

16 BDS and Zionophobic Racism

Judea Pearl

Judea Pearl was thrust into the public eye by the brutal 2002 murder of his son, reporter Daniel Pearl, by jihadi radicals in Pakistan whose hate was focused on Daniel's Jewishness. Pearl and his family went on to establish the Daniel Pearl Foundation to continue his son's "life-work of dialogue and understanding and to address the root causes of his tragedy." Pearl's global reputation for moral rectitude, intellectual clarity, and great dignity inspired us to invite his contribution to our volume. In this essay, he analyzes the moral bankruptcy of the BDS movement and exposes its venomous goals, unabashedly identifying it as a racist movement. On the relationship between BDS and freedom of speech, Pearl is particularly decisive, writing, "A racist movement that shows no respect for truth or other people's identity can hardly be expected to respect the sanctity of academic freedom."

Preface

My contribution to this volume builds heavily on an article I wrote for the *Los Angeles Review of Books* (LARB) titled "BDS, Racism and the New McCarthyism."¹ It was written three years ago, when the Boycott, Divestment, and Sanctions (BDS) movement was still an enigmatic phenomenon and only a handful of writers recognized its hypocritical and downright racist character. Things have changed in the past three years. On the global sphere, BDS has managed to reveal its agenda and to galvanize the Jewish community in an unprecedented wave of unity and determination. If the Jewish people ever needed a name for its sworn enemies, a name that negates the core of Israel's existence, free of secondary issues of territories, antisemitism, or political grievances, BDS has given it to us. In fact, it was BDS and the gullible intellectuals who joined its bandwagon that revealed to the world the persistent and uncompromising nature of Arab rejectionism. Even some of my J Street colleagues, who never miss an opportunity to spoil Jewish consensus, managed to find a reason to oppose BDS.

In the microcosm of my own campus, while BDS cronies continued to harass fellow students and silence pro-coexistence voices, the word *BDS*

became synonymous with “toxic nuisance” and essentially disappeared from the public square. Even BDS-controlled groups such as Students for Justice in Palestine (SJP) and the Muslim Student Association (MSA) now try hard to hide any association with their mother ideology, BDS, pretending to be working independently. More revealing yet, Hillel’s students at University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA) began urging me not to write anti-BDS op-eds anymore, lest they receive undue attention and wake up from their blissful slumber. The recent defeat of a pro-BDS resolution at the Modern Language Association (MLA), the traditional stronghold of anti-Israel academics, testifies to a movement gone stale, kept alive by its adversaries more than its supporters.

It was not BDS’s fictional call for an economic boycott of Israel but its threat to the Zionist idea itself that galvanized this broad resistance and has helped people discover what values unite them all, liberal and conservatives, orthodox and secular, and how central the existence of Israel is to Jews and to people of conscience everywhere. With this context in mind, I here submit a revised version of my earlier article.

Imagine a forum on the spread of Islamophobia. The first thing that comes to mind is: “Yes, we should measure the magnitude of this phenomenon, understand the origins of its ideology, examine what drives its advocates, unearth who funds them, assess the dangers they pose to society, and so on.”

Similar expectations came to mind when I was invited to participate in the LARB forum on BDS.

Now, imagine my surprise on discovering that this forum did not intend to investigate the inner workings of the BDS movement but to be a “balanced debate” on the merits of its objective: an academic boycott of Israel. Moreover, some of the contributors to the forum were active leaders in the BDS phenomenon and longtime delegitimizers of Israel.

My thought was: should I bestow academic credibility onto an ideology that accuses me of crimes as ridiculous as ethnic cleansing, apartheid, and colonialism when I do research at my alma mater, the Technion, in Israel?

I further thought: why have the editors chosen to give a stage to advocates of a morally deformed movement that even anti-Israel advocate Noam Chomsky describes as a “hypocrisy rising to heaven,”² and arch Israel-hater Norman Finkelstein characterizes as a “hypocritical, dishonest cult” led by “dishonest gurus”³? It would be like hosting a balanced debate between supporters and detractors of the Flat Earth Society (FES), or, God forbid, the Americans for the Restoration of Slavery (ARS). Evidently, the editors of LARB had deemed some of the BDS arguments to be semirational or even debatable.

Despite these misgivings, I accepted their invitation, hoping to prove them wrong on both counts.

The BDS Arguments and Tactics

The core of the BDS appeal seems compelling in its simplicity⁴.

- The Israeli-Palestinian conflict has been going on for too long; it has caused much suffering and must come to an end.
- Israel is guilty of prolonging the conflict, be it via action, inaction, or by merely continuing to exist.
- Boycotting is a nonviolent way of pressuring Israel to act the way we (BDS) think she should.

As many of us have witnessed, BDS tactics are brilliant. Boycott has never been its aim; what university would go along with such a childish, antiacademic idea? Its aim has always been to bombard campuses with an endless stream of anti-Israel resolutions. The charges may vary from season to season, the authors may rotate, and it matters not whether a resolution passes or fails, nor whether it is condemned or hailed. The victory lies in having a stage, a microphone, and a finger pointing at Israel saying, “On trial!” It is only a matter of time before innocent students, mostly the gullible and uninformed, will start chanting, “On trial!” It worked in Munich, and it has worked on some campuses. The effect will be felt among the next generation of policy makers.

The Facts Behind the Rhetoric

Everyone agrees that the Middle East conflict has inflicted unimaginable suffering on both Palestinians and Israelis, that the status quo is not sustainable, and that it must end through some sort of healing and compromise. However, note a fundamental difference in optics between the BDS spokespersons and their opponents. The former see one and only one type of suffering; the latter see suffering on both sides.⁵

Some human beings are endowed with an amazing capacity to filter reality and see only that which fits their agenda. BDS advocates see the checkpoints, the separation wall, the night raids, and the home demolitions in the West Bank. They do not see the innocent victims of terror. They do not see the innocent babies who owe their lives to the wall. They certainly do not see the anxiety of 7.9 million human beings living under the shadow of hundreds of thousands of deadly rockets, aimed at their civilian populations.

BDS followers possess infinite capacity to remember every horror of the 1948 war that led to the Palestinian refugee problem but zero capacity to remember another refugee problem. Between 1936 and 1940, the British government succumbed to mass Palestinian riots and blockaded Jewish refugees from entering Palestine—thus sealing their fate in Auschwitz. My grandparents were among them. Perhaps it is hard for BDS supporters to acknowledge these refugees

because they are not with us to testify. What they should be able to acknowledge, though, and rarely do, is the 1948 Arab attack on the newly created nation of Israel, which, by all historical accounts, was genocidal in intent and left deep scars on the Israeli psyche. I mention these scars because they are deliberately ignored by those who urge one side to undo injustices of the past. Scars on both sides beg for healing; seeing some and not others is seeing none.

The one-way prism worn by BDS advocates is most glaring when it comes to the issue of self-determination. Some of their intellectuals preach for hours and hours on the moral right of Palestinians to self-determination. At the same time, they intentionally forget, wish away, or deny the moral right of their neighbors to that same self-determination. In the old days, we used to label such intellectuals *racists* and shun them from the company of those of goodwill. Nowadays, the label *racist* is reserved primarily for Islamophobes and white settlers, real and imaginary, while the distinct racist character of the BDS ideology is rarely condemned for what it is. It is time to change that.

Israel's Exclusive Guilt of Action and Inaction

It is true that the occupation is an ugly predicament. However, anyone who sees Israel as the sole culprit for this unfortunate entanglement is guilty of blindness or dishonesty. Israel has been pilloried elsewhere in this forum, I am sure, so I am going to focus on the Arab contribution that prolongs this conflict. Often overlooked by Israel's detractors is that the Arab side has taken what should have been a diplomatic negotiation on borders and resources and turned it into an almost unresolvable security issue. How? By nurturing a culture in which coexistence means defeat and ending the conflict is a cardinal sin.

Of course, settlements present a roadblock to a two-state solution. But how can an honest person fixate on a roadblock and not notice the white elephant ahead—the deeply entrenched, triple-tier, hundred-foot wall of Arab rejectionism that blocks all roads to this or to any other solution?

Assigning guilt to one side only and rushing to issue an indictment, a verdict, and a sentence—as BDS has done—is dishonest, reckless, and probably racist. Most people of conscience understand that Israel derives no pleasure from controlling another people's lives. The current situation is imposed on Israel by neighbors who continue to announce that they wish her dead and lifting the occupation would only embolden their wishes. BDS's complaints about travel restrictions on students in the West Bank appear grotesque compared to the daily existential threats that Israelis are enduring.

The BDS Agenda: From Slander to Elimination

Some people are of the opinion that supporters of the boycott are “decent people whose main motivation is to create the conditions for genuine intellectual

exchange.”⁶ This is indeed what one may be tempted to conclude from reading the texts of their resolutions and proclamations on campuses and in public—a glorious hymn to human rights, peace, brotherhood, and social justice. However, this is not the purpose for which these proclamations are being used.

The leaders of the BDS movement do not hide their real purpose: In every conversation with them, they admit that their ultimate goal is not to end the occupation, and surely not to promote peace or coexistence, but to choreograph an arena in which the criminality of Israel is debated and her character defamed. In other words, their goal is not to win a debate but to stage one, in which the words *boycott Israel* are repeated time and again to slowly penetrate listeners’ minds, thereby tarnishing Israel’s image with a stain of criminality. Net effect: bullying pro-coexistence voices into silence.⁷

Omar Barghouti, cofounder and top ideologist of BDS, repeatedly has stated that ending the occupation is not the end of BDS. BDS will continue its struggle until Israel’s legitimacy is eroded and its sovereignty dissolved. In a video dated September 29, 2013, for example, he states: “Colonizers [read: Zionists] are not entitled to self-determination by any definition of self-determination.”⁸ In his lecture at UCLA on January 15, 2014, he stated again that Jews in Israel are not entitled to any form of self-determination, on any piece of land, however slim. “They are not a people,” he proclaimed (with a straight face), “and the UN principle of the right to self-determination does not apply to them.”⁹

Consider the implications of committing 6.4 million human beings to eternal statelessness, stripped of their protective sovereignty, in a neighborhood that is boiling with genocidal designs. In so doing, Barghouti has, in effect, defined BDS as a racist, if not genocidal, movement. His statements were not disavowed by any BDS activist that I know of and certainly not by my esteemed colleague Professor Robin Kelley, who introduced Barghouti at UCLA with reverence befitting a reincarnated Mandela. Kelley is a distinguished professor of history, specializing in social movements, poverty, colonialism/imperialism, and race, and has other noble credentials. To charge such professors with racism or bigotry would normally be considered heresy of the first degree. But should it be? Shouldn’t they be reminded that words and actions have consequences, that there are human beings affected by those consequences, and that the cruelty of those consequences can exceed that which is inspired by acknowledged racists and bigots?

Who Is Indigenous, and Who Is a Colonizer?

When a student stood up at Barghouti’s UCLA lecture and said that he was a tenth-generation Israeli and therefore indigenous, Barghouti scoffed, “You aren’t indigenous just because you say you are.” So, what does Barghouti accept as a qualification for indigeneity? You guessed correctly: race! According to Barghouti, that young student could be indigenized at the end of a few generations if his family intermarried with the Arab claimants of the land.¹⁰

This genetically defined conception of ownership is not uncommon in BDS circles; it is endemic to societies lacking historical narratives and traditions on which to base claims.¹¹ While modern norms no longer accept racial criteria as a basis for claims, BDS intellectuals are still playing the race card when it comes to Israel. The idea that indigeneity, peoplehood, and nationhood are based on collective memories and continuity of historical narratives, not on genetic lineage, must be as foreign to BDS intellectuals as history itself.

It is not surprising, therefore, that misrepresenting Israel as a “white settlers colonialist society” has become a cornerstone of BDS ideology and propaganda. UCLA’s James Gelvin, for example, another history professor turned BDS propagandist, continues to teach this white settlers ideology to unsuspecting students year after year, with full knowledge of his department. Readers are invited to count the number of times these labels are used in essays written by BDS supporters.

And, while counting, readers should ask themselves if they can recall:

- One case of white settlers moving into a country they perceived to be the birthplace of their history
- One case of white settlers speaking a language spoken in the land before the language spoken by its contemporary residents
- One case of settlers whose holidays commemorated historical events in the land to which they moved—not in the lands from which they came
- One case of settlers who did not name towns like New York, New Amsterdam, and New Wales (Israeli towns are not named “New Warsaw,” “New Berlin,” and “New Baghdad”), but after names by which those towns were known in ancient times.
- One case of settlers who narrated their homecoming journey for eighty generations in poetry, prose, lore, and daily prayers

Modern philosophers of political liberalism (like John Stewart Mill in “On Liberty”), after rejecting race as a basis for settling territorial claims, have identified collective memory and historical continuity as far more reasonable bases for defining boundaries between groups and nationalities. Today, these collective states of mind are the strongest forces that tie functional societies together—among them the pluralistic, secular, multiethnic, and multiracial society of Israel. They cannot be replaced by the old glues of common blood, common color, or common place of residence.

Why Pick on Israel?

Some of my colleagues find contradiction in BDS’s relentless attacks on tolerant Israel, while obvious violators of human rights, such as Iran, Saudi Arabia,

or Palestine, enjoy BDS silence, if not favors. I for one am not surprised. For BDS, human rights is merely a slogan to rally the uninformed around the banner of Israel bashing. What is puzzling to me, however, are the intellectuals who have read a chapter or two in the history of the Middle East yet buy into this deception. I can only conclude that there must be some deeply ingrained animosity that turns such intellectuals against Israel. What is it?

I believe the answer lies in what Israel represents to BDS followers and to the world.

To most of the civilized world, Israel represents the ideas of nation-building, historical continuity, and man's victory over repression and death. Marxist-leaning intellectuals (most BDS followers), on the other hand, see Israel's success as a failure of their ideology. It is a pillar of their belief that nationalism is an evil and anachronistic myth. The success of the Zionist experiment refutes this belief. It has unveiled the infinite energy that can be unleashed through that anachronistic and mythical idea called *peoplehood*, as it emerges from the unifying and creative force called *shared history*. It has demonstrated to the world how scattered tribes of beggars and peddlers can lift themselves from the margins of history and transform themselves into a world center of art, science, and entrepreneurship. Marxist intellectuals will never forgive Israel for proving their textbooks wrong.

The entire neural architecture of BDS intellectuals is wired around the hated image of white settlers who have long disappeared from the earth (not counting the Falkland Islands). Israel is hated because the white settler must be reinvented to fit the villain script. These intellectuals cannot stomach Israel's narrative of "a nation rebuilding its historical homeland," which has inspired so many communities to seize control over their destinies and strive for freedom and excellence. They cannot forgive Israel for giving new meaning to man's existence, a meaning that transcends class struggle and racial strife and, instead, unites people and propels them to move forward and dare the impossible. It is no coincidence that despite the daily threats to her existence, Israel is one of the most optimistic nations on earth.

The Anti-Academic Issue

Some of my colleagues are surprised that BDS has chosen to cross the red line of academic freedom and call for a boycott of Israeli universities. They claim that any university that does not officially denounce the occupation is guilty of a crime and should therefore be punished by boycott. (It is as if any American university that does not officially denounce the Tea Party or abortion clinics deserves punishment.)

I am not a bit surprised, because, as we have seen before, it is not the veracity of the charges that matters but their music—in the grand opera of BDS's slander

machine, it is not the libretto that matters but the stage and the megaphone. A racist movement that shows no respect for truth or other people's identity can hardly be expected to respect the sanctity of academic freedom.

One academic organization that was lured by the siren song of BDS was the hapless American Studies Association (ASA), which in 2014 passed a resolution calling for an academic boycott of Israel. This turned the whole notion of academic freedom on its head, and naturally, it generated an immediate backlash: over two hundred college and university presidents condemned the ASA for their resolution.

The backlash was, in fact, so profound that, at UCLA, SJP, the campus proxy of BDS, had to change tactics and distance themselves from the BDS movement when they tried to convince the student council to vote for a divestment resolution. They failed—because the tactic was transparently dishonest—and the resolution was defeated seven to five. The important lesson is that, from the students' perspective, affiliation with BDS has finally turned into a liability. One can only hope that this perspective will become the norm on all US campuses. Nevertheless, BDS proxies continue to harass pro-coexistence students and others who do not share the BDS agenda, as we have witnessed in the case of Milan Chatterjee, former president of the Graduate Students Association, who ultimately felt forced to leave UCLA after months of harassment.¹²

What Can University Administrators Do?

My own position on academic boycotts is summarized in an open letter I wrote to John Sexton, president of New York University (NYU):

January 20, 2014

Dear President Sexton,

I am writing to you as an alumnus of an NYU-affiliated school who is deeply concerned with the recent boycott resolution by the American Studies Association (ASA) and its adverse impact on the reputation of NYU.

I received my Ph.D. in 1965 from the Polytechnic Institute of Brooklyn, which last month became part of NYU. In November 2013, I was awarded the Distinguished Alumnus Award from NYU-Poly, an honor that made my association with NYU stronger and full of pride. I was disappointed therefore to learn that the leadership of the ASA, which pushed through a resolution that threatens the very fabric of academic life, is so intimately connected with NYU, both academically and administratively.

Four ASA National Council members (25%) are affiliated with NYU and vocally campaigned for the resolution. In particular, the ASA President-elect, Lisa Duggan, is NYU Professor of Social and Cultural Analysis. This means that in the next couple of years, NYU will become the semi-official host to most activities of this organization, and will be perceived as the academic

lighthouse from which this group will be broadcasting its irresponsible, anti-coexistence and anti-academic ideology.

I represent a group of professors who are particularly affected by the ASA boycott resolution. As part of my recent appointment to Visiting Professor at the Technion, Israel Institute of Technology, I am engaged in joint scientific projects with the Technion and its research staff. I also collaborate with Israeli universities on journalistic projects, named after my late son, Daniel Pearl, which aim at bringing Israeli and Palestinian journalists together.

I think you can appreciate how demoralizing the ASA action has been for me, as well as for other professors in my position. It is not that we view the ASA action as a danger to the continuation of our research projects—scientific collaboration has endured many hecklers in the past, much louder than the ASA drummers, and the latter are clearly more interested in defamation than in an actual boycott. What we do consider dangerous is the very attempt to contaminate our scientific explorations with a charge of criminality, and to bring that “criminality” for a so-called “debate” in the public square, on our own campuses. We view this attempt as a new form of McCarthyism that is aimed at intimidating and silencing opposing voices, and thus threatens academic freedom and the fundamental principles of academic institutions.

When a group of self-appointed vigilantes empowers itself with a moral authority to incriminate the academic activities of their colleagues, we are seeing the end of academia and the end of the sacred academic principles that have been painstakingly developed over centuries.

It is for this reason that I was personally disappointed with your letter which, while expressing opposition to boycotts in general and the ASA resolution in particular, failed to identify the ASA action as an imminent threat to NYU’s reputation. Your letter did not state whether the ASA will be able to continue using NYU facilities and services as its de facto national headquarters, and what action you plan to take to restrain its leaders from re-staining the name of NYU with similar actions in the future.

In the name of many NYU alumni who wish to remain proud of their alma mater, I strongly urge you to remove NYU’s name from the ASA “institutional member” list (as other universities have done), and to voice a strong and unequivocal condemnation of the pro-boycott activities of the ASA leadership.

Sincerely,

Judea Pearl
UCLA

This letter to President Sexton was intended to close a gap between what university administrators say about the boycott and what they have done about it thus far. If the boycott stands contrary to basic academic principles, then, surely, boycott advocates are undermining those principles and should be exposed.

Of course, no one expects university administrators to discipline professors who violate academic principles; academic freedom survives by leaving its principles vulnerable to abuse. What one nevertheless expects campus leaders to do is to *define* the norms of a desirable campus environment and to identify activities that do not contribute to such an environment. I hope that activities that undermine academic principles are classified in this category.

I have recently come to understand how campus norms are shaped by willing administrators without infringing on anyone's free speech and without curtailing anyone's academic freedom. It came to my attention in a letter that the chancellor of UC Davis sent to the campus community. The occasion was an event planned for January 13, 2017, featuring Milo Yiannopoulos, an editor at Breitbart News, known for his provocative anti-leftist commentary. In a masterfully worded letter, Davis's interim chancellor, Ralph J. Hexter, said this: "A university is at its best ... when it listens to opposing views, especially ones that many of us find upsetting or even offensive." Thus, Yiannopoulos is a welcome guest. But then came the punchline: "This does not mean, however, that we take an approving or even neutral position with respect to speech intended to express hate or to denigrate or offend others. . . . Such speech we unequivocally condemn." In other words, we are not censoring nor excluding, not even condemning, this ugly speaker, not least because doing so will invite complaints, if not legal action, from organizations such as Council on Islamic-American Relations (CAIR) and the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU). No. We are noble, inclusive, and absolutely viewpoint-neutral. What we can do, however, is tell the campus community which speakers we believe are radioactive and which are safe, and we do so only if it is true that their "speech [is] intended to express hate or to denigrate or offend others."

I call this approach selective neutrality. The neutrality is just right, I think, and both wise and effective. But why selective? Because such a message was not sent by Davis's chancellor in the week preceding the anti-Zionist speech of Azka Fayyaz, who spoke at UC Davis in January 2015 at the invitation of the SJP. Nor was such a letter sent by the UCLA chancellor in the day preceding the offensive appearance of Roger Waters on November 30, 2016, who spoke at UCLA at the invitation of the SJP.

A first step for university administrators who are serious about restoring campus civility, then, must be to internalize the equation: Zionophobia = Islamophobia. The antipathy to Jewish self-determination is no less heinous than the antipathy to Islam and to Muslims. Religion, in other words, has no monopoly on human sensitivity. All identity-defining symbols should be equally respected, and equal protection should be applied against all forms of discrimination, including anti-Zionism, Islamophobia, white supremacy, and more.

Selective neutrality should be the instrument with which the university administration distinguishes those who contribute to a respectful campus climate

and productive discourse and debate from those who disrupt such a climate and discriminate against various identities. It must be selective, not in the sense of being inconsistent but in the sense of defining and shaping appropriate campus norms. So understood, it is perhaps the only legitimate means by which academic norms can be reestablished on campus.

Peace and the Future of Israel/Palestine

For those who are curious about my own thoughts on the prospects of peace in the Middle East, they can be summed up in one sentence:

“Two states for two peoples, equally legitimate and equally indigenous.”

When Palestinian leadership gathers the courage to utter the magical words *equally indigenous*, peace will become unstoppable—not even BDS will be able to stop it.¹³

JUDEA PEARL is Chancellor Professor of Computer Science and Director of the UCLA Cognitive Systems Laboratory. Known internationally for his contributions to artificial intelligence, human reasoning, and philosophy of science, he is a member of the National Academy of Sciences and a founding fellow of the Association for Artificial Intelligence. Pearl is also the father of slain *Wall Street Journal* reporter Daniel Pearl and president of the Daniel Pearl Foundation. With his wife, Ruth, he edited the book *I Am Jewish: Personal Reflections Inspired by the Last Words of Daniel Pearl*, winner of the 2004 National Jewish Book Award.

Notes

1. Judea Pearl, “BDS, Racism, and the New McCarthyism,” *Los Angeles Review of Books* (March 16, 2014), <https://lareviewofbooks.org/essay/bds-new-mccarthyism/>. Material appears here by permission.

2. Dave Markland, “Chomsky on BDS: A Transcript,” *Z Blogs* (July 4, 2017), <https://zcomm.org/zblogs/chomsky-on-bds-a-transcript/>.

3. Marcus Dysch, “Finkelstein Disowns ‘Silly’ Israel Boycott,” *The Jewish Chronicle* (February 16, 2012), <https://www.thejc.com/news/uk-news/finkelstein-disowns-silly-israel-boycott-1.31716>.

4. See the official website of the BDS movement: <https://bdsmovement.net/what-is-bds> (accessed November 14, 2017).

5. I invite readers to examine the essays in the original *Los Angeles Review of Books* collection and note this glaring asymmetry.

6. David N. Myers, “U.S. Academics Should Not Boycott Israeli Universities,” *Jewish Journal* (December 18, 2013), <http://jewishjournal.com/opinion/125482/>.

7. Indeed, this LARB “forum” was itself a great achievement for BDS: it provided a public arena where the words *boycott Israel* were repeated many times and, unless taken humorously, helped achieve their subliminal goal on unsuspecting readers.

8. Benjamin Doherty, "Watch: Omar Barghouti on 'Ethical Decolonization' and Moving Beyond Zionist Racism," *The Electronic Intefada* (September 29, 2013), <https://electronicintifada.net/blogs/benjamin-doherty/watch-omar-barghouti-ethical-decolonization-and-moving-beyond-zionist-racism>.
9. Roberta Seid, "Omar Barghouti at UCLA: A Speaker Who Brings Hate," *Jewish Journal* (January 16, 2014), <http://jewishjournal.com/opinion/126186/>
10. Eyewitness report by Roberta Seid in Ryan Torok, "Eritrean Solidarity Rally Underscores Community Divisiveness Over Israel," *Jewish Journal* (January 22, 2014), http://jewishjournal.com/news/los_angeles/126278/.
11. A Columbia professor, George Saliba, became famous for allegedly scolding a green-eyed Jewish student for tracing her ancestry to Semitic roots and biblical times. Saliba claimed that the green-eyed student, as well as most Jews of European origin, are descendants of the medieval Khazars and, therefore, have no claim to Middle Eastern lands. See Aymen Jawad, "Middle Eastern Christians and Antisemitism," *The Jerusalem Post* (August 1, 2011), <http://www.jpost.com/Opinion/Op-Ed-Contributors/Middle-Eastern-Christians-and-anti-Semitism>.
12. See chapter 26 in the current volume.
13. Acknowledgment: This article benefited substantially from discussions with David Brandes.