



**Report on Antisemitic Activity in 2015 at U.S. Colleges and Universities
With the Largest Jewish Undergraduate Populations**

Table of Contents

I. Introduction..... 3

II. Research Methods..... 4

III. Findings..... 6

IV. Discussion..... 12

V. Conclusions..... 19

VI. Lead Researchers..... 20

Appendix A: Categories of Targeting Jewish Students for Harm.....21

Appendix B: Categories of Antisemitic Expression..... 23

I. Introduction

Recent studies have suggested alarming rates of antisemitic activity on college and university campuses across the country. A survey of U.S. Jewish college students by Trinity College and the Louis D. Brandeis Center for Human Rights Under Law revealed that 54% of surveyed students reported experiencing or witnessing instances of antisemitism on campus during the first six months of the 2013-2014 academic year.¹ Another survey of campus antisemitism conducted by Brandeis University in the Spring of 2015 found that three-quarters of North American Jewish college student respondents had been exposed to antisemitic rhetoric, and one-third of students surveyed reported having been harassed because they were Jewish.² Both surveys found that anti-Israel expression, particularly expression related to anti-Israel Boycott, Divestment, Sanctions (BDS) campaigns, was a major factor in students' reported experiences of anti-Jewish hostility.

In order to understand more fully the nature and scope of campus antisemitism on U.S. campuses, as well as the factors influencing it, AMCHA Initiative investigated antisemitic activity over the last year on more than 100 public and private colleges and universities with the largest Jewish undergraduate populations. Unlike previous studies, which assessed levels of campus antisemitism by measuring student attitudes and subjective reports, the current study assessed antisemitic activity by focusing on verifiable incidents compiled from media accounts and eyewitness reports.

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

- 1) **Antisemitic Expression** – Incidents were identified as having antisemitic expression if they contained language or imagery that used one or more of eight tropes included in the U.S. State Department definition of antisemitism.³ This definition, used extensively by the U.S. State Department to monitor antisemitic activity in countries around the world, identifies both classical and contemporary manifestations of antisemitism, and includes anti-Zionist expression⁴.
- 2) **Targeting of Jewish Students** – Incidents involving behavior that targeted Jewish students for particular harm based on their Jewishness or perceived association with Israel were identified. Harms consisted of direct threats to the safety and well-being of Jewish students or violations of their civil rights, and included behaviors such as physical assault, harassment, destruction of property, discrimination and suppression of speech.
- 3) **BDS Activity** – Any activity that contained the promotion or endorsement of an anti-Israel boycott, divestment or sanction effort, or of the BDS movement as a whole, was identified as BDS Activity. The BDS movement was established with the intention of economically, academically and culturally isolating the Jewish state in order to eliminate it. The campaigns and activities that promote BDS routinely employ hate-filled rhetoric and imagery intended to demonize and delegitimize Israel, expression which is consistent with the U.S. State Department definition of antisemitism.

¹ <http://www.trincoll.edu/NewsEvents/NewsArticles/Documents/Anti-SemitismReportFinal.pdf>

² <http://www.brandeis.edu/cmjs/pdfs/birthright/AntisemitismCampus072715.pdf>

³ <http://www.state.gov/j/drl/rls/fs/2010/122352.htm>

⁴ In this report, the term “anti-Zionist” is understood to mean “opposed to the existence of Israel as a Jewish state.”

While all three kinds of activity contributed to the overall prevalence of campus antisemitism, the targeting of Jewish students for harm took on special significance. This was used as a direct measure of anti-Jewish hostility at a given school, allowing for an analysis of the factors that have had the most deleterious effect on campus climate for Jewish students.

Our study also differed from previous studies in its examination of possible agents of campus antisemitism. In particular, we investigated the prevalence of anti-Israel or anti-Zionist student groups and faculty who support an academic boycott of Israel, and we determined their association with each kind of antisemitic activity.

The findings of this study provide, for the first time, objective confirmation of student reports of widespread antisemitic expression, BDS activity, and behavior which targets Jewish students for harm, as well as confirmation of student perceptions that certain kinds of expression, especially those associated with BDS promotion, have created a hostile environment for Jewish students. The findings also clearly indicate that the primary sources of antisemitic activity are anti-Israel students and faculty who support an academic boycott of Israel.

Finally, as the first systematic investigation of campus antisemitism, which introduces a comprehensive taxonomy of antisemitic activity, this study has important methodological implications for the study of antisemitism both on and off campus.

II. Research Methods

Data Collection

Hillel International compiles an annual list of the 120 public and private colleges and universities with the largest populations of Jewish students in North America. This study examined each of the 113 U.S. schools, eliminating the Canadian schools on Hillel's list, as to number and kind of incidents containing antisemitic expression, number and kind of incidents containing BDS activity, and number and kind of incidents that directly threatened or targeted Jewish students for harm, occurring at the school in 2015.

Data were gathered by reviewing submitted incident reports, media accounts, social media postings and on-line recordings.

In addition, the following information was collected about each school:

- Whether it was public or private
- The total number of undergraduates enrolled
- The percentage of Jewish undergraduate students
- The presence or absence of active anti-Zionist students groups
- The number of faculty who had signed one or more petitions or statements endorsing an academic boycott of Israeli universities and scholars

Identifying Antisemitic Activity

Identifying the Targeting of Jewish Students

An incident was determined to threaten or target Jewish students if one or more of the following harmful actions was perpetrated against a student or group of students because of their Jewishness or perceived identification with Israel:

- Physical Assault
- Discrimination
- Destruction of Jewish Property
- Genocidal Expression
- Suppression of Speech/Movement/Assembly
- Verbal Assault
- Intimidation
- Harassment
- Denigration

(A complete description of the taxonomy used in determining the categories of antisemitic targeting can be found in Appendix A).

Identifying Antisemitic Expression

Language or imagery was determined to contain antisemitic expression if it included one or more of the following antisemitic tropes derived from the U.S. State Department definition of antisemitism⁵:

- Historical Antisemitism
- Condoning Terrorism against Israel or Jews
- Comparing Jews to Nazis
- Accusing Jews of Inventing or Exaggerating the Holocaust
- Denying Jews Self-determination
- Demonization of Israel
- Delegitimization of Israel

(A complete description of the taxonomy used in determining the categories of antisemitic expression can be found in Appendix B).

Identifying BDS Activity

Petitions, statements, meetings, events and rallies, in which BDS was promoted, supported, discussed, or voted on, were counted as instances of BDS activity.

⁵ <http://www.state.gov/j/drl/rls/fs/2010/122352.htm>

Research Questions

The following overarching research questions were asked of the data:

1. How prevalent are the three different kinds of antisemitic activity (Targeting of Jewish Students for Harm, Antisemitic Expression and BDS Activity) at schools most popular with Jewish students?
2. To what extent do the three different kinds of antisemitic activity correlate with one another?
3. To what extent does the existence of one or more active anti-Zionist student groups correlate with: a) the overall incidence of antisemitic activity; and b) each kind of antisemitic activity?
4. To what extent do the presence and number of faculty who have endorsed an academic boycott of Israel correlate with: a) the overall incidence of antisemitic activity; b) each kind of antisemitic activity; and c) the presence of one or more active anti-Zionist groups?
5. At schools most popular with Jewish students, what are the best predictors of: a) overall incidence of antisemitic activity; and b) anti-Jewish hostility, as measured by the incidence of Targeting of Jewish Students for Harm?

III. Findings

1) Targeting of Jewish Students, Antisemitic Expression and BDS Activity are all prevalent in public and private schools with significant Jewish undergraduate populations.

309 incidents involving either targeting of Jewish students for harm, antisemitic expression, BDS activity, or some combination of these, occurred in 2015 at the schools most popular with Jewish students. 79 (70%) of these schools had incidents involving one or more kinds of these activities.

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

Table 1

Total Number of Incidents of Each Kind of Antisemitic Activity and the Number and Percentage of Schools that Played Host to Them

	Total # Incidents in 2015	# Schools with ≥ 1 Incidents	% Schools with ≥ 1 Incidents (Out of Total 113)
Targeting of Jewish Students	79	46	41%
Antisemitic Expression	219	73	65%
BDS Activity	168	61	54%

The number of incidents at each school ranged from 1 – 10 for Antisemitic Expression, and 1 – 6 for Targeting of Jewish Students and BDS Activity.

The number of incidents containing each kind of antisemitic activity was not associated with whether the school was public or private,⁶ the school's undergraduate population,⁷ or the percentage of Jewish undergraduate students at the school.⁸

Table 2 shows the schools with the highest incidence of each kind of antisemitic activity, as well as overall antisemitic activity.

Table 2

Schools with the Largest Incidence of Antisemitic Expression, BDS Activity, Targeting of Jewish Students for Harm and overall Antisemitic Activity

Highest Incidence Targeting	Highest Incidence of Antisemitic Expression	Highest Incidence of BDS Activity	Highest Overall Antisemitic Activity
****UC Santa Cruz (7)	****Northwestern U. (10)	****UC Santa Cruz (6)	****Northwestern U. (16)
****Northwestern U. (6)	****UC Santa Cruz (9)	****Northwestern U. (6)	****UC Santa Cruz (13)
****UC Berkeley (4)	****UC Berkeley (8)	****San Diego State U. (6)	****UC Berkeley (11)
****UC Davis (4)	****UCLA (8)	***Stanford Univ. (6)	****UC Davis (9)
****Northeastern U. (3)	****Columbia U. (6)	**Oberlin College (6)	****UCLA (9)
Hunter College (3)	***UC Santa Barbara (6)	Princeton Univ. (6)	*Northeastern U. (8)
UCLA (2)	**Drexel U. (6)	**UC Berkeley (5)	****San Diego State U. (8)
****Columbia U. (2)	Boston U. (6)	****UC Davis (5)	****Stanford U. (8)
****Stanford U. (2)	****UC Davis (5)	****Northeastern U. (5)	***U. of Michigan (7)
Pace U. (2)	*Stanford U. (5)	***Univ. of Michigan (5)	***UC Santa Barbara (7)
Brooklyn College (2)	*Pace U. (5)	***UC Santa Barbara (5)	**Oberlin College (7)
****San Diego State U. (2)	**Brooklyn College (5)	Brown U. (5)	**Hunter College (6)
Tufts U. (2)	U. of Chicago (5)	**UCLA (4)	****Columbia U. (6)
U. of Minnesota (2)	U. of Washington (5)	****Columbia U. (4)	**Tufts U. (6)
***U. of Illinois UC (2)	Emory U. (5)	***U. of Illinois UC (4)	***U. of Illinois UC (6)
U. of Maryland (2)	****Northeastern U. (4)	***Pace U. (4)	**Drexel U. (6)
***U. of Michigan (2)	*** Hunter College (4)	**U. of Texas Austin (4)	**U. of Texas Austin (6)
Cornell U. (2)	****San Diego State U. (4)	**Vassar College (4)	**Vassar College (6)

** School occurs on two lists *** School occurs on three lists. **** School occurs on four lists.

⁶ Public or private schools: Overall Antisemitic Activity (Mann-Whitney U = 1448; n₁ = 54 and n₂ = 59; p = .41); Antisemitic Expression (Mann-Whitney U = 1428; n₁ = 54 and n₂ = 59; p = .34); BDS Activity (Mann-Whitney U = 1390.5; n₁ = 54 and n₂ = 59; p = .25); Targeting of Jewish Students (Mann-Whitney U = 1512; n₁ = 54 and n₂ = 59; p = .65).

⁷ Undergraduate population: Overall Antisemitic Activity (Pearson r = .16; n = 112; p = .08); Antisemitic Expression (Pearson r = .16; n = 112; p = .09); BDS Activity (Pearson r = .14; n = 112; p = .14); Targeting of Jewish Students (Pearson r = .13; n = 113; p = .16).

⁸ Percentage of Jewish undergraduate students: Overall Antisemitic Activity (Pearson r = -.08; n = 112; p = .37); Antisemitic Expression (Pearson r = -.09; n = 112; p = .36); BDS Activity (Pearson r = -.07; n = 112; p = .47); Targeting of Jewish Students (Pearson r = -.09; n = 112; p = .34).

2) Antisemitic Expression and BDS Activity are both strongly associated with the Targeting of Jewish Students for Harm, and Antisemitic Expression and BDS Activity are themselves very strongly associated.

- a. Antisemitic Expression and Targeting of Jewish Students⁹** - The occurrence of antisemitic expression was strongly correlated with the occurrence of incidents that targeted Jewish students for harm.
- 54% of schools with evidence of antisemitic expression had one or more incidents that targeted Jewish students for harm, whereas of the schools with no evidence of antisemitic expression, only 23% had incidents targeting Jewish students. ($\chi^2 = 12.9$, $n = 112$, $p < .001$).
 - Furthermore, schools with more incidents of antisemitic expression tended to have more incidents that targeted Jewish students for harm (Pearson $r = .30$; $n = 112$; $p < .01$).
- b. BDS Activity and Targeting of Jewish Students** - The occurrence of BDS activity was strongly correlated with the occurrence of incidents that targeted Jewish students for harm.
- 56% of schools with evidence of BDS activity had one or more incidents that targeted Jewish students for harm, whereas of the schools with no evidence of BDS activity, only 23% had incidents targeting Jewish students. ($\chi^2 = 12.40$, $n = 112$, $p < .001$).
 - Furthermore, schools with more incidents of BDS activity tended to have more incidents that targeted Jewish students for harm (Pearson $r = .59$; $n = 112$; $p < .001$).
- c. BDS Activity and Antisemitic Expression** - The occurrence of BDS activity was very strongly correlated with the occurrence of antisemitic expression.
- 95% of schools with BDS activity had one or more incidents of antisemitic expression, whereas of the schools with no evidence of BDS activity, only 33% had antisemitic expression. ($\chi^2 = 49.00$, $n = 112$, $p < .001$).
 - Furthermore, schools with more incidents of BDS activity have tended to have more incidents of antisemitic expression (Pearson $r = .70$; $n = 112$; $p < .001$).

3) There is a very strong correlation between the presence of anti-Zionist student groups such as Students for Justice in Palestine and overall antisemitic activity, as well as strong correlations between the presence of anti-Zionist student groups and each kind of antisemitic activity independently.

Active Anti-Zionist student groups were found on 75 (66%) of the schools most popular with Jewish students, and their presence was strongly correlated with the following:

⁹ Since 86% of the incidents involving the targeting of Jewish students also contained antisemitic expression, in determining the association of these two variables we did not count antisemitic expression when it co-occurred with the targeting of Jewish students.

- a. **Anti-Zionist Student Group(s) and Overall Antisemitic Activity** - The presence of one or more anti-Zionist student groups is very strongly correlated with the overall number of antisemitic incidents. 99% of the schools with one or more active anti-Zionist student group had one or more incidents of antisemitic activity, whereas only 16% of schools with no active anti-Zionist student group had incidents of antisemitic activity. ($\chi^2 = 25.66$, $n = 112$, $p < .001$); (Pearson $r = .63$; $n = 112$; $p < .001$).
 - b. **Anti-Zionist Student Group(s) and Targeting of Jewish Students** – The presence of one or more anti-Zionist student groups is strongly correlated with the targeting of Jewish students for harm. 57% of the schools with one or more active anti-Zionist student group had one or more incidents that targeted Jewish students for harm, whereas only 8% of schools with no active anti-Zionist student group had incidents that targeted Jewish students. ($\chi^2 = 25.66$, $n = 112$, $p < .001$); (Pearson $r = .38$; $n = 112$; $p < .001$).
 - c. **Anti-Zionist Student Group(s) and Antisemitic Expression** - The presence of one or more anti-Zionist student groups is very strongly associated with the occurrence of antisemitic expression. 91% of the schools with one or more active anti-Zionist group showed evidence of antisemitic expression, whereas only 16% of schools with no active anti-Zionist student group showed evidence of antisemitic expression. ($\chi^2 = 59.65$, $n = 112$, $p < .001$); (Pearson $r = .58$; $n = 112$; $p < .001$).
 - d. **Anti-Zionist Student Group(s) and BDS Activity** - The presence of one or more anti-Zionist groups is very strongly associated with the occurrence of BDS activity. 80% of schools with one or more active anti-Zionist group showed evidence of BDS activity, whereas only 3% of schools with no active anti-Zionist student group showed evidence of BDS activity. ($\chi^2 = 60.77$, $n = 112$, $p < .001$); (Pearson $r = .56$; $n = 112$; $p < .001$).
- 4) **There is a very strong correlation between the presence and number of faculty who publicly endorsed an academic boycott of Israel and the occurrence of overall antisemitic activity, as well as strong associations with each kind of activity independently.**

95 (84%) of the schools most popular with Jewish students employed anywhere from 1 to 50 faculty members who had endorsed an academic boycott of Israel. The presence and number of faculty boycotters was strongly correlated with each kind of antisemitic activity:

- a. **Faculty Boycotters and Overall Antisemitic Activity** - The presence of faculty boycotters is very strongly correlated with the overall number of antisemitic incidents.
 - 81% of the schools with one or more faculty boycotters had one or more incidents of antisemitic activity, whereas only 17% of schools with no faculty boycotters had incidents of antisemitic activity. ($\chi^2 = 30.34$, $n = 112$, $p < .001$).
 - 100% of the 33 schools with 10 or more faculty boycotters had one or more incidents of antisemitic activity
 - Furthermore, schools with more faculty boycotters tended to have more incidents of overall antisemitic activity. (Pearson $r = .55$; $n = 112$; $p < .001$).

- b. Faculty Boycotters and Targeting of Jewish Students** – The presence of faculty boycotters is correlated with the targeting of Jewish students for harm.
- 46% of schools with faculty members who endorsed the academic boycott of Israel showed evidence of targeting Jewish students for harm, whereas only 11% of schools with no faculty boycotters showed evidence of targeting Jewish students. ($\chi^2 = 7.77$, $n = 112$, $p < .01$).
 - Furthermore, schools with more faculty boycotters tended to have more incidents involving the targeting of Jewish students. (Pearson $r = .51$; $n = 112$; $p < .001$).
- c. Faculty Boycotters and Antisemitic Expression** - The presence of faculty boycotters is strongly associated with the occurrence of antisemitic expression.
- 74% of schools with faculty members who endorsed the academic boycott of Israel showed evidence of antisemitic expression, whereas only 17% of schools with no faculty boycotters showed evidence of antisemitic activity. ($\chi^2 = 21.51$, $n = 112$, $p < .001$).
 - Furthermore, schools with more faculty boycotters tended to have more incidents that contained antisemitic expression. (Pearson $r = .50$; $n = 112$; $p < .001$).
- d. Faculty Boycotters and BDS Activity** - The presence of faculty boycotters is strongly associated with the occurrence of BDS activity.
- 62% of schools with faculty members who endorsed the academic boycott of Israel showed evidence of BDS activity, whereas only 11% of schools with no faculty boycotters showed evidence of BDS activity. ($\chi^2 = 15.84$, $n = 112$, $p < .001$).
 - Furthermore, schools with more faculty boycotters tended to have more incidents with BDS activity. (Pearson $r = .51$; $n = 112$; $p < .001$).
- e. Faculty Boycotters and Anti-Zionist Student Groups** - The presence of faculty boycotters is strongly associated with the presence of one or more anti-Zionist student groups.
- 76% of the schools with faculty members who endorsed the academic boycott of Israel had one or more active anti-Zionist groups, whereas only 11% of schools with no faculty boycotters had an anti-Zionist students group. ($\chi^2 = 23.70$, $n = 112$, $p < .001$).
 - Furthermore, schools with more faculty boycotters were more likely to have one or more active anti-Zionist groups. (Pearson $r = .43$; $n = 112$; $p < .001$).

Table 3 is a concise summary of the correlation data found in sections 2, 3, and 4 above.

Table 3

**Correlation Coefficients (R) Among Overall Antisemitic Activity, Antisemitic Expression, BDS Activity, Targeting of Jewish Students and Faculty Boycotters
(All correlations were significant at the $p < .001$ level)**

	Overall Antisemitic Activity	Antisemitic Expression	BDS Activity	Targeting of Jewish Students	Anti-Zionist Student Groups	Faculty Boycotters
Overall Antisemitic Activity	1	.29 ^a	.69 ^b	.43 ^c	.63	.55
Antisemitic Expression	.29 ^a	1	.70	.30 ^d	.58	.50
BDS Activity	.40 ^b	.70	1	.59	.56	.51
Targeting Jewish Students	.43 ^c	.30	.59	1	.38	.51
Anti-Zionist Student Groups	.63	.58	.56	.38	1	.43
Faculty Boycotters	.55	.50	.51	.51	.43	1

^a Overall Antisemitic Activity was calculated without incidents of Antisemitic Expression; $p < .01$.

^b Overall Antisemitic Activity was calculated without incidents of BDS Activity.

^c Overall Antisemitic Activity was calculated without incidents of Targeting of Jewish Students.

^d $p < .01$

5) The presence of anti-Zionist student groups and the number of faculty boycotters were very strong predictors of overall antisemitic activity. In fact, BDS activity and the number of faculty boycotters were the strongest predictors of incidents that target Jewish students, the factor with the most deleterious effect on campus climate for Jewish students.

- a. A multiple linear regression was calculated to predict the overall incidence of antisemitic activity based on the presence of one or more anti-Zionist student groups and the number of faculty boycotters. The regression equation was highly significant ($F(2,109) = 18.46, p < .001, R^2 = .49$), indicating that the combination of these factors had considerable predictive value, with the presence of anti-Zionist student groups ($p < .001$) and number of faculty boycotters ($p < .001$) being the strongest predictors of overall antisemitic activity.
- b. A multiple linear regression was calculated to predict the targeting of Jewish students based on the occurrence of four factors: antisemitic expression, BDS activity, the presence of one or more anti-Zionist student groups, and the number of faculty boycotters. The regression equation was highly significant ($F(4,107) = 18.90, p < .001, R^2 = .41$), indicating that a combination of these factors had considerable predictive

value, with BDS activity ($p < .001$) and number of faculty boycotters ($p < .001$) being the strongest predictors of anti-Jewish hostility on campus.

IV. Discussion

The Prevalence of Antisemitic Activity

There is clear evidence of antisemitic activity at 70% of the colleges and universities most popular with Jewish students. Language and imagery containing classic and contemporary antisemitic tropes were found on a majority of campuses, as were instances of BDS activity. In addition, evidence of Jewish students being targeted for harmful action was found on a significant number of campuses.

It is important to point out that these results -- both in terms of the number of incidents of antisemitic activity and the number of schools affected by them -- are undoubtedly far lower than the reality. In particular, we believe that the vast majority of incidents involving the direct targeting of Jewish students for harm go unreported or underreported, making it impossible to find evidence of them when investigating the sources of information available to us.

Furthermore, constraints in our data collection made it impossible to know for sure whether many of the events that were suspected of containing either antisemitic expression or the promotion of BDS actually did contain one or both of these. For example, if a speaker well known for using antisemitic tropes or promoting BDS in his or her public lectures gave a talk at a particular school, but we did not have access to a recording or report of the talk, it was not included in the data set.

Nevertheless, the data that we did collect are cause for serious concern. Forty-one percent of the schools showed evidence of targeting of Jewish students for harm, an alarmingly high figure. No Jewish student should *ever* be targeted for harm because of his or her perceived religious or ethnic identity, and yet at far too many schools Jewish students are routinely threatened because of their identity: they are harassed and intimidated, their places of residence defaced with swastikas and other antisemitic graffiti, their participation in campus activities or student government shunned, the events they organize disrupted and shut down, and more.

These data are consistent with Jewish student reports. The Brandeis University study found that one-third of student respondents had experienced verbal harassment because of their Jewishness, and almost 40% of respondents had witnessed it. At the University of California, four of whose campuses were among the top 6% of the schools in this study with the highest number of incidents of targeting of Jewish students for harm (see Table 2), a 2015 survey conducted by AMCHA Initiative of 229 Jewish students found that more than 70% reported experiencing or witnessing one or more of the following forms of anti-Jewish bigotry directed against them or other Jewish students on their UC campuses: antisemitic graffiti; heckling, name-calling, false accusations or derogatory remarks; email or social media with hateful or derogatory language about Jews sent or posted by fellow students; their property or the property of other Jewish students damaged or destroyed; and threats or acts of physical violence.¹⁰

¹⁰ <http://www.amchainitiative.org/70-students-experienced-antisemitism-survey-reveals/>

The incidence of antisemitic expression and BDS activity, found in 65% and 54% of the schools respectively, is also consistent with student reports. The Brandeis University study found that nearly three-quarters of respondents said that they had been exposed to at least one of six statements containing classic and contemporary antisemitic tropes, and more than half of all respondents were aware of BDS campaigns. The AMCHA Initiative survey of Jewish students at the University of California found that 80% of respondents were aware of campus activities promoting BDS, which is no doubt related to the fact that all five of the UC campuses in the current study were among the top 10% of schools with the highest incidence of BDS activity (see Table 2).

It is important to point out that Jewish students' subjective perceptions and reports are not only consistent with our findings about the prevalence of all three kinds of antisemitic activity -- targeting of Jewish students, antisemitic expression, and BDS activity -- they also accord with our study's (and the U.S. State Department's) inclusion of anti-Zionist actions, language and imagery under the general rubric of antisemitic activity. The Brandeis University study found that close to 80% of Jewish student respondents considered statements that call for Israel's destruction or oppose Israel's right to exist as a Jewish state to be antisemitic. One reason for this is suggested by a 2011 survey of 400 Jewish students nationwide, which found that the overwhelming majority of respondents considered concern for the Jewish state an integral part of their Jewish identity: Ninety percent of respondents agreed that Israel is the spiritual center of the Jewish people, and 83% said that caring about Israel is an important part of being Jewish.¹¹ For the large majority of Jewish students who hold such views, expression that seeks to deny Israel's existence is not only considered an assault against the Jewish people and a threat to the safety of Jews worldwide but against the student's own religious or ethnic identity.

Factors that Contribute to Campus Antisemitism

The presence of one or more anti-Zionist student groups and the number of faculty who have publicly endorsed an academic boycott of Israel are, in combination, very strong predictors of overall antisemitic activity ($R^2 = .49$; $p < .001$). In addition, each factor alone is a strong predictor, with the presence of an anti-Zionist student group being a somewhat more reliable predictor of antisemitic activity than the number of faculty boycotters.

Anti-Zionist Student Groups

It is not at all surprising that the presence of anti-Zionist student groups would be so highly correlated with overall antisemitic activity. Members of these groups, which have a presence on 77 (66%) campuses with the largest Jewish undergraduate populations,¹² are not only, in many cases, directly responsible for the antisemitic expression, BDS activity and targeting of Jewish students found on their campuses, they often have mission statements or foundational documents that contain antisemitic language and prescribe antisemitic behavior. For example, the mission statements of most chapters of Students for Justice in Palestine (SJP), an organization found on 85% of those campuses with active anti-Zionist groups, contain either an explicit commitment to engaging in BDS activity,¹³ or a

¹¹ <http://www.jewishvirtuallibrary.org/jsource/US-Israel/AmerJewishStudentPoll2011.PDF>

¹² <http://www.amchainitiative.org/sjp-chapters>

¹³ See, for example, these mission statements, among many: Columbia University SJP - https://www.facebook.com/ColumbiaSJP/info/?tab=page_info; Tufts University SJP:

commitment to promoting the “BDS demands,” whose fulfillment would result in the dismantling of the Jewish state.¹⁴ On some campuses other student groups with similar missions, such as Jewish Voice for Peace (JVP)¹⁵ or a specific group devoted solely to promoting an anti-Israel divestment campaign,¹⁶ exist alongside SJP or a differently-named but identical student group. Consistent with their anti-Zionist mission, members of SJP and other related student groups host numerous events and rallies, construct displays, engage in guerilla theater, write op-eds, and carry out campaigns designed to promote BDS and other efforts to harm Israel. These activities usually contain language and imagery that meet the U.S. State Department definition of antisemitism.

In addition, many anti-Zionist student groups have explicitly adopted the “anti-normalization” policies of the BDS movement, which reject all forms of pro-Israel expression and demand an end to all interaction with any individuals and organizations that do not endorse the BDS movement’s anti-Zionist tenets.¹⁷ For example, in one of its founding documents the SJP group at Binghamton University outlined strategies for harassing Jewish students and disrupting or shutting down their Israel-related events in a section entitled “Tactics and Strategies Used to Counter Zionist Normalization.”¹⁸ Often the “anti-normalization” tactics include targeting all Jewish students on campus, regardless of their feelings on Israel. For example, at University of California Berkeley, the announcement for an SJP rally promoting BDS included the demand that the University end its “Study Abroad Programs in Israel,” and that it cease its “coordination and strategizing” with many Jewish organizations including, the Anti-Defamation League, the Jewish Community Relations Council, and the American Jewish Congress.¹⁹ In our data, more than half of the incidents that directly targeted Jewish students were carried out by members of SJP and related groups in clear conformity with these “anti-normalization” policies. Incidents included the disruption of Jewish students’ Israel-related events; the harassment, denigration, or physical and verbal assault of Jewish students for their perceived support of Israel; the vandalizing of Israel-related displays; discrimination against Jewish students’ participation in school activities because of their presumed pro-Israel stance; and attempts to block student trips and academic exchange programs in Israel.

Anti-Zionist Faculty

The contribution of anti-Zionist faculty to campus antisemitism is less direct than that of anti-Zionist student groups, but it is no less impactful. These faculty contribute to antisemitic activity in a number of ways. First, some anti-Zionist faculty directly support the efforts of anti-Zionist student groups. For instance, 130 faculty members at New York University,²⁰ 40 faculty members at the University of

https://www.facebook.com/TuftsSJP/info/?tab=page_info; Stanford University SJP:

https://www.facebook.com/StanfordSJP/info/?tab=page_info

¹⁴ See, for example, the mission statement of Yale University SJP:

https://www.facebook.com/YALESJP/info/?tab=page_info

¹⁵ See, for example, this JVP group at American University:

https://www.facebook.com/JewishVoiceforPeaceatAU/info/?tab=page_info

¹⁶ See, for example, the group DePaul Divest: <http://www.dpudivests.org/>

¹⁷ <http://www.adl.org/israel-international/anti-israel-activity/c/anto-normalization-campaign.html>

¹⁸ <http://www.amchainitiative.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/10/SJP-Binghamton-DeclarationofPrinciplesandStrategies.pdf>

¹⁹ <https://www.facebook.com/events/883358391754677/>

²⁰ <https://twitter.com/nyusjp/status/586285039731769344>

California,²¹ and 31 faculty members at Stanford University²² signed letters endorsing the anti-Israel divestment campaigns of anti-Zionist student groups at their universities. At the City University of New York, close to 200 faculty signed a letter defending CUNY SJP's anti-Zionist activism,²³ which has included actions opposing the school's "Zionist administration" and calls for "Zionists out of CUNY."²⁴ Anti-Zionist faculty have also been complicit in actions which have resulted in the targeting of Jewish students for harm. At University of California Santa Cruz, for example, faculty boycotters from the Feminist Studies department joined with members of anti-Zionist student groups in protesting and seeking to shut down a Jewish student event entitled "Being Queer in Israel."²⁵

In addition, faculty members who are leaders of the BDS movement and engage in anti-Zionist activism extramurally routinely give talks at their own institutions and others, in which they promote BDS and use language that meets the U.S. State Department definition of antisemitism. These talks are often sponsored by anti-Zionist student groups, but many are sponsored or co-sponsored by academic departments and administrative offices. In fact, in 2015 at least 35 events containing BDS promotion and/or antisemitic expression -- including the condoning of terrorism against Jews, the comparison of Jews to Nazis, calls for the elimination of the Jewish state, and the open promotion of BDS -- were sponsored by multiple academic departments and administrative offices on 22 campuses. Several of these talks also featured faculty boycott leaders arguing for stronger academic freedom protections, which would provide faculty activists like themselves the unfettered freedom to promote the boycott of Israel and other anti-Zionist advocacy within the academy. Not surprisingly, all of these departmentally-sponsored events occurred on campuses with one or more faculty members who had expressed public support for the academic boycott of Israel. In contrast, at schools without any faculty boycotters, there was no evidence of departmentally or university-sponsored talks containing antisemitic expression or BDS promotion.

BDS Activity

Although anti-Jewish hostility, as measured by the targeting of Jewish students for harm, is well predicted by a combination of factors -- including antisemitic expression, BDS activity, the presence of anti-Zionist student groups and the number of faculty boycotters ($R^2 = .41$; $p < .001$) -- BDS activity stands out as the statistically strongest predictor by far. It is not hard to understand why.

As mentioned above, the majority of incidents involving the targeting of Jewish students for harm were consistent with the "anti-normalization" policies of the BDS movement. These harms included suppression of Jewish students' speech and assembly, harassment, denigration, discrimination, destruction of property, and even assault.

Beyond the clear effect that BDS activities have had on provoking anti-Jewish hostility, they have also had a less direct, but no less harmful, impact on the campus climate for Jewish students. Based wholly

²¹ <http://www.dailycal.org/2015/03/06/statement-uc-faculty-divestment-israel/>

²² <http://soopalestine.weebly.com/updates/stanford-faculty-letter-in-support-of-divestment>

²³ <https://nycsjp.wordpress.com/2015/11/23/cuny-faculty-affirms-the-rights-of-students-to-organize-protest-and-resist/>

²⁴ <http://www.algemeiner.com/2015/11/13/zionists-out-of-cuny-long-live-the-intifada-chanted-at-cuny-student-protest-at-hunter-administration-looks-other-way/>

²⁵ <http://www.jweekly.com/article/full/73823/israels-gay-friendly-message-not-welcome-in-santa-cruz/>

on a movement whose goal, as articulated by its founders and leaders, is to economically, academically and culturally isolate the Jewish state in order to eliminate it, BDS initiatives and campaigns are replete with language and imagery that are not simply critical of the state of Israel, but that seek to deny its very right to exist. As such, they are the purest form of anti-Zionist expression found on college campuses today, expression intended to incite hatred not only of the Jewish state and the Jews who live in it, but of the Jews who are presumed to identify with and support it, namely, Jewish students who have not renounced Zionism.

Anti-Zionism: The Face of Campus Antisemitism in 2015

Just as a quantitative analysis of our data has shown that anti-Zionist activity is highly correlated with antisemitic expression and the targeting of Jewish students for harm, a qualitative analysis reveals that anti-Zionism permeates and is inseparable from contemporary campus antisemitism.

There is a predominance of anti-Zionist expression on campus:

More than 150 talks, rallies, statements, films, displays, agitprop, op-eds and social media posts contained expression that demonized or delegitimized Israel by drawing on classic antisemitic tropes of Jewish evil, power and mendacity. On more than 60 campuses, Israel was vilified with false accusations of racism, ethnic cleansing, genocide, crimes against humanity, brutal slaughter, state-sponsored terrorism, theft of land, water and human organs, settler-colonialism, apartheid, fascism, white supremacy and Nazism. On several campuses Israel was falsely accused of “pinkwashing” -- mendaciously portraying Israel as a haven for the LGBTQ community in order to distract attention from Israel’s “crimes against humanity” – and engaging in the same malevolent deception with respect to its record on environmentalism (“greenwashing”) and its commitment to religious tolerance (“faithwashing”). A speaker at one school even called Israel “the embodiment of evil.”

At one-quarter of the schools most popular with Jewish students, speakers and writers were explicit about their anti-Zionist stance, indicating that they were not simply critical of Israel’s policies but opposed to the very existence of the Jewish state. For example:

- At San Francisco State University, an announcement for a student group’s event included the words: “The General Union of Palestine Students – GUPS SFSU supports the uprisings in Palestine!...End to the Zionist state!”²⁶
- At Cornell University, an SJP-sponsored talk by Columbia University professor Joseph Massad included the claim that “Jews are not a nation...The Jewish state is a racist state that does not have a right to exist.”²⁷
- At UCLA, a panel discussion sponsored by the Center for Near Eastern Studies featured UC Riverside English Professor David Lloyd, who claimed that the idea of “a Jewish state for a Jewish people” was “utter stupidity,” and he advocated its elimination.²⁸

²⁶

<https://www.facebook.com/GeneralUnionofPalestineStudents/photos/a.427821270610383.99022.419960624729781/960183580707480/?type=1&theater>

²⁷ <http://www.thecornellreview.org/joseph-massad-at-cornell-israel-has-no-right-to-be-jewish-state/>

- At the University of Washington, the Center for the Humanities sponsored a talk by BDS founder Omar Barghouti, in which he called for the dissolution of the Jewish state.²⁹

There was a clear conflation of classic antisemitic and anti-Zionist expression, indicating that the speaker or writer did not distinguish between the two:

- At UCLA, a student posted several antisemitic messages on the Facebook pages of a famous Jewish UCLA alumna and a Jewish student group, including: “Fucking Jews. GTFHOH with all your Zionist bullshit. Crazy ass fucking troglodyte albino monsters of cultural destruction...Give the Palestinians back their land, go back to Poland or whatever freezer-state you’re from, and realize that faith does not constitute race.”³⁰
- In a talk given on several campuses across the country, including at Brooklyn College,³¹ Emory University³² and UC Berkeley,³³ journalist David Sheen not only accused Israel of being a racist state, he claimed that sacred Jewish texts such as the *Torah*, *Talmud* and *Tanya* were “deeply racist” and called for the brutal murder of non-Jews and homosexuals, and he accused the Jewish people of engaging in a “eugenics program” similar to the Nazis, in order to prevent intermarriage.
- At University of Central Florida, a newsstand outside a dormitory was defaced with two stickers, one showing a Jewish star with the words “1%” and “Bankers” underneath, a second showing a swastika on a flag with a superimposed message calling for a boycott of Israel.³⁴
- At Binghamton University, British historian Alison Weir gave a talk in which she applied classic antisemitic tropes of Jewish power and a conspiratorial plan for world domination, made famous in the *Protocols of the Elders of Zion*, to American Jews who support Israel, accusing them of a “Zionist Agenda” which includes gaining political control over “every sector of our society,” and claiming that “Israel Partisans” control the media.³⁵

A majority of incidents that threatened the safety or well-being of Jewish students or violated their civil rights were linked to Israel or Zionism:

- A swastika and the word “Jew” were scrawled next to an Israeli flag displayed outside a Jewish student’s dorm room door at Drexel University.³⁶
- “Zionists should be sent to the gas chamber” was etched into a bathroom wall at UC Berkeley.³⁷

²⁸ <http://www.international.ucla.edu/media/podcasts/Conference-on-Palestine-and-Pedagogy-at-the-University-1-cw-z5x.mp3>

²⁹ <https://mikereport.wordpress.com/2015/03/13/outrage-as-uw-sponsors-anti-israel-speaker/>

³⁰ <http://www.dailywire.com/news/2247/ucla-student-working-david-geffen-medical-center-pardes-seleh>

³¹ <http://humanrightscolumbia.org/?q=content/israel-palestine-bullet-ballot-and-boycott>

³² <https://www.facebook.com/events/562394590581001>

³³ <https://www.facebook.com/events/528418097305641/>

³⁴ <http://www.centralfloridafuture.com/story/news/2015/12/08/more-ucf-cases-anti-semitic-vandalism-reported/77009990/>

³⁵ <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=k4cNrbo15ME>

³⁶ <http://jewishexponent.com/headlines/2015/05/jewish-drexel-student-finds-swastika-next-to-israeli-flag>

³⁷ <http://www.thedailybeast.com/articles/2015/03/19/berkeley-s-swastika-problem-are-america-s-liberal-colleges-breeding-anti-semitism.html>

- A message that was tweeted on the day of an anti-Israel divestment resolution vote at University of Michigan read: "Has anyone else noticed the zionazi trash talking on the #UMDivest thread this morning?".³⁸
- a Yik Yak message posted during the week of an anti-Israel divestment referendum at San Diego State University read: "SDSU divest so we can get rid of the Jews."³⁹
- "Fuck Zionist Pinkwashing" was written on a flyer advertising a Jewish student event at UC Santa Cruz.⁴⁰
- Candidates for student government at UCLA and Stanford University were accused by anti-Israel activists of being unfit for student office because of their Jewishness;⁴¹ a Jewish student senator at UC Santa Cruz was told he had to abstain from voting on an anti-Israel divestment resolution because of his "Jewish agenda";⁴² and a Jewish student senator at University of Michigan was subjected to a frivolous "ethics probe" because he raised concerns about an anti-Israel display in the campus square.⁴³
- Anti-Israel activists shut down, disrupted or blocked access to events organized or sponsored by Jewish student groups at Cornell University,⁴⁴ Harvard University,⁴⁵ Rice University,⁴⁶ Goucher College,⁴⁷ Johns Hopkins University,⁴⁸ UC Santa Cruz,⁴⁹ Tufts University,⁵⁰ and University of Florida.⁵¹
- Jewish students were assaulted or harassed at anti-Israel events, protests or actions at UC Berkeley,⁵² Northwestern University,⁵³ UC Santa Cruz,⁵⁴ CUNY Hunter College,⁵⁵ and UC Davis.⁵⁶
- Efforts to curtail Jewish student trips to Israel (Birthright) by branding them as racist and denigrating Jewish students on campus who participate in them were carried out at Vassar University,⁵⁷ University of Minnesota,⁵⁸ CUNY Brooklyn College, CUNY Hunter College, New York University, Pace University, and Columbia University.⁵⁹

³⁸ <http://imgur.com/a/iLq6O>

³⁹ <http://www.thedailyaztec.com/66142/opinion/anti-semitic-posts-divest-from-social-progress/>

⁴⁰ <http://www.amchainitiative.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/01/Defaced-Flyer-from-LGBT-Event.jpg>

⁴¹ <http://www.stanforddaily.com/2015/02/17/senate-reverses-divestment-vote-passes-resolution/>

⁴² <http://www.jns.org/latest-articles/2015/11/18/uc-santa-cruz-student-warned-to-abstain-from-bds-vote-over-jewish-agenda#.Vk9OVfViko=>

⁴³ <http://www.thecollegefix.com/post/25296/>

⁴⁴ <https://www.facebook.com/CornellS4JP/>

⁴⁵ <http://www.thecrimson.com/article/2015/10/16/students-protest-hillel-event/>

⁴⁶ <https://www.facebook.com/events/1551613331759003/>

⁴⁷ <http://www.amchainitiative.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/12/Letter-to-President-Bowen-November-19-2015.pdf>

⁴⁸ <https://nlonthedl.wordpress.com/2015/11/12/students-walk-out-dershowitz-stands-ground/>

⁴⁹ [http://www.jweekly.com/article/full/73823/israels-gay-friendly-message-not-welcome-in-santa-cruz/;](http://www.jweekly.com/article/full/73823/israels-gay-friendly-message-not-welcome-in-santa-cruz/)

[https://www.facebook.com/StandWithUs/videos/10152874993152689/;](https://www.facebook.com/StandWithUs/videos/10152874993152689/)

<http://www.cityonahillpress.com/2015/11/08/students-for-justice-in-palestine-interrupt-slugs-for-israel-tabling/>

⁵⁰ <http://tuftsdaily.com/news/2015/10/30/sjp-members-disrupt-annual-taste-israel-event-signs-flyers/>

⁵¹ http://www.alligator.org/news/campus/article_695910cc-b8cb-11e4-9db0-e758f830d45c.html

⁵² <http://www.jweekly.com/article/full/76086/zoa-jewish-student-was-assaulted-at-cal/>

⁵³ <http://dailynorthwestern.com/2015/05/13/campus/sjp-holds-mock-border-demonstration-student-files-bias-report-in-response/>

⁵⁴ <http://www.cityonahillpress.com/2015/03/05/students-for-justice-in-palestine-set-up-mock-checkpoints/>

⁵⁵ <http://www.algemeiner.com/2015/11/13/zionists-out-of-cuny-long-live-the-intifada-chanted-at-cuny-student-protest-at-hunter-administration-looks-other-way/>

⁵⁶ <http://www.haaretz.com/jewish/features/1.640825>

⁵⁷ <http://miscellanynews.org/2015/11/18/opinions/birthright-program-ignores-israeli-conflict/>

In 2015, it was the prevalence of anti-Zionist expression, its strong association with classic antisemitic tropes, and its clear contribution to anti-Jewish hostility that identified anti-Zionism as the most prominent face of contemporary antisemitism on the campuses most popular with Jewish students.

V. Conclusions

As the first comprehensive investigation of antisemitic incidents on American college and university campuses, our study has made several important contributions to understanding the nature and scope of campus antisemitism:

- We introduced a useful and comprehensive taxonomy for quantifying antisemitic activity, which utilized the U.S. State Department definition of antisemitism as well as measurements of anti-Jewish hostility based on actions that directly target Jewish students for harm.
- We provided, for the first time, a quantitative and statistically significant account of the prevalence of antisemitic activity on campuses most popular with Jewish students. These findings are consistent with subjective reports found in recent studies.
- Using numerous examples drawn from the data, we demonstrated that anti-Zionism is the most prominent face of contemporary antisemitism on campuses today. This provides further support for using a definition of antisemitism that includes anti-Zionist expression, in order to accurately identify antisemitic activity on college and university campuses.
- We showed that the best statistical predictors of overall antisemitic activity on a campus are the presence of an anti-Zionist student group such as Students for Justice in Palestine, and the number of faculty who have endorsed the academic boycott of Israel. The best statistical predictor of anti-Jewish hostility, as measured by actions that directly target Jewish students for harm, is the amount of BDS activity.

The results of this study can provide vital information for decision-making, activism, educating and policy making, and can be used by university stakeholders such as students and prospective students, parents, alumni, community activists, university leaders and government officials.

⁵⁸<https://www.facebook.com/SJP.UMN/photos/a.160457610677030.34319.140113659378092/853178298071621/?type=3&theater>

⁵⁹ <https://www.facebook.com/events/1727689847462158/>

VI. Lead Researchers

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

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

Appendix A

Categories of Targeting Jewish Students for Harm With Examples

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

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

E.g. At UC Berkeley, an SJP member grabbed a pro-Israel sign from a Jewish student and then shoved him.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Appendix B

Categories of Antisemitic Expression With Examples

Language, imagery or behavior deemed antisemitic by the U.S. State Department definition of antisemitism⁶⁰:

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

E.g. In a talk at Binghamton University, an invited speaker accused American Jews who support Israel of controlling the media and having a plan to gain political control over “every sector of our society.”

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

E.g. At Brooklyn College, an SJP poster called for the “Third Intifada,” which is a campaign of terror against Israeli Jews.

- **COMPARING JEWS TO NAZIS**

E.g. An invited speaker at Emory University accused Jews of engaging in a Nazi-like “eugenics program” to prevent intermarriage.

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

E.g. At Brandeis University, an invited speaker accused Israel of exaggerating the Holocaust and a victimhood mentality to commit crimes against Palestinians.

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

E.g. At San Francisco State University, the announcement for a student group’s event included the words “End to the Zionist state!”

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

⁶⁰ <http://www.state.gov/j/drl/rls/fs/2010/122352.htm>

E.g. An invited speaker at the University of Arizona falsely accused Israelis of intentionally “maiming,” “stunting” and “debilitating” Palestinians.

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

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