

ISRAEL AND ACADEMIC FREEDOM

JOHN MEARSHEIMER

FREEDOM OF SPEECH lies at the heart of American academic life.¹ It means that scholars and students can say what they want on virtually any subject and bring controversial speakers to campus. Universities go to great lengths to promote open discourse and not endorse or discriminate against any particular perspective. Academic freedom is easy to support in principle, but not always easy to embrace in practice. At times, individuals and groups both within and outside the academy dislike what is being said on campus and try to silence the voices they find offensive.

A major threat to academic freedom today comes from the Israel lobby.

Universities are the one place in the United States where Israel tends to be treated like a normal country. Although Israel has many defenders on college campuses, it gets criticized there for its past and present behavior in ways that rarely happen in the mainstream media or among politicians and policy makers in Washington. Thus, it is not surprising that Natan Sharansky, the head of the Jewish Agency for Israel, remarked in January 2011, "I believe that the most important battlefield which we have, and the most difficult one, is American universities."²

Many hard-line supporters of Israel—both inside and outside universities—find this situation deeply troubling, which causes them to work assiduously to suppress criticism leveled at either Israeli policy or America's "special relationship" with Israel. Of course, they also work to promote a positive image of Israel on campuses. To achieve their goals, pro-Israel forces not only seek

to marginalize or silence critics of Israel in the academy, but to limit their numbers as well.

The aim of this chapter is to analyze this situation in more depth by describing the strategies the lobby employs to achieve its goals on college campuses. I will then attempt to explain why Israel's supporters are so deeply committed to trying to make sure that Israel—and its special relationship with the United States—is always portrayed in a positive light.

Before delving into these matters, however, I want to emphasize that in principle there is nothing wrong with the lobby trying to influence campus life.³ The key proviso, however, is that it should be done in legitimate ways. For example, it is acceptable for pro-Israel donors to give money to establish a chaired professorship in Israel studies, or even to establish an Israel studies program. Moreover, a donor can give money to set up a speaker series that brings pro-Israel speakers to campus or help fund a college magazine that seeks to be Israel-friendly.

Individuals and groups outside the academy can also write articles and books that are critical of particular professors as well as universities, as Martin Kramer did in *Ivory Towers on Sand*.⁴ But my concern is not with these kinds of activities, which are legitimate and consistent with the way business is conducted at colleges and universities across the United States. Instead, my focus is on the illegitimate strategies that the lobby employs to foster a one-sided discourse about Israel.

MINIMIZING THE NUMBER
OF ACADEMIC CRITICS

The Israel lobby tries to influence the hiring and promotion process as a way of limiting the number of Israel's critics at American colleges. Probably the most well-known case was DePaul University's June 2007 decision to deny tenure to Norman Finkelstein, who has long been an outspoken critic of Israeli policies toward the Palestinians. Pro-Israel groups and individuals put significant pressure on DePaul to fire Finkelstein. Harvard law professor Alan Dershowitz led the charge, sending professors in DePaul's law school and political science department what he described as "a dossier of Norman Finkelstein's most egregious academic sins, and especially his outright lies, misquotations, and distortions."⁵ Nevertheless, the political science department voted 9-3 to give him tenure and a college-level tenure committee voted

unanimously in his favor. His promotion was nixed, however, at the highest levels of the university.

Another prominent promotion case involved Nadia Abu El-Haj, an anthropology professor at Barnard College who came up for tenure in 2007. A 1982 Barnard graduate, who is an Israeli settler on the West Bank, organized a campaign to pressure Barnard and Columbia University to deny her tenure. The opposition was angered by Abu El-Haj's critique of efforts by Israeli archaeologists to find evidence of an ancient Jewish presence in Palestine. Critics claimed that her book, *Facts on the Ground*, is a polemic against the state of Israel. The campaign against Abu El-Haj was aided by the *New York Sun*, which has since gone out of business, but which at the time monitored Columbia closely and vehemently criticized it whenever someone at the school said or did something that was considered hostile to Israel. However, the lobby's efforts failed in this case, as Abu El-Haj was awarded tenure in November 2007.⁶

Pro-Israel forces also interfere in the hiring process at universities. Consider what happened in the early 2000s, when Columbia was recruiting Rashid Khalidi, who was then teaching at the University of Chicago. According to Jonathan R. Cole, the Columbia provost at the time, "when it became known that we were recruiting Khalidi to Columbia the complaints started flowing in from people who disagreed with the content of his political views." Princeton faced much the same problem a few years later when it tried to woo Khalidi away from Columbia. Nevertheless, both Columbia and Princeton made offers to Khalidi, which shows the lobby does not win every fight.⁷

Of course, not every case has a happy ending, as Finkelstein's firing make clear. Also consider that in 2006 the history and sociology departments at Yale voted an appointment for Professor Juan Cole, a distinguished historian at the University of Michigan, who is a sharp critic of many Israeli policies. Pro-Israel columnists at the *Wall Street Journal* and the *Washington Times* attacked Cole's appointment, and *Jewish Week* reported that several prominent Jewish donors had called Yale officials to protest the decision, which was subsequently overturned by the university's appointments committee. The actual impact of donor pressure is unknown, but the incident underscores the importance some supporters of Israel place on shaping discourse on campus.⁸

SMEARING CRITICS

The lobby also seeks to marginalize critics within academia by smearing them. This strategy was employed at Columbia in 2004, when the "David Project," a Boston-based pro-Israel group concerned with campus issues, produced a propaganda film alleging that faculty in the Middle Eastern studies program were not only anti-Semitic, but were also intimidating Jewish students who defended Israel. Columbia was raked over the coals in pro-Israel publications like the *New York Sun*, but a faculty committee assigned to investigate the charges found no evidence of anti-Semitism. The only incident worth noting was the possibility that one professor had "responded heatedly" to a student's question.⁹

The David Project apparently has changed its mind about the utility of smearing scholars by labeling them anti-Semites. In early 2012, it published a "white paper" that called for rethinking how to do Israel advocacy on American campuses. In particular, the report's authors maintained that:

Accusing faculty members who propagandize against Israel of "academic malpractice" is likely to be a much more effective strategy than challenging specific allegations or invoking anti-Jewish bigotry. Rightly or wrongly, the current campus atmosphere is much more sympathetic to charges that teachers are not satisfactorily teaching their subject than to complaints of anti-Jewish bias and Israel supporters will likely have a greater practical impact by framing their concerns in this manner.¹⁰

Another example of the lobby smearing Israel's campus critics took place at the University of California-Los Angeles in January 2009. The Center for Near Eastern Studies sponsored a panel discussion dealing with the implications of Israel's war against Gaza (Operation Cast Lead) for human rights and international law. As reported in *Tikkun* by one of the panel members and a professor in the audience at the event, "The talks by the four speakers were largely uneventful, being interrupted by pro-Israeli jeers just once and briefly. The question and discussion period grew a bit more heated and contentious. But it was hardly uncivil, save for a mostly irrelevant rant read by an insistent member of the Socialist Workers Party."

Israel's supporters, however, misrepresented what happened at the panel, and some went so far as to accuse the panelists of leading the audience into chanting, "Zionism is Nazism" and "F-ck, f-ck Israel." One article written by a member of Stand With Us, a key organization in the lobby, ran under the headline: "Reviving 1920's Munich Beer Halls at UCLA, Courtesy of California Taxpayers." The panel was also described as "an academic lynching of Israel" and a " Hamas recruiting rally." Regarding these various charges, the authors of the *Tikkun* article write: "Both of us were present throughout the entire event, we have listened in the wake of these absurd accusations to the publicly available podcasts of the talks, and we have checked with others present. Nothing could be further from the truth."¹¹

Smearing outspoken professors is not merely designed to silence or marginalize them. It also has a powerful deterrent effect. Specifically, it sends a clear message to other scholars who might be inclined to criticize Israel or American policy toward Israel that if they speak out, the lobby will make a concerted effort to damage their reputations and marginalize them within and outside the academy. This is a potent threat that can strike fear into the hearts of many academics.

STOPPING THE PRINTING PRESSES

Another strategy that pro-Israel forces employ is attempting to suppress the publication of scholarly works that make arguments they deem wrongheaded and dangerous. For example, in 1998, the Anti-Defamation League (ADL) called on the publisher of Norman Finkelstein and Ruth Bettina Birn's *A Nation on Trial* to halt its release. *A Nation on Trial* is a sharply worded critique of Daniel Goldhagen's controversial best seller *Hitler's Willing Executioners*, which argues that the Holocaust was not mainly the product of Nazi ideas and Hitler's own madness, but was instead rooted in a pervasive "eliminationist ideology" in German society that predated the Nazi period. Like the Goldhagen book, *A Nation on Trial* elicited praise as well as criticism from respected scholars. Yet ADL head Abraham Foxman maintained that *A Nation on Trial* should not have been published, claiming that the issue was not "whether Goldhagen's thesis is right or wrong but what is 'legitimate criticism' and what goes beyond the pale." Fortunately, Foxman's campaign failed and *A Nation on Trial* was published as planned.¹²

A similar episode took place in 2003, when lawyers representing Alan Dershowitz sent threatening letters to the University of California Press in an

attempt to halt publication of Finkelstein's book, *Beyond Chutzpah*, which is an extended critique of Dershowitz's own book, *The Case for Israel*. Dershowitz also wrote to California governor Arnold Schwarzenegger as part of his campaign against Finkelstein. Dershowitz subsequently claimed that he was not trying to suppress publication, but that is certainly not how officials at UC Press interpreted his actions. They resisted these pressures, however, and issued Finkelstein's book anyway.¹³

Four years later in 2007, the lobby put significant pressure on the University of Michigan Press not to distribute Joel Kovel's book, *Overcoming Zionism*, which originally had been published in Britain by Pluto Press. Not only did the press initially cave in to the pressure, it also decided to end its long-standing arrangement to distribute Pluto Press books in the United States. There was an outcry, however, as soon as these controversial decisions became public knowledge, and the University of Michigan Press reversed itself and said it would distribute Kovel's book. However, it severed its ties with Pluto Press in 2008, when the contract between the two presses expired.¹⁴

KEEPING CRITICS OFF CAMPUS

The lobby also works to limit criticism of Israel by keeping outside voices from speaking on campuses. A case in point is the decision in the spring of 2007 by the University of St. Thomas in Minnesota to cancel a speech by the Nobel laureate, Archbishop Desmond Tutu. The move was prompted by pressure from members of the local Jewish community, who were offended by the archbishop's criticism of Israel's treatment of the Palestinians and his comparison of Israeli behavior in the Occupied Territories with the apartheid policies of white-dominated South Africa. The mainstream media naturally said little about Tutu being disinvited from St. Thomas. However, the story was posted on Muzzle Watch, a website run by Jewish Voice for Peace (JVP) that tracks efforts by the lobby to stifle debate about Israel. The ensuing publicity, which included an e-mail campaign encouraged by JVP, forced St. Thomas to reverse field in October 2007 and re-invite the archbishop to speak.¹⁵

A few years earlier in 2002, Hanan Ashrawi, an articulate Palestinian moderate who had worked for Yasser Arafat, was invited to Colorado College to be a keynote speaker at a symposium looking at the events of September 11 one year later. Pro-Israel forces were up in arms about the invitation; indeed, the Zionist Organization of America described Ashrawi as an "apologist for terrorism" and said she "should be disinvited" from the forum. Cooler heads

prevailed, however, and she was allowed to speak, although the president of the school made sure that an Israeli was invited to be the keynote speaker the night after Ashrawi's address.¹⁶

This outcome illustrates that when the lobby cannot prevent a speaker from appearing on campus, its fallback position is invariably to demand "balance," which means also inviting someone to speak who has impeccable pro-Israel credentials. That politically correct person might be paired with the speaker on the same stage or appear separately after the critic has spoken. When Jimmy Carter appeared at Brandeis in January 2007 to talk about his controversial book, *Palestine: Peace Not Apartheid*, Alan Dershowitz wanted to be present to debate him. The sponsors of the event, as well as Carter, wanted the former president to be on stage alone. So arrangements were made for Dershowitz to speak after Carter spoke.¹⁷

More recently, the controversial Israeli historian, Ilan Pappé, was scheduled to speak in February 2012 at three California campuses: California Polytechnic State University in San Luis Obispo, California State University-Fresno, and California State University-Northridge. The Amcha Initiative, a newly formed organization that "endeavors to inform the California Jewish community about manifestations of harassment and intimidation of Jewish students on colleges and university campuses across the state," led an effort to prevent Pappé from speaking at those schools. It asked the president of each university to "rescind all . . . sponsorship and support from the Ilan Pappé events."

To their great credit, the presidents refused to cave in to the pressure. Instead, they reminded the Amcha Initiative that "our universities do not endorse any particular position, but emphatically support the rights of people to express and hear all points of view. For these reasons, it is not appropriate for our universities, as public institutions, to decide whether speakers are permitted to appear on campus based on the ideas they hold. Others are always welcome to invite speakers and create events that offer opposing views."¹⁸

WAGING LAWFARE FOR ISRAEL

In some of its other cases, the Amcha Initiative has employed a relatively new strategy for dealing with criticism of Israel. Under pressure from the lobby, Secretary of Education Arne Duncan mandated in October 2010 that Title VI of the 1964 Civil Rights Act, which was designed to fight racial segregation in the South, could be extended to include religious discrimination. This

decision allows Jewish individuals and groups to file complaints either in the courts or with the Office for Civil Rights in the Department of Education. Specifically, it allows them to try to make the case that criticizing Israel is tantamount to anti-Semitism, and thus any school that tolerates such criticism is creating a hostile environment for its Jewish students and should be punished.

A good example of this strategy at work is the case filed against the University of California-Santa Cruz by Tammi Rossman-Benjamin, a cofounder of the Amcha Initiative. Her twenty-nine-page brief to the Office for Civil Rights concludes with these words:

The anti-Israel discourse and behavior in classrooms and at departmentally and College-sponsored events at UCSC is tantamount to institutional discrimination against Jewish students, which has resulted in their intellectual and emotional harassment and intimidation, and has adversely affected their educational experience at the University . . . The institutional discrimination against Jewish students has shown no signs of abating, and has in some ways worsened with time.

So far, it appears that nine cases involving anti-Israel activity have been filed under Title VI. None have been successful, although it is too early to know whether the lobby will be able to make this strategy work either in the courts or with the Office for Civil Rights. There is little doubt that if this approach is successful, it will have a chilling effect on academic freedom.¹⁹

CO-OPTING STUDENTS

The lobby commits a large amount of time and resources to influencing students on campus. The American Israel Public Affairs Committee (AIPAC), which is surely the most powerful pro-Israel organization, has been doing this since at least the late 1970s. In the early 2000s, when Israel was being widely criticized on college campuses, it moved aggressively to "take back the campuses." But AIPAC was hardly the only group to participate in this effort. Indeed, the Israel on Campus Coalition, which was founded in 2002 "to create positive campus change for Israel," includes thirty-three organizations.

These various groups target Jewish as well as non-Jewish students. The objective with Jewish students is to motivate them to support Israel enthusiastically and fearlessly and also instruct them on how to sell Israel on campus.

An important element in the strategy is instructing Jewish students on how to win non-Jewish students over to Israel's side.

Aside from the fact that there is something disturbing about an outside lobbying group waging a wide-ranging campaign to influence how students think about a foreign country, many of the tactics the lobby employs are antithetical to core academic values. Consider the advice that is proffered to students in the *Hasbara Handbook: Promoting Israel on Campus*. They are told that two approaches can be used to sell Israel on campus: "point scoring" and "genuine debate." Point scoring aims "to give the impression of rational debate, whilst avoiding genuine discussion." The goal, in other words, is to manipulate the facts in clever ways to make Israel's case. The *Hasbara Handbook* goes on to note, "Point scoring can irritate audiences who are genuinely committed to thinking about their views on a subject." One would hope so. But more importantly, universities are committed to discouraging point scoring and instead teaching students to think critically and engage in genuine debate.

The lobby also pays careful attention to winning over non-Jewish students by co-opting them. This strategy is clearly laid out in the David Project's 2012 white paper on how to advocate for Israel on campus. It starts with the assumption that today's college students are easy to manipulate, because they "are largely politically apathetic" and most of them are not serious about their studies. For the most part, they see college "as a time to focus on recreation and self-exploration." This situation is abetted by the fact that "many universities and colleges are not academically rigorous environments for many of their students."

Given this fertile recruiting ground, the white paper emphasizes that "campuses should first be 'mapped' by student leaders," which "means identifying campus influencers, whether individuals or groups." Then, an effort should be made to win them over to Israel's side. "Co-opting them into pro-Israel efforts is an opportunity for a significant 'win' by Israel advocates." The David Project goes so far as to suggest that particular groups, like Indian Americans, "have a potential for natural affinity," in part because India and Israel are both "primary targets of Islamist terrorism [and] suffer from protracted border disputes with majority Muslim populations." "Other Asian groups" like Chinese and Korean students are also said to be good prospects for Israel's cause.

Pro-Israel forces also place a high premium on molding student thinking by influencing what is written about Israel in college newspapers. "Campus Israel advocates," says the white paper, "should work to achieve leadership

roles on these publications themselves or at least develop relationships with those who do positively impact their coverage of Israel." Although there is nothing wrong with trying to foster positive media coverage on campus, this strategy shows that the lobby leaves no stone unturned in its crusade to shape how college students all across the United States think about Israel.²⁰

HITTING COLLEGES AND THE POCKETBOOK

Finally, the lobby attempts to shape the campus discourse about Israel by monitoring what professors say and threatening to curtail financial support from outside sources—individual donors, foundations, and the government—when Israel is criticized. In September 2002, for example, Daniel Pipes established Campus Watch, a website that posted dossiers on suspect academics and encouraged students to report comments or behavior that might be considered hostile to Israel. This transparent attempt to blacklist and intimidate scholars prompted a harsh reaction and Pipes later removed the dossiers, but the website still invites students to report alleged anti-Israel behavior at American colleges. Turning students into snitches is hardly consistent with core academic values.

Pipes's campaign to stamp out criticism of Israel on college campuses did not stop there. Together with Martin Kramer, an Israeli American scholar who is a fellow at the Washington Institute for Near East Policy and president of Shalem College in Jerusalem, Pipes began encouraging Congress to curtail or at least closely monitor Title VI money that the federal government gives to Middle East and other area studies programs at major universities. The aim is to silence critics of Israel and hopefully force universities to hire scholars whose views are more in line with those of Kramer and Pipes.²¹

Even more importantly, when Israel gets seriously criticized in a university setting, some Jewish donors invariably call administrators to complain and in some cases threaten to stop donating to the school. This could have significant consequences for a college if those donors are wealthy and if large numbers of them stop giving gifts. A good example of this strategy at work occurred in February 2012, when the University of Pennsylvania hosted a Boycott, Divestment, and Sanction (BDS) conference. BDS is a bête-noire of the pro-Israel community, which was deeply upset that the conference was being held at an Ivy League university. Not surprisingly, the school newspaper ran a story just before the conference started with a headline saying: "BDS Conference

Arrives This Weekend: Alums Are Threatening to Cease Donations for Allowing the Conference on Campus.”

Unsurprisingly, the university went to great lengths to assure Israel's supporters that “it does not support sanctions or boycotts against Israel.” In particular, the president of Penn and the chairman of its board of trustees wrote a joint op-ed in the school newspaper in which they said: “We want to be absolutely clear . . . the University has repeatedly, consistently and forcefully expressed our adamant opposition to this agenda. Simply stated, we fundamentally disagree with the position taken by Penn BDS.”

University administrators, however, are not supposed to take a position on the ideas expressed by their professors or at conferences held on their campuses; they are supposed to remain neutral so as not to prejudice the discussion in any way. When individuals in positions of power and authority pass judgment on ideas that are under debate, it cannot help but have a chilling effect on what professors and students say. But Penn's leaders violated that norm, surely because they feared there would be negative financial consequences if they did not make clear that they loathed BDS and wished that the conference was not being held on their campus. Nevertheless, the conference was held at Penn without incident.²²

In sum, pro-Israel individuals and groups have been especially active on campuses in recent years, working hard to silence criticism of Israel and promote a positive image of the Jewish state. Unfortunately, they have often employed strategies that are illegitimate and threaten open discourse in the academy.

ISRAEL AND THE DANGER OF OPEN DISCOURSE

There are two related reasons why defenders of Israel think that criticism of Israel is so dangerous and thus relentlessly labor to police academia. First, the case for America's special relationship with Israel is weak. Second, contrary to the claims of Israel's strongest backers, support for that relationship among the American people is neither wide nor deep. Americans do have a generally favorable image of Israel, but most of them do not think the United States should back Israel unconditionally.

This means that if there is an open and freewheeling discussion of Israeli history, Israeli policy in the Occupied Territories, and the U.S. relationship

with Israel, it would probably lead more Americans to pressure their leaders in Washington to abandon the special relationship and treat Israel like a normal country, much the way it treats other democracies like Britain, France, and India. The lobby wants to make sure that this does not happen, and thus it works 24/7 to shape the discourse so that Israel is portrayed in a favorable light.

Israel's relationship with the United States has no counterpart. Indeed, as the late Yitzhak Rabin once said, U.S. support for Israel is “beyond compare in modern history.”²³ To be more specific, the special relationship means that Washington gives Israel consistent diplomatic backing and more foreign aid than any other country, and gives it nearly unconditionally. In other words, Israel gets this aid even when it does things that the United States opposes, like building settlements in the Occupied Territories.

Many of Israel's supporters maintain that this special relationship is based on the fact that Israel is a vital strategic asset for the United States, and moreover, that it shares core American values.²⁴ Viewed objectively, however, these arguments cannot explain why Washington gives Israel so much aid and diplomatic support with so few strings.

Israel may have been a strategic asset during the Cold War, but that conflict is over. Today, giving Israel nearly unconditional support is one of the reasons the United States has a terrorism problem, and it makes it harder to address a range of other problems in the Middle East. Support for Israel is not the only source of anti-Americanism, of course, and our problems in the Middle East would not disappear if the United States had a more normal relationship with Israel. And Washington does benefit from some forms of strategic cooperation with Israel. But it is hard to argue that giving it nearly unconditional backing is making the United States more popular around the world or making American citizens more secure. On balance, it is now a strategic liability.²⁵

As for the claim that Israel is a democracy that shares our values, yes, Israel is a democracy, but so are many other countries, and none gets anywhere near as much support, and they certainly do not get it unconditionally. Furthermore, the United States is a liberal democracy that goes to great lengths not to discriminate against its citizens on the basis of religion, ethnicity, or race. It is certainly not a Christian state. Israel, on the other hand, is a Jewish state that discriminates against its Palestinian citizens in theory and in practice. Moreover, its cruel treatment of the Palestinians living in the Occupied

Territories is sharply at odds with American values. There is a strong moral case for Israel's existence—based on the long history of anti-Semitism—but its survival is fortunately not in jeopardy, and past crimes against the Jewish people do not justify giving Israel a blank check today.²⁶

THE AMERICAN PEOPLE AND ISRAEL

Some of Israel's staunchest defenders recognize that both the strategic and moral rationales do not carry much explanatory weight on close inspection, and argue instead that the United States backs Israel because there is broad and deep support for the special relationship among the American people, and politicians are just doing what the public wants.²⁷

This argument is not persuasive for several reasons. Americans do have a generally positive image of Israel—in part because of the lobby's efforts to promote favorable media coverage and stifle negative commentary—but most of them do not think their country should give Israel unconditional or one-sided aid. A survey conducted for the ADL in 2005 found that 78 percent of Americans think the United States should favor neither side in the Israeli-Palestinian conflict; and another survey conducted by the University of Maryland in 2003 found that over 70 percent of "politically active" Americans favored cutting aid to Israel if it refused to settle that conflict. A poll taken in August 2011 by the University of Maryland found that just 56 percent of Americans surveyed have a favorable view of Israel, and only 27 percent want the United States to "lean toward Israel" over the Palestinians.

The Pew Research Center for the People and the Press has been asking Americans for many years whether they sympathize more with Israel or the Palestinians. There has always been much more sympathy for Israel, but from 1993 through 2006, the number sympathetic to Israel only went above 50 percent once—it was 52 percent during the second Lebanon war in 2006—and was as low as 37 percent in July 2005. The American public's sympathies have changed hardly at all since 2006, according to subsequent Pew surveys.

Furthermore, most Americans recognize that the United States pays a price for its unyielding support of Israel. A Pew survey conducted in November 2005 found that 39 percent of the American public said that Israel was "a major cause of global discontent." Among opinion leaders, the numbers were substantially higher. Indeed, 78 percent of members of the news media

72 percent of military leaders, 72 percent of security experts, and 69 percent of foreign affairs specialists believe that backing Israel seriously damages America's image around the world. More recently, a BBC poll released on March 7, 2011, found that 43 percent of Americans thought that Israel's influence on the world was "mainly positive," while 41 percent said it was "mainly negative."²⁸

So while Americans have a generally favorable image of Israel and want it to exist and be secure, they are not insisting that Washington back it no matter what. But that is pretty much what U.S. policy is, and this gap is due largely to the political influence of the Israel lobby.

In sum, the strategic and moral justifications for the U.S. special relationship with Israel are weak, and there is no evidence that the American people are in favor of it. These basic facts mean that the lobby has to work hard to shape the discourse about Israel and make sure the American public thinks there are good reasons for maintaining that unique relationship. Its task, of course, is not easy in the halls of academia, where free speech and open discourse are core values. Nevertheless, Israel's supporters have mounted a full-court press on campuses across the country and have scored some notable successes. But thankfully they have not won every fight.

BIGGER TROUBLE AHEAD

In all likelihood, this situation will get worse, not better, in the foreseeable future. There is little reason to think that Israel will abandon the West Bank and allow the Palestinians to have a viable state of their own. Instead, Israel is likely to continue colonizing the West Bank while denying the Palestinians basic human rights and keeping them trapped in enclaves on the West Bank and Gaza. What this means is that there is going to be a Greater Israel between the Jordan River and the Mediterranean Sea, not a Palestinian state and an Israeli state living side by side.

Greater Israel, however, will be an apartheid state. Former Israeli prime minister Ehud Olmert made this point in November 2007, when he said that if there is no two-state solution, Israel will "face a South-African-style struggle." He went so far as to argue that "as soon as that happens, the state of Israel is finished." Former prime minister Ehud Barak, who later became Israel's defense minister, said in February 2010 that "as long as in this territory west of the Jordan River there is only one political entity called Israel it is going to be

either non-Jewish, or non-democratic. If this bloc of millions of Palestinians cannot vote, that will be an apartheid state.²⁹

The critical problem that Greater Israel's defenders will face is that it is impossible to defend apartheid, because it is antithetical to core Western values. How does one make a moral case for apartheid, especially in the United States, where democracy is venerated and segregation and racism are routinely condemned? It is hard to imagine the United States having a special relationship with an apartheid state for very long. Indeed, it is hard to imagine Americans having much sympathy for one. It is much easier to imagine the United States strongly opposing that racist state's political system and working hard to change it. Many other countries around the globe would surely follow suit. This is why former prime minister Olmert said that going down the apartheid road would be suicidal for Israel.

Given Israel's trajectory, there is not likely to be any letup in criticism of Israel inside and outside of the United States in the years ahead. Indeed, it is likely to intensify, because the discrimination and repression that are the essence of apartheid will be increasingly visible to people all around the world. Israel and its supporters have worked hard with considerable success to keep the mainstream media in the United States from telling the truth about what Israel is doing to the Palestinians in the Occupied Territories. The Internet, however, is a game changer. It not only makes it much easier for opponents of apartheid to get the real story out to the world, but it also allows Americans to learn the story that the *New York Times*, the *Wall Street Journal*, and the *Washington Post* have been hiding from them. Over time, this situation might even force those media institutions to cover the story more accurately themselves.

Naturally, the threat of even more pronounced criticism of Israel, and consequent criticism of America's support for an apartheid state, will motivate the lobby to work harder to defend Greater Israel. This surely means that hard-line defenders of the special relationship will intervene even more forcefully in academia and do everything possible to silence Israel's critics. They simply cannot allow an open discourse about Israel in the United States without placing the special relationship at risk.

In short, the lobby is likely to increase its already substantial presence on campuses and in the process do serious harm to the core principle of academic freedom that makes American colleges and universities so successful.

NOTES

1. This chapter is a revised version of a talk given at the Freedom and the University Symposium held at Columbia University on October 30, 2007.
2. Quoted in David Epstein, "We Need All of You," *Israel Campus Beat*, January 21, 2011. Also see Robert Wiener, "Sharansky Sees Campuses as Jewish Battleground," *New Jersey Jewish News*, May 25, 2011.
3. For a discussion of the Israel lobby, see John J. Mearsheimer and Stephen M. Walt, *The Israel Lobby and U.S. Foreign Policy* (New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2007), chap. 4.
4. Martin Kramer, *Ivory Towers on Sand: The Failure of Middle Eastern Studies in America* (Washington, D.C.: Washington Institute for Near East Policy, 2001).
5. Jennifer Howard, "DePaul Rejects Tenure Bid by Finkelstein and Says Dershowitz Pressure Played No Role," *Chronicle of Higher Education*, June 8, 2007. Also see Patricia Cohen, "Outspoken Political Scientist Denied Tenure at DePaul," *New York Times*, June 11, 2007.
6. Karen W. Arenson, "Fracas Erupts Over Book on Mideast by a Barnard Professor Seeking Tenure," *New York Times*, September 10, 2007; Annie Karni, "After Battle, Barnard Professor Given Tenure," *New York Sun*, November 2, 2007.
7. Jonathan R. Cole, "The Patriot Act on Campus: Defending the University Post 9/11," *Boston Review* 28, no. 3/4 (Summer 2003): 16-18; Chanakya Sethi, "Khalidi Candidacy for New Chair Draws Fire," *Daily Princetonian*, April 22, 2005; Chanakya Sethi, "Debate Grows Over Khalidi Candidacy," *Daily Princetonian*, April 28, 2005.
8. Liel Liebovitz, "Middle East Wars Flare Up at Yale," *Jewish Week*, June 2, 2006; Steve Lipman, "Opening the Ivy Doors," *Jewish Week*, December 22, 2006; Philip Weiss, "Burning Cole," *The Nation*, July 3, 2006.
9. Robert Gaines, "The Battle at Columbia University," *Washington Report on Middle East Affairs* (April 2005): 56-57; Nathaniel Popper, "Columbia Students Say Firestorm Blurs Campus Reality," *Forward*, February 11, 2005; Scott Sherman, "The Mideast Comes to Columbia," *The Nation*, April 4, 2005; "Columbia University Ad Hoc Grievance Committee, Final Report, New York, 28 March 2005 (excerpts)," in *Journal of Palestine Studies* 34, no. 4 (Summer 2005), 90-100.
10. David Project, *A Burning Campus? Rethinking Israel Advocacy at America's Universities and Colleges* (Boston, Mass.: 2012). Also see Julie Wiener, "The New Israel Campus Strategy," *Jewish Week*, February 14, 2012.
11. David Theo Goldberg and Saree Makdisi, "The Trial of Israel's Campus Critics," *Tikkun*, September/October 2009.
12. Ralph Blumenthal, "Cries to Halt Publication of Holocaust Book," *New York Times*, January 10, 1998; Norman G. Finkelstein, *Beyond Chutzpah: On the Misuse of Anti-Semitism and the Abuse of History* (Berkeley, Calif.: University of California Press, 2005), 55-56.
13. Jon Weiner, "Giving Chutzpah New Meaning," *The Nation*, July 11, 2005; "Dershowitz, Prof Spar Over Plagiarism," *New York Times*, July 14, 2005; Jennifer Howard,

- "Calif. Press Will Publish Controversial Book on Israel," *Chronicle of Higher Education*, July 22, 2005; Jon Wiener, "Chutzpah and Free Speech," *Los Angeles Times*, July 11, 2005.
14. Scott Jaschik, "A Book on Hold," *Inside Higher Ed*, September 11, 2007; Scott Jaschik, "Michigan Severs Ties to Controversial Publisher," *Inside Higher Ed*, June 18, 2008; Michal Lando, "Israel Critique on Campus," *Jerusalem Post*, November 4, 2007.
 15. Scott Jaschik, "Desmond Tutu, Persona Non Grata," *Inside Higher Ed*, October 4, 2007; Scott Jaschik, "St. Thomas Agrees to Invite Tutu," *Inside Higher Ed*, October 11, 2007; Jeff Shelman, "Oct. 10: About-face: Tutu Gets St. Thomas Invite," *Minneapolis Star Tribune*, October 22, 2007; Cecile Surasky, "Archbishop Tutu Barred by U. of St. Thomas Because of Criticism of Israel," posted on *MuzzleWatch*, October 3, 2007, <http://muzzlewatch.com/2007/10/03/bishop-tutu-barred-by-u-of-st-thomas-because-of-criticism-of-israel>.
 16. Michael Janofsky, "Invitation to Palestinian Draws Protest at Colorado College," *New York Times*, August 30, 2002; Michael A. de Yoanna, "Palestinian Activist Equated with 'Terror' in Fliers at U. Colorado," *New York Times*, September 6, 2002; Valerie Richardson, "College Rapped for 9/11 Speaker; Palestinian Pick on Anniversary Draws Outrage," *Washington Times*, August 30, 2002; Zionist Organization of America, "Hanan Ashrawi, Apologist for Terror, Should Be Disinvited from Colorado Symposium on 9/11 Anniversary," press release, August 30, 2002.
 17. Pam Beiluck, "At Brandeis, Carter Responds to Critics," *New York Times*, January 24, 2007; Nathaniel Popper, "Carter Wins Over Student Crowd at Brandeis, Receives Ovation," *Forward*, January 26, 2007; "Jimmy Carter Ducks Dershowitz, Open Questions," *Newsmax.com*, January 23, 2007.
 18. Cecile Surasky, "State University Hosts Israeli Historian Ilan Pappé—Says No to McCarthy Campaign," posted on *MuzzleWatch*, February 18, 2012, <http://muzzlewatch.com/2012/02/18/state-university-hosts-israeli-historian-ilan-pappe-says-no-to-mccarthyite-campaign>. On the Amcha Initiative's mission, see its website at <http://amchainitiative.org>. For its letter to the three presidents, see http://amchainitiative.org/pappe_at_csu.
 19. Naomi Zeveloff, "Coming Up Empty on Title VI," *Forward*, March 16, 2012; Naomi Zeveloff, "College Leaders Balance Israel and Speech," *Forward*, January 20, 2012; Zionist Organization of America, "ZOA Praises Office for Civil Rights—Opening Title VI Investigation of Anti-Semitic Environment at UC Santa Cruz Arising from Israel-Bashing," press release, March 14, 2011. A copy of Tammi Rossman-Benjamin's brief can be found at http://brandeiscenter.com/images/uploads/cases/complaint_ucsc.pdf.
 20. David Project, *A Burning Campus*; World Union of Jewish Students, *Hasbara Handbook: Promoting Israel on Campus* (Jerusalem: World Union of Jewish Students, March 2002); Mearsheimer and Walt, *The Israel Lobby*, 178–79.
 21. Mearsheimer and Walt, *The Israel Lobby*, 179–82.
 22. Amy Guttman and David L. Cohen, "Protecting Speech We May Not Like," *Daily Pennsylvanian*, February 1, 2012; Sarah Smith, "BDS Conference Arrives This

- Weekend: Alums Are Threatening to Cease Donations for Allowing the Conference on Campus," *Daily Pennsylvanian*, February 3, 2012; Shelli Gimelstein, "From 'Water Buffalo' to BDS, Penn Faces Free Speech Question," *Daily Pennsylvanian*, February 14, 2012.
23. Mearsheimer and Walt, *The Israel Lobby*, 23.
 24. Robert D. Blackwill and Walter B. Slocumbe, *Israel: A Strategic Asset for the United States* (Washington, D.C.: Washington Institute for Near East Policy, November 2011).
 25. Mearsheimer and Walt, *The Israel Lobby*, chap. 2; Stephen M. Walt, "News Flash: WINEP Defends the 'Special Relationship'," *Foreign Policy* (blog), November 9, 2011.
 26. Mearsheimer and Walt, *The Israel Lobby*, chap. 3.
 27. For a sophisticated version of this argument, see Jerome Slater, "The Two Books of Mearsheimer and Walt," *Security Studies* 18, no. 1 (January–March 2009): 4–57. For a rebuttal, see John J. Mearsheimer and Stephen M. Walt, "Is It Love or the Lobby? Explaining America's Special Relationship with Israel," *Security Studies* 18, no. 1 (January–March 2009): 58–78.
 28. British Broadcasting Corporation, "BBC World Service Country Rating Poll," press release, March 7, 2011, 19–20; Mearsheimer and Walt, *The Israel Lobby*, 108–10; Pew Research Center for the People and the Press, "Views of Middle East Unchanged by Recent Events," June 10, 2011; Steven Kull and Shibley Telhami (principal investigators), "The American Public on the 9/11 Decade" (program on International Policy Attitudes, University of Maryland, September 8, 2011), 15; Stephen M. Walt, "Do the American People Support the 'Special Relationship'?", *Foreign Policy* (blog), June 3, 2011.
 29. Barak Ravid et al., "Olmert to Ha'aretz: Two-State Solution, or Israel Is Done For," *Ha'aretz*, November 29, 2007; Rory McCarthy, "Barak: Make Peace with Palestinians or Face Apartheid," *Guardian*, February 2, 2010.