



Task Force on Preventing and
Responding to Antisemitism

FINAL REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Submitted:

March 31, 2017

Task Force on Preventing and Responding to Antisemitism

Final Report and Recommendations

March 31, 2017

Introduction

In Spring 2016, the President convened a Task Force on Preventing and Responding to Antisemitism in response to a number of antisemitic incidents that had occurred on campus earlier that year. These incidents, occurring in a short period of time relative to each other, provided a compelling reason for the university to focus intentionally on this form of prejudice and bias. Sue Guenter-Schlesinger, Vice Provost for Equal Opportunity and Employment Diversity, was asked to chair the Task Force, with membership that included faculty, staff, administrators, and students (**Membership at Attachment 1**). Since its formation, the Task Force has promoted engagement and dialogue about antisemitism and included antisemitism within broader discussions focused on marginalized groups, prejudice, and discrimination.

The Task Force was charged with recommending ways to educate the campus community about antisemitism and the negative impacts of antisemitic actions targeting Jewish members of the Western community (**Charter at Attachment 2**). In undertaking work to develop recommendations, the scope of the Task Force included the following:

- Review of the impact of antisemitism in historical and contemporary contexts;
- Review of best practices to prevent and respond to expressed concerns of antisemitism;
- Consult with and seek input from various members of the Western community to inform recommendations.

In order to accomplish these goals, the Task Force convened three subcommittees. Results of the work undertaken by these subcommittees provided the foundation for and informed the Task Force's recommendations. Summaries of the subcommittees' work are provided in **Sections I – III** of this Report. The Task Force's resulting recommendations are contained in **Section IV**.

This Report is respectfully submitted to the President who will share it with the Vice Presidents.

Section I: Report of the Subcommittee on Antisemitism in Historical and Contemporary Contexts

Subcommittee members: Brian Burton, Steven Garfinkle, Mark Greenberg, and Emily Weiner

As a beginning, and with the hope of bringing the University community to a greater understanding of antisemitism, we present first a brief summary of the history of antisemitism around the world, an invitation to consider definitions of antisemitism, and a summary of manifestations of antisemitism as experienced on college and university campuses. We start with history because, however defined and experienced by individuals, antisemitism is a real phenomenon that is thousands of years old. Context is vital for understanding antisemitism as experienced in the present.

Antisemitism: A Brief History

Antisemitism is a form of ethnic, cultural, and religious prejudice and hatred directed towards Jews with historical antecedents that date back to Classical Antiquity. The large and diverse cities of the Hellenistic Mediterranean (cities like Alexandria and Caesarea in the third through first centuries BC) witnessed the first recorded acts of public violence and massacre against Jews based on their ethnic and religious identity. Roman violence against Jews was pursued at times as official policy when foreign religions were seen as a threat to the cohesiveness of the empire and the stability of Roman rule. This continued after Christianity became the focus of Roman state religion and provided a basis for the destruction in late antiquity of prominent synagogues throughout Europe and the Mediterranean.

The early Christian era witnessed the growth of antisemitism in part as official practice, since the Church placed communal blame on Jews for the death of Jesus. Some Church fathers argued that this allowed for the killing of Jews. In spite of numerous ecclesiastical rejections of this position, this libel continues to inspire antisemitism and violence against Jews to the present day.

Antisemitism was a virulent part of the culture of Europe in the Middle Ages and beyond, and this has continuing influence on the treatment of Jews in modern societies. Certain negative themes characterized the historical development of antisemitism (for example: Jews as loyal only to other Jews and not to the states, nations, or communities in which they are members; and Jews seeking worldwide power through secret means) and negative stereotypes (for example: Jews as greedy or cheap).

These negative images of Jews were often fostered and nurtured by the prejudices that inspired them. In much of Europe during the Middle Ages and the Renaissance, Jews were forced to live apart from surrounding communities -- in many cases in ghettos -- and they were forbidden from participating in a variety of professions as well as in government service. This forced dislocation fed the ideas that Jews were not loyal to the larger community and that they focused on certain professions, such as money lending. These pervasive negative stereotypes can be seen in contemporary literature (see Shakespeare's *Merchant of Venice*, and its portrayal of Shylock), but they also repeatedly played out in government policies to displace and dispossess Jews.

In Medieval Europe, the crusades expressed themselves in a virulent antisemitism, as well as in some of the earliest expressions of Islamophobia. The “People’s Crusade” at the end of the 11th century preceded the formal crusades and included widespread pogroms against Jews along the Rhine and in other parts of Germany, which resulted in the deaths of thousands. [A pogrom is an organized massacre of a particular ethnic group. The term is often used in connection with organized violence against Jews in eastern Europe in the early modern and modern eras. Pogroms were especially common in Imperial Russia in the 19th century following its expansion into Poland and the Ukraine.]

Widespread violence occurred throughout Europe, including in England. In 1190, the Jewish community of York (numbering approximately 150) was massacred. In 1290, Jews were expelled from England and not allowed to return until the 17th century. In 1492, Ferdinand and Isabella ordered the expulsion of all Jews from Spain who had not already been forcibly converted as a result of religious persecution and mob violence against them over the previous century. (This decree was not formally overturned until 1968). Such expulsions happened periodically throughout Europe in the 13th through 16th centuries. These actions went hand in hand with longstanding claims that Jews exercised a malignant influence on the communities that harbored them. During periods of the plague in Europe, Jews were often blamed for its appearance and spread. This was also the era in which the so-called “blood libel” took hold -- a claim that Jews used the blood of Christian victims in certain ritual celebrations.

The prejudice against Jews received some clerical support as well. For example, Martin Luther, late in his life, published extensively on the subject of Jews in Europe. In a work that was repeatedly reprinted during his lifetime, *On Jews and Their Lies*, Luther counseled the destruction of Jews and their property and their expulsion from Christian communities. This advice was periodically taken up throughout the Christian kingdoms of Europe, and in some cases Jewish communities were asked to pay for the right to remain.

Secular antisemitism flourished among so-called enlightenment thinkers as well. Voltaire’s writings contained numerous anti-Jewish statements and perpetuated negative stereotypes that undoubtedly influenced the treatment of Jews in western Europe. One of the most famous incidents involved the prosecution and imprisonment of Alfred Dreyfus, a French military officer who was falsely accused of giving military secrets to the Germans. This long history and these destructive prejudices lay at the heart of modern antisemitism, a term first coined in the late 19th century in Germany. The earliest references to the term “antisemite” date to this era when Germans and others in western Europe used it to describe their anti-Jewish sentiment.

The beginning of antisemitism in the 20th century was marked by the appearance of an especially pernicious text created in Russia but purported to be of Jewish origin, which “exposed” a plot on the part of worldwide Jewry to achieve global domination. The *Protocols of the Elders of Zion* claimed to be the report of a secret meeting of powerful Jews but was instead a forgery invented in Russia and translated and published all over the world, including in the United States where the industrialist Henry Ford funded its printing. Although long ago exposed as a hoax, the text continues to receive endorsements from politicians in the Middle East and Europe in the 21st century.

The Holocaust stands out as the most violent and destructive episode in the history of

antisemitism. The hateful ideology of the Nazis, expressed by Hitler and others throughout the 1920s and 1930s brought together various strains of antisemitism and targeted Jews and other ethnic and religious minorities as sub-humans and threats to Aryan society. Following their rise to power and the extension of that power over much of Europe, the Nazi regime carried out the planned extinction of the Jews and their removal from modern society. As a result of this, much of European Jewry was extinguished, and 6,000,000 Jewish men, women, and children were murdered.

Since the second half of the 20th century, the existence of the State of Israel has both confused and exacerbated the issue of antisemitism, especially in the Middle East, Europe, and the United States. We note at the outset that not all criticism of Israel is antisemitic. As with the rest of the modern world, legitimate criticism of any state is a natural part of political affairs. At the same time, there is a line between legitimate criticism and incendiary prejudice. Criticism of Israel that is based on antisemitic themes or tropes or that holds the state to standards not applied elsewhere in the world crosses that boundary. Moreover, targeting Jews and Jewish institutions outside of Israel in response to decisions taken in Israel constitutes another example of antisemitic anti-Israel rhetoric.

Recent events at Western, and those in the national news, make clear that antisemitism as a form of hate and prejudice remains embedded in modern society alongside other pernicious types of intolerance. We hope that this document helps both to educate our community and to combat hate speech and antisemitic actions of any type.

The tragic history of antisemitism can be seen to arise from several different sources; just so, as people have grappled with antisemitism, they view it through different lenses, which at their heart have different definitions of antisemitism in thought, word, and deed. The following section illustrates the complexity of the definitional question and invites us as individuals and a community to consider this question ourselves.

Defining Antisemitism

Antisemitism harms everyone by degrading the educational experience. It reduces complexity to the simplistic. It prejudices rather than welcoming new understanding. It marginalizes voices rather than broadening discussion. It drives intellectual and social wedges rather than building bridges. It scapegoats instead of exploring collective responsibility. Antisemitism is wholly incompatible with Western's educational mission.

In order to educate the Western community to better understand antisemitism and its negative impacts, including how to prevent and respond to it, a university-wide conversation about the definition of antisemitism must first occur. The process of discussing and developing a "working definition" can help to frame historical and contemporary contexts, build a common vocabulary, increase consistency when comparing and contrasting events or situations, raise awareness about where particular speech or actions may shade into antisemitism, and reduce incidents of

antisemitism at Western.¹ In essence, dialog is a form of action. Efforts to define and prevent antisemitism must not infringe upon First Amendment rights or academic freedom. Instead, efforts to develop a “working definition” should be framed in an educational context that advances Western’s commitment to “an atmosphere where students, faculty, and staff interact and engage in effective and courageous conversations, modeling a process of social development through civil discourse.”²

It is not the Task Force’s intent to impose a definition of antisemitism, but discussions about a contemporary working definition should be grounded in scholarship and public policy that recognize the term’s evolution over time. In the early 19th century, scholars applied the term “Semitic” to the family of Middle Eastern and northeast African languages that include Hebrew, Aramaean, Arabic, Ethiopic, and ancient Assyrian. Semite also referred to the descendants of Noah’s son Shem in the Bible. There is no such thing as “Semitism;” Jews do not constitute a single linguistic group or race; and antisemitism historically was used exclusively to denote antipathy toward Jews; therefore, the spelling “anti-Semitism” conveys erroneous meaning on multiple levels.³

The word antisemitism dates to late 19th-century Germany. In 1879, Wilhelm Marr founded the Antisemiten-Liga (League of Antisemitism), a group that railed against Jews’ failure to assimilate fully into German society, alleged a race war between Germans and Jews, and advocated for Jews’ removal from the country. An 1882 German dictionary entry echoed Marr’s race-based belief that antisemitism stemmed from Jews’ perceived behavior when it defined an antisemite as someone “who hates Jews or opposes Judaism in general, and struggles against the character traits and intentions of the Semites.”⁴ According to the Oxford English Dictionary (OED), the first published evidence of the word “anti-Semite” or “anti-Semitism” in English occurred in the British periodical *The Athenaeum* (London, 1881 and 1882). OED’s editors also place antisemitism in exclusively Jewish terms – “hostility and prejudice directed against Jewish people; (also) the theory, action, or practice resulting from this.” In 1950, Theodor W. Adorno identified an ideological dimension to antisemitism: “stereotyped negative opinions describing the Jews as threatening, immoral, and categorically different from non-Jews, and of hostile attitudes urging various forms of restriction, exclusion, and suppression as a means of solving ‘the Jewish problem.’”⁵ Nearly forty years later, Helen Fein emphasized antisemitism’s cultural elements, consisting of “a persisting latent structure of hostile beliefs toward Jews as a collectivity manifested in *individuals* as attitudes, and in *culture* as myth, ideology, folklore, and imagery, and in *actions* – social or legal discrimination, political mobilization against Jews, and collective or state violence – which results in and/or is designed to distance, displace, or destroy

¹ Kenneth L. Marcus, “Why Universities Need a Definition of Anti-Semitism,” *Jewish Advocate*, July 17, 2015.

² “Diversity at Western,” <http://www.wvu.edu/diversity/index.shtml>.

³ Philologos, “Should Anti-Semitism Be Hyphenated?” *The Forward*, November 18, 2012; Doris L. Bergen, *War and Genocide: A Concise History of the Holocaust*. (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 2009), p. 4.

⁴ Kenneth L. Marcus, “The Definition of Antisemitism,” in Charles Asher Small, ed., *Antisemitism: A Crisis of Modernity* (Leiden, NL: Brill, 2013), p. 98.

⁵ Theodor W. Adorno, et al., *The Authoritarian Personality*, 1st ed. (New York: Harper, 1950), p. 71.

Jews as Jews.”⁶

While scholars and other thinkers have redefined antisemitism numerous times since the 1880s to reflect the place, politics, and culture of the time, few policy makers debated the meaning of the word until the 1990s. In the last quarter century, the growing list of local, regional, and international tensions blamed on Jews -- among them political and social unrest between the State of Israel and the Palestinians, the First and Second Gulf Wars, the “War on Terror,” globalization, and mass migration and dislocation -- troubled policy makers in Europe and the United States and spurred them to action. Three definitions -- one from the European Union Monitoring Center on Racism and Xenophobia (EUMC), another from the U.S. State Department, and a third from the International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance in 2016 -- offer excellent options to promote discussion at Western.

Following a series of reports on and denunciations of the increasingly virulent and violent antisemitic activity disrupting European life, the EUMC partnered with the American Jewish Committee, and Organization for Security and Co-Operation in Europe’s Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights to proffer a definition of antisemitism in January 2005.⁷ The EUMC definition is designed to deal not with bigoted beliefs about or images of Jews but instead with rhetoric and actions directed toward them. It is intended as a practical, early 21st-century tool for western democracies to monitor and evaluate incidents of antisemitism that allow observers to gauge, compare, and ultimately combat antisemitism. To that end, the EUMC language is a “working definition,” complete with examples. The document reads:

Antisemitism is a certain perception of Jews, which may be expressed as hatred toward Jews. Rhetorical and physical manifestations of antisemitism are directed toward Jewish or non-Jewish individuals and/or their property, toward Jewish community institutions and religious facilities.

In addition, such manifestations could also target the state of Israel, conceived as a Jewish collectivity. Antisemitism frequently charges Jews with conspiring to harm humanity, and it is often used to blame Jews for “why things go wrong.” It is expressed in speech, writing, visual forms and action, and employs sinister stereotypes and negative character traits.

Contemporary examples of antisemitism in public life, the media, schools, the workplace, and in the religious sphere could, taking into account the overall context, include, but are not limited to:

- *Calling for, aiding, or justifying the killing or harming of Jews in the name of a radical ideology or an extremist view of religion.*
- *Making mendacious, dehumanizing, demonizing, or stereotypical allegations about Jews as such or the power of Jews as collective — such as, especially but not exclusively, the*

⁶ Helen Fein, "Dimensions of Antisemitism: Attitudes, Collective Accusations and Actions," in Helen Fein, ed. *The Persisting Question: Sociological Perspectives and Social Contexts of Modern Antisemitism*, Current Research on Antisemitism (Berlin: De Gruyter, 1987), p. 67.

⁷ European Parliament Working Group On Antisemitism, “EUMC Working Definition of Antisemitism,” <http://www.antisem.eu/projects/eumc-working-definition-of-antisemitism/>.

myth about a world Jewish conspiracy or of Jews controlling the media, economy, government or other societal institutions.

- *Accusing Jews as a people of being responsible for real or imagined wrongdoing committed by a single Jewish person or group, or even for acts committed by non-Jews.*
- *Denying the fact, scope, mechanisms (e.g. gas chambers) or intentionality of the genocide of the Jewish people at the hands of National Socialist Germany and its supporters and accomplices during World War II (the Holocaust).*
- *Accusing the Jews as a people, or Israel as a state, of inventing or exaggerating the Holocaust.*
- *Accusing Jewish citizens of being more loyal to Israel, or to the alleged priorities of Jews worldwide, than to the interests of their own nations.*

In what has become the most controversial section of the working definition, the EUMC included examples it believes essential to understanding antisemitism in the early 21st century – specifically, connections between antisemitism and Israel:

Examples of the ways in which antisemitism manifests itself with regard to the State of Israel taking into account the overall context could include:

- *Denying the Jewish people their right to self-determination, e.g., by claiming that the existence of a State of Israel is a racist endeavor.*
- *Applying double standards by requiring of it a behavior not expected or demanded of any other democratic nation.*
- *Using the symbols and images associated with classic antisemitism (e.g., claims of Jews killing Jesus or blood libel) to characterize Israel or Israelis.*
- *Drawing comparisons of contemporary Israeli policy to that of the Nazis.*
- *Holding Jews collectively responsible for actions of the state of Israel.*

However, criticism of Israel similar to that leveled against any other country cannot be regarded as antisemitic.

Antisemitic acts are criminal when they are so defined by law (for example, denial of the Holocaust or distribution of antisemitic materials in some countries).

Criminal acts are antisemitic when the targets of attacks, whether they are people or property – such as buildings, schools, places of worship and cemeteries – are selected because they are, or are perceived to be, Jewish or linked to Jews.

Antisemitic discrimination is the denial to Jews of opportunities or services available to others and is illegal in many countries.

The U.S. Department of State’s Special Envoy to Monitor and Combat Anti-Semitism released its own contemporary definition in June 2010 and reissued it in January 2017, based in significant part on the EUMC language.⁸ On connections between antisemitism and Israel, the Department of State suggested three Ds – demonization, double standard, and delegitimization as

⁸ U.S. Department of State, “Defining Anti-Semitism,” <https://www.state.gov/s/rga/resources/267538.htm>.

examples where antisemitism and anti-Israel or anti-Zionism expression or actions might intersect. The State Department document asked:

What is Anti-Semitism Relative to Israel?

EXAMPLES of the ways in which anti-Semitism manifests itself with regard to the state of Israel, taking into account the overall context could include:

DEMONIZE ISRAEL:

- *Using the symbols and images associated with classic anti-Semitism to characterize Israel or Israelis*
- *Drawing comparisons of contemporary Israeli policy to that of the Nazis*
- *Blaming Israel for all inter-religious or political tensions*

DOUBLE STANDARD FOR ISRAEL:

- *Applying double standards by requiring of it a behavior not expected or demanded of any other democratic nation*
- *Multilateral organizations focusing on Israel only for peace or human rights investigations*

DELEGITIMIZE ISRAEL:

- *Denying the Jewish people their right to self-determination, and denying Israel the right to exist*

However, criticism of Israel similar to that leveled against any other country cannot be regarded as anti-Semitic.

In its May 2016 definition, the [International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance](#) adopted some sections of the EUMC and U.S. State Department language but omitted or revised other sections pertaining to Israel in order to reduce emphasis on this particular form of antisemitism and thus to seek wider acceptance within the international community.⁹

The inclusion of anti-Israel or anti-Zionist speech or actions in a working definition of antisemitism has been particularly controversial and can derail broader efforts to define and prevent antisemitic rhetoric and actions unrelated to Israel or Zionism. Critics of the EUMC and U.S. State Department documents have expressed strong opposition, arguing that they threaten First Amendment rights, academic freedom, and chill public discourse. The Task Force recognizes the legitimacy and importance of this concern. The Task Force believes that criticism of Israel is not the place to start a conversation about antisemitism but instead is a place to advance toward. Any successful effort to understand, educate, and combat antisemitism must first explore the meaning and centuries-long history of antisemitism – a history that long predates

⁹ Romanian Chairmanship 2016, Working Definition of Antisemitism, May 26, 2016, International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance.

Zionism and the creation of the State of Israel. The Task Force fully endorses robust discussions about Israel and Zionism and calls attention to situations when stereotypes, images, and accusations historically leveled at Jews or Judaism are reframed in political terms to describe Israel and Zionism. It is neither accurate nor helpful to Western's educational mission to claim that all criticism of Zionism or Israel is antisemitic. Conversely, it is equally erroneous and unhelpful to that mission to claim that no criticism of Israel or Zionism can be antisemitic. The key is to understand if, when, or how historical antisemitic themes and tropes have found their way into discussion about Israel and Zionism – situations where Israel is framed as the “Jew among nations.”

Instead, the Task Force recommends a nuanced approach to identifying antisemitic rhetoric and actions. It recognizes that some statements and behaviors cross clear boundaries and require decisive intervention. Other alleged antisemitic statements may be harder to categorize. Specific wording, context, repetition, patterns, and response to challenge may serve as guideposts. The Task Force further understands that individuals bring their own perspectives and sensitivities to topics involving Jews and antisemitism. Some may believe their statements or actions innocuous while others might take great offense. In these cases, the Task Force recommends discussion and remedies consistent with allegations of sexism, racism, or homophobia. For example, individuals should no more quickly accept or dismiss an allegation of antisemitism leveled by a Jewish student than they would a charge of racism leveled by a student of color. In both situations, respectful clarification, conversation, and, if necessary, remedy are in order.

Whether or not Western chooses to adopt a single, university-wide definition of antisemitism, the deliberate, thoughtful, informed, and ongoing discussion of the term offers significant educational and practical opportunities to advance an inclusive teaching and learning environment. Discourse grounded in scholarship and effective teaching practices promises to build understanding about Jews and the Jewish experience, to highlight the corrosive impact of bigoted rhetoric and actions targeting Jews on university life and broader society, and to advance challenging conversations on local, regional, and global topics in respectful ways. Cultivating this kind of educational environment is fundamental to eliminating antisemitism at Western.

In addition to understanding the history of antisemitism and considering its definition, we must understand its behavioral manifestations on college and university campuses, at Western and elsewhere. This is important because to combat antisemitism we must know in what forms it will strike us.

Particular Forms of Antisemitism Seen on College and University Campuses

Nationwide

According to a 2014 survey of Jewish college students issued by the Louis D. Brandeis Center for Human Rights Under Law and Trinity College,¹⁰ more than half of self-identified Jewish

¹⁰ Barry A. Kosmin and Ariela Keysar, “National Demographic Survey of American Jewish College Students 2014: Anti-Semitism Report,” Louis D. Brandeis Center for Human Rights Under Law and Trinity College, February,

students experienced or witnessed antisemitism on their campuses. The most common antisemitic incidents occurred as part of everyday life. They included rude or disparaging remarks from individuals, with 29% of respondents experiencing antisemitism from an individual student; 10% in clubs or societies; 10% in other contexts (such as graffiti, noticeboards, flyers, social media and emails with hostile content as well as the defacing and tearing down of posters of Jewish student organizations); 8% in a lecture or class; 4% in the student union; and 3% by their university administrative system.

The final item in the 2014 survey asked *“In your opinion, what are the crucial issues concerning young Jewish people like yourself today?”* One student’s answer highlights a common experience of Jewish college students: *“Subtle anti-Semitism – it’s the ‘last socially acceptable form of racism.’”*

To identify and understand contemporary incidents of antisemitism on college campuses nationwide, it is important to note that historic forms of antisemitism described above are being repeated. An excellent guide to the most common motifs in antisemitic discourse is the 4-page “Fact Sheet on the Elements of Anti-Semitic Discourse” published by the Louis D. Brandeis Center for Human Rights Under Law.¹¹

One of the most persistent antisemitic stereotypes has been the portrayal of Jews as loyal only to other Jews and not to the states, nations, or communities of which they are members. The barring of European Jews from government service during the Middle Ages and the Renaissance, as well as under Nazi rule, echoed recently at several American universities. In 2015, UCLA’s student council voted against a Jewish student serving on the judicial review board after posing the following question: “Given that you’re a Jewish student and very active in the Jewish community, how do you see yourself being able to maintain an unbiased view?” During the deliberations, another student commented, “I don’t know. For some reason I am not comfortable. I just don’t know why. I can definitely see she’s qualified. I am just worried about her affiliations.” (The vote was reversed after a school administrator intervened in the deliberations.) The same year, a Jewish member of the student government at University of Santa Cruz received a text message saying he should abstain from a vote on a pro-BDS (Boycott, Divestment and Sanctions movement) resolution because he was president of the school’s Jewish Student Union and was elected on a “Jewish agenda.”¹²

The historic isolation of Jews is also being echoed on college campuses when Jews are prevented from participating in student activities. In a *New York Times* op-ed column October 1, 2016,¹³ a

2015, <http://www.trincoll.edu/NewsEvents/NewsArticles/Documents/Anti-Semitism%20Report%20Final.pdf>.

¹¹ Kenneth L. Marcus, “Fact Sheet on the Elements of Anti-Semitic Discourse,” Louis D. Brandeis Center for Human Rights Under Law, http://www.ohchr.org/Documents/AboutUs/CivilSociety/ReportHC/75_The%20Louis%20D.%20Brandeis%20Center%20Fact%20Sheet%20Anti-Semitism.pdf.

¹²Sean Savage, “UC Santa Cruz student warned to abstain from BDS vote over ‘Jewish agenda,’” Jewish News Service, <http://www.jns.org/latest-articles/2015/11/18/uc-santa-cruz-student-warned-to-abstain-from-bds-vote-over-jewish-agenda#.WFHCGX0vw6F>.

¹³ Benjamin Gladstone, “Anti-Semitism at My University, Hidden in Plain Sight,” *New York Times*, October 1,

Brown University student, Benjamin Gladstone, described many of the common experiences of antisemitism faced by Jewish college students across the country. He wrote, in part:

“Last semester, a group came to Providence to speak against admitting Syrian refugees to this country. As the president of the Brown Coalition for Syria, I jumped into action with my peers to stage a counter demonstration. But I quickly found myself cut out of the planning for this event: Other student groups were not willing to work with me because of my leadership roles in campus Jewish organizations.

“That was neither the first nor the last time that I would be ostracized this way. Also last semester, anti-Zionists at Brown circulated a petition against a lecture by the transgender rights advocate Janet Mock because one of the sponsors was the Jewish campus group Hillel, even though the event was entirely unrelated to Israel or Zionism. Ms. Mock, who planned to talk about racism and transphobia, ultimately canceled. Anti-Zionist students would rather have no one speak on these issues than allow a Jewish group to participate in that conversation.

Gladstone went on to describe two other echoes of historic antisemitism:

My fellow activists tend to dismiss the anti-Semitism that students like me experience regularly on campus. They don’t acknowledge the swastikas that I see carved into bathroom stalls, scrawled across walls or left on chalkboards. They don’t hear students accusing me of killing Jesus.

The “University of California Jewish Student Campus Climate Fact-Finding Team Report and Recommendations”¹⁴ reported that in 2010 and 2011 the use of the swastika drawn next to, or integrated with, the Jewish Star of David was commonplace. The appearance of swastikas explicitly targeting Jewish students continues to be widely reported, including here at Western Washington University.

While criticism of the State of Israel is not inherently antisemitic, on college campuses across the country and around the world, antisemitic incidents are happening alongside and interspersed with criticism of Israel—incidents that have included assault, harassment, Holocaust denial, disruption, and intimidation against participation in activities sponsored by Jewish organizations. An understanding of this political context is necessary to recognize and respond to antisemitism at Western. Scholars, organizations, political leaders, and government agencies have written extensively on how to distinguish between those forms of hostility to Israel that are antisemitic and those that are not—including detailed analysis in Kenneth L. Marcus’s 2015 book, *The Definition of Anti-Semitism*.¹⁵

2016, <http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/02/opinion/sunday/anti-semitism-at-my-university-hidden-in-plain-sight.html>.

¹⁴ Richard “Rick” D. Barton and Alice Huffman, “University of California Jewish Student Campus Climate Fact-Finding Team Report & Recommendations: President’s Advisory Council on Campus Climate, Culture, & Inclusion,” <https://cascholars4academicfreedom.files.wordpress.com/2012/07/jewish-climate-fact-finding-report-july-2012-final.pdf>.

¹⁵ Kenneth L. Marcus, *The Definition of Anti-Semitism*, Oxford University Press, New York, 2015.

Many of the campus incidents that conflate antisemitism and anti-Zionism employ language that was used by the Nazis. In March 2015, “Zionists should be sent to the gas chamber” was etched into a bathroom wall at UC Berkeley.¹⁶ At the University of Central Florida in November 2015, a newsstand outside a dormitory was defaced with two stickers -- one showing a swastika on a flag with a superimposed message calling for a boycott of Israel, the second showing a Jewish star labelled “1%” and “Bankers.”¹⁷ The stereotype of Jewry as wealthy, powerful, and greedy can be traced to the Middle Ages and figured prominently in Nazi propaganda.

Another antisemitic stereotype holds American-Jewish students responsible for actions of the government of Israel—assigning collective guilt reminiscent of the antisemitic notion that “the Jews killed Christ.”

Since ancient times, Jews have been falsely accused of killing Gentiles for ritual purposes. Kenneth Marcus reported that this so-called “blood libel” reappeared at San Francisco State University in 2002 when students circulated a flyer that featured a picture of a dead baby on a can accompanied by the words, “Palestinian Children Meat—Slaughtered According to Jewish Rites under American License.”¹⁸

Western Washington University

From Spring Quarter 2016 through Winter Quarter 2017, the Equal Opportunity Office (EO Office) was made aware of 11 incidents involving acts of antisemitism, including the use of swastikas or other anti-Jewish symbols and/or hate language (e.g. Nazi vocabulary). In response to these incidents, and to the extent possible given that most of the perpetrators were unknown and could not be identified, the EO Office investigated or conducted inquiries into these incidents. This office also met with the targeted individuals to inform them about available counseling and support resources. When the incident perpetrator(s) were known, the EO Office met with these individual(s) to engage in educational conversations highlighting the impact that acts of antisemitism have on targeted individual(s) and the broader community. This office also coordinated and worked with University Residences and the Office of Student Life when sanctions were issued.

Post-Election Considerations

While antisemitism has existed in American society previous to the national election in 2016, the United States has seen a surge of white nationalist activity, including an alarming increase in the use of hate symbols like swastikas or other SS-insignias to deface property. The use of the swastika symbol evokes the Nazi extermination of six million Jews and is therefore violently

¹⁶ Anti-Defamation League, “Anti-Semitic Incidents on College Campuses in 2015,” May 27, 2015, <http://newyork.adl.org/anti-semitic-incidents-on-college-campuses-in-2015/>.

¹⁷ Rachel S Stuart, “UCF newsstand vandalized with anti-Semitic stickers,” *Central Florida Future*, November 15, 2015, <http://www.centralfloridafuture.com/story/news/2015/11/15/ucf-newsstand-vandalized-anti-semitic-stickers/75847076/>.

¹⁸ Barton and Huffman, “University of California Jewish Student Campus Climate Fact-Finding Team Report & Recommendations: President’s Advisory Council on Campus Climate, Culture, & Inclusion.”

antisemitic. One or more types of hate speech -- racist, anti-Muslim, anti-immigrant, anti-LGBTQ, antisemitic (as well as hate speech against other groups) -- often accompany these acts of aggression.

The Southern Poverty Law Center has reported a national increase in hate crimes post-election.¹⁹ In recent weeks the United States has seen a wave of antisemitism in the United States, including the desecration of cemeteries and over 160 bomb threats against Jewish institutions and community centers. On college campuses, white supremacists are currently engaged in racist and antisemitic activities, including an “unprecedented outreach effort to attract and recruit students” according to a report released by the Anti-Defamation League (ADL) on March 6, 2017. “White supremacist engagement tactics on campus range from the virtual, such as sending racist fliers to thousands of campus fax machines, to on the ground rallies and speaking engagements. More extremists are also making a point of visiting campuses to speak with students individually. This is part of a push to move their activism from online chatter to “real world” action.”²⁰

¹⁹ Mark Potok, “The Year in Hate and Extremism,” *Intelligence Report*, February 15, 2017, <https://www.splcenter.org/fighting-hate/intelligence-report/2017/year-hate-and-extremism>.

²⁰ Anti-Defamation League, “White Supremacists Making Unprecedented Effort on U.S. College Campuses to Spread Their Message, Recruit,” <https://www.adl.org/news/press-releases/adl-white-supremacists-making-unprecedented-effort-on-us-college-campuses-to>.

Section II: Report of the Subcommittee on Promising Practices

Subcommittee members: Eric Alexander, Sandra Alferts, Leonard Jones, & Emily Weiner

The original task of this subcommittee was to define “best practices” in reducing and responding to antisemitism. After initial conversations and research, including meetings with invited guests, the committee suggested initially that its goal may need to shift. This conclusion came from our discussions and philosophical stance that there are truly no “best practices,” given a) antisemitism still exists; and b) practices that work in one area or on one campus may or may not work here at Western. As such, the subcommittee embarked on the mission of researching and defining “promising practices” in preventing and responding to antisemitism. Some of the suggested promising practices found in the research looked like they were effective elsewhere, or looked potentially useful as they were made from nationally focused groups. However, it is the translation that will be the challenge for our Task Force to make them truly “best practices” for and at Western.

The subcommittee began its work during the summer of 2016, with the following ideas for methodology being offered as a pathway to understanding current practices for preventing and responding to antisemitism:

- 1) A review of the current literature focused on preventing and responding to antisemitism by different organizations;
- 2) A review of current standards of practice at comparable institutions; and
- 3) A review of reports and standards suggested by major agencies who are missioned to reduce and respond to antisemitism.

Primary resources included:

- a) “Best Practices Guide for Combating Campus Antisemitism and Anti-Israelism”²¹
- b) “National Demographic Survey of American Jewish College Students 2014: Antisemitism Report”²²
- c) “Anti-Semitism on Campus: A Clear-and-Present Danger”²³
- d) “Responding to Bigotry and Intergroup Strife on Campus: A Guide for University Presidents and Senior Administrators”²⁴

²¹ Kenneth L. Marcus, “Best Practices Guide for Combating Campus Anti-Semitism and Anti-Israelism,” Louis D. Brandeis Center for Human Rights Under Law, http://www.brandeiscenter.com/images/uploads/practices/guide_02.pdf.

²² Kosmin and Keysar, “National Demographic Survey of American Jewish College Students 2014: Anti-Semitism Report.”

²³ Harold Brackman, “Anti-Semitism on Campus: A Clear and Present Danger,” June 12, 2015, Simon Wiesenthal Center, http://www.wiesenthal.com/atf/cf/%7B54d385e6-f1b9-4e9f-8e94-890c3e6dd277%7D/CAMPUS-REPORT_HB_6-12-15.PDF.

²⁴ Anti-Defamation League, “Responding to Bigotry and Intergroup Strife on Campus: A Guide for College and University Presidents and Senior Administrators,” 2008.

From these reviews and internal conversations, the subcommittee has been able to develop areas of focus to create a holistic and robust model that describes the multiple areas of need in order to prevent and respond to antisemitism on campus. Below is the initial consolidation of our thinking and visual representation of the core elements we feel are essential practices, to include:

- 1) Clear Institutional Policies and Definitions
- 2) Transparent Reporting and Response Protocols
- 3) Focused Education and Training
- 4) Strengthen and Develop Interconnected Practice
- 5) Engaged Community Discourse
- 6) Support Leadership Development

Core Practices for Preventing and Responding to Antisemitism



Below we offer first thoughts and reflections on items for further discussion:

Clear Institutional Policies and Definitions

- 1) Develop a clear working definition of antisemitism (Kosmin & Keysar, 2015) to include a glossary of terms, for instance, the ADL publication “Fighting Back: A Handbook for Responding to Anti-Israel Campaigns on College & University Campuses” and/or the “ADL Fact Sheet on the Elements of Anti-Semitic Discourse.”²⁵
- 2) Develop and amend campus policies to include antisemitism.
- 3) Develop a sound response system to antisemitism, including clear communication by university leadership to convey that antisemitism and other forms of hate are inconsistent with our mission, norms, and values as well as symbolic community actions (e.g. “cleaning” symbols of hate). “The long-term goal of university leaders,” according to the LDB Best Practices Guide, “should be to define in their formal policies and procedures, anti-Semitism (and other forms of bias) with the same degree of specificity that they use to define sexual harassment.”

Transparent Reporting and Response Protocols

- 1) Reporting and response mechanisms must be readily available to campus community members.
- 2) These mechanisms should help to re-establish safety on the campus through appropriate intervention and responses that are “prompt, sensitive, and effective” (Kosmin & Keysar, 2015).
- 3) Prevent discrimination and hate crimes (Kosmin & Keysar, 2015).
- 4) Ensure campus police, security, and first responders/witnesses (i.e., custodial, student employees, RA’s, etc.) are trained in recognizing antisemitic activities and know how to report them/respond.
- 5) Annual reporting about antisemitism (and other bias incidents) should be made clear and available to the public (see University of Texas – Campus Climate Response Team at <http://diversity.utexas.edu/ccrt/>).
- 6) Develop accurate knowledge about the perpetrators (Kosmin & Keysar, 2015).
- 7) Ensure that any climate surveys or annual assessments include questions focused on students’ experiences with antisemitism (Kosmin & Keysar, 2015).

Focused Education and Training

- 1) Invest in staff, students, and faculty to participate in this process (gleaning time, talent, energy) with the possibility of specialized positions being created (we may not be able to simply add duties to current positions).
- 2) Recognize such participation in meaningful ways by incentivizing participation.
- 3) Involve staff, faculty, students, administrators in identifying classes and programs, creating programs and curriculum in a collaborative, transparent bottom-up process.
- 4) Provide staff to focus on and raise awareness about antisemitism, anti-Zionism, and understanding of issues (for example, the “Fact Sheet on the Elements of Anti-Semitic

²⁵ Marcus, “Fact Sheet on the Elements of Anti-Semitic Discourse.”

Discourse” as a guide). (Kosmin & Keysar, 2015)

- 5) Create programming and training which models ‘best practices’ of discourse (for example, intergroup dialogue). These can be ongoing and integrated into existing programs.

Strengthen and Develop Interconnected Practice

- 1) Identify existing programs, clubs/organizations, groups etc.; strengthen and connect them, also in tandem with others on campus.
- 2) Create intergroup coalition with both campus student groups and parent/partner groups in the community.
- 3) Include antisemitism prevention education and training in existing and future campus-wide training/educational programs.
- 4) Include working to prevent antisemitism and religious oppression into existing and future equity/diversity taskforces.
- 5) Connect university position on antisemitism to the position held on other forms of hate and bias (Kosmin & Keysar, 2015).

Engaged Community Discourse

- 1) Enhance social media literacy, critical thinking, and knowledge about antisemitism.
- 2) Ensure civility by continuously and regularly speaking about the environment we hope for at Western (Kosmin & Keysar, 2015).
- 3) Protect speech and the right for free speech (Kosmin & Keysar, 2015) and ensure time, place, and manner to prevent disruptions (<https://www.thefire.org/>).
- 4) There is a need to simultaneously define antisemitism and defend against it while also supporting the right for people to offer criticism, for example, of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict (Kosmin & Keysar, 2015).
- 5) Provide and create spaces for meaningful conversations among groups, with particular focus on intergroup dialogue (examples: Intergroup Relations Institute at UCLA <http://www.igr.ucla.edu/>; National Intergroup Dialogue Institute at the University of Michigan <https://igr.umich.edu/article/national-intergroup-dialogue-institute>; and the Intergroup Dialogue, Education, and Action [IDEA] Center at the University of Washington, <http://depts.washington.edu/sswidea/>).
- 6) Foster the improvement of interpersonal skills for critical conversations.

Support Leadership Development

- 1) Redefine (student) leadership to be more inclusive of students not in ‘official’ roles – via departments, programs, etc.
- 2) Redefine activism to be more inclusive of “dialogue as action,” versus simply seeing direct action organizing as the only mechanism to create change.
- 3) Support University administrative leadership, including the Presidency, in clearly

articulating and defining the “moral centers of the University and values for which the University stands,” particularly as related to antisemitism.²⁶

²⁶ “Responding to Bigotry and Intergroup Strife on Campus: A Guide for College and University Presidents and Senior Administrators”; and Marcus, “Best Practices Guide for Combating Campus Anti-Semitism and Anti-Israelism.”

Section III: Report of the Subcommittee on Gathering Input from Faculty, Staff and Student Governance and the University Community

Subcommittee members: Steven Garfinkle, Sue Guenter-Schlesinger, and Emily Weiner

The Task Force on Preventing and Responding to Antisemitism was charged with recommending ways to help educate the campus community in order to better understand, prevent, and respond to antisemitism and its negative impacts. To undertake these efforts, the Task Force was also charged with consulting and seeking input from various members of the Western community. In order to accomplish this goal, the Task Force created a subcommittee and consulted with faculty, staff, and student governance leaders, as well as additional members of the university and external communities. In addition, Sue Guenter-Schlesinger, Task Force Chair served on behalf of the Task Force in the role of liaison to the Chair of the President's Task Force on Equity, Inclusion and Diversity (President's Task Force on EID), Karen Dade. Steven Garfinkle and Sue Guenter-Schlesinger co-chaired this subcommittee.

In addition to the Task Force Chair consulting with the Chair of the President's Task Force on EID, three members of the Task Force on Preventing and Responding to Antisemitism also sit on the President's Task Force on EID and provided continual feedback and context from these dual roles. The work undertaken and the proposed recommendations contained in this Report were reviewed and edited by the Chair of the President's Task Force on EID. It is anticipated that the membership of the President's Task Force on EID will be involved in discussions regarding implementation of the recommendations.

The co-chairs for this sub-committee also met with the Associated Students (AS) Board on July 29, 2016. At this meeting, they reviewed the Task Force Charter with the Board members, including the convening of the Task Force as well as its charge, membership, timeline, and deliverables. Board members were also encouraged to provide input to the Task Force.

Further, on August 17, 2016, the subcommittee co-chairs met with Kristen Larson, Faculty Senate President. Based on discussion at the meeting, she utilized the Faculty Senate President blog to solicit faculty feedback and experiences related to the Task Force's work. Responses included the following feedback from faculty members:

- "The campus needs to be better educated about all forms of hate speech, including antisemitism." Recent incidents have brought forward responses within the community that are not well informed, and do not demonstrate "the level of empathy" that Western desires within the community. These responses show how far we have to go "to highlight the cruel power of hate speech," to identify symbols of hatred and oppression, "and to combat prejudice and stereotyping that is deeply rooted in our society."
- "[E]fforts must include faculty at a basic level," as faculty "can help to model better responses for... students," as well as "help to better educate students."
- Faculty members expressed having experienced antisemitism directly both in their departments and from colleagues on campus.
- Faculty also described the importance of being "aware of the problems that attend to different types of hate speech on campus." Certain groups may be less likely to report or

follow-up on incidents.

- Faculty recommended specifically “that Western could promote understanding of [antisemitism by rededicating] efforts to include Holocaust lesson planning in its teacher training,” to include participation beyond Woodring College of Education.

Task Force members also received input from guests Michael Berenbaum and John Roth at the October 19, 2016 Task Force meeting. Dr. Berenbaum serves as Professor of Jewish Studies at the American Jewish University in Los Angeles and is the Director of the Sigi Ziering Institute: Exploring the Ethical and Religious Implications of the Holocaust. Dr. Roth serves as Founding Director of the Center for the Study of the Holocaust, Genocide, and Human Rights at Claremont McKenna College. Task Force members participated in a robust discussion with Drs. Berenbaum and Roth, which included the following points of conversation:

- In determining whether behavior or speech rises to the level of antisemitism, Dr. Berenbaum discussed the “Three D’s” – double standards, de-legitimization, and demonization.
- Dr. Berenbaum highlighted that there is a line that can be crossed where one may venture into antisemitism (usually related in some way to one or more of the three D’s); but that by itself, criticism of Israel is legitimate and does not constitute antisemitism. Dr. Berenbaum described antisemitism as multifaceted.
- Discussion touched on the ways in which social media and the Internet provide a microphone for hatred. On the other hand, social media and the Internet have created opportunities for personalization and relationship building that may not have been possible before and this helps to reduce prejudice.
- Dr. Berenbaum discussed how hate crimes, including antisemitic acts, are crimes against the entire community. When a hate crime occurs, it is important to bring the issue into the open so that the entire community can address it and heal.
- In combatting antisemitism and other forms of hate and bias, Dr. Berenbaum described the difference between a proactive versus reactive approach. He emphasized the importance of creating a transformative culture that respects different backgrounds and identities and promotes intergroup dialogue and civility. The Task Force also discussed the importance of analyzing the intersection of race/racism and other forms of discrimination with antisemitism.
- Dr. Roth shared that in combatting antisemitism and other forms of discrimination, it is important to teach respect for inquiry that is grounded in evidence and truth and is mindful of the proliferation of bad or false information. He noted that hatred cannot stand up to intellectual scrutiny; hatred is based on prejudices and stereotypes that are not based in truth but in lies.
- Dr. Berenbaum highlighted the success of other higher education institutions in engaging voices on passionate issues by establishing a distinguished lecture series sponsored by top members of the administration.
- The discussion also focused on understanding what is within one’s sphere of influence. Rather than examining broadly how we can stop crimes against humanity, Dr. Roth advised that we identify opportunities where we have leverage. He recommended educating students, staff, faculty, and the community on those points of leverage, both positive and negative.

Additionally, the Subcommittee reached out to leaders in Western's Hillel and Chabad student clubs. On November 4, 2016, the co-chairs met with the Hillel President, as well as the Executive Representative of Chabad House. In their discussion, the students highlighted other incidents and behavior in the community that are not being reported. In particular, students expressed concern about situations that have arisen with their peers, and in which Jewish students are not well informed about how to respond and where to locate university resources that might assist them. The students indicated that they want ways to gain knowledge, including opportunities for dialogue and formal course curricula. Students shared that they were unaware of any current Western courses available on the topic of antisemitism. The students expressed a willingness and interest to have the tough and potentially controversial conversations, as long as there is an ability to have civil and respectful discussions that explore the issues from multiple perspectives.

Also on November 4, the subcommittee co-chairs met with Rabbi Joshua Samuels of Congregation Beth Israel and Rabbi Avremi Yarmush of Chabad House. Similar to the discussions with the student club leaders, the rabbis indicated that antisemitic incidents and behavior being experienced in the community are being underreported. The rabbis also relayed discussions with students who may be experiencing antisemitism, but indicated that the students are not sure what to do. Because these incidents are not being reported, the behavior is not being investigated. Therefore, while not all of the behavior may rise to the level of antisemitism, the rabbis relayed that students do not have a sufficient understanding about antisemitism to make that evaluation themselves or about how to respond appropriately.

On November 15, 2016, subcommittee co-chair Sue Guenter-Schlesinger and Task Force member Emily Weiner met with members of the Professional Staff Organization (PSO) Executive Committee. Discussion included the following points:

- The importance of widening the conversation to include antisemitism as well as other forms of bias and discrimination. Conversation also touched on the Task Force's efforts as an opportunity for teaching and learning.
- Suggestions included the availability of training/workshops related to antisemitism and other forms of discrimination and bias through the Campus Equity and Inclusion Forum. Staff expressed the desire to learn more about how to be effective allies as well as how to better understand and educate the Western community about the immediate and extended impact on those who experience hate and bias.
- Suggestions for training included the development of short educational videos that can be watched at any time and that could provide the basic building blocks for meaningful conversations. This type of training could be easily shared beyond the immediate Western community. Videos should include personal statements regarding the impact of hate speech and hate symbols.
- Mandatory training for employees, similar to sexual harassment prevention training, was also suggested and discussed.
- Conversation pointed to the need for regular dialogue between individuals from different backgrounds and identities within the greater Western community.

Further, the Task Force invited Hilary Bernstein, Pacific Northwest Regional Director of the Anti-Defamation League, to meet with Task Force members on December 1, 2016. Task Force

members participated in a robust discussion with Ms. Bernstein, which included the following important points:

- Task Force members discussed their goals for a community that promotes both dialogue and listening as forms of action. When talking about divisive issues, some initial point of disagreement can be sufficient to shut down further dialogue. There is an important difference between listening to understand versus listening to respond. The discussion led the group to ask: “How do you motivate someone to engage on a topic that is outside of their comfort level or area of interest?” Often there is hesitancy or fear to have the tough but healthy conversations with those who feel differently about a topic, so we need to educate the university community on how to have these conversations and how to “build bridges.”
- Ms. Bernstein discussed the misconception that antisemitism is a thing of the past. Antisemitism cannot be viewed as a story that is over; it is an ongoing story.
- Discussion focused on the importance of basic knowledge of antisemitism and other forms of discrimination and bias being taught in the K-12 curriculum, as well as the role of higher education in growing students’ knowledge about these issues. In particular, it is important for the university to help students explore difficult issues by identifying ways to integrate them into the curriculum. The Task Force discussed how racism, homophobia, sexism, antisemitism, etc., derail the educational mission of the university. Task Force members explored the idea of developing programming and training on symbols of oppression, which would speak to the experiences of different students, faculty, and staff, bring a broader group to the table, and help widen the conversation on antisemitism by including other prejudicial beliefs.

Section IV: Recommendations

The following recommendations emanated from the work of the three subcommittees, as discussed in the previous **Sections I – III** of this Report. They are organized within the model of “Core Practices for Preventing and Responding to Antisemitism” as depicted on page 16 of this Report.

Clear Institutional Policies and Definition

- Develop a clear working definition of antisemitism to guide the implementation of these recommendations.
- Explicitly include “antisemitism” in existing and future relevant policies and embed in charges to groups created with the purpose of addressing broad issues of discrimination, prejudice, and bias.

Transparent Reporting and Response Protocols

- Increase transparency regarding the various reporting options for incidents of antisemitism and resources available for those who experience it.
- Create response protocols for all bias incidents that include an invitation to the university campus and local community to participate in removing physical expressions of prejudice, bias or hate, in order to promote education/training and to build the broadest possible participation in acts of solidarity.
- On an annual basis, the EO Office will collect information on all bias incidents of antisemitism, along with other categories of bias and discrimination, and periodically report to university leadership.

Focused Education and Training

- The Task Force recognizes that antisemitism constitutes one of many forms of violence, prejudice, and bias and should be addressed both as a specific topic and as part of larger university conversations about discrimination, prejudice, and bias.
- Develop a list of course syllabi and co-curricular programs that help educate Western and the broader community about antisemitism and identify additional curricular and co-curricular needs.

- Identify and allocate funds and invest in professional expertise, when necessary, to develop and implement curricular and co-curricular courses, training, and public programs that address antisemitism and its negative impacts.
- Integrate university conversations about antisemitism into broader discussions about equity, inclusion, and diversity.
- Include a training module on bias, prejudice, and discrimination -- including a section on antisemitism -- in parallel with the mandatory Sexual Harassment Prevention Training course for all employees.

Strengthen and Develop Interconnected Practice

- Create opportunities for campus conversations using the model of “Intergroup Dialogue” to build coalitions across the university (See resources referenced in **Section II** of this Report, under “Engaged Community Discourse”).
- Identify existing programs, student clubs, and campus groups to encourage training and participation in the “Intergroup Dialogue” model.
- Invite participation by Jewish student groups in conversations about their inclusion in the new Multicultural Student Center.

Engaged Community Discourse

- Integrate a discussion of antisemitism into university conversations about equity and inclusion, with a focus on understanding the impact of discrimination, prejudice, and bias on community discourse, including discussion of symbols of hatred and oppression.
- Improve university culture to enable difficult but civil, informed, and respectful conversations about controversial subjects, including Israel and the Israeli-Palestinian conflict.
- Enhance outreach to university and local organizations impacted by antisemitism or engaged in broader discussions of discrimination, prejudice, and bias.

Support Leadership Development

- Include antisemitism prevention and response education and training in existing and future campus-wide training/educational programs for student leadership (e.g., AS Board, RA’s, RD’s, etc.).
- Ensure that administrative, staff, faculty, and student leadership are trained in understanding discrimination, bias, and prejudice -- including antisemitism -- and their negative impacts on individuals and the community. This training should be informed by

both internal and external experts in the field (e.g., Western faculty and staff, ADL, Southern Poverty Law Center, etc.).

Implementation of Task Force Recommendations

- Designate the Equal Opportunity Office and the Office for the Dean of Students, Student Activities as primary facilitators for the implementation of these recommendations. These offices will report to the Provost and the Vice President for Enrollment and Student Services, respectively, as the responsible senior leadership.
- Create an advisory group of campus stakeholders to assist in the implementation of the Task Force's recommendations regarding preventing and responding to antisemitism, and in the identification of areas for further improvement to the university climate.
- Ensure that future climate surveys or annual assessments include questions focused on student, staff, and faculty experiences with antisemitism.

Attachment 1

Membership



Task Force on Preventing and Responding to Antisemitism Membership

Eric Alexander, Associate Dean for Student Engagement / Director of Viking Union

Sandra Alferts, Founding Director, The Ray Wolpov Institute for the Study of the Holocaust, Genocide, and Crimes Against Humanity; and Professor, Modern & Classical Languages; Faculty Representative

James Brady, Plumber/Pipefitter/Steamfitter Lead, Facilities Management; Classified Staff Representative

Brian Burton, Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs

Mohammed Cato, Assistant Director, Equal Opportunity and Deputy Title IX Coordinator

Naomi Edelstein, Student Representative

Steven Garfinkle, Professor, History; Faculty Representative

Mark Greenberg, Dean of Libraries

Sue Guenter-Schlesinger, Vice Provost for Equal Opportunity and Employment Diversity, Title IX and ADA Coordinator; Task Force Chair

Julianna Jackson, Student Representative

Leonard Jones, Director of University Residences

Emma Palumbo, AS VP for Student Life (2015-16); Student Representative

Wayne Rocque, AS VP for Student Life (2016-17); Student Representative

Emily Weiner, Manager of Foundation Partnerships, WWU Foundation; Professional Staff Representative

Attachment 2

Charter



Task Force on Preventing and Responding to Antisemitism

CHARTER

Background

Western is committed to creating and maintaining welcoming and inclusive learning and working environments for our students, faculty, staff and visitors of all religious and ethnic background identities. This commitment is reflected in the University's policy on Ensuring Equal Opportunity and Prohibiting Discrimination and Retaliation. As part of this commitment, Western recognizes the need to ensure a campus environment that is respectful and inclusive of individuals from all religious and ethnic backgrounds.

During Winter quarter, 2016, four alleged incidents of antisemitism on campus were brought to the attention of University administration and investigated by our Equal Opportunity Office. After investigation, three of the four incidents were found to constitute discrimination based on civil rights law. Among other things, the investigations revealed that some members of our campus community have little understanding of the gravity of antisemitic symbols and language.

This Task Force has been convened to recommend ways to educate the campus community about antisemitism and the negative impacts of antisemitic actions targeting Jewish members of our community. Addressing antisemitism on campus, and working to prevent future displays of antisemitism, is important to creating a respectful and safe community for all of our students, faculty, staff and visitors.

This Task Force will work in close coordination with the President's Task Force on Equity, Inclusion and Diversity (EID) to develop a series of recommendations to educate the campus community on antisemitism.

Scope

The Western Washington University Task Force on Preventing and Responding to Antisemitism will review the impact of antisemitism in historical and contemporary contexts, review best practices to prevent and respond to expressed concerns of antisemitism, and after consultation with the President's Task Force on Equity, Inclusion, and Diversity; faculty and student governance leaders; and members of the university community, recommend ways to help educate the campus community in better understanding antisemitism and its negative impacts, including how to prevent and respond to it.

Membership

Vice Provost for Equal Opportunity and Employment Diversity (chair)

Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs

Associate Dean for Student Engagement / Director of Viking Union

Director of University Residences

Dean of Libraries

Assistant Director, Equal Opportunity

2 Faculty Representatives

Classified Staff Representative

Professional Staff Representative

3 Student Representatives

Chair

The group will be chaired by the Vice Provost for Equal Opportunity and Employment Diversity.

The Chair shall convene the meetings, approve agendas, and preside at all meetings of the group.

Meetings

Meetings shall be called by the Chair.

Reportage

The group will report to the Provost, who will share the recommendations with the other Vice Presidents and the President to consider implementation.

Timeline

Recommendations will be forwarded to the Provost no later than the end of Winter quarter, 2017.

Term

The Task Force will dissolve after the recommendations are completed and provided to the Provost.