



Institute for the Elimination of Poverty & Genocide

July 15, 2019

**Re: S. 4001/A. 5755 Will Stifle Constitutionally Protected Speech in Support of Justice and Freedom for Palestinians**

Dear New Jersey Senate Education Committee member:

As civil and human rights organizations, we support efforts to confront the racism and bigotry that are increasingly rampant and deadly across the United States, including on campuses. Incidents of racism, xenophobia, Islamophobia, antisemitism, and other forms of discrimination have been on the rise in recent years.<sup>1</sup> In light of deadly acts of bigotry against Jewish, Muslim, Black, and other communities in Pittsburgh, Christchurch, San Diego, and elsewhere, it is incumbent on lawmakers at all levels to take action to ensure safety and security for all people.

<sup>1</sup> Southern Poverty Law Center, The Year in Hate: Rage in Change, <https://www.splcenter.org/fighting-hate/intelligence-report/2019/year-hate-rage-against-change> (documenting 30% increase in hate groups during the Trump era).

We write to raise concerns with [S. 4001/A. 5755](#), an Act prohibiting anti-Semitism in public schools and institutions of higher education (the Act), which fails to achieve this goal. The Act codifies a widely contested redefinition of antisemitism that includes protected speech critical of Israel.<sup>2</sup> This vague and overbroad redefinition in the Act conflates political criticism of Israel with anti-Jewish hate, encouraging infringements on constitutionally protected speech related to a human rights movement, and undermining the fight against real antisemitism.

Indeed, in our experience defending civil rights on college campuses, we have seen first-hand how the redefinition that the Act would codify has been used as a tool to silence students, faculty, and staff who advocate for Palestinian rights.<sup>3</sup> This experience makes clear that the primary aim of this bill is to censor First Amendment-protected criticism of Israeli government policies and speech calling for freedom, justice, and equality for Palestinians. It invites New Jersey schools and universities to violate free speech rights by discriminating against certain viewpoints and chilling one side of an important political debate.

We urge you to reject this bill that will chill free speech.

## **I. The redefinition of antisemitism endorsed by the Act equates criticism of the Israeli government with antisemitism**

The Act purports to address rising antisemitism in schools and on college campuses, but a plain reading reveals that its real purpose is to silence advocacy for Palestinian rights and to censor criticism of Israeli government policies.

The Act would redefine antisemitism for purposes of determining whether allegations of discrimination in the education context are motivated by antisemitic intent. Much of that redefinition is uncontroversial and aligns with a traditional understanding of the term.<sup>4</sup> But the

---

<sup>2</sup> S. 4001, 218<sup>th</sup> Leg. (N.J. 2019), [https://www.njleg.state.nj.us/2018/Bills/S4500/4001\\_I1.HTM](https://www.njleg.state.nj.us/2018/Bills/S4500/4001_I1.HTM). The redefinition of antisemitism contained in the Act was listed on the U.S. Department of State website prior to 2018 and promoted in other forums. U.S. Dep't of State, *Defining Anti-Semitism*, ARCHIVE.ORG (Jan. 20, 2017), <https://web.archive.org/web/20180117193205/https://www.state.gov/s/rga/resources/267538.htm> [hereinafter 2018 State Department Definition]. It is substantially similar to the one adopted by the International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance (IHRA), currently listed on the U.S. Department of State website, and proposed in the Anti-Semitism Awareness Act of 2019 (S. 852) currently pending before Congress. See IHRA, Working Definition of Antisemitism (adopted May 26, 2016), <https://www.holocaustremembrance.com/working-definition-antisemitism> (last visited May 3, 2019); U.S. Department of State, Defining Anti-Semitism, <https://www.state.gov/defining-anti-semitism/> (last visited May 22, 2019); Anti-Semitism Awareness Act of 2019, S. 852, sec. 3, 116<sup>th</sup> Cong. (2019), <https://www.congress.gov/bill/116th-congress/senate-bill/852/text?r=1&s=4>. These different versions of the redefinition all raise similar constitutional concerns. For a detailed backgrounder on the origins and various incarnations of this redefinition, see Palestine Legal, "Backgrounder on Efforts to Redefine Antisemitism as a Means of Censoring Criticism of Israel," May 2019, <http://palestinelegal.org/s/Backgrounder-on-Efforts-to-Redefine-Antisemitism.pdf>.

<sup>3</sup> See Part III *infra* for examples. See also Palestine Legal and the Center for Constitutional Rights, THE PALESTINE EXCEPTION TO FREE SPEECH (2015), <https://palestinelegal.org/the-palestine-exception> (documenting incidents where the redefinition of antisemitism was deployed to allege violations of Title VI at universities where students/faculty have engaged in the following speech activities: a screening of the film *Occupation 101*; an event critical of Israeli policies featuring a Holocaust survivor; using the term "apartheid" to describe Israeli government policies; equating Zionism with racism; calling for a boycott for Palestinian rights; and wearing a Palestinian keffiyeh, or scarf). For a more recent update, see Palestine Legal, 2018 Year-In-Review: Censorship of Palestine Advocacy in the U.S. Intensifies, <https://palestinelegal.org/2018-report>.

<sup>4</sup> For example, the IHRA redefinition states: "Anti-Semitism is a certain perception of Jews, which may be expressed as hatred toward Jews. Rhetorical and physical manifestations of anti-Semitism are directed toward

redefinition radically departs from that understanding with its examples related to criticism of Israel, including:

- “[D]emonizing Israel by using the symbols and images associated with classic anti-Semitism to characterize Israel or Israeli people, drawing comparisons of contemporary Israeli policy to that of the Nazis, or blaming Israel for all inter-religious or political tensions;
- [A]pplying a double standard to Israel by requiring behavior of Israel that is not expected or demanded of any other democratic nation, or focusing peace or human rights investigations only on Israel; and
- [D]elegitimizing Israel by denying the Jewish people their right to self-determination and denying Israel the right to exist.”<sup>5</sup>

This redefinition falsely conflates political criticism of Israel with antisemitism. Human rights advocacy calling for freedom, justice, and equality for Palestinians, or discussions that vigorously criticize Israeli policies, are simply not comparable to anti-Jewish hate, and are in fact based on its opposite: principles of universal human rights and dignity.

Moreover, the redefinition is so vague and broad that it could encompass any and all criticism of Israel and would put school administrators in the position of government censor. What is a “double standard” with regards to criticism of Israel and how and by whom will it be judged? How many additional countries would students and professors be required to criticize when they criticize Israel, and what degree or depth of criticism would they be required to make in order to avoid applying a “double standard” to Israel? Would a legal panel on the constitutional right to engage in boycotts for Palestinian rights be considered a “double standard”? How would a school or a university define “delegitimizing” or “demonizing” Israel? Would a mock-checkpoint on a campus quad, aimed at raising awareness about Israeli military checkpoints that restrict Palestinian freedom of movement, be considered demonizing? Would a lecture on Israel’s violations of international law or Israel’s “Nation State” law (enacted in July 2018, to enshrine the right of national self-determination for Jews only<sup>6</sup>) be considered delegitimization?

Requiring schools and universities to enter such a morass of viewpoint-based distinctions would chill and invite punishment of constitutionally protected speech.

## **II. Adopting a redefinition of antisemitism that conflates antisemitism with criticism of Israel will result in First Amendment violations**

Adoption of the redefinition of antisemitism as a standard to assess whether political speech constitutes discrimination has unconstitutional implications, and requiring schools to

---

Jewish or non-Jewish individuals and/or their property, toward Jewish community institutions and religious facilities.” IHRA, Working Definition, *supra* note 2. Merriam-Webster defines antisemitism as, “Hostility toward or discrimination against Jews as a religious, ethnic or racial group.” <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/anti-Semitism> (last visited May 3, 2019).

<sup>5</sup> S. 4001, 218<sup>th</sup> Leg. (N.J. 2019); 2018 State Department Definition, *supra* note 2.

<sup>6</sup> See David M. Halbfinger and Isabel Kershner, *Israeli Law Declares the Country the ‘Nation-State of the Jewish People,’* NEW YORK TIMES, July 19, 2018, <https://www.nytimes.com/2018/07/19/world/middleeast/israel-law-jews-arabic.html>.

apply the redefinition is tantamount to directing administrators to violate the First Amendment.<sup>7</sup> It is especially inappropriate for the legislature to impose a definition of antisemitism that encompasses criticism of Israel and discussions about violations of Palestinian human rights because of the essential role that academic freedom and unfettered debate play on university campuses.<sup>8</sup>

Kenneth Stern, the redefinition's original drafter, has repudiated its application on college campuses and stated during his testimony before a House Judiciary Committee hearing on antisemitism on college campuses in 2017 his opposition to a similar federal version of the Act.<sup>9</sup>

The U.S. Department of Education's (DOE) Office for Civil Rights (OCR) affirmed in four separate cases—after conducting lengthy investigations into alleged harassment of Jewish students based on student and faculty advocacy for or academic engagement on Palestinian rights issues—that expression of political viewpoints does not, standing alone, give rise to actionable harassment under federal anti-discrimination law simply because some may find it offensive.<sup>10</sup>

---

<sup>7</sup> The redefinition of antisemitism endorsed by the Act is not currently binding law in the United States, although the State Department may be using a substantially similar version to monitor antisemitism abroad. *See* 22 U.S.C. § 2731(b); U.S. Department of State, Defining Anti-Semitism, *supra* note 2. In recent years, there has been a concerted push to get state and local governments to adopt similar redefinitions of antisemitism. In 2018, South Carolina passed a bill similar to the Act as an amendment to the state budget after it failed to pass as a standalone bill. *See* Ali Younes, *Critics denounce South Carolina's new 'anti-Semitism' law*, AL JAZEERA, May 16, 2018, <https://www.aljazeera.com/news/2018/05/critics-denounce-south-carolina-anti-semitism-law-180513113108407.html>. Recently, Florida passed a law that includes the redefinition. H.B. 741 (Fla. 2019), <https://www.flsenate.gov/Session/Bill/2019/00741>. All of these legislative efforts raise similar constitutional concerns. The Act's First Amendment savings clauses fail to overcome the fundamental constitutional concerns raised by the redefinition. S. 4001, sec. 3(b), 5(b), 218<sup>th</sup> Leg. (N.J. 2019).

<sup>8</sup> The U.S. Supreme Court has recognized the importance of this role, stating that “[o]ur Nation is deeply committed to safeguarding academic freedom, which is of transcendent value to all of us and not merely to the teachers concerned. That freedom is therefore a special concern of the First Amendment, which does not tolerate laws that cast a pall of orthodoxy over the classroom.” *Keyishian v. Board of Regents*, 385 U.S. 589, 603 (1967).

<sup>9</sup> *Examining Anti-Semitism on College Campuses; Hearing before the H. Judiciary Comm.*, 115<sup>th</sup> Cong. (2017) (testimony of Kenneth S. Stern, Executive Director, Justus & Karin Rosenberg Foundation), *available at* <https://docs.house.gov/meetings/JU/JU00/20171107/106610/HHRG-115-JU00-Wstate-SternK-20171107.pdf>; *see also* Kenneth Stern, *Will Campus Criticism of Israel Violate Federal Law?*, NEW YORK TIMES, Dec. 12, 2016, <https://www.nytimes.com/2016/12/12/opinion/will-campus-criticism-of-israel-violate-federal-law.html>; Kenneth Stern, *Should a major university system have a particular definition of anti-Semitism*, JEWISH JOURNAL, June 22, 2015, [http://www.jewishjournal.com/opinion/article/should\\_a\\_major\\_university\\_system\\_have\\_a\\_particular\\_definition\\_of\\_anti\\_semit](http://www.jewishjournal.com/opinion/article/should_a_major_university_system_have_a_particular_definition_of_anti_semit).

<sup>10</sup> As the Department of Education (DOE) noted, “harassment must include something beyond the mere expression of views, words, symbols or thought that a student finds personally offensive. The offensiveness of a particular expression, standing alone, is not a legally sufficient basis to establish a hostile environment.” Letter from Zachary Pelchat, Team Leader, U.S. Department of Education Office for Civil Rights (DOE OCR), San Francisco, to UC Berkeley Chancellor Robert Birgeneau, OCR Case No. 09-2-2259 (August 19, 2013), *available at* [http://news.berkeley.edu/wp-content/uploads/2013/08/DOE.OCR\\_.pdf](http://news.berkeley.edu/wp-content/uploads/2013/08/DOE.OCR_.pdf) [UC Berkeley determination letter]. *See also* Letter from Zachary Pelchat, Team Leader, DOE OCR, San Francisco, to Carole E. Rossi, Chief Campus Counsel, UC Santa Cruz, OCR Case No. 09-09-2145 (August 19, 2013), *available at* [https://news.ucsc.edu/2013/08/images/OCR\\_letter-of-findings.pdf](https://news.ucsc.edu/2013/08/images/OCR_letter-of-findings.pdf) [UC Santa Cruz determination letter]; Letter from Zachary Pelchat, Team Leader, DOE OCR, San Francisco, to UC Irvine Chancellor Michael Drake, OCR Case No. 09-07-2205 (August 19, 2013), *available at* [https://ccrjustice.org/sites/default/files/assets/files/OCR-UCIrvine\\_Letter\\_of\\_Findings\\_to\\_Recipient.pdf](https://ccrjustice.org/sites/default/files/assets/files/OCR-UCIrvine_Letter_of_Findings_to_Recipient.pdf); Letter from Emily Frangos, Compliance Team Leader, DOE OCR, New York, to Morton A. Klein, President, Zionist Organization of America, OCR Case No. 02-11-2157 (July 31, 2014), *available at* <https://www.documentcloud.org/documents/1300803-ocr-decision-on-title-vicomplaint-7-31-14.html> [Rutgers determination letter].

OCR, in addressing the importance of diverse viewpoints and expression on college and university campuses,<sup>11</sup> noted that the activities described in the harassment complaints

constituted expression on matters of public concern directed to the University community. In the University environment, exposure to such robust and discordant expressions, even when personally offensive and hurtful, is a circumstance that a reasonable student in higher education may experience.<sup>12</sup>

The politicization of this issue under Trump appointee Kenneth Marcus's leadership of the DOE's OCR makes New Jersey's opposition to the inclusion of the redefinition of antisemitism in this Act all the more important. Marcus has been a driver of efforts to stifle campus speech critical of Israel, using the redefinition as a tool to justify suppression of protected speech.<sup>13</sup> He is a long-time advocate for the redefinition contained in the Act and similar state and federal legislation.<sup>14</sup> One of his first acts in office was to re-open the Title VI case filed by the Zionist Organization of America (ZOA) against Rutgers University, a case which OCR closed in 2014 after a three-year investigation cleared the university of allegations that it had tolerated a climate of antisemitism.<sup>15</sup> In re-opening the investigation, Marcus noted that the IHRA definition of antisemitism is "in use" by OCR.<sup>16</sup>

But DOE previously had rejected this redefinition of antisemitism under both the Trump and Obama administrations.<sup>17</sup> In a letter, Secretary of Education DeVos stated that "OCR does not adopt definitions of particular forms of racism or national origin discrimination because such inquiries are inherently fact-specific and because expressions of racism and discrimination can evolve over time."<sup>18</sup> The U.S. Congress has also twice rejected legislation that would codify the redefinition for use by OCR in 2016 and 2018, because of free speech concerns.<sup>19</sup>

---

<sup>11</sup> DOE OCR has stated it will not, in its enforcement of anti-discrimination laws, exceed the boundaries of the First Amendment for either private or public universities. See Gerald A. Reynolds, Assistant Secretary, Office for Civil Rights, U.S. Department of Education, "Dear Colleague Letter: First Amendment," July 28, 2003, available at <http://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocr/firstamend.html> ("OCR's regulations should not be interpreted in ways that would lead to the suppression of protected speech on public or private campuses.").

<sup>12</sup> See UC Berkeley determination letter and UC Santa Cruz determination letter, *supra* note 10.

<sup>13</sup> See Letter from Civil Rights Groups to Kenneth L. Marcus, Assistant Secretary for Civil Rights, U.S. Department of Education, Nov. 30, 2018, available at <https://palestinelegal.org/s/Civil-Rights-Coalition-Letter-to-Marcus-11-30-18.pdf>.

<sup>14</sup> See *id.*

<sup>15</sup> Letter from Kenneth L. Marcus, Assistant Secretary for Civil Rights, U.S. Department of Education, to Susan B. Tuchman, Zionist Organization of America, OCR Case No. 02-11-2157, August 27, 2018, available at <https://palestinelegal.org/s/US-Department-of-Education-and-Working-Definition1-1.pdf>. See also Rutgers determination letter, *supra* note 10.

<sup>16</sup> 2018 Letter from Kenneth L. Marcus to Susan B. Tuchman, OCR Case No. 02-11-2157, *supra* note 15.

<sup>17</sup> Letter from Betsy DeVos, Secretary of Education, U.S. Department of Education, to Congressman Brad Sherman, September 8, 2017, available at <https://reason.com/assets/db/15369499618934.pdf> (last visited May 3, 2019); Letters from Arne Duncan, Secretary of Education, U.S. Department of Education, to Congressman Brad Sherman and Senator Harry Reid, December 18, 2015 (on file with Palestine Legal).

<sup>18</sup> 2017 Letter from Secretary DeVos to Congressman Brad Sherman, *supra* note 17.

<sup>19</sup> See Anti-Semitism Awareness Act of 2018, S. 2940/H.R. 5924, 115<sup>th</sup> Cong. (2018); Anti-Semitism Awareness Act of 2016, S. 10/H.R. 6421, 114<sup>th</sup> Cong. (2016). Previous versions of the bill were widely criticized in the media for endorsing a substantially similar redefinition. See, e.g., Editorial Board, *Undermining Free Speech on Campus*, LOS ANGELES TIMES, Dec. 6, 2016, <https://www.latimes.com/opinion/editorials/la-ed-senate-antisemitism-20161202-story.html>; Tana Geneva, *How Legitimate Fear Over Bias-Motivated Crimes is Generating Potentially Unconstitutional Policies*, WASHINGTON POST, Dec. 6, 2017, [5](https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/the-</a></p></div><div data-bbox=)

If the legislature adopts the Act, schools and universities will be required to investigate the content of political speech of only particular members of the campus community, those who advocate for Palestinian rights, to determine whether the speaker is applying “double standards” to Israel or “demonizing” Israel. Moreover, enforcement of the Act’s requirements would compel speech (for example, by requiring someone to criticize policies of other nations when critiquing the Israeli government) in violation of the First Amendment. The resulting content and viewpoint-based discrimination, essentially a political litmus test, will violate speakers’ First Amendment rights.

Administrators, who have a legal duty to mitigate racially-hostile environments, would be pressured to restrict speech critical of Israel that anti-Palestinian rights groups routinely claim meets the criteria laid out in the redefinition. Under the mistaken illusion that it is appropriate to penalize such speech and advocacy, administrators may end up violating First Amendment rights, exposing universities and well-intentioned administrators to liability.<sup>20</sup>

Further, adoption of the redefinition would almost certainly have a chilling effect on constitutionally protected speech and academic inquiry related to Israel. Students, professors, and researchers will inevitably act in ways to avoid the specter of antisemitism accusations.<sup>21</sup>

### **III. Impact of the redefinition on protected expression**

In recent years, an increasing number of individuals and organizations inside the United States have sought to raise awareness of Israel’s military occupation and discriminatory treatment of Palestinians, with many of these discussions and activities taking place on college campuses. Different versions of the redefinition, including that endorsed by this Act, have been used to threaten forms of protected expression calling for Palestinian human rights.

In April 2019, a group of anonymous students filed a lawsuit asking the court to force the cancellation of a panel at the University of Massachusetts Amherst. The panel planned to discuss censorship of speech supporting Palestinian rights. The lawsuit argued that the IHRA redefinition of antisemitism justified a court order to cancel the event because the panelists’ criticism of Israel and its policies fell within that definition. The court rejected this argument, finding “nothing that would justify a prior restraint on speech” and no allegation that the panel “will include any other form of speech that is unprotected by the First Amendment.”<sup>22</sup>

---

[watch/wp/2016/12/07/how-legitimate-fear-over-bias-motivated-crimes-is-generating-potentially-unconstitutional-policies/?utm\\_term=.3e780ecbef4b](https://www.nytimes.com/2016/12/07/how-legitimate-fear-over-bias-motivated-crimes-is-generating-potentially-unconstitutional-policies/?utm_term=.3e780ecbef4b); Jesse Singal, *The Anti-Anti-Semitism Bill the ADL Is Pushing Is (Still) Such a Free-Speech Mess*, NEW YORK MAGAZINE, Dec. 7, 2016, <http://nymag.com/intelligencer/2016/12/the-adl-is-pushing-a-bad-anti-free-speech-campus-law.html?gtm=top&gtm=bottom>.

<sup>20</sup> See, e.g., *White v. Lee*, 227 F.3d 1214, 1237 (9th Cir. 2000), in which the court denied qualified immunity to Department of Housing and Urban Development officials who investigated protected speech activity – like op-eds, protests and pamphlets – causing unconstitutional chilling effects. The investigators were looking into alleged violations of unlawful intimidation under the Fair Housing Act.

<sup>21</sup> See, e.g., *Monteiro v. Tempe Union High School Dist.*, 158 F.3d 1022, 1029 (9th Cir. 1998) (finding that legal complaints based on speech protected by the First Amendment have far-ranging and deleterious effects, and the mere threat of civil liability can cause schools to “buy their peace” by avoiding controversial material).

<sup>22</sup> *Doe v. Manning*, No. 2019-01308-H (Mass. Sup. Ct., Suffolk Div., May 3, 2019) (denying motion for preliminary injunction), available at <http://palestinelegal.org/s/Doe-v-Manning-19cv1308-Decision-on-Ps-Mtn-Injunctive-Relief.pdf>. See also Democracy Now!, *Mass. Judge Refuses to Halt Pro-Palestinian Event at UMass Featuring*

In April 2019, professor and former Harvard University president Larry Summers cited the redefinition to label educational activities at Harvard antisemitic. Summers was criticizing Harvard students' Israel Apartheid Week, during which they aimed to educate their peers about Israel's application of different sets of laws to Palestinians and Jewish Israelis. He claimed the events were antisemitic "in both effect and intent" according to the redefinition.<sup>23</sup>

A November 2018 vigil organized by Jewish students at UC Berkeley to jointly mourn the deaths of Palestinian children killed in Gaza and Jewish people killed in the Pittsburgh massacre<sup>24</sup> is now the subject of a Title VI complaint to OCR.<sup>25</sup> Attorneys who filed the complaint alleged that the vigil was to portray "Israel as a barbarian and racist nation," falling under the IHRA definition being applied by Marcus's OCR, and said the students who organized the vigil should be expelled.<sup>26</sup> Instead of the planned public event, students held a small private vigil due to the threats and intimidation.

Referencing the U.S. State Department's definition of antisemitism, the Indiana University campus branch of an Israel lobby group attempted to censor a November 2018 talk about Palestinian rights delivered by Jamil Dakwar, a prominent international human rights lawyer and director of the ACLU's Human Rights Program.<sup>27</sup> The talk proceeded only after the student council rejected several attempts to censor the speaker.

These are only a few of many examples of university members being targeted for their political speech activities. In each of these cases, the speakers and students had to go to significant lengths to defend their right to speak out for Palestinian rights, under the threat of censorship. Instead of safeguarding Jewish community members against discrimination, the redefinition endorsed by the Act is being weaponized to scrutinize and censor protected speech, targeting viewpoints critical of Israel and chilling one side of an important political debate.

#### IV. Conclusion

The Act's reliance on an overbroad and vague redefinition of antisemitism fails to offer the proper tools to fight antisemitism and other forms of discrimination in the education context. Instead, it will encourage schools and universities to infringe on protected speech in violation of the First Amendment and encourage attacks on human rights defenders.

We urge you to drop consideration of this bill and, instead, engage in meaningful efforts to address anti-Jewish, racist, anti-Muslim, anti-immigrant, and anti-LGBTQ incidents and other

---

Roger Waters & Linda Sarsour, May 3, 2019,

[https://www.democracynow.org/2019/5/3/mass\\_judge\\_refuses\\_to\\_halt\\_pro](https://www.democracynow.org/2019/5/3/mass_judge_refuses_to_halt_pro).

<sup>23</sup> Lawrence H. Summers (@LHSummers), Twitter (Apr. 4, 2019, 9:34 AM),

<https://twitter.com/LHSummers/status/1113842399183351808>.

<sup>24</sup> Students for Justice in Palestine at UC Berkeley, *Joint Statement on Vigil With Jewish Voice for Peace at Berkeley*, Facebook (Nov. 9, 2018), <https://www.facebook.com/notes/students-for-justice-in-palestine-at-uc-berkeley/joint-statement-on-vigil-with-jewish-voice-for-peace-at-berkeley/1917395535013465/>.

<sup>25</sup> Aaron Bandler, *Pro-Israel Students File Complaint to Department of Education About SJP Vigil at Berkeley*, JEWISH JOURNAL, Nov. 13, 2018, <http://jewishjournal.com/news/nation/241882/pro-israel-students-file-complaint-department-education-sjp-vigil-berkeley/>.

<sup>26</sup> *Id.*

<sup>27</sup> Palestine Legal, IIPAC Tries to Censor Jamil Dakwar's Lecture at Indiana University, Dec. 17, 2018, <https://palestinelegal.org/news/2018/12/17/iipac-jamil-dakwar?rq=jamil%20dakwar>.

forms of discrimination that threaten vulnerable communities. This bill will ultimately undermine civil liberties, while failing to address real bigotry in schools and on campuses.

Sincerely,

American-Arab Anti-Discrimination Committee (ADC)

American Muslims for Palestine (AMP)

AMP of New Jersey

Center for Constitutional Rights

Council on American-Islamic Relations (CAIR)

CAIR New Jersey

Jewish Voice for Peace

Jewish Voice for Peace of Central New Jersey

Jewish Voice for Peace of Northern New Jersey

National Lawyers Guild International Committee

Palestinian American Community Center (PACC)

Palestine Legal

Partnership for Civil Justice Fund

Project South

US Campaign for Palestinian Rights