

**Officers of the
National Commission**

National Chair
Marvin D. Nathan
CEO
Jonathan A. Greenblatt
Past National Chairs
Barbara B. Baber
Howard P. Berkowitz
Kenneth J. Bialkin
Barry Curtiss-Lusher
Burton S. Levinson
Glen S. Lewy
Melvin Salberg
David H. Strassler
Robert G. Sugarman
Glen A. Tobias

Vice Chairs
Martin Budd
Meyer Eisenberg
Está Gordon Epstein
James Grosfeld
Charles Kriser
Steven Lyons
Ruth Moss
George Stark
Mark Wolf
Christopher Wolf

Honorary Vice Chairs
Rudy Boschwitz
Yossie Hollander
Geri M. Joseph
Bernard Marcus
Cynthia Marks
Samuel H. Miller
Haim Saban
Michael Steindhardt
Gerald Stempler

Treasurer
Milton S. Schneider
Honorary Treasurer
Robert H. Naftaly
Secretary
Thomas C. Homburger
Assistant Secretary
Stanford Baratz

Standing Committee Chairs

Administration
Lawrence Rosenbloom/
Pamela Schwartz

Audit
Shelley Parker

Budget
Mitchell Weseley

Civil Rights
Elizabeth A. Price

Development
Ben Sax

Education
Miriam Weisman

Information Technology
Arthur Reidel

International Affairs
Eric Horodas

Leadership
Tracy Grossman/Tracy Treger

Funding for The Future
Lawrence Miller

Marketing & Communications
Joseph Goldblum

Outreach & Interfaith Affairs
Martin L. Budd

Planning
Milton S. Schneider

Regional Operations
Está Gordon Epstein

Washington Affairs
Michael Sheetz

Senior Management Team

Deputy National Director
Kenneth Jacobson

Chief of Staff
Emily Bromberg

Growth
Frederic L. Bloch, SVP

Leadership
Shari B. Gersten, SVP

Finance & Administration
Michael A. Kellman, SVP

Policy & Programs
Deborah M. Lauter, SVP

Technology
Rafail Portnoy, SVP

Talent & Knowledge
Tom Ruderman, SVP

General Counsel, Privacy & Security
Steven C. Sheinberg, SVP

Brand & Marketing
Amy Aronoff Blumkin, VP

Gov't Relations, Advocacy, &
Community Engagement
Stacy Burdett, VP

Law Enforcement, Extremism &
Community Security
David Friedman, VP

Communications
Todd Gutnick, VP

Education
Lorraine Tiven, VP (Interim)

Regional Operations
& Advancement
David S. Waren, VP

**Anti-Defamation League
Foundation**

President
Glen S. Lewy

National Director Emeritus
Abraham H. Foxman



June 20, 2017

The Honorable Charles Grassley
Chair
Senate Judiciary Committee
Washington, D.C. 20510

The Honorable Dianne Feinstein
Ranking Member
Senate Judiciary Committee
Washington, D.C. 20510

Dear Chairman Grassley and Ranking Member Feinstein:

We write to provide the views of the Anti-Defamation League (ADL) for today's Senate Judiciary Committee hearings on "Free Speech 101: The Assault on the First Amendment on College Campuses" and ask that this statement be included as part of the official hearings record.

The Anti-Defamation League

Since 1913, the mission of ADL has been to "stop the defamation of the Jewish people and to secure justice and fair treatment for all." Dedicated to combating anti-Semitism, prejudice, and bigotry of all kinds, as well as defending democratic ideals and promoting civil rights, ADL is proud of its leadership role in developing innovative materials, programs, and services that build bridges of communication, understanding, and respect among diverse racial, religious, and ethnic groups.

We work with colleges and universities across the country, on both proactive education about hate, bigotry and bias, and in response to specific hate incidents on campus when they occur. ADL's expertise in combatting hate, building inclusive communities, and safeguarding civil rights, perfectly positions our organization to weigh in on this critical issue for institutions of higher education.

Free Speech and the Marketplace of Ideas

In our work around the country, we regularly encounter virulent hate speech. Even the most heinous speech is largely protected by our federal and state constitutions – and ADL staunchly and consistently supports this bedrock principle of American democracy. The ability to express controversial and even offensive ideas is a cornerstone of our nation's democratic ideals – one of the principal ways our nation is exceptional and distinguished from the vast majority of countries around the globe where unpopular viewpoints can be – and are – punished.

While odious hurtful speech may be permissible, it is not harmless, and must not go unanswered. As early as the 1600's, John Milton introduced the concept of American society as a "marketplace of ideas." He posited that truth will emerge from the competition of ideas in free, transparent public discourse. Yet this marketplace is not self-executing. Rather, it depends on people's willingness to respond to words which are intended to demean, humiliate, and deride. Malicious speech, including hate speech, must be responded to with better speech. This commitment to counter hateful speech is particularly critical at our university and college campuses as they are our best laboratories for nurturing ideas, innovation, and debate.

ADL Community Support Center

Anti-Defamation League, 605 Third Avenue, New York, NY 10158-3560 T 212.885.7700 www.adl.org

The Integral Role Universities Play When Responding to Hate Speech

In the past six months, ADL has not only seen a spike in anti-Semitic/hateful incidents on campus, but we have documented a changing nature of incidents, and an increased impact on communities that coincides with a polarized climate. College and university leaders play a key role in responding to these types of situations: they must ensure that no one is punished for their protected speech just because it discomfites some and, simultaneously, use their bully pulpit to counter hateful speech with timely, specific and direct responses. We have seen this technique successfully utilized across the country.

For instance, on Valentine's Day, a Central Michigan University (CMU) Republican student group distributed gift bags to students including a card that read, "my love 4 u burns like 6,000 jews." The card included a photo of Adolf Hitler. In response to this incident, CMU President George Ross issued a forceful statement that the card's language, "while protected by the First Amendment, is unacceptable and is not consistent with our values and standards." He continued by calling upon "each of our students, faculty and staff to be beacons of peace, respect, inclusivity and civility — to be role models of integrity, dignity and leadership."¹

More than 100 faculty members heeded this call when they wrote an Open Letter to the university community. It stated,

"First and foremost, we stand in unflinching solidarity with Jewish communities on our campus and beyond. We uphold you now and always. We will do everything in our power to protect you, to listen to and hear your truths, to affirm and teach your histories and current-day experiences, and to celebrate your people.

Further, we reject acts of hate against any group of fellow humans on our campus and in our communities at home and abroad. Here, too, we vow to uphold the values of a diverse society that treasures the multiplicity of voices, experiences, and identities.

We condemn any rhetoric or any group that provides fertile ground for hate speech. We will not hesitate to name things for what they are. Speaking out against hate and intolerance isn't a partisan act; it is a moral imperative rooted in the fight for justice, dignity, and human rights.

We won't make peace with hate on our campus or anywhere else."²

Even though the creator of the valentine turned out not to be a student, the initial impact of the incident was deeply painful to the campus community. When messages appear on campus that are demeaning to a group of people or demonstrate actions that are contradictory to the values of diversity, equity and inclusion, trust is eroded and communities need to heal. Make no mistake: hate speech on campus, though it may be protected by the First Amendment, has a significant impact. It distracts from the learning community institutions strive to create, and it increases the perception of division in an already deeply-polarized political climate. A study released in April 2017³ by the Cooperative Institutional Research Program at the Higher

¹ <https://www.cmich.edu/news/article/Pages/card-statement.aspx>

² <https://docs.google.com/document/d/1j2k-LRpoTknuCdIL9Gsoc2eMhI-1TLmaj-nGsb2qhQY/pub>

³ https://www.insidehighered.com/sites/default/server_files/files/TheAmericanFreshman2016PREPUB.pdf

Education Research Institute at UCLA reports the 2016 cohort of incoming first-year students to be “the most politically polarized” in the more than 50 years of this annual study.

This issue of hate speech creating a distraction from learning is important. When a person’s sense of value and belonging in a place they call home is challenged, it interferes with a student’s ability to learn inside the classroom and out, and it impacts the success of staff and faculty who are also affected.

While civility and discourse are critical, educational institutions also must take into account the fact that historically-marginalized and other minoritized groups bear a greater burden when speech targets their personal identities and sense of self. Gaps in success rates for students of color are well documented. There are several compounding factors at work for many of these students, including that they are already vulnerable to bias, stereotypes, threats and, in some cases, financial concerns, and pressures from being the first in their family to attend college. We note this to say that, while the ideal of open expression appears to be equal, inequities in impact certainly exist. For this reason, it is critical that administrators, staff, faculty, students, and all community members speak and act, both against hate, and toward a civil environment that accounts for the complexities of a diverse community. Colleges and universities must build an institution for learning that works toward inclusion and equity while also ensuring open expression and a marketplace for ideas. This requires flexibility and the ability for campus leadership to shift policies and practices for the needs of their community.

Heckler’s Veto

Our free speech rights may be the world’s broadest, but they are not unlimited. Speech that intentionally intimidates, threatens, or otherwise interferes with the legal rights of others is not protected. While protest, for instance, is a time-honored manifestation of our free speech rights, there are limits to this expressive activity too. No outside person has a right to be invited to speak on campus, but when they are invited in an authorized manner by a university department, faculty, or an authorized student group, First Amendment free speech rights attach. Preventing authorized speakers from talking is not protected by the First Amendment. Regrettably, we are seeing protesters employ this tactic – sometimes referred to as a “heckler’s veto”- increasingly on campuses. When campus authorities or police allow dissenters to drown out someone’s speech or prevent someone from speaking, they are allowing protesters to silence that speaker, and fail to protect the constitutional rights of both the speaker and the audience.

Sadly, this sequence has become all too familiar. Just this year, we have watched it play out at institutions including Middlebury College, University of California at Berkeley, Claremont McKenna College, New York University, Columbia University, University of Buffalo, University of California at Irvine and Northwestern University.⁴ These intentional interruptions – done under the guise of free expression -- contravene the First Amendment and undermine academic freedom and the open exchange of ideas. Presenters and protestors can both be heard without one infringing upon the rights of the other. Campus policies should reflect this, and administrators must act to prevent speakers from being deprived of their constitutional rights. In academia, not all ideas must be legitimized, but when presented, they should be given the opportunity to be heard. Open expression and academic freedom are guiding principles toward honest inquiry and the shaping of a society where current unpopular ideas have a path to becoming future truths.

⁴ <http://www.nationalreview.com/corner/448132/year-shout-down-worse-you-think-campus-free-speech>

For example, last April, at San Francisco State University, protestors equipped with sound amplifiers effectively shut down a scheduled presentation by Jerusalem Mayor Nir Barkat. Despite the presence of a university administrator and campus police at the event, Mayor Barkat was forced to retreat with a smaller group while protestors continued using amplified sound in an effort to prevent him and the audience from exercising their First Amendment rights, therefore inhibiting any dialogue on the issues. We have seen similar conduct directed at pro-Israel speakers at other universities including the University of California at Davis, the University of California at Irvine, the University of Minnesota and the University of Chicago. These disruptions are part of a troubling campaign designed to preclude pro-Israel speakers from being heard on campus.

Legislation Pertaining to Free Speech on Campus

In an attempt to respond to this ill-conceived, deeply offensive 'shout-down' strategy," legislators in 17 states have introduced legislation purported to protect free speech on campus. These bills are largely based on a model written by the Goldwater Institute⁵ and contain troubling provisions that would shift discretion on how to handle these incidences from the university to the statehouse. Some proposed legislation mandates suspension and/or expulsion as a result of infringing the expressive rights of others, and other proposals allow for similar exclusionary discipline. ADL has broad concerns about these legislative proposals and strongly believes that decisions about discipline must be left to the judgment of individual university leaders. Additionally, we have concerns that fear of such harsh discipline and consequences will have a chilling effect on student and faculty speech.

The Institute's Model also places an emphasis on the need for individuals to be permitted to spontaneously assemble and distribute literature. The model, however, does not contain a definition of spontaneous. This ambiguousness could lead to unintended consequences such as attempts to circumvent the permit process⁶ or other ways in which colleges and universities authorize speakers for campus events in a constitutional manner, designed to ensure both freedom of speech and safety and order on campus.

Perhaps most troubling, one-third of these bills include a condition that universities "(1) shall strive to remain neutral, as an institution, on the public policy controversies of the day, and (2) may not take action, as an institution, on the public policy controversies of the day in such a way as to require students or faculty to publicly express a given view of social policy."⁷ Precluding universities from advocating on behalf of issues that reflect their institutional values violates fundamental academic norms and inhibits their ability to maintain a safe and inclusive campus climate.

For instance, after President Trump issued his Executive Orders signaling a crackdown on illegal immigration, many students around the country felt deep-seated fear and uncertainty. In order to assuage students' anxiety, 28 universities vowed to offer sanctuary to their undocumented students⁸. For example, University of Pennsylvania President Amy Gutmann announced that, "The University of Pennsylvania will not allow Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) / Customs and Border Protection (CBP) / U.S. Citizenship and Immigration

⁵ <http://goldwaterinstitute.org/en/work/topics/constitutional-rights/free-speech/campus-free-speech-a-legislative-proposal/>

⁶ For instance, a bill currently in the Texas Assembly requires that members of the university's community be allowed "to spontaneously and contemporaneously assemble or distribute written materials without a permit or other permission from the institution."

⁷ http://ftp.legis.state.tx.us/bills/85R/billtext/html/house_bills/HB02500_HB02599/HB025271.htm

⁸ Goldwater institute model

⁸ <http://remezcla.com/lists/culture/sanctuary-campus-daca/>

Services (USCIS) on our campus unless required by warrant...Further, the university will not share any information about any undocumented student with these agencies unless presented with valid legal process.⁹ University leaders must not be stripped of their policy making discretion and other tools to create a campus where all community members feel welcome.

When the state of Indiana was grappling with whether or not to pass an amendment banning same-sex marriage statewide, the University of Indiana was the state's first college or university to join Freedom Indiana – a bipartisan coalition of organizations and businesses dedicated to thwarting the ban. The university's capacity to speak out in no way undermined the ability of individual students, faculty, or administrators to articulate a contradictory opinion.

In 2005, Lawrence Summers, then president of Harvard University, made public remarks to the conference of the National Bureau of Economic Research expressing skepticism of discrimination as a factor in gender gaps facing women in science fields. While controversial, it was important that Summers have the ability to speak freely, and that dissenters to his speech also be allowed to express other views.

A Collective Response: UC Final Report on the Principles Against Intolerance

In 2016, the University of California Regents took an important step forward in outlining university rights and responsibilities on campus when it unanimously passed its *Final Report of the Regents Working Group on Principles Against Intolerance*.¹⁰ This pioneering approach not only recognized that First Amendment and academic freedom principles must remain paramount, but also established an aspirational tone that reflects an understanding of the many real challenges presented when a college atmosphere becomes the target of anti-Semitic behavior, racism, or discrimination of any kind. Most critically, the report highlighted the vital role of university leadership in addressing tolerance. ADL supported the adoption of the Report and has urged the California State University system to adopt similar principles.¹¹

Colleges and universities must have the ability to pivot as the needs of the community and the context of American society shift. This past year, issues related to extremism have affected campuses in a disturbing, new way.

White Supremacists on Campus: Unprecedented Recruitment Efforts Underway

ADL has documented that white supremacists are engaged in unprecedented outreach efforts on American college campuses – another sign that these hate groups feel emboldened by the current political climate.¹² Throughout the 2016-17 school year, students, faculty, and staff on 110 American college campuses were confronted by 159 separate incidents of racist fliers and stickers, as well as numerous on-campus appearances by white supremacists and several rounds of anti-Semitic, targeted racist faxes, and emails.

White supremacists are mobilizing in hopes of translating their online activism to “real world” action, and campuses – and young people – are prime targets, in part because they are still figuring out who they are, and what they believe. Extremists also undoubtedly see value in recruiting a new generation that can carry the movement for years to come.

Longtime white supremacist Jared Taylor recently wrote on his website, American Renaissance, that colleges are of special interest “because they are bastions of anti-white propaganda.” Before he imploded publicly in February, Islamophobic and misogynist gadfly Milo Yiannopoulos

⁹ <https://news.upenn.edu/message-penn-community-concerning-our-daca-and-undocumented-community-members>

¹⁰ <http://regents.universityofcalifornia.edu/aar/mare.pdf>

¹¹ <http://la.adl.org/news/joint-statement-in-support-of-uc-regents-policy-against-intolerance/>

¹² <https://www.adl.org/blog/white-supremacists-on-campus-unprecedented-recruitment-efforts-underway>

told CNN, "I am speaking on college campuses because education ... is really what matters. It's a crucible where these bad ideas are formed. Bad ideas like ... progressive social justice, feminists, Black Lives Matter..."¹³

Yiannopoulos' appearances (some of which were cancelled) seem to have had an energizing impact on other racists. Nathan Damigo, founder of the white supremacist group Identity Evropa, has called Yiannopoulos "an inspiration," and showed up at the (ultimately cancelled) Yiannopoulos speech at UC Davis, hoping to poach a few fans for his own cause, which he outlined in a Tweet: "We will not rest until Alt-Right ideas are represented on campuses nationwide."

While the vast majority of white supremacist campus actions involve hateful fliers ("Imagine a Muslim-Free America,") and stickers ("Make America White Again"), white supremacists have also sent anti-Semitic faxes and, in the case of white supremacist Richard Spencer, delivered speeches on campus.

Many of these incidents are linked to larger coordinated promotional efforts by white supremacist groups, like Identity Evropa's "Project Siege," which includes actual campus recruitment visits, and American Vanguard's "Northern Propaganda Campaign." Not coincidentally, these two groups are responsible for the majority of the white supremacist fliers and events tracked over the last several months.

In January, American Renaissance launched a hate-filled campus campaign, which for now seems to be limited to hanging "pro-white" propaganda posters. "Racial activists," Jared Taylor wrote on the American Renaissance website, should place the "attractive posters" in "high-traffic areas" around campus. Racist fliers and posters have adorned parking garages, street signs, billboards, utility poles and along corridors.

Andrew Auernheimer, a white supremacist hacker known as "Weev," took targeting to the next technological level when he sent out anti-Semitic and racist fliers via many thousands of campus printers across the country. One flier, which was adorned with swastikas, read in part: "I unequivocally support the killing of children. I believe that our enemies need such a level of atrocity inflicted upon them... So the hordes of our enemies from the blacks to the Jews to the federal agents are deserving of fates of violence so extreme that there is no limit to the acts by which can be done upon them in defense of the white race." The fliers referenced The Daily Stormer, Andrew Anglin's neo-Nazi website.

Until recently, on-the-ground white supremacist actions have been relatively infrequent on college campuses – but there have been notable exceptions. In 2013, Matthew Heimbach attempted to start a White Student Union at Towson University in Maryland to "represent the unique cultural heritage, folk customs and strong Christian traditions that define white civilization." Later that same year, Patrick Sharp established a similar group at Georgia State University.

In 2015, two white supremacist groups, the now-defunct National Youth Front (NYF) and Traditionalist Youth Network (TYN), launched a campaign against two intellectuals whose work focuses on race-related issues. The targets of their online and on-campus protests were Lee Bebout, an associate professor of English at Arizona State University who was teaching a

¹³ <http://www.cnn.com/2017/02/02/us/milo-yiannopoulos-ivory-tower/index.html>

course called “U.S. Race Theory and the Problem of Whiteness,” and Tim Wise, an independent scholar who delivers lectures on racism on campuses across the country.

These days, white supremacists are taking more forceful steps to establish a physical presence on campus. Identity Evropa (founded by Nathan Damigo) was clear in its goals – and used fittingly “academic” language – when describing “Project Siege” plans for the 2016-17 school year: Go talk to actual students. “Project Siege is the beginning of a long-term cultural war of attrition against the academia’s cultural Marxist narrative that is maintained and propagated into society through the indoctrination of the future managerial class. If we are to be successful in combating the current paradigm,” the online message read, “it is imperative that we create space for our ideas at universities across the country. Speaking with students and helping them unpack some of their assumptions while gaining name recognition for our organizations are the ways in which we will create the foundation for that space.”

Sometimes, students take things into their own hands. Damigo, for example, is a student at California State University at Stanislaus. At the University of Wisconsin, Daniel Dropik, a 33-year-old student-employee who was convicted in 2006 of setting fire to two black churches, attempted to form the Madison branch of the American Freedom Party, which urges students to “fight anti-white racism.” The American Freedom Party is a white supremacist group founded by William Johnson, and was heavily involved in the 2016 presidential campaign, calling voters nationwide urging them to vote for Trump.

White supremacist events on campus face particular scrutiny and, in some cases, speakers are able to circumvent the school altogether, avoiding heated debates over free speech rights. In December, when Richard Spencer spoke on the Texas A&M campus, he wasn’t there as a guest of the University. Instead, he spoke to supporters and onlookers in a room rented for the occasion by local neo-Nazi Preston Wiginton.

Why now?

White supremacists, emboldened by the rhetoric of the 2016 presidential campaign, are stepping out of the shadows and into the mainstream. In January, Jared Taylor wrote, “It is widely understood that the election of Donald Trump is a sign of rising white consciousness... Now is the time to press our advantage in every way possible.” Richard Spencer has stated that now is the time to “professionalize” white supremacist beliefs, and is currently fundraising to take his message to campuses across the country. “These types of events are tremendous opportunities for us to communicate our message,” he told supporters in December. “They are ways for us to reach millions of people who would otherwise never have heard our ideas.”

Campus responses

Fear and anger are the most common reactions to white supremacist fliers and events, usually followed by a powerful response from students and others who are appalled by the display of hate and divisiveness. Rallies and other gatherings are common. At Purdue, a group of students replaced American Vanguard’s “pro-white” posters with their own inclusive messages, and loud protests met Richard Spencer when he arrived to speak at Texas A&M.

College administrators are responding more quickly and forcefully to campus hate speech; the president of the University of Texas at Austin immediately called for a town hall meeting after anti-Muslim and anti-immigrant fliers (courtesy of American Vanguard) were found all over the campus. While this town hall did not alone heal tensions, they and many schools are launching new Diversity, Equity and Inclusion initiatives, with which the schools intend to make all campus populations feel safer and more empowered.

Addressing Anti-Semitism on Campus: The Anti-Semitism Awareness Act (ASAA)

ADL has documented the fact that anti-Semitism is disturbingly pervasive and moving into the mainstream. In recent years, the issue of hostility towards Jewish students and Israel and anti-Semitic incidents on college campuses have attracted considerable national attention. The League has been doing an annual *Audit of Anti-Semitic Incidents* since 1979. According to recent *Audits*, anti-Semitic incidents at colleges and universities nearly doubled from 2014 to 2015, with this significantly heightened activity increasing further in 2016.

Most incidents of anti-Semitism on campus are entirely unrelated to anti-Israel activity. But some are. We are concerned about organized anti-Israel activity on college campuses which can create an atmosphere in which Jewish students feel intimidated and under siege. And sometimes anti-Israel activism on campus crosses the line into anti-Semitism.

Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 is one of the most important federal education anti-discrimination statutes. But it only prohibits discrimination on the basis of race, color, or national origin. In March 2010 a broad coalition of Jewish community organizations wrote¹⁴ to urge the Department of Education to interpret Title VI to protect Jewish students from anti-Semitic harassment, intimidation and discrimination – and they did. In fact, both the Department of Justice¹⁵ and the Department of Education¹⁶ have properly concluded that Title VI prohibits discrimination against Jews, Muslims, Sikhs, and members of other religious groups when the discrimination is based on the group's actual or perceived shared ancestry or ethnic characteristics.

What the legislation would do

Since 2010, the Department of Education has used its inclusive interpretation of Title VI authority in a number of religious discrimination cases.¹⁷ The ASAA would codify the Department's authority to investigate and remedy instances of harassment and intimidation against Jewish students and others targeted because of their actual or perceived shared ancestry or ethnic characteristics.

Understanding the nature and magnitude of a problem is essential to address it. Anti-Semitism is a multifaceted form of prejudice which can be, and is, manifested in many different ways. The State Department has developed a definition of anti-Semitism and accompanying examples to serve as a guidepost for America's diplomats abroad who report on incidents and trends around the world.¹⁸

The ASAA references the State Department definition, but does not use it to automatically trigger federal education anti-discrimination investigations or enforcement actions – because much of what is covered by the definition and accompanying examples is First Amendment-protected speech. It is essential to accurately distinguish First Amendment-protected speech – including disagreement and even harsh criticism of the government of Israel – from intentional, targeted conduct that unlawfully threatens, harasses, or intimidates particular Jewish students and jeopardizes their equal educational opportunities. That conduct is not protected by the First

¹⁴ <https://www.adl.org/news/press-releases/adl-urges-education-secretary-to-protect-jewish-students-on-campus-from>

¹⁵ https://www.justice.gov/sites/default/files/crt/legacy/2011/05/04/090810_AAG_Perez_Letter_to_Ed_OCR_Title%20VI_and_Religiously_Identifiable_Groups.pdf

¹⁶ <https://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocr/letters/colleague-bullying-201410.pdf>

¹⁷ <https://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocr/religion.html>

¹⁸ <https://www.state.gov/s/rqa/resources/267538.htm>

Amendment – and it should not be deemed inactionable simply because that conduct is couched as “anti-Israel” or “anti-Zionist.”

Following an alleged violation of federal education anti-discrimination laws, the plain language of the ASAA simply requires the Department of Education to “take into consideration” the State Department definition of anti-Semitism “as part of the Department’s assessment” of whether an investigation of that allegation is warranted.

Finally, it’s not easy to make out a federal anti-discrimination case – and it shouldn’t be. There’s no need to make a *federal case* out of things that can and should be resolved in school or on campus. This legislation will not affect the current coverage of other religious groups under Title VI – and it will not change the substantive rights, obligations, or standards of review under Title VI. But enactment of the ASAA is a step in the right direction to help ensure that Jewish students remain safe on campus while at the same time protecting the free speech rights of all students.

Policy Recommendations

1) Reject legislative attempts to strip university leaders of their discretion and link federal funding to speech.

In addition to state efforts to shift decision-making regarding academic freedom and free expression from university halls to statehouses, there is also a movement advocating tying eligibility for tax-exempt status or federal student aid under the Higher Education Act to how universities respond in the face of free speech challenges. The prospect of creating a free speech ‘test’ which a college or university must ‘pass’ in order to receive federal financial assistance is disquieting. The business of safeguarding our educational institutions’ free speech is a non-partisan one and should not be legislated by Congress. Rather, it should be left in the hands of the academy. We urge Congress to reject attempts at linking federal funds to a unilateral vision of what speech on campus should look like.

2) Educate faculty and students on the parameters of their First Amendment free speech rights.

Based on our decades-long work on campuses, we believe that the best means of helping people understand and exercise their First Amendment rights is to educate them. ADL has shared its program – “Identity, Inclusiveness, and Free Speech on Campus” which helps administrators, faculty, students and campus security balance the complex interplay of free expression, bias, and offers insights on how best to create an inclusive campus environment. We have had the privilege of working with a number of California, Illinois, Texas, Massachusetts, New York, and Washington, D.C. campuses on this issue.

Another of our programs, “Words to Action,¹⁹” helps students learn how to respond constructively when dialogue becomes heated or even aggressive. ‘Words to Action’ has served over 2500 students in the past year. Additionally, for over 15 years, ADL has been sharing with college administrators our resource guide “Responding Bigotry and Intergroup Strife on Campus: A Guide for College and University Presidents and Senior Administrators.” This manual provides guidance and techniques to use in response to severe conflicts on campus.

¹⁹ <https://www.adl.org/words-to-action>

3) Improve training for campus officials and police on responding to bias incidents and hate crime.

Every year, thousands of students are the victims of bias-motivated slurs, vandalism, threats, and physical assaults on college campuses. In 1998, to increase awareness of hate violence on college campuses, Congress enacted an amendment to the Higher Education Act (HEA) requiring all colleges and universities to collect and report hate crime statistics to the Office of Postsecondary Education (OPE) of the Department of Education. Unfortunately, the Department of Education's current hate crime statistics²⁰ reflect very substantial underreporting. Even worse, the limited available data frequently conflicts with campus hate crime information collected by the Federal Bureau of Investigation under the 1990 Hate Crime Statistics Act (HCSA).²¹

The Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2013²² amended the Clery Act²³ to require campus security and local law enforcement to identify, record, and effectively respond to incidents motivated by gender identity bias and national origin bias – in addition to the longstanding requirements to report hate crime incidents based on race, gender, religion, disability, sexual orientation, or ethnicity bias.

The Department of Education and the Department of Justice should work with law enforcement organizations (including campus police) and civil rights and religious groups with interest and expertise in combating hate violence to do outreach and education – highlighting the recently-added issues of gender-identity and national origin based hate violence, using the updated Clery Handbook.²⁴ Coordination with relevant college and university offices in these efforts is essential.

4) Dedicate resources to determining the most effective means of capturing and responding to bias incidents.

ADL has tracked a significant increase in hate incidents at colleges and universities across the country over the past eight months. The fact that many of these incidents fall within the protection of the First Amendment does not lessen their painful and far-reaching impact. Academic institutions have created various ways to both capture the frequency of such incidents (e.g. online reporting forms) and respond to them meaningfully and effectively (e.g. campus climate response teams). However, this data is being captured in a piecemeal way. Studying bias incidents and campus climate from a national perspective would be exceptionally valuable. What works? What doesn't? Who reports? Who doesn't? How do we assess effectiveness? We urge Congress to approve funding to study these questions. Investing in finding answers will have tremendous bearing on how best to protect free speech while ensuring a safe and inclusive campus.

5) Create and convene a National Task Force on Inclusive Excellence.²⁵ Colleges and universities operate under the premise that equity, inclusion, and belonging are key factors of a successful learning environment. Without inclusion at every level, excellence is not achieved. Creating a more diverse community brings benefits of varied viewpoints for creative problem solving, and it also creates the need for a wide lens with which to view the needs of all members of a diverse community. In a society that faces challenges of inequity, colleges and universities

²⁰ <https://ope.ed.gov/campussafety/#/>

²¹ <https://ucr.fbi.gov/hate-crime/2015>

²² Public Law 113-4 (2013) <https://www.congress.gov/113/plaws/publ4/PLAW-113publ4.pdf>

²³ Public Law 101-542 (1990) <https://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/STATUTE-104/pdf/STATUTE-104-Pg2381.pdf>

²⁴ <https://www2.ed.gov/admins/lead/safety/handbook.pdf>

²⁵ <https://www.aacu.org/making-excellence-inclusive>

face this as well. There is a growing awareness of unconscious bias, achievement gaps, and overt hate speech. This is the first step toward inclusion, but a national task force is needed to ensure that solving these problems is considered critical to success of higher education institutions and the experience of all students, staff, faculty administrators, and visitors. Systems must be created that consider the ways in which all members experience the environment, curriculum, student services, tenure and promotion procedure, leadership opportunities, and day-to-day living and learning. A task force specific to equity and inclusion elevates the message that all people must know that their success is valuable. Working toward inclusion is working toward every member of our campuses and our society reaching their full potential without some people feeling the additional burdens of stereotypes, biases, and systems that were not designed to include them.

Ultimately, improving campus climate – both for those speaking and for those listening – can only result from a steadfast commitment to civility, dialogue, and education. ADL appreciates this Committee's willingness to highlight this important issue. We look forward to further discussion and progress on fulfilling the promise of creating educational institutions that both safeguard free expression from all perspectives *and* ensure that all members of the community feel safe and welcome.

Sincerely,



Elissa Buxbaum
Director
Campus Affairs



Michelle Deutchman
Western States and National
Campus Counsel



Oren Segal
Director
Center on Extremism