *Australian Financial Review*, 21 September 2001.
27. Scott Burchill, "A Year On, the Question Remains: Why?" *The Age*, 11 October 2003.
28. Scott Burchill, "Betrayal of a Looted People," *The Australian*, 12 October 2000.
29. Scott Burchill, "Why Arafat Can No Longer Read from the Thief's Script," *Sydney Morning Herald*, 18 October 2000.
30. Scott Burchill, "An Offer Too Easy to Refuse," *The Australian*, 10 May 2002.
31. Burchill, "Betrayal."
32. Lord Caradon, television interview, *McNeil/Lehrer Report* (PBS USA), 30 March 1978.
33. UN Security Council Resolution 242.
34. Andrew Vincent, "Arrogant, but Hussein Has a Case," *Sunday Herald*, 5 August 1990.
35. Antony Loewenstein, "Hanan Ashrawi and the Price of Dissent," *Znet*, 23 October 2003, www.www.zmag.org/content/showarticle.cfm?ItemID=4387 (viewed 12 May 2006).
36. Antony Loewenstein, "The Rise of Fascism," *Antony Loewenstein*, 8 August 2005, www.antonyloewenstein.blogspot.com/2005_08_07_antonyloewenstein_archive.html (viewed 12 May 2006).

37. Antony Loewenstein, "Some Legacy," *Antony Loewenstein*, 6 January 2006, www.antonyloewenstein.blogspot.com/2006_01_01_antonyloewenstein_archive.html (viewed 12 Mar 2006).
38. Antony Loewenstein, "A Future for Israel/Palestine?" *New Matilda*, 21 December 2005, www.newmatilda.com/admin/preview/home/articledetail.asp?ArticleID=1241. After his mistake was pointed out, Loewenstein subsequently corrected his *New Matilda* column.
39. www.blogger.com/comment.g?blogID=11508415&postID=113520948401456764&isPopup=true (viewed 10 May 2006).
40. Mark Franklin, "NSW Education Department Dumps Mid-East Simulation," *Australian Jewish News*, 27 January 2006.
41. Philip Mendes, "Jews and the Left," in Geoffrey Brahm Levy and Philip Mendes, eds., *Jews and Australian Politics* (East Sussex: Sussex Academic Press, 2004).
42. Jones, Vincent, and Loewenstein did not respond to the opportunity for comment that was offered them.

List of Contributors

Dr. Edward S. Beck is cofounder and president of Scholars for Peace in the Middle East (SPME) (www.spme.net). He is currently an adjunct faculty member at the Schools of Psychology of Walden University and of Alvernia College. He is also director of the Susquehanna Institute in Harrisburg, Pennsylvania. He has served on the administrations and taught psychology and professional ethics at Penn State, New York University, Rutgers University, Lebanon Valley College, Rosemont College, and the City University of New York.

Prof. Leila Beckwith is a professor emeritus of the Pediatrics Department, University of California-Los Angeles. A developmental psychologist, she has taught and conducted research at UCLA for more than thirty years. The Palestinian war against Israeli civilians during the Second Intifada, and the Al-Qaeda assault against American civilians on 9/11, led her to become politically active in the University of California framework.

Prof. Ilan Benjamin is professor of chemistry at the University of California-Santa Cruz. In 2004 he established a UCSC chapter of the international organization Scholars for Peace in the Middle East to help educate the campus community about Israel's struggle for security and peace.

Corinne Berzon is originally from Montreal, where she completed an undergraduate honors degree at Concordia University in political science and liberal arts. She moved to Israel in 2003 and is completing an MA in political philosophy at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem. In 2005 she was an intern at the JCPA.

Dr. Ruth Contreras is a member of the Board of Directors of Scholars for Peace in the Middle East from 2002 to the present. She is also the European coordinator for SPME and coordinator of the Austrian Chapter of SPME. Formerly head of the Department of Entomology at the Museum of Natural History in Vienna, she is now pursuing Jewish studies at the University of Vienna.

Barbara Crook is associate director and North American representative of Palestinian Media Watch. She teaches at the School of Journalism and Communications at Carleton University in Ottawa, Canada. She holds an Honors BA in English literature from Queen's University, an MA in journalism from the University of Western Ontario, and is a Southam Fellow at the University of Toronto.

Ronnie Fraser is founder and director of Academic Friends of Israel. He is a lecturer at Barnet College in London and a member of the University and College Union. In 2005, he completed an MA in Jewish studies at Southampton University. His articles have been published by the JCPA and in Paul Iganski and Barry Kosmin, eds., *A New Anti-Semitism* (London: Profile Books, 2006).

Prof. Alain Goldschläger is Ontario Region Co-Chair of the League for Human Rights of B'nai Brith Canada. A specialist in Holocaust education, he is director of the Holocaust Literature Research Institute and professor of French at the University of Western Ontario. His most recent publications include (editor, with Clive Thomson) *Le Discours scientifique comme porteur de préjugés* (Scientific Discourse as Prejudice-Carrier) (London: Mestengo, 1998); (editor) *La Shoah: Témoignage impossible?* (The Shoah: Impossible Testimony?) (Brussels: Presses de l'Université de Bruxelles, 1998) [French]; *Building History: The Shoah in Art, Memory, and Myth* (New York: Peter Lang, 2001); and (editor, with Jacques Lemaire) *Antisémitisme après la Shoah* (Antisemitism after the Shoah) (Brussels: Éditions Espace de Libertés, 2003) [French]. He is currently working on a book on Holocaust testimonies.

Aryeh Green is director of MediaCentral, a provider of services to foreign media based in Israel, and is a business consultant active in Israel's public diplomacy (*hasbara*) efforts. He works with former minister Natan Sharansky on issues related to young Jewish leadership, *hasbara*, and anti-Semitism, and served as a senior adviser to Sharansky in the Israeli Prime Minister's Office, where he coordinated a global effort to support Jewish university students and to defend Israel in academia. He has visited over seventy-five universities, and has spoken to and with thousands of university students and faculty members in Europe, the United States, and Israel in the past two decades.

Gavin Gross was a postgraduate student from 2004-2006 and chair of the Jewish Society at the School of Oriental and African Studies (SOAS), University of London. In September 2006 he completed his MA in Near and Middle Eastern Studies and now serves as director of public affairs for the Zionist Federation of Britain and Ireland.

Jonathan Jaffit is a graduate of the University of Toronto and is currently pursuing an MA in religious studies at York University. He was the founding president of Betar-Tagar, the University of Toronto's Zionist Student Association, and, as it expanded, served as director of campus affairs for Betar-Tagar Canada. He is currently the Canadian director of student development for Ohr Somayach International, a Jewish outreach organization. This case study was written during his research internship at the JCPA.

Ted Lapkin is a commentator on public affairs whose work has appeared in leading U.S. and Australian newspapers, including the *Los Angeles Times*, *The Australian*, and the *Sydney Morning Herald*. He has also written for *Quadrant Magazine* (Australia) and has appeared as an analyst on Australian TV and radio. He earned a BA in history from Tel Aviv University and an MA in government administration from the University of Pennsylvania.

Dr. Martin Kramer is the Wexler-Fromer Fellow at the Washington Institute for Near East Policy, Olin Institute Senior Fellow at Harvard University, and Adelson Institute Senior Fellow at the Shalem Center in Jerusalem. His book *Ivory Towers on Sand: The Failure of Middle Eastern Studies* (Washington: Washington Institute for Near East Policy, 2001) provided a critique of Middle Eastern studies in the United States, documenting academe's failure to explain or predict major developments in the Middle East.

Rebecca Leibowitz is a graduate of Rutgers University, where she graduated Phi Beta Kappa and as a Henry Rutgers Scholar with BAs in psychology and Jewish studies. She served as student president of Rutgers Hillel and the Jewish Community Service Organization. She was also a member of the "Israel Inspires" Executive Committee, the Israel Action Committee of Rutgers University, the Rutgers Israel Public Affairs Committee, as well as a Grinspoon Israel Active Intern for Hillel International. Her essay was written during an internship at the JCPA.

Noah Liben is a graduate of Columbia University and the Jewish Theological Seminary, and a former president of LionPAC, Columbia's pro-Israeli political action group. He has conducted research at the JCPA, where his essay was written during a 2005 internship.

Itamar Marcus is the founder and director of Palestinian Media Watch. He was appointed by the Israeli government to be the Israeli representative (communications specialist) to the Trilateral (Israeli-Palestinian-American) Anti-Incitement Committee established under the Wye Accords. From 1998 to 2000, Mr. Marcus served as research director of the Center for Monitoring the Impact of Peace, writing reports on PA, Syrian, and Jordanian schoolbooks. He holds a BA in political science from City College of New York and an MA in Hebrew culture from New York University.

Tammi Rossman-Benjamin is a lecturer in Hebrew at the Language Program of the University of California, Santa Cruz, and a Jewish educator who teaches widely in the local Jewish community. She is cofounder of the UCSC chapter of Scholars for Peace in the Middle East.

Roz Rothstein serves as national director of StandWithUs and all its affiliated programs. She was born in Los Angeles, a child of Holocaust survivors. She worked for a decade with Jewish Community Centers (JCCs) as the supervisor of children's programs at the Westside Jewish Community Center. She was a practicing family therapist for two decades before becoming one of the founders of StandWithUs.