

ACE-FEDERAL

CATHERINE

CALLING FOR ACCOUNTABILITY:

STOPPING ANTISEMITIC COLLEGE CHAOS

Thursday, May 23, 2024

House of Representatives,

Committee on Education and The Workforce,

Washington, D.C.

The committee met, pursuant to call, at 9:48, a.m., in room 2175, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Virginia Foxx, [chairwoman of the committee] presiding.

Present: Representatives Foxx, Walberg, Grothman, Stefanik, Allen, Banks, Owens, Good, Steel, Kiley, Bean, Burlison, Chavez-DeRemer, Williams, Houchin, Scott, Courtney, Bonamici, Takano, Adams, DeSaulnier, Norcross, Jayapal, Wild, Omar, Stevens, Leger Fernandez, and Manning.

Staff present: Cyrus Artz, Staff Director; Nick Barley, Deputy Communications Director; Mindy Barry, General Counsel; Isabel Foster, Press Assistant; Daniel Fuenzalida, Staff Assistant; Sheila Havenner, Director of Information Technology; Amy Raaf Jones, Director of Education and Human Services Policy; Julianne Jones, Intern; Isaiah Knox, Legislative Assistant; Georgie Littlefair, Clerk; Hannah Matesic, Deputy Staff Director; Audra McGeorge, Communications Director; Rebecca Powell, Staff Assistant; David

Samberg, Associate Investigative Counsel; Maura Williams, Director of Operations; Ari Wisch, Senior Counselor to the Chairwoman; Brittany Alston, Minority Operations Assistant; Ni'Aisha Banks, Minority Staff Assistant; Ilana Brunner, Minority General Counsel; Ellie Berenson, Minority Press Assistant; Amaris Benavidez, Minority Professional Staff; Nekea Brown, Minority Director of Operations; Hailee Clack, Minority Intern; Scott Estrada, Minority Professional Staff; Rashage Green, Minority Director of Education Policy & Counsel; Christian Haines, Minority General Counsel; Raiyana Malone, Minority Press Secretary; Marie McGrew, Minority Press Assistant; Paola Milbank, Minority Staff Assistant; Veronique Pluviose, Minority Staff Director; Samantha Wilkerson, Minority CBCF Fellow; and Banyon Vassar, Minority Director of IT.

Chairwoman Foxx. Good morning. The Committee on Education and the Workforce will come to order. I note that a quorum is present. Without objection, the Chair is authorized to call a recess at any time. I want the door shut, it's too noisy. Okay.

In Ernest Hemingway's novel, *The Sun Also Rises*, two characters are discussing bankruptcy. "How did you go bankrupt," asked Bill. "Two ways," Mike responds. "Gradually then suddenly." No three words better apply to the decline in postsecondary education that has transpired gradually, then suddenly.

These three little words paved the road that led to today's hearing. Over the course of years, decades even, universities gradually nurtured a campus culture of radicalism, in which antisemitism grew and became tolerated by administrators. The Committee's been steadfast in its dedication to attacking the roots of antisemitic hatred, including anti Israel DEI bureaucracies, and questionable foreign funding.

Then suddenly, over the course of weeks, days even, universities burst into antisemitic chaos. October 7th ignited a powder keg of pro-terror campus fervor, a shocking spectacle for the American public. Suddenly, the radicalized zealots found a cause and group that they could graft their hate onto. Somehow Jews fit neatly into DEI's oppression matrix, thereby justifying antisemitism.

In the morning following October 7th, radicalized students have harassed, assaulted, and intimidated their Jewish peers. These antisemitic protests have led to hijacking buildings, erecting unlawful encampments, disrupting classrooms, and cancelling commencements. They've been the principal agents of anti-Jewish harassment and violence, and have made an absolute mockery of so-called university leaders.

That's why the Committee is yet again calling for accountability from those in charge of universities. Today, with Mr. Michael Schill of Northwestern University, Dr.

Gene Block of UCLA, and Dr. Jonathan Holloway of Rutgers University.

Each of you should be ashamed of your decisions that allowed antisemitic encampments to endanger Jewish students. Mr. Schill and Dr. Holloway, you should be doubly ashamed for capitulating to the antisemitic rulebreakers. Our job today is first and foremost, to hold those who are supposed to be in charge to account.

Dr. Gene Block, you will testify to the horrific violent events that unfolded at UCLA, leading to 243 arrests. You cleared the encampment only after a violent riot erupted. For days you stood by as Jews were assaulted, and illegal checkpoints blocked access to campus in broad daylight. Your actions were too little too late.

Second, the Committee will highlight the concessions universities doled out to rulebreakers. Dr. Holloway, you accepted 8 of the 10 encampment demands, including an egregious amnesty deal to Rutgers students and faculty involved in the encampment. I'd like to know what sort of message you think that sends to your Jewish students.

Mr. Schill, you cut a disgraceful deal with the encampment that prompted 7 Jewish members of your own antisemitism advisory committee to resign in protest. You and President Holloway struck deals that guaranteed jobs and admissions to Palestinians, an apparent violation of federal antidiscrimination laws. I'd like to know how you think your quotas comply with the Civil Rights Act.

Those who are in charge of universities who negotiate with pro-terror protestors are not doing their jobs. Taxpayer dollars have no business funding universities without principles that align with the principles of this country. Each of you refused to enforce your own rules, preserve campus safety, and protect Jewish students.

Finally, I want to make one thing clear. The purpose of these hearings is not to enact right wing cancel culture, as purported by the left. The purpose is to end antisemitic violence and harassment on campus, full stop. Hearing with college

Presidents are meant to help guide postsecondary education policies going forward that meet the needs and respect the rights of all students.

We will certainly keep your answers to our questions in mind as the Committee conducts further business. With that, I yield to the Ranking Member.

Mr. Scott. Thank you, Madam Chair, and thank our witnesses for appearing today. There's no question that we can do more to combat antisemitism, not just on college campuses, but everywhere. No one should be threatened, harassed or attacked because of who they are, or who they worship.

Moreover, students cannot learn if they feel unsafe, yet here we are for the fifth time in six months holding another hearing to complain about the problem of antisemitism, but no work is being done to find a meaningful solution to address the animus on college campuses.

Complaining about a problem is not a solution. Certainly, it certainly riles people up, generates a lot of media coverage, but it doesn't solve anything. To the best of my knowledge the only change that has resulted from these hearings is that a handful of individuals have lost their jobs, schools have had to dedicate hours that they could have spent working to combat discrimination on campus, instead of responding to majority's legal requests and law firms advising college Presidents have made a lot of money preparing their clients to testify in these hearings.

In 2017, after white supremacists marched through the grounds of the University of Virginia, chanting slogans such as, "Jews will not replace us." I wrote a letter to my republican colleagues asking for a hearing to discuss rising tensions and discrimination on college campuses. Regrettably, the Committee did not hold any such hearings, and we did not address the issue at the time.

Jewish students, in fact all students, have a right to attend college free from

hostility, and in compliance with Title 6 of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. There's no excuse for antisemitism on campus, and everyone is entitled to a safe harbor, and this is why we should ensure that the Department of Education's Office of Civil Rights has the resource it needs to investigate where campuses are failing to protect against antisemitic acts, or otherwise not protecting against civil rights violations.

And I believe we should increase funding for that office, in light of the increased number of complaints. But last year my republican colleagues called for a 25 percent cut in funding for that office. This would have been a significant impediment for the Department of Education's efforts to investigate these issues. Meanwhile, DEI programs, which try to bring people together are being disparaged and eliminated.

As I said before, hateful incidents of antisemitism do not happen in isolation, they are a byproduct of this country's century-long history of white supremacy and antisemitism. And we cannot feign surprise at hate speech on our college campuses. I'll note again the campuses are polarized, as is our society. We have unfortunately seen a disturbing rise in incidents, not only of antisemitism, but also Islamophobia, racism, homophobia, and all other forms of hate, and all of which need to be addressed.

As Mr. Lawrence notes in his testimony today, colleges and universities exist to examine complex issues, challenges and ideas to provide a forum in which issues and opinions can be explored and can be debated. Freedom of inquiry and expression must include the right to protest.

And he also notes that the limits of this expression are reached when actual threats, or undue disruption of the university's operations are involved. No one in this panel is advocating for violence, harassment, or disruption of university's operations, but students have the right to peacefully protest and express their opinions regardless of whether or not those opinions are politically unpopular, or morally abhorrent.

In public colleges and universities, two of which are with us today, the First Amendment protects both popular and agreeable speech, and speech that people can reasonably disagree with, including sometimes hateful words, but again, in painting with a broad brush the majority has attempted to remove any distinction between hate speech and genuine political protests.

And I'd like to remind everyone that the civil rights movement of U.S. past, has always moved public opinion, rather than just waiting it for change. Today, 81 percent of Americans report a favorable opinion of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. But in 1966, a Gallop survey found that nearly two thirds of Americans had an unfavorable opinion of Dr. King. Two years later, in the immediate aftermath of his assassination, another survey found that roughly one third of Americans felt that he brought it on himself.

In closing, as members of Congress, we have the responsibility to hold ourselves to a higher standard and be role models for our communities. By fueling culture wars, as I believe these hearings have done, we're setting an example of others to feed into, and continue to escalate the tensions on college campuses.

To that end, our students deserve more from us. They deserve a thoughtful, deliberate conversation about the Constitutional questions before us that can lead to a meaningful change, and I hope my colleagues will rise to that challenge. Thank you, Madam Chair, and I yield back.

Chairwoman Foxx. Thank you, Mr. Scott. Pursuant to Committee Rule 8-C, all members who wish to insert written statements into the record may do so by submitting them to the Committee Clerk electronically, in Microsoft Word format, by 5:00 p.m. 14 days after the date of this hearing, which is June 6, 2024.

And without objection, the hearing record will remain open for 14 days to allow such statements and other extraneous material referenced during the hearing to be

submitted for the official hearing record. I now turn to the introduction of our witnesses, and I recognize Ms. Bonamici to introduce our first witness.

Ms. Bonamici. Thank you, Madam Chair. Michael Schill is Northwestern University's 17th President. He also serves as a Professor of Law at the Northwestern Pritzker School of Law, and a Professor of Finance and Real Estate in the Kellogg School of Management.

He previously spent seven years as President of my alma mater, the University of Oregon. He's also served as Dean and Professor at the Law Schools of the University of Chicago and UCLA and has also held tenured faculty positions at New York University, and the University of Pennsylvania.

President Schill founded NYU's Furman Center for Real Estate and Urban Policy, which has become one of the nation's leading research centers on housing. Welcome to the Committee, President Schill.

Chairwoman Foxx. Thank you. Thank you, Ms. Bonamici. Our second witness is Dr. Jonathan Holloway, who is the President of Rutgers University in New Brunswick, New Jersey.

Our next witness is Mr. Frederick Lawrence, who is the Secretary and CEO of the Phi Beta Kappa Society located in Washington, D.C. Our final witness is Dr. Gene Block, who is the Chancellor of UCLA in Los Angeles, California.

We thank you for being here today and look forward to your testimony. I will remind the witnesses that we have read your written statements, which will appear in full in the hearing record. Pursuant to Committee Rule 8-D, and Committee practice, I ask that you each limit your oral presentation to a five-minute summary of your written statement. I also remind the witnesses to be aware of their responsibility to provide accurate information to the Committee. I will first recognize President Schill for five

minutes.

**STATEMENT OF MR. MICHAEL SCHILL, PRESIDENT, NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY,
EVANSTON, ILLINOIS**

Mr. Schill. Thank you, Chairman Foxx, Ranking Member Scott, and members of the Committee, and also thank you Representative Bonamici for that kind introduction. I agree with the Committee that antisemitism is rising on college campuses, including our own.

This Committee is also right to be shining a light on the subject for the American people. In that spirit, let me address four issues as they relate to Northwestern. Antisemitism on campus, our guiding principles of community safety and academic freedom, the encampment itself in our plans moving forward.

First, our universities are on the frontlines of the disturbing spike in antisemitism that accelerated following Hamas's horrific terrorist attacks on October 7th. Across the country the open harassment and intimidation of Jewish people on the streets and social media, has also infected our classrooms and our campuses.

As the descendent of Holocaust victims and survivors, rising antisemitism in the world affects and alarms me, personally. I lost relatives in the Holocaust, so it is not abstract to me that the world's Jewish population has not recovered to where it was before World War II. The fact that Israel is a cherished homeland, is not theoretical to me. It is where family members who survived the war found refuge.

My family's history is a constant reminder to me of what can happen when antisemitism is allowed to take root. Where there is conduct that threatens the Northwestern community, we must impose discipline, and we have done so. Yet I'll be the first to admit our existing rules and policies are falling short. We must improve our

processes to meet the current challenge.

At my direction, we'll be working over the summer to update our student conduct code. These new policies will be in place before students return to campus. We are confident we can continue to promote two principles at the core of our mission. Free expression, and academic freedom, while disciplining harassment and intimidation.

I want to take a moment to address the encampment at Northwestern, and the choices we made. On the morning of April 25th, an encampment was erected on Deering Meadow, an iconic gathering space at the center of our campus. As I watched what was unfolding and at encampments across the country, I believed that the danger it posed grew every day it stayed up.

Every day brought new reports of intimidation and harassment, and then on April 28th, the day before the tents came down, the threat of confrontation escalated with the addition of outsiders to the university. For the safety of our entire community, I knew I had to act. We had three options to do so. The first option was letting the tents stay up indefinitely.

We never seriously considered this option. They were a threat to our community. The encampment was breaking our rules. There was antisemitic behavior that was making our Jewish students feel unsafe. I knew we had to take down the encampment and get it down quickly and permanently.

Second, sending in our Student Affairs Officers and the Northwestern Police Department to make arrests, that was the second option. This option ended up posing too high a risk to our students, staff, and police officers. There were limited law enforcement resources available to the university, and it also created, as we saw around the country, escalation, renewed encampments.

Finally, talking with the students about leaving voluntarily. This was the path we

took, and the encampment came down in just five days. We did not give in to any of the protestor's demands, and the commitments we made are consistent with our values. Importantly, I rejected the main student demand for divestment, and will not ever recommend that Northwestern use its resources for political purposes.

By engaging students with dialogue instead of force, we modeled the behavior we want to apply going forward. Now going forward I want to make you, every one of you, know I am personally committed to fighting antisemitism. We're going to reconstitute a task force that will benefit from the information from other task forces.

We will revise our student code. We will enhance enforcement. We will increase our security, and we will do what we do best, teaching our students about the dangers of antisemitism. I'd like to thank you all for listening, and I look forward to your questions.

[The statement of Mr. Schill follows:]

*****COMMITTEE INSERT*****

**STATEMENT OF JONATHAN HOLLOWAY, PRESIDENT, RUTGERS UNIVERSITY, NEW
BRUNSWICK, NEW JERSEY**

Chairwoman Foxx. Thank you. I now recognize President Holloway for five minutes.

Mr. Holloway. Chairwoman Foxx, Ranking Member Scott, and members of the Committee. Thank you for this opportunity. My name is Jonathan Holloway, and I'm the President of Rutgers University, the State University of New Jersey. To help you understand me better I offer the following.

My maternal great-grandfather, Willian Johnson Trent, was an early organizer of the colored YMCA in Atlanta, and served as President of Livingston College in Salisbury, North Carolina. His son, Bill Trent, Jr., my grandfather, was Dean of Education at Bennett College in Greensboro, North Carolina before becoming the founding Executive Director of the United Negro College Fund.

Sure. May I start the paragraph at the beginning? Okay. Where I left off. Even closer. Okay. His son Bill Trent, my grandfather was Dean of Education at Bennett College in Greensboro, North Carolina before becoming the founding Executive Director of the United Negro College Fund.

My father, a career officer in the Air Force, was the first black person to teach at the Air War College in Montgomery, Alabama. I share this to make clear that a commitment to education, and providing access is in my DNA. And though I fully recognize the myriad ways in which my experience and that of our Jewish community are different, I know something about the awful impact of discrimination too.

When I served as an intern for the House Ethics Committee, my father brought me to Capitol Hill on my first day. As we approached the Committee offices he said when I

was your age, the only way someone who looked like us could cross the threshold, is if you were pushing a food cart. This is part of the reason this discussion matters so much to me.

I tell you with pride that Rutgers boasts one of the largest Jewish student populations in America, and I tell you with conviction that we condemn antisemitism in the strongest terms possible. We do so today, we did so long before October 7th, and we will always do so.

Rutgers, home to nearly 100,000 students, faculty and staff, takes pride in being a public university. We conduct lifechanging research in clinical care, and we educate tomorrow's leaders, many of them first generation college students, and many of them from low-income families.

What's more, Rutgers is world renown for its Jewish scholarly community. We are one of only a few dozen universities in America with the Department of Jewish Studies. Our Bildner Center for the Study of Jewish Life holds public lectures, trains teachers on Holocaust education, and hosts the Rutgers Jewish Film Festival.

Rutgers is also home to the Miller Center on the Policing and Community Resilience, which is dedicated to protecting valuable communities that are facing antisemitism, or other forms of intolerance. The Rutgers Hillel and Chabad Houses, both among the largest in higher education, sit in the heart of our big ten campus in New Brunswick.

During my Presidency we have developed a formal partnership with Tel Aviv University focused on faculty collaborations. As part of that relationship, TAU researchers will have a presence in the Health and Life Sciences Center being built in New Brunswick. We find ourselves here today because of the devastation that the Hamas terrorist attacks have wrought.

It is heartbreaking to think about the senseless and horrific violence of October 7th, about the hostages still held captive by Hamas, 230 days later, about the thousands of Palestinian children killed in the war, about the humanitarian crisis in Gaza that gets worse every day.

At Rutgers, this war has been a tragedy for our Jewish and Palestinian communities. Many in our community, searching for a way to curtail this tragedy, have turned to activism and protest. During this period of heightened fear, anxiety and polarization, Rutgers has focused on three essential priorities, to ensure the safety of our community, to affirm and uphold our policies, and to promote dialogue and education.

I'd like to emphasize this last point, dialogue and education. Disciplining a person for breaking a rule is easy. It is much harder to build the trust to question, and to understand across difference. The battle against antisemitism, against bigotry in all of its forms, must be waged with education. We began this semester with lectures and films centered on meeting discrimination with humanity.

In New Brunswick, we established an advisory council on antisemitism and Jewish life, whose work continues to be pivotal. Jewish studies and Middle Eastern studies faculty have brought Israeli and Palestinian students together in a classroom, not to convince or to change minds, but simply to listen to each other.

We have planned training and discussion around antisemitism, and we have partnered with the Anti Defamation League in these efforts. Like so many other universities this spring we saw a protest encampment take shape on our New Brunswick Campus.

It lasted for a little more than 72 hours. When on the third morning, some student protestors called for a rally to disrupt exams, we moved quickly to shut the encampment down. We made a choice. That choice was to engage our students through

dialogue, as a first option, instead of police action.

We had seen what transpired at other universities and sought a different way. Without compromising on my fundamental stance against divestment and boycotts, we agreed to talk and to listen. If ever there was a time for dialogue, and a focus on civil discourse it is now.

We are in a highly polarized time where we are confronted by objectionable and offense ideas. Part of what universities do is to help the members of our community navigate that reality, so that they become better, stronger, and more resilient citizens. We do that by teaching people to be curious, to listen, and to engage in civil discourse.

Finally, let me speak briefly to the Rutgers community. I have heard you over the last several months. I have heard your frustration, at injustice in our world. Your pain since the suffering, and your desire to make Rutgers a stronger community. For that I want to say publicly, thank you.

We cannot give into the easy path of letting our differences become our divisions. The healing will take time, and through our efforts, through these efforts I mentioned earlier I'm committed to it, we are committed to it. Thank you, and I look forward to your questions.

[The Statement of Mr. Holloway follows:]

*****COMMITTEE INSERT*****

Chairwoman Foxx. Thank you, President Holloway. Mr. Lawrence, I recognize you for five minutes, and I ask you in advance to pull the mic close to you. Again, we have a very inadequate sound system right now.

STATEMENT OF MR. FREDERICK M. LAWRENCE, SECRETARY AND CEO, THE PHI BETA KAPPA SOCIETY, WASHINGTON, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. Lawrence. Thank you, Madam Chair, and I'd like to thank the Committee for inviting me today to speak with you. My name is Frederick M. Lawrence, and I am here in my personal capacity to share my experience and thoughts as a former Law School Dean, a former University President, and a Professor of American Higher Education Law.

The past academic year has deeply challenged all stakeholders of our college and university communities, and our society at large. Images of campus protests and unrest will long stay in our minds. It is precisely at times like these that we must hold fast to the first principles that underlie the mission of American higher education, and that form the bedrock of the flourishing democratic society, and a vibrant culture.

Let me first emphasize that the safety of students on campus is critical, and it is essential. Students cannot learn if they fear for their safety. No one is permitted to threaten another. And a university it is both entitled to and required to respond to violence or threats of violence. Similarly, students do not have a right to disrupt the operations of a university unduly. For example, defacing, occupying or blocking entry to campus buildings is not protected expression, whereas protests outside a building would be.

So what should our universities do in these challenging times? When looking at

any issues on campus, we always need to keep in mind that the fundamental goal of our colleges is the creation, discovery and sharing of knowledge. The intellectual challenges of campus life may come from many sources, including protest.

That is why colleges should begin by presuming expression, including protest, to be protected forms of academic freedom and a free inquiry. Again, the limits of this expression are reached when actual threats or undue disruption of the university operations are involved.

Universities must treat all members of a campus community as part of "we", not "they." There is no they where our students are concerned. We must encourage listening to each other, robust debate, and learning. Schools do best when they seek dialogue across ideological and political differences between and among the members of the campus community, and when they share a commitment to transparent decision making.

This approach is most successful when it draws on months, if not years of conversation, and engagement. I not only believe this to be true, I have seen it. I have had the opportunity to participate in the application of these principles on campus firsthand, including the recent free expression residency that was part of an ongoing campus wide engagement on issues of expression of community and dialogue.

During this time, I met with Jewish and Muslim student leaders to discuss their views on the Israel Palestine conflict, and how it affected their lives. I shared personal stories of a former colleague who suffered the tragic loss of his daughter and son-in-law, when they were murdered on October 7th, and a former student, born in Gaza, whose families confronts the humanitarian crisis there.

The ensuing discussion was not easy, but I believe that the students both spoke to, and listened to each other. Campus officials have told me that these meetings continue

in a spirit of cooperation, not antagonism, with the goal of advancing difficult conversations, even where there are strong feelings and disagreements about key fundamentals.

Colleges and universities exist to examine complex issues, challenges and ideas, and to provide a forum in which issues and opinions can be explored and can be debated. Freedom of inquiry and expression must include the right to protest. As we seek productive paths forward, it is worth recognizing that this is not just a campus issue.

We have seen increased polarization throughout the world, so we should not be surprised when this happens as well on our college campuses. And when it does, we have the opportunity to build on the critically important work of role modeling, and of teaching how to practice free speech, not just with people who share our views, but also those with whom we disagree passionately, and yet with whom we share a community.

I thank the Committee, and I look forward to your questions.

[The Statement of Mr. Lawrence follows:]

*****COMMITTEE INSERT*****.

Chairwoman Foxx. Thank you. Chancellor Block, you're recognized for five minutes.

STATEMENT OF DR. GENE BLOCK, CHANCELLOR, UCLA, LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA

Mr. Block. Good morning, Chairwoman Foxx, Ranking Member Scott, Members of the Committee. My name is Gene Block. I'm the Chancellor at UCLA. Thank you for inviting me here today. Let me start by affirming that all forms of discrimination, including antisemitism and Islamophobia, are antithetical to UCLA's values and corrosive to our culture.

I wish I could say that our campus has been immune to the disturbing rise of antisemitism across our country since October 7th. Sadly, that's not the case. What I can say, and what I'll address today is how we've been confronting and will continue to confront this challenge.

Last summer I announced my intent to retire this July, after leading UCLA for 17 years. These are my final months of Chancellor of this distinguished institution. While I'm saddened by the recent turmoil on our campus, I'm also proud of our legacy as a university deeply committed to the peaceful expression of differing viewpoints.

To have a functioning democracy, we must be able to speak freely about the most consequential events of the day. As a public university, UCLA is subject to a dual legal mandate. The First Amendment obligation to protect free speech on campus, and the obligation under federal laws to protect students from discrimination and harassment.

This balance is often difficult to achieve and has been especially difficult since October 7th. I'm fully aware that many of our Jewish students have had to confront

rhetoric and images on campus that any reasonable person would find repugnant. Trust me, I understand their pain. I've lived it myself.

As a Jewish kid growing up in the Catskill Region of New York with relatives who were Holocaust survivors and victims. As the former Provost of the University of Virginia, watching news coverage of NeoNazis rioting outside the synagogue in Charlottesville, where my children were called to the Torah.

As the Chancellor of UCLA where an art show depicted me with exaggerated facial features that were reminiscent of caricatures of Jews during the Nazi era. As we all know, being an American means sometimes being asked to tolerate offensive, and even hateful speech protected by our Constitution, but there are limits.

At UCLA we draw the line when speech crosses into intimidation, threats and harassment of our community. UCLA has a proud history of peaceful protest. Before October 7th, we successfully navigated campus protests using strategies recommended by the University of California. But on April 25th, as a result of a conflict that spread across universities across the country, a protest sprang up at the center of our campus testing the limits of our approach.

We are part of the University of California system. We followed University of California policy guidelines that directs its 10 campuses to only use law enforcement to remove protestors when absolutely necessary to protect the physical safety of our community. Accordingly, the encampment remained.

As the encampment grew to more than 500 protestors, some of whom were not even affiliated with UCLA, it disrupted normal access to some classes. On April 28th I decided to remove the encampment after violence broke out between opposing demonstrators, and I asked for a security plan to do so.

We gave the protestors written notice that the encampment was unlawful on

April 30th and instructed them to disperse. Before the necessary police resources could be assembled, assailants attacked the encampment that evening. Tragically, it took several hours before law enforcement could quell the violence.

On May 1st, with the support of the University of California's President Michael Drake, we provided protestors a final opportunity to leave. But when more than 200 protestors refused police orders, law enforcement removed the encampment that night.

With the benefit of hindsight, we should have been prepared to immediately move the encampment, if and when the safety of our community was put at risk. We've since taken decisive action. I created a new Office of Campus Safety that reports directly to me. UCLA is conducting a thorough examination of our security processes.

The University of California has also engaged independent law enforcement experts to initiate a review of the confrontation, including our planning and security protocols. Finally, we will hold accountable all those engaged in violence, or violated our policies. No student should be threatened or excluded, based on their beliefs or identity.

While we'll always have to strive hard to meet this obligation, we must also maintain our commitment to academic freedom and free speech, the balance is central to UCLA's educational mission. It's not always easy to strike a perfect balance, but that must be our goal. Thank you again, and I'm looking forward to answering your questions.

[The Statement of Mr. Block follows:]

*****COMMITTEE INSERT*****

Chairwoman Foxx. Thank you, Chancellor Block. Under Committee Rule 9, we will now question witnesses under the five-minute rule. I ask members to keep your questions succinct, so the witnesses will have time to answer, and not ask a question with a few seconds left.

I now recognize myself for five minutes of questioning. This question is for all three of the Presidents. All of your universities have been hot beds of pervasive antisemitism. Please tell me how many students have your universities suspended, how many students have been expelled for antisemitic conduct since October 7th. President Schull?

Mr. Schill. To my knowledge, no student has been expelled, or suspended. We have ongoing investigations, and there have been terminations of staff.

Chairwoman Foxx. President Holloway?

Mr. Holloway. We have ongoing investigations as well, but I can report that we've suspended four people, and then 19 others have experienced other levels of disciplinary consequence.

Chairwoman Foxx. Chancellor Block?

Mr. Block. Yes. We have, I believe over 100 active investigations right now, evaluating 100 cases since October 7th both antisemitism, and Islamophobia.

Chairwoman Foxx. So very few students have received any kind of disciplinary action from your campuses. Now, President Shull, you said some staff have received disciplinary actions, so I'll ask all three of you the same question. How many faculty and staff have you fired or suspended for antisemitic conduct, or conduct related to the pro-terror encampments since April 17th?

Mr. Schill. So Dr. Foxx if I might just correct the premise of your question. The

fact that we didn't -- have not yet suspended, or expelled students does not mean that students have not received discipline. There's a wide range of discipline, and discipline has been meted out to many of those students, but they haven't yet -- we haven't yet suspended or expelled anyone. I'm sorry.

Chairwoman Foxx. Okay. Staff? Staff? How many staff?

Mr. Schill. I don't have the precise number, but we have had staff terminations.

Chairwoman Foxx. President Holloway, staff?

Mr. Holloway. And this question was since April 17th, ma'am? Is that correct?

Chairwoman Foxx. Yes.

Mr. Holloway. I don't know that we suspended anybody from the staff at that time, but we do have ongoing disciplinary proceedings.

Chairwoman Foxx. Yeah. Chancellor Block?

Mr. Block. Ongoing disciplinary proceedings.

Chairwoman Foxx. Okay. Mr. Schill, in your deal with the self-proclaimed "Northwestern liberated zone," you promised to reestablish an advisory committee on investment responsibility this fall. Northwestern Students for Justice in Palastine call this, "An important step towards our ultimate goal divestment from Israel." Will you make clear here and now that Northwestern will categorically reject any divestment, or academic boycott of Israel?

Mr. Schill. I will make clear that I would never recommend to the Board of Trustees divestment of anything or any academic boycott of Israel.

Chairwoman Foxx. Okay. Why did you agree to create the perception that you'd do so, which encouraged other universities to cave on this?

Mr. Schill. That committee is a committee that preexisted. We had that committee for several years. We had already told the investment committee of the

board of trustees that we would be beginning that committee, starting that committee up again in September. That was done months before the encampment. And so we were going to do that anyway, and there is no intent.

That is not a board committee, that is an advisory committee.

Chairwoman Foxx. Okay.

Mr. Schill. It has faculty, and two students, and they're not necessarily from this group.

Chairwoman Foxx. Thank you. Chancellor Block, numerous videos showed Jewish and other UCLA students being denied access to central parts of campus by encampment members who had set up unauthorized checkpoints. In some cases, the students were questioned on whether they were Zionists. Why did you fail to immediately clear these checkpoints?

Mr. Block. Thank you, Chairwoman. I heard accounts of students being blocked, and we issued instructions to our staff to make sure that all walkways were free, and the students could freely pass without obstruction, and that was I believe I then sent a memo out to the entire community on I believe, April 30th, instructing that that was intolerable, and we would not tolerate the blocking of access to parts of campus.

Chairwoman Foxx. And did it stop as a result of what you said?

Mr. Block. I believe it did, but we kept vigilant.

Chairwoman Foxx. Thank you. I yield back. Mr. Courtney?

Mr. Courtney. All right. Thank you, Madam, Chairwoman, and thank you to all the witnesses for being here today. As Mr. Scott pointed out, this is our fifth hearing on this topic, which is perfectly legitimate and appropriate, but I think it's also important to remember we're an Article 1 branch of government whose job it is to authorize and appropriate the U.S. Department of Education.

The Civil Rights Division of the Department of Education just reported in 2023, they had a record number of complaints for the Department. If you go back to 2009, it's tripled in terms of the number of complaints, and a lot of those complaints involve antisemitism.

But the staffing level at the Civil Rights Division of the U.S. Department of Education back in 2009 is larger than it is today. And as Mr. Scott pointed out, the budget that the majority reported out last year from the Appropriations Committee for the Civil Rights Division would have cut their budget by 25 percent, which I would characterize as the equivalent of defunding the antisemitism police.

And again, I think it's our job at some point to focus on the fact that we need to beef up the ranks of that Department, whose mission it is to investigate and to curtail this type of activity. Madam Chairwoman, I would now like to yield the balance of my time to Mr. Norcross from New Jersey.

Chairwoman Foxx. Without objection.

Mr. Courtney. And could I have an article admitted to the record on that report?

Chairwoman Foxx. Without objection.

[The Information of Mr. Courtney follows:]

*****COMMITTEE INSERT*****

Mr. Courtney. Thank you. Appreciate that.

Mr. Norcross. Thank you, Mr. Courtney, for yielding. President Holloway, great to see you again. For those of you who don't know Rutgers, the flagship university in New Jersey, home to nearly 100,000 diverse students, faculty, plus second highest Jewish population, close to 7,000 students, and almost 7,000 Muslim and Arabic students.

Since October 7th, there's no question that the antisemitic has increased at Rutgers. In fact, we had the conversation year over year, it could be as high as ten times what it was the year before. And you and I have talked about this. In fact, I called you at 6:30 in the morning when I first heard about Rutgers "negotiating" to end the encampment, and you picked up the phone. And we've had that continuing conversation.

You know, I've spent my life representing workers protesting. I know it quite well. I'm a firm believer in First Amendment. But that being said, as I know, and many others, there are rules. In all types of protests on college campuses, no matter what the reason is.

So, and I participated in protests over my lifetime, and when I crossed the line, I paid the consequences. So, what I want to dig in today is what are those lines? When were they crossed? And how you reacted - how Rutgers reacted. Specifically, the encampment at the New Brunswick Campus, concerned, it was - called Vorhees Mall.

So, when did you first find out that there was a protest at the mall there?

Mr. Holloway. Thank you for the question, Congressman. There was a protest that had been approved in our free speech zone on campus. I think that was a Monday, sir. And then the protestors -- and that's a legitimate area. And the protestors then moved down to Vorhees Mall, it's about a three block walk as you might recall and started setting up an encampment.

So I was learning of it as it was happening on that Monday.

Mr. Norcross. Were there any communication with the participants as they created , or started the encampment?

Mr. Holloway. Communication from me, sir?

Mr. Norcross. From you, Rutgers, Rutgers Police, any communication or did they just allow it?

Mr. Holloway. I see. No, no, no. We for any approved protest there's a whole process people go through in order to register their space, and how they want to proceed. And we have student affairs professionals, and university police, the Rutgers University Police Department, RUPD, and security.

So they were engaged with those activists from the very beginning in an ongoing way.

Mr. Norcross. Setting the stage. This was a time of year that most students don't look forward to, it's called finals. Obviously, some of the most difficult times. Were the participants advised that the disruptions of finals in this case, or other activities would not be permitted?

Mr. Holloway. The participants, it was made clear that we were going to allow the encampment and consider it a speech act in the spirit of First Amendment free expression, but that that encampment could not disrupt university processes, could not bar people from entering buildings, could not be disruptive in terms of excessive noise.

Mr. Norcross. So, I only have 10 seconds, and I'll be able to finish the line of questioning, but certainly we're going to continue on this timeframe so we can get a better understanding. I yield back the balance of my time.

Chairwoman Foxx. Thank you, Mr. Norcross. Mr. Walberg, you're recognized for five minutes.

Mr. Walberg. I thank you Madam Chairman. President Schill, your President's Advisory Committee on Preventing Antisemitism and Hate recently disbanded after 7 Jewish members of the Committee, including it's Co-Chair and a University Trustee resigned in protest of your caving to the encampment's demands. You and your administration have cited the creation of this Committee as proof you are working to counter antisemitism.

The three faculty members you had appointed, two had objected to the Committee's very creation in a letter that downplayed antisemitism, and defended the phrase, "From the River to the Sea." At least two of them have supported BDS's efforts against Israel.

Question, why did you believe it was appropriate to appoint faculty members who have defended and made excuses for antisemitism, and oppress and oppose the Committee's purported mission of combating antisemitism?

Mr. Schill. Thank you for your question, Congressman Walberg. the Number one, I'd like to just address the premise of your question. The 7 members who resigned from the Committee resigned for two reasons. They were unable to reach consensus about what antisemitism was.

Mr. Walberg. How could they reach consensus if you have people already having made clear statements that were antisemitic, that spoke for BDS and said that from the river to the sea is a good statement?

Mr. Schill. And they resigned because they were not consulted with respect to the negotiations.

Mr. Walberg. Surprise, surprise.

Mr. Schill. They did not resign. I'm sorry. Go ahead.

Mr. Walberg. Let me ask you, will you commit to keeping off those type of

members of a committee if you reconstitute this Committee as you say you're going to do?

Mr. Schill. I will be appointing to the task force that we are going to create faculty, staff, administrators, who I believe are committed to fighting antisemitism, and as committed to fighting antisemitism as I am.

Mr. Walberg. We'll be watching. President Schill, one of the Advisory Committee members, Jessica Winegar, has been a leader of academic boycott efforts against Israel. She's also referred to and I quote, "Zionist media," and condemned, "White liberal dialogue politics." And she signed a petition defending a Palestinian terrorist who murdered two Israel college students in a bombing.

Do you know Professor Winegar as grossly unfit for a Committee meant to combat antisemitism?

Mr. Schill. I do not believe in the BDS movement. I am in print against it at my previous university, and I will not be discussing individual faculty members, or the writing --

Mr. Walberg. So you won't say that a person like her? Let's not -- forget her name, but a person with her principles will not be on this Commission?

Mr. Schill. I will be appointing people to the Committee who are committed to fighting antisemitism.

Mr. Walberg. Your record isn't that way. You also appointed the leader of Northwestern's Middle Eastern and North African Student Association to the Advisory Committee, despite the fact that in the days after October 7th, the MINA student association released the statement explicitly supporting the terrorist attack saying this, and I quote, "We resounded support Palestinian resistance to over 75 years of Israeli state sanctioned violence, and calling the terrorists killed in the attack martyrs."

Do you agree these comments are shocking and beyond the pale?

Mr. Schill. I will not be commenting, certainly not commenting on any student at that in what students say.

Mr. Walberg. I think we're hearing that there's no change going to take place at Northwestern University, relative to antisemitism. How could you possibly appoint a student who supported the October 7th terrorist attack to a committee meant to combat antisemitism?

Mr. Schill. I'm not going to comment on the speech of our students or our faculty, or our staff. What I will say is that committee was a committee that wasn't just antisemitism. We tried to do something which actually turned out to be impossible.

Mr. Walberg. Well, we saw that. We saw that very clearly. Let me just finish this. I think we've heard your response. In March, the Advisory Committee hosted the University of Michigan Professor Juan Cole to speak on Islamophobia, and "anti-Arab and anti-Palestinian" biases. Fine. But Cole has made numerous antisemitic statements, including claiming that Israel "was founded on a formal racial supremacist principle that Jews must rule the state.

And that quote, the only thing that Palestinians and their sympathizers can do to make Zionists happy is to bend over and allow themselves to be royally screwed. What kind of Committee on antisemitism invites an antisemite like this to speak? And with that, sadly, I end my questioning. I yield back.

Chairwoman Foxx. The gentleman yields back. Ms. Bonamici, you're recognized for five minutes.

Ms. Bonamici. Thank you, Madam Chair. Thank you to the witnesses. Once again, I reiterate that we must stand together against antisemitism, and do more to combat the harassment of Jewish students. There has been an undeniable rise in hate speech,

including antisemitism, and Islamophobia on college campuses across the country.

And although I realize that institutions must be held accountable, continuing to schedule repetitive politicized hearings to attack college Presidents will not solve this scourge of antisemitism. We need to work with experts on antisemitism, legal scholars with expertise in the area, people knowledgeable in the field who could help us determine what the government response can and should be to the increase of antisemitism and racial hostility on campuses.

Mr. Lawrence, thank you for so clearly articulating the value of higher education, and why it's important to promote discussion in ways that respect free speech while keeping students safe. And as I've mentioned in this Committee before, the American Jewish Committee, Jewish Federations, the Anti-Defamation League and others, have expertise we can draw on.

And because this is also a Title 6 issue, let's focus as Ranking Member Scott and Representative Courtney said, on equipping the Office of Civil Rights with the resources that it needs, rather than cutting their budget, as my colleagues across the aisle have proposed.

And I also want to note as I did recently in the Subcommittee, that my colleagues across the aisle express concern about antisemitism on college campuses, but we do not see the same concern when antisemitic comments and tropes come from their side of the aisle.

For example, just a few days ago the Truth Social account of Donald Trump included an outrageous video with Nazi-like language about a unified Reich. Did any of my colleagues on this Committee call that out, and ask the candidate that most of them have endorsed, for its removal?

It baffles me that some people are opposed to antisemitism, when it's politically

convenient, instead of whenever it rears its ugly head. I'm also concerned about any suggestion that the first step to address a protest should be to call police. It doesn't work in some cases, and as both Presidents Schill and Holloway and Chancellor Block noted, oftentimes many of the people protesting are not students, further complicating the issue.

Northwestern and Rutgers both reached agreements with student protestors to address campus safety concerns, while recognizing free speech rights. These agreements involved a shared learning environment that fostered the exchange of ideas between schools and school administration, actions that are directly in line with the university's academic message and mission.

So, President Schill, in your testimony you discussed how you identified three options to address the encampment on Northwestern's campus. You talked a little bit about why you made the decision you did, and that talking with the students was the best option.

But will you explain how the final agreement you reached with student protestors de-escalated activities on campus, and how that worked? And did the agreement address rights or protections for Jewish or Israeli students?

Mr. Schill. Thank you, Congresswoman Bonamici. So, we looked at this. What we were experiencing with the encampment was a huge increase in antisemitic activity. We had things that we hadn't seen before like complaints of antisemitism jumped up. There was a sign of a Mogen David with a slash on it put on Deering Gate.

There was a picture of me with horns and blood as all of you know, that's an antisemitic trope. So, we made a decision. And it was making our Jewish students feel unsafe. So we made a decision, those tents had to come down. Those tents had to come down. We thought about bringing in the police as an option, that option turned out to be

not possible to ensure safety.

And my number one objective and mandate, when parents give me their children, or lend me their children, I need to keep them safe, and I'm going to do everything I can to keep them safe and bringing in police because of the size of our police force, and the resources would have endangered our police. They would have endangered our students, and they would have endangered our student affairs staff.

So, then we made the decision to talk to our students, to model the behavior that we want to be engaged in, the dialogue rather than force. And we had a deescalation. The tents came down right after the agreement was struck. The entire protest is now in conformity with university rules.

We also did not -- there was nothing in that agreement that, just to be responsive to your full question, that specifically addressed the interests of Jewish students other than getting rid of that encampment, which was making our Jewish students feel unsafe. They couldn't walk through Deering Meadow. They couldn't pass Deering Meadow.

They were worried about the outsiders on our campus, and we were worried about the insiders and the threat that they entailed for our students.

Ms. Bonamici. I see my time has expired. I yield back.

Mr. Schill. Thank you.

Chairwoman Foxx. Thank you, Ms. Bonamici. Ms. Stefanik, you're recognized for five minutes.

Ms. Stefanik. President Schill, the ADL released its report card for university's responses to antisemitism, and you're aware that Northwestern was the only university whose grade was downgraded; correct?

Mr. Schill. Yes. I am aware of that.

Ms. Stefanik. And isn't it also true that Northwestern earned an F for your failure

to respond and combat antisemitism, and they called for your resignation. Is that correct?

Mr. Schill. I have great respect for the ADL.

Ms. Stefanik. I'm not asking your respect for the ADL, I'm asking is it a fact that you earned an F, and they called for your resignation?

Mr. Schill. I have great respect for the ADL. I am sad that they gave Northwestern an F.

Ms. Stefanik. But it's true, you got an F. Yes. Moving on. Let me tell you why you earned an F. I want to discuss what has been referred to as the Deering Meadows agreement, your unilateral capitulation to the pro-Hamas anti-Israel, antisemitic encampment. But let's talk about what has occurred on this encampment.

Isn't it true that Jewish Northwest -- a Jewish Northwestern student was assaulted?

Mr. Schill. So, I want to question the premise of your question.

Ms. Stefanik. No, no, no, no. I'm asking the questions. You're answering.

Mr. Schill. Well, my answer is not a capitulation.

Ms. Stefanik. I'm asking questions, you're required to answer. Isn't it true that a Jewish Northwestern student was assaulted?

Mr. Schill. There are allegations that a Jewish student was assaulted. We are investigating those allegations.

Ms. Stefanik. Isn't it true that a Jewish student was verbally harassed and stalked to Hillel?

Mr. Schill. There are allegations of that sort, and we are investigating them.

Ms. Stefanik. Isn't it true that a Jewish student wearing a Yarmulke was spat on?

Mr. Schill. All of these are allegations that are being investigated.

Ms. Stefanik. How long are these investigations going to occur?

Mr. Schill. Well, if you remember the encampment was up just a few weeks ago, so we believe at Northwestern in due process. We believe in investigations. We believe --

Ms. Stefanik. So when are the investigations going to be finalized?

Mr. Schill. I'm not going to be able to tell you that. They will be finalized when the conduct office and the Title 6 office, which are well on this issue come up with --

Ms. Stefanik. This is why you've earned an F. Isn't it true that a Jewish student was told to, "Go back to Germany and get gassed?"

Mr. Schill. I've heard that alleged. Again, it is being investigated. We will investigate any claim of discrimination or harassment.

Ms. Stefanik. A zero, but it is a fact you said that there have been zero suspensions, zero expulsions.

Mr. Schill. Thus far, with lots of investigations on their way.

Ms. Stefanik. You said something that was very important. You said we did not give into demands, but the commitments we made as part of the Deering Meadows agreement, you said the word "commitments." Let me talk about those commitments. One of those commitments was funding two visiting Palestinian faculty for two years. Is that true?

Mr. Schill. This is part of a program that we have had. We have used it with Afghanistan, Ukraine, it's for war torn countries.

Ms. Stefanik. But isn't it true? I'm asking you. Okay. The other one is you will fund the full cost for five Palestinian undergrads?

Mr. Schill. That is also part of the program sponsored by our Buffett Institute. It is not a new program. It exists for people whose education and research has been

interrupted.

Ms. Stefanik. It was announced as part of the Deering Meadows agreement, is that correct?

Mr. Schill. It was part of it was a goal set, our fourth in the Deering Meadow agreement. It will also include people from Israel.

Ms. Stefanik. And who was consulted? Who was consulted when you embarked on the Deering Meadows agreement? Was the President's Advisory Committee on Preventing Antisemitism and Hate consulted?

Mr. Schill. That was not within the purview of the antisemitism and other forms of hate committee.

Ms. Stefanik. Was Northwestern's Board of Trustees consulted?

Mr. Schill. The Chair of our Board was consulted.

Ms. Stefanik. But not the entire Board of Trustees?

Mr. Schill. Our Board of Trustees has over 120 members.

Ms. Stefanik. And isn't it a fact that members of the Board of Trustees expressed dissatisfaction with your failure to consult them?

Mr. Schill. There's been some members of our Board of Trustees who have expressed dissatisfaction that they were not part of the decision making.

Ms. Stefanik. Did you consult with the General Counsel of Northwestern, or an outside counsel on the Deering Meadows agreement before it was agreed to?

Mr. Schill. Yes.

Ms. Stefanik. Are you aware that Board members asked you this question, and you said that you had not consulted?

Mr. Schill. Not the outside counsel, the General Counsel of the University was part of my team managing this problem.

Ms. Stefanik. Did you consult with two members of the Advisory Committee that I referenced previously, the anti-Israel Professor Jessica Winegar, and the Kellogg Professor Nora Catelli? Were they consulted on the Deering Meadows agreement?

Mr. Schill. I consulted with several members, including them, but also including the Hillel Director, and also including the Chair of the Committee.

Ms. Stefanik. Talk about the Hillel Director consultation. Isn't it true that you asked the Hillel Director whether it was possible to hire an anti-Zionist Hillel, head of Hillel, Rabbi?

Mr. Schill. I did not. I absolutely did not. I would never hire anyone based upon their views of being Zionist or anti-Zionist, that is not what I do. That's not what a great university does.

Ms. Stefanik. That's not according to the whistleblowers that have come forward to this Committee.

Mr. Schill. I can't say who has talked to you or not talked to you, but I can tell you the truth.

Chairwoman Foxx. Ms. Stefanik, your time has expired.

Ms. Stefanik. I can assure you many people have spoken to this Committee.

Mr. Schill. Thank you.

Chairwoman Foxx. Mr. Takano, you're recognized for five minutes.

Mr. Takano. Thank you Madam Chair. And thank you to the witnesses for being here today. I'll begin with a few questions for the current Presidents. If you would please just answer with a yes or no if possible. My first question is should colleges and universities be places where the right to free speech and free exchange of ideas is protected, President Schill?

Mr. Schill. Yes.

Mr. Takano. Mr. Holloway?

Mr. Holloway. Yes, sir.

Mr. Takano. Chancellor Block?

Mr. Block. Yes, sir.

Mr. Takano. At the same time do colleges and universities have an obligation to keep students safe from harm, and ensure that they're able to study and attend class without impediment, President Schill?

Mr. Schill. Absolutely.

Mr. Takano. President Holloway?

Mr. Holloway. Yes, sir.

Mr. Takano. Chancellor Block?

Mr. Block. Yes, sir.

Mr. Takano. Have your schools taken substantive steps to eliminate discrimination, including antisemitism as defined by Title 6, President Schill?

Mr. Schill. Yes, but we need to do more.

Mr. Takano. Got it. President Holloway?

Mr. Holloway. I agree with Mr. Schill in the same way, yes. But we are always a work in progress, and we're committed to it.

Mr. Takano. Chancellor Block?

Mr. Block. I would say the same. We've made progress. We have programs, and we need to do more.

Mr. Takano. Great. The University of California Riverside, which is in my District, was the first school in the UC system to reach a peaceful resolution with student protestors. Students had set up an encampment on Monday, April 29th, and following negotiations between college administration and the leadership of the protest, the

encampment was dissolved peacefully within a week without a single arrest.

Chancellor Wilcox, Kim Wilcox, announced the terms of the agreement in a letter to the UCR community. Classes and final exams continued, and the commencement ceremony will be in just a couple days. My university is leading by example, but my republican colleagues are characterizing any agreement made between university administrators, and student protestors as "conceding to the mob."

Mr. Lawrence, in your experience as the former President of Brandeis University, what are the hazards of immediately punishing campus protestors, rather than opening a dialogue between administrators and students?

Mr. Lawrence. Thank you for the question, Congressman. There are two main concerns here. One, we always have to remember that even in these tense moments on campuses, we are an educative institution. We are educators, so the goal is to engage with students to the extent possible, as part of the education process of all of the issues that are involved.

Second, and regarding safety, we're always looking to try to find ways to de-escalate conflict to the extent possible. Understand that sometimes that's not going to be possible, and sometimes there are consequences that have to be pursued down the road, but you don't start that way. You start trying to de-escalate the conflict.

And in my experience reaching out to the students, to all of the stakeholders, and trying to build dialogue first with the administration and the students, and then among and between the students is the best way to reduce conflict.

Mr. Takano. So, Dr. Schill, was the encampment at Northwestern dismantled peacefully?

Mr. Schill. Yes it was.

Mr. Takano. Were there any arrests?

Mr. Schill. There were no arrests needed.

Mr. Takano. And Dr. Holloway, the same question. Was Rutgers encampment dismantled peacefully?

Mr. Holloway. Yes it was, sir.

Mr. Takano. Were there any arrests?

Mr. Holloway. No. There were not.

Mr. Takano. And Dr. Schill, did the agreement Northwestern came to with the encamped students -- did that agreement remove any rights or protections for Jewish or Israeli students?

Mr. Schill. No. It actually gave them the ability to feel safe on campus because it was no longer there.

Mr. Takano. And Dr. Holloway, did Rutgers agreement remove any rights or protections for those students?

Mr. Holloway. No, sir. There is no diminution of rights and protections for Jewish students.

Mr. Takano. And I will say looking at the UCR agreement, I do not see that any rights were abridged, or removed for Jewish or Israeli students either. Chancellor Block, UCLA's unfortunate contrast to what happened at Rutgers and Northwestern. Tensions exploded into an incident that lasted several days, led to arrests of many, maybe hundreds of arrests, and put students in the hospital.

In hindsight, do you - or could you or your administration have done anything differently to prevent things? As Mr. Lawrence said, sometimes it's- not possible, but in hindsight might there have been another approach?

Mr. Block. Thank you to your question. You know always we'll review. We're going to review all of our incidents, and to see whether there was another pathway. We

tried very hard to find an offramp for a student protesters, so they could leave the encampment. It wasn't to be. Safety became an issue for the whole community, and we had to ask all the encampment members to leave the encampment.

Mr. Takano. Can you tell me just how much time was actually spent negotiating with the students, or dialoguing? I mean was that possible.

Mr. Block. Attempt was made first through intermediaries, through faculty, and then eventually our Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost actually sat in the encampment and discussed potential solutions, and was unsuccessful, so there was a real attempt for discussion, but unfortunately was not successful.

Mr. Takano. Well, thank you. I yield back Madam Chair.

Chairwoman Foxx. Thank you, Mr. Takano. Mr. Allen, you're recognized for five minutes.

Mr. Allen. Thank you, Madam Chairman, and first I'd like to ask each one of you the answer of the day is under investigation. What are these students doing while they're being investigated? Are they still attending classes? Are they still demonstrating? Are they still involved in this intolerable behavior on campus? So real quickly, what are you -- are they dismissed from the university until the investigation is complete? Tell me what's going on there, Dr. Schill?

Mr. Schill. I can't say for specific students what they're doing, but we are still in session. We began --

Mr. Allen. Okay. So they're still attending classes, and we don't know if they're still involved in protests and everything else. Dr. Holloway, what about your university?

Mr. Holloway. We had a very successful and quiet commencements two weeks ago, and students who are under disciplinary review are not on our campus. There's no protest at this time.

Mr. Allen. Dr. Holloway, what are you doing to those students who are under investigation?

Mr. Holloway. Was that to me, sir?

Mr. Allen. No. I can't see the camera, Dr. Block, Chancellor Block?

Mr. Block. So, during this period of time students are still attending classes. I should emphasize there is no encampment, and there have been no demonstrations that are problematic.

Mr. Allen. Dr. Block, Section 185 of the California Penal Code outlaws wearing a mask to evade identification in committing a public offense. Why have you not banned the wearing of masks on your campus in accordance with California law?

Mr. Block. Well, we're still apparently allowed to wear masks for COVID protection, and students continue to wear them.

Mr. Allen. Those are medical masks.

Mr. Block. Medical masks.

Mr. Allen. Right. These are not medical masks. So you're allowing this behavior?

Mr. Blocks. We've allowed masks on campus, although we have a policy they should be unmasked, but during the time of COVID we allowed medical masking, and we've continued to allow that.

Mr. Allen. I'll yield to Ms. Stefanik the remainder of my time.

Ms. Stefanik. President Schill, you talked about you said there's been a wide range of discipline after testifying there have been zero suspensions, zero expulsions. And you said discipline has been meted out. How has discipline been meted out?

Mr. Schill. Discipline has run the gamut that is the discipline that's already completed, run the gamut from meetings with Student Affairs staff at the very lowest level of severity, up to disciplinary probation, which means if there is another offense,

students will be expelled or suspended.

Ms. Stefanik. And you testified when I asked about the Deering Meadows agreement with the visiting Palestinian faculty members, isn't it true that the university committed to fundraise above and beyond its current commitment as part of the Deering Meadows agreement?

Mr. Schill. I did not commit. I don't know who told you that.

Ms. Stefanik. Well, I'm reading it from the statement put out by the university that says, "The university commits to fundraise to sustain its program beyond this current commitment." I'm reading your words put out by your office.

Mr. Schill. That is a program that is not just about the Middle East. That is a program that is about war torn areas, all across this world. Ukraine for example would be one.

Ms. Stefanik. Isn't it a fact that that was part of the agreement to increase the commitment to that?

Mr. Schill. I don't think the agreement increased the commitment .

Ms. Stefanik. It did. I'm reading it for you. You put this out from your office, "The university commits to fundraise to sustain its program beyond this current commitment." Is that no longer part of the Deering Meadows agreement?

Mr. Schill. When I hear, "beyond this commitment."

Ms. Stefanik. I'm reading what your office put out.

Mr. Schill. Are you asking me to interpret what my office put out, or are you just reading it?

Ms. Stefanik. Well, I'm ask you isn't that the fact? What does beyond this current commitment mean?

Mr. Schill. What I read that to be is beyond this current commitment, the rest of

the world and over time.

Ms. Stefanik. That's not -- it's specifically focused on the Palestinian faculty members. Let me ask you this.

Mr. Schill. But we're also going to be including Israeli faculty members.

Ms. Stefanik. It doesn't say that in the commitment. Why didn't you include Israeli faculty members when you put out the Deering Meadows agreement?

Mr. Schill. Because, the Deering Meadows agreement, which actually I never called it that, but the Deering Meadows agreement was just a framework of an agreement that was reached with students at four o'clock in the morning.

Ms. Stefanik. At the pro-Hamas encampment.

Mr. Schill. If you would like to see the entire program, go on our website and that will explain it to you, and you will see it doesn't violate Title 6.

Ms. Stefanik. No. I'm asking you about what the university put out. There is no mention of Israeli students, or Israeli faculty. Isn't that the case?

Mr. Schill. In the agreement that we reached that there wasn't Israeli students there or Jewish students there.

Ms. Stefanik. Because they weren't consulted. Isn't that the fact? Jewish and Israeli students were not consulted?

Mr. Schill. Jewish and Israeli students were not consulted with respect to the agreement, and it would have been impractical to do that, Representative Stefanik, with all respect.

Ms. Stefanik. Exactly, yield back. Exactly. Yield back.

Chairwoman Foxx. The time has expired. Dr. Adams, you're recognized for five minutes. I'm sorry. Mr. Norcross, you're recognized for five minutes.

Mr. Norcross. Thank you, Madam Chairwoman. To pick up where we left off, and

the premise behind this is we were talking about the encampments, or the beginning protests. You know, what were those lines?

When were they crossed, and how you reacted, so just to bring back context, and certainly understanding that, you know, since that time you have , and I certainly had met with students, instructional staff quite frankly the union of the professors.

But one of the issues that comes up, and they're bringing to my attention is when the students, Rutgers Students for Justice in Palestine became - they began - to issue "Fuck Finals call" which right in the middle of finals for an emergency protest at 7:00 a.m. on the second.

So, obviously this is a heightened, from what you suggested was peaceful protest, to something that's going to interfere with the ability of students to either attend their finals, feel threatened. Why didn't you order an immediate removal of the encampments, once you learned that the participants were going to try to disrupt the finals?

Mr. Holloway. Thank you for the question. On the day of I woke up probably around 6:15, and that's when I discovered the Instagram post that you're referencing, sent out by SJP. Within minutes I was in touch with my leadership team, and I would say roughly by 6:30 we were all on a Zoom talking about the situation. Because at that time that I said that the encampment had to go down, this is a wild violation of -- across the line, to use your language sir.

A wild violation. And we decided then to take the encampment down. In order to do so, in talking with the Chief of Police at Rutgers he said that the process would take a few hours to make sure that a sufficient number of police there that it could be done safely.

Mr. Norcross. So I assume you were in consultation, this is the Rutgers Chief of

Police. Did you consult with your Board of Governors, or with lawyers that you have on staff or others?

Mr. Holloway. Our General Counsel was in that group that I was referencing. The Chief of Police was dialed in at all times. We were engaged with him directly. The Board of Governors, I was in touch with the Chair and Vice Chair, not at 6:30 in the morning, but at a reasonable hour for them to give them a head's up as to what was happening.

Mr. Norcross. But is this when the negotiation started with the protestors?

Mr. Holloway. The protestors - I discovered that they had sent in a list I think on Tuesday, sir. This is Thursday that I'm talking about, sent in the list on Tuesday. And then the Chancellor of New Brunswick, who runs that campus on a daily basis, she and my Chief of Staff talked with four representative students on Wednesday, and then this is the day before finals began, and the agreement was made then that we will be happy to talk with you, but this encampment cannot be disruptive -.

They cannot block access. It can't be raising noise. It needs to be silent because we have final exams tomorrow. They agreed to that. And then the next morning we discovered that they had broken that agreement.

Mr. Norcross. So the negotiations then were taking place while the encampment was still there? I'm just -- is that correct?

Mr. Holloway. Yes. I mean yes.

Mr. Norcross. So, knowing that, and the -- I'll call it the agreement that was reached with the protestors, after that why did it take so long to remove the encampment, even after the deal was done?

Mr. Holloway. The students asked for another meeting on Thursday morning. That's when they learned that I had already given the order to take the encampment down. And they had hoped that we could have some further conversation on different

points. I'm like well, if you want to talk anything, you've got to agree to have this encampment down.

We extended the timeline to four o'clock, and that was a matter of public safety, sir. In talking with regular engagement with the Attorney General of the State of New Jersey, when we sent out a request for mutual aid, they needed more time to make sure there were proper police there, proper mounted police.

We had 125 police mustered ready to go by early afternoon.

Mr. Norcross. I think I heard you say you spoke with the Attorney General.

Mr. Holloway. Yes, sir.

Mr. Norcross. And why was he brought into this?

Mr. Holloway. As I discovered sir, that when - I did not know it at the time. When police asked for mutual aid in the State of New Jersey, and they ask for more assistance, that request ultimately lands- with the Attorney General's Office, sir.

Mr. Norcross. And what was his reaction, or suggestion that you do? Take it down immediately? Wait, go?

Mr. Holloway. He wanted to make sure that we had given, since we had allowed them to be there as a speech act, he wanted to make sure we'd would give them proper notice to tres - , that they were now in trespass , and then allow time to disperse

Mr. Norcross. So the Attorney General said wait until we tell them they're trespassing? Okay. I yield back the balance of my time. Thank you.

Chairwoman Foxx. I'm going to say to the members when I start hitting the gavel, I want to be respectful to the witnesses answering questions, but if I hit the gavel, no more questions. Okay. Thank you. Mr. Banks, you're recognized.

Mr. Banks. President Schill, have you had any conversations over the last year about leaving the Big 10 Conference?

Mr. Schill. No. No conversations.

Mr. Banks. The Big 10 Conference? No consideration, no conversations?

Mr. Schill. No. We're proud to be in the big 10 Conference. We're proud of our football team, and we're proud of being the charter member of the Big 10.

Mr. Banks. Are you fully committed to remaining in the Big 10 Conference?

Mr. Schill. We are fully committed to remaining in the Big 10 Conference.

Mr. Banks. Last year you fired the popular football coach, coach Fitzgerald, after allegations of hazing in the locker room. You hired a law firm. You spent hundreds of thousands on dollars to do that.

That law firm came back with a recommendation to give a two-week suspension of the football coach because there was no credible evidence that he was aware at all of the harassment, or the hazing allegations in the locker room. You issued that two-week suspension, correct.

Mr. Schill. I feel like this is a matter, as you know, the former coach Fitz is suing us, and you're asking for facts, and your premise is inaccurate, but I don't think --

Mr. Banks. Don't accuse me of that. That's outrageous.

Mr. Schill. Well, it's wrong what you just said.

Mr. Banks. Let me get to my point.

Mr. Schill. Okay.

Mr. Banks. Because I think your performance here has been very embarrassing to your school. After 72 hours, you gave him a two-week suspension, and then you received a lot of backlash from the left wing mob, including a letter from six professors who attacked you and said that wasn't good enough. By the way, three of those professors were also -- they also attacked you later for creating the Committee on Antisemitism and Hate. You responded to that left wing backlash, as well.

So then you fired the popular football coach 72 hours later after you originally gave him a two-week suspension. Here's what's relevant, Mr. President. You said that the decision to originally suspend Coach Fitzpatrick was mine and mine alone, as is the decision to part ways with him. So it's your decision, your decision alone.

Let me ask you about Stephen Thrasher. He's one of the goons in the photo behind me. He's a Professor of Journalism at Northwestern. He and several of your faculty members locked arms, they scuffled with police officers, blocked the police officers on your campus from doing their job. Do they continue to teach students at Northwestern University after this embarrassing incident?

Mr. Schill. So, I will not comment on individual faculty members, nor on matters --

Mr. Banks. Is it your decision, and your decision alone to allow those professors to continue to teach students on your campus?

Mr. Schill. We believe in due process at Northwestern University.

Mr. Banks. You believe in due process except for the decision that you made about Coach Fitzgerald.

Mr. Schill. We followed the contract, that was the process.

Mr. Banks. Have your cake and eat it too.

Mr. Schill. We had an investigation, but I don't -- I'm not going to go on and on about that.

Mr. Banks. Is it okay for faculty members at Northwestern University to scuffle with police officers to lock arms, and prevent police officers from doing their job? You said in your opening statements that this encampment was responsible for antisemitic behavior that made Jewish students feel unsafe to go to class. Is it okay for faculty members? Is it okay? Do they get away with that at Northwestern University?

Mr. Schill. I am not going to comment in ongoing investigations and faculty

personal matters.

Mr. Banks. Unbelievable, unbelievable, President Schill.

Mr. Schill. At the university and that is confidential.

Mr. Banks. That those faculty members would continue to have a job. Thrasher, by the way, is something of a professional prognosticator. In fact, he went to Columbia University to participate in their encampment, and you pay his bills. You're responsible for Stephen Thrasher's activities, which is really crazy.

Let me ask you this. Are the Houthis, and is Hamas a terrorist organization?

Mr. Schill. Everything I know suggested that Hamas is a terrorist organization.

Mr. Banks. Is it okay for professors or faculty members at Northwestern University to praise Hamas or the Houthi's? Hamas, by the way, responsible for the attacks on October 7th that killed over 1,000 Jews and Israelis on the very terrible dark day in Israel. Is it okay for your faculty members to praise Hamas and the Houthi's?

Mr. Schill. And are you saying okay meaning is it something that I would do, or are you saying, okay?

Mr. Banks. No. Do you allow your professors here, and faculty members to do that?

Mr. Schill. Our professors and our faculty members have all of the rights of free speech that --

Mr. Banks. I'd like to submit these statements for the record, Madam Chair, of faculty members at Northwestern who have praised Hamas and the Houthi's, and by the way is it okay for faculty members, teachers to tell their students to go to these -- the encampments, or coerce them, push them, toward that type of political behavior to go participate and lock arms with the encampments, and maybe tie their grades to that, or make them feel like that that's something that they should participate with?

Mr. Schill. May I answer, Chair?

Chairwoman Foxx. You may answer.

Mr. Schill. Thank you. Our faculty members, no one at our school may engage in discriminatory, harassing, or intimidating behavior.

Mr. Banks. Madam Chair, I want to submit this for the record as well, these comments, 4 billion dollars have gone to your university. We shouldn't give you another taxpayer dollar for the joke your university has become.

Chairwoman Foxx. Mr. Banks, your time has expired. Without objection, your material will be submitted for the record.

[The Information of Mr. Banks follows:]

*****COMMITTEE INSERT*****

Chairwoman Foxx. Ms. Jayapal, you're recognized for five minutes.

Ms. Jayapal. Thank you, Madam Chair. Free speech and the right to protest are foundational to our democracy, and upholding these rights without allowing them to be twisted into weapons of hate is no easy task. And nowhere perhaps is it more difficult than on college campuses, places that help students to think, to engage, to broaden their mindsets, and to express their ideas without violence or intimidation.

Antisemitism, Islamophobia, anti-AAPI hate, LGBTQIA hate, and indeed all forms of hatred have no place in our society, including on college campuses. The history of protests on college campuses is mirrored in today's history in today's protests. As college administrators, protecting all of your students, and allowing your campuses to remain as communities of free debate is your responsibility.

So, instead of using these hearings for political bullying purposes, which is what the majority seems to do. And if you want to be embarrassed about something, perhaps be embarrassed about the fact that this majority has not been able to govern in this cycle without being saved by democrats.

I for one, am interested in hearing and learning about what successful negotiation and de-escalation looks like in the context of protecting students and free speech. Mr. Schill, I'm a proud MBA graduate from the Kellogg School at Northwestern University. In fact, many of my courses were about negotiation and mediation.

And you have described college Presidents as being between a rock and a hard place in a recent op-ed, and certainly we see that. I agree completely with your eloquent comments on the need to fight the scourge of antisemitism on our campuses, and everywhere, and I appreciate your own lived experience, and your work to do that.

You did not mention other forms of hate that have also risen against Palestinian,

Arab and Muslim students on your campus. Do you have the same level of commitment to fight that kind of hate against those students, and can you tell me what efforts you are taking to address safety concerns for those communities?

Mr. Schill. Absolutely. Any form of hate, any form of discrimination or harassment based upon Title 6, or other rules at the university, we will investigate any complaints, and we have gotten complaints that sound in Islamophobia. We will investigate them. We will also protect all of our students, whether on campus or off campus.

And we will connect and communicate. I had a dinner for 45 Jewish kids, and I asked them about what they needed. I had a dinner for Islamic students and asked them what they needed. We are a university -- these are all of our students. These -- everyone is part of our community, and I owe an obligation.

My number one obligation is public safety and is their safety because if you don't feel safe, you cannot learn. And that's what Northwestern does better than any other university, as you know, because you're an alumna, it teaches, and it does research, and it creates an environment for learning.

Ms. Jayapal. Thank you. You commented some on this, but I wanted to know if you had more to say about the options and the outcomes that you considered before choosing negotiation. You were actually successful in ending your college's encampment by peacefully negotiating with the protestors. Did you have anything you wanted to add about what you were considering as you decided to take that course of negotiation?

Mr. Schill. So, as I said, we had to get the encampment down. We needed to -- the police solution was not, number one, not going to be available to us to keep people safe, but also may not be the wise solution as we've seen at some other universities around the country.

So we found, and we were fortunate to have students who were willing to negotiate, and were willing to give up their demands that they came into us for. Their number one demand was divestment. We said no. We said absolutely not. We said nothing that singles out Israel.

And then we said let's think about what will make the university stronger. What will be important for your community, and then we came to this agreement over time hearing what their needs are. And I would do that, I would listen to the needs of any community, and I have to say most of these things we had already been in communication with our Muslim students. For example, the House for Muslim students and MINA students, that was already in conversation. For a year they had no place to pray, they had no place to eat and celebrate Ramadan.

So that was something that we accord to our Jewish students, to our Catholic students, to our Lutheran students. So we want to meet the needs of our students where they are, and that's what the agreement ended up being.

Ms. Jayapal. I really appreciate your focus on negotiation, and a peaceful resolution, and protecting all students. Thank you, President Schill.

Mr. Schill. Thank you.

Ms. Jayapal. I yield back Madam Chair.

Chairwoman Foxx. Thank you, Ms. Jayapal. Mr. Owens, you're recognized for five minutes.

Mr. Owens. Thank you, thank you very much. I'm going to start off by saying that courage and leadership finds itself in the moment, and I must say as a nation we're seeing that it was not available. We did not see that in these college campuses. What I think we're looking for was strength, fairness to all, including our Jewish students, wisdom, and the recognition that hate cannot be negotiated with.

I'm really curious, I'm trying to understand how you have negotiations. By the way, President Schill, would you have the same patience, the same strategy if these were KKK white supremacists that we try to negotiate that was actually attacking and intimidating black people? Would you have the same patience with that?

Mr. Schill. Representative Owens, thank you for the question. I'm not going to engage in hypotheticals like that. That has not happened.

Mr. Owens. No, no, this is how you deal with hatred. I'm trying to give you a kind of understanding that with college Jewish students. If it was black students against the KKK, instead of pro-Hamas, would you deal with them the same exact way as you dealt with these students?

Mr. Schill. I'm not going to engage in --

Mr. Owens. All right. So the answer is no. Okay. Let's move on. I'll just say this, it's striking that you decided to negotiate a sweetheart deal with pro-Hamas students, and profess to deny October 7th, either they died, they celebrated, or they simply don't care. I look at that as pure evil.

Mr. Schill, now how much money has Northwestern University, we see from Qatar sources, including Qatar connected entities at the Qatar Foundation?

Mr. Schill. The amount that we've received from the Qatar Foundation to fund our campus in Qatar, all of the resources that we have gotten, there's been a lot --

Mr. Owens. I'm not -- I'm looking for short answers. I only have about three minutes left so please, okay, so how much?

Mr. Schill. I don't have the dollar numbers. You have the check that says --

Mr. Owens. Oh yeah, let's say between 500 and 700 million you've got, okay?

Mr. Schill. You have the check that says that amount. Every dollar has gone to the operation of the campus, or the management of the campus.

Mr. Owens. Would you mind, I'd like to have a complete, transparent accounting to just how much exactly is coming from this. Now, are you aware that this is same Qatar government that is partnered that currently harbors the leaders of Hamas and estimated to have given the terrorist organization of Hamas about 1.8 billion dollars. Are you aware of that, Qatar?

Mr. Schill. They are harboring those leaders at the with the knowledge -the United States government supports that and has supported that

Mr. Owens. I'm just asking a question, yes, or no, yes, or no? Are you aware that 1.8 billion has been given to Hamas from Qatar?

Mr. Schill. Pardon me?

Mr. Owens. Are you aware that terrorists have given --- that Qatar has given to terrorism 1.8 billion dollars to Hamas?

Mr. Schill. I -- this is not my area of expertise.

Mr. Owens. Okay. All right. You're not aware. Okay. Are you aware that the Iranian officials traveled in and out of Behar to meet with Hamas?

Mr. Schill. This is not in my area of expertise.

Mr. Owens. Okay. Do you think if this was true, do you think it would be a good idea for the university, Northwestern, to partner with a government that harbors terrorist Hamas, and Iranian hostages, who help fund terrorism. Yes, or no?

Mr. Schill. I'm not going to engage in yes or no answers.

Mr. Owens. Okay. So obviously you don't have a problem with that. Northwestern's School of Journalism is a form of --

Mr. Schill. I really am offended by you telling me what my views are.

Mr. Owens. I'm sorry. My time. My time. A former partnership with a Qatar media outlet, Al Jazeera, did you know that?

Mr. Schill. I'm sorry?

Mr. Owens. Did you know that Northwestern School of Journalism has a former partnership with Al Jazeera?

Mr. Schill. I in fact just found out about that last week.

Mr. Owens. Okay. Well, let me tell you, let me make you aware of then because Al Jazeera, because of their pro-Hamas reporting, the Secretary of State, Anthony Blinken, asked the Qatar Prime Minister to tone down, as there was anti-Israel incitement. Also, it was Israel, Saudi Arabia, Jordan and Egypt that have blocked Al Jazeera because of their pro-Hamas mouthpiece.

My understanding is that you have a contract with the Qatar allegation that expires at the end of 2027-2028 academic year, which now that you know about Qatar, would you be willing to -- are you going to still renew that contract?

Mr. Schill. The review of that contract is being done by the Provost Office, and it will be --

Mr. Owens. I'm sorry, I'm sorry.

Mr. Schill. May I just finish the answer?

Mr. Owens. I'm sorry. These are really sort of quick questions. Knowing that Al Jazeera is a mouthpiece for Hamas, are you willing to end that partnership?

Mr. Schill. The decision with respect to the Qatar campus is ultimately the Board of Trustees, and I actually am concerned by the agreement that you're talking about with Al Jazeera.

Mr. Owens. Well, you should be.

Mr. Schill. And we are going to look into it.

Mr. Owens. Yeah, okay. This is an issue that I'm thankful we'll pulling, it goes back because this is not just beginning now. Obviously, it's been going on a long, long time.

We're going to make sure we keep up on this thinking, and I yield back.

Chairwoman Foxx. Mr. Owens, your time is expired. Mrs. Manning, you're recognized for five minutes.

Mrs. Manning. Thank you, Madam Chair. Thank you to our witnesses for being here today. Clearly, none of you were prepared for what happened on your campuses after October 7th. And I have spoken with Jewish students, faculty members, alumni, who have described countless, horrifying and relentless incidents of harassment, intimidation, the use of Jewish tropes, the putting up of leaflets, and the tearing down of hostage posters.

The isolation of Jewish student groups, of Jewish students rather, forcing them to leave official student groups from student government to dance troops. Students were unable to get to class, they were afraid to go to the dining rooms, they could not study, they had classes and exams cancelled. What has been described to me has been nothing short of the normalization of antisemitism on your campuses.

But this normalization of antisemitism did not start on October 7th. It predated that date by many years. And it reflects a failure to take antisemitism seriously. A failure to treat antisemitism the same way you would treat any other kind of discrimination. It has been fostered by years of teaching a one-sided, anti-Israel view by many of your professors, and by a demonization of Zionism, which is the century's old quest by the Jewish people to return to their ancestral homeland and control their own destiny.

President Schill, why hasn't Northwestern taken serious steps to address the normalization of antisemitism and anti-Zionist teachings on your campus long before October 7th?

Mr. Schill. So, thank you for the question, Congresswoman Manning. I believe we are taking steps. I believe you are absolutely right. None of us were prepared for what

we saw after October 7th, and you have my commitment that we will do what is necessary to combat antisemitism, but we will also do what is necessary to educate our students in the evils of antisemitism, as well as the roots of antisemitism.

Mrs. Manning. And it's a shame that this disaster finally brought a recognition that that kind of education is necessary. I know you had an antisemitism task force. It had no experts on antisemitism on the task force. Will you commit to putting together a task force that has experts on antisemitism?

Mr. Schill. It actually did. We did have a faculty member who was a consultant to the Holocaust Museum, so we did have someone on the Committee there, but we will definitely have people who are knowledgeable, and who are aware of antisemitism.

Mrs. Manning. And will you commit to training not just students, but also your faculty members on what antisemitism is, and the dangers that it presents, not just to Jewish students, but to the foundations of our democracy?

Mr. Schill. I believe that's a good idea.

Mrs. Manning. Thank you. Chancellor Block, same question for you?

Mr. Block. Yes. So we admit that this is a challenge.

Mrs. Manning. And it's been a challenge. I have emails dating back to 2014 from dedicated alumni who tried to alert you of the growing problem with antisemitism that was growing on your campus.

Mr. Block. So, we responded. We tried to respond with education, and obviously with enforcement where there are complaints about specific antisemitic events, developed an online training module on anti-discrimination. We bolstered the part on antisemitism at orientation.

Mrs. Manning. Are all your students required to take antisemitism training?

Mr. Block. They're not required to take antisemitism. The anti-discrimination

module is recommended for all incoming. Approximately, 90 percent of our students take online training for it. It's talked about at orientation.

Mrs. Manning. Does that include antisemitism training?

Mr. Block. It has Antisemitism discussion.

Mrs. Manning. Do you think it needs more?

Mr. Block. I think we need to do more. I would agree.

Mrs. Manning. And do your faculty also need to take that antisemitism training?

Mr. Block. I think faculty can benefit also from understanding the challenges of our students today, and I agree.

Mrs. Manning. Okay. And President Holloway, same question to you? By the way, I have Bennett College in my District, so I understand your roots.

Mr. Holloway. Thank you, ma'am. There is -- I want to say from the beginning that we are living in an age of heightened discrimination and antisemitism, absolutely. The campuses are no different from the rest of the country. And any expression of it I think is absolutely horrible.

What I also want to say is that we address every instance that's brought to our attention of discriminatory behavior, including antisemitism.

Mrs. Manning. Thank you. My time has expired. I yield back.

Chairwoman Foxx. Thank you, Ms. Manning. Mr. Good, you're recognized for five minutes.

Mr. Good. Thank you, Madam Chairman. President Holloway, the Rutgers Newark Campus hosts a think tank called the Center for Security Race and Rights, or CSRR. In just the past week CSRR, which astonishingly is 50 percent funded by your Chancellor's discretionary budget, and the Director's \$232,000.00 salary of course is paid for by the university.

In just the past week CSRR, again a so-called think tank called the Center for Security, Race and Rights has exposed its antisemitic agenda. In a post on X, CSRR called Israel's government, "genocidal." Do you think Israel's government is genocidal?

Mr. Holloway. Sir, I don't have an opinion on Israel's, in terms of that phrase sir.

Mr. Good. You do not have an opinion as to whether or not Israel's government is genocidal?

Mr. Holloway. No, sir. I think Israel has the right to exist, and to protect itself.

Mr. Good. You think Israel's government is genocidal?

Mr. Holloway. I think Israel has a right to exist and to protect itself, sir.

Mr. Good. But you will not say that Israel's government is not genocidal? You can't say that?

Mr. Holloway. Sir, I believe in the government's right to - the- country's right to exist.

Mr. Good. You can be that surprised by the topic of discussion today, and you can't say that Israel's government is not genocidal. That's interesting. Another CSRR post said the Biden's administration shift on Israel is a gain that can and must be built on, meaning the Biden's administration's portrayal of Israel.

Another post from the Center said the real threat to American Jews comes not from students, but from MAGA republicans who are shouting about antisemitism the loudest. Do you agree with this again, Rutgers funded think tank, half funded by your Chancellor's discretionary budget, Director has a \$232,000.00 salary funded by Rutgers.

Do you agree that MAGA republicans are a threat to American Jews?

Mr. Holloway. Sir, my -- these statements that you're reading I find all deeply troubling and unsettling, sir.

Mr. Good. Just start with a yes or no. Do you think that MAGA republicans are a

threat to American Jews?

Mr. Holloway. I'm not in a position to answer that question, sir.

Mr. Good. Are you in a position to answer any questions?

Mr. Holloway. Yes, I am.

Mr. Good. Do you have an opinion on anything on this subject that's at hand today? I mean what does that mean? Do you think that anti-Israel political advocacy is an appropriate use of taxpayer dollars by a public university like Rutgers?

Mr. Holloway. I think that a public university we have to abide by the First Amendment, and be a place for --

Mr. Good. Should Rutgers fund anti-Israel political advocacy?

Mr. Holloway. Sir, we should not be funding anti-Israel advocacy. No.

Mr. Good. That's good to hear. On the 20th anniversary of September 11th, CSRR sponsored an event featuring a speaker who was convicted in 2006 for material support of a terrorist group, the Palestinian Islam Jihad. His name is Sami Al-Arian, and he pleaded guilty to several charges.

The event was designed to so-called challenge the narrative surrounding 911, and how 911 supposedly legitimized a war on terror, and other imperialist wars and interventions. I should note that 750 New Jerseyans died on 911. They were murdered on 911. So, do you think it's acceptable for a New Jersey state university to sponsor an event about 911 with a speech by a convicted terrorist conspirator?

Mr. Holloway. I learned about that person's involvement. I don't support that person's ideas in the least. I think they're wildly offensive. I also -- well that's all. I'll just stop there, sir.

Mr. Good. I'm sorry?

Mr. Holloway. I was ending my question.

Mr. Good. Yeah. Well, you were present at that time. Did you do anything about this event taking place on your campus, or to prevent future events like this from taking place?

Mr. Holloway. Did you ask me if I would prevent that from happening, sir? Is that what you said?

Mr. Good. Yes. Again, do you think it's okay for the New Jersey State University Rutgers, to sponsor an event about 911 with a speech by a convicted terrorist conspirator? You said no. You did not think so.

Mr. Holloway. That's correct, sir.

Mr. Good. So did you do anything about it when you learned about it? You were present at the time?

Mr. Holloway. Sir, we are a community of 100,000 people. There are events happening on every day of the campus that I'm not aware of at any given moment.

Mr. Good. Okay. As noted before, the Director of CSRR, Sahar Aziz, has made numerous antisemitic statements, again with her \$232,000.00 Rutgers funded salary. She signed a statement -- signed a statement condemning "The racial supremacy of Jewish Zionist Nationals," saying that Jews are more privileged than Muslims, and de-legitimizing both Israel and the U.S. as "racist settler colonial states."

Given that statement, and her Center's antisemitic pro-terrorist activities, do you think it's appropriate for Rutgers to continue to fund this office and pay her salary of \$232,000.00? Is that okay? Is that cool with you and Rutgers?

Mr. Holloway. There's very little that I find easy about this Center, sir. I personally disagree deeply with a lot of the ideas that are -- come from that Center, but.

Mr. Good. Are you going to close the Center, or just keep on funding it, keep on paying that salary?

Mr. Holloway. I have no plans to close the Center, sir.

Mr. Good. Yeah. I'm not surprised. Thank you, Madam Chair, and I yield back.

Chairwoman Foxx. Thank you, Mr. Good. Ms. Wild, you're recognized for five minutes.

Ms. Wild. Thank you, Madam Chair. President Holloway, just as an incidental matter. As Ranking Member of the House Ethics Committee I want to thank you for your early service to that Committee. I hope it was a valuable experience for you. While I understand that free speech is a critical tenant of our democracy. I think we all agree on that.

I do worry about whether the campus protests we've seen this year veer into hate speech. Thankfully, the protests on the campuses in my District, Pennsylvania 7, which hosts a number of wonderful schools like Lehigh University, Muhlenberg College, Lafayette College, and so forth, the protests have been peaceful and respectful, and I'm deeply appreciative of our students for that.

Let me also say that I commend the restraint shown by some of you in not creating a police state on your campuses. There is a fine line between law and order, and oppression of the right to protest, and that's a really fine line, and I respect the very difficult job you've all had this year.

As a Jewish mother of two young adults, I have to say that I am deeply saddened and dismayed by the increased evidence of antisemitism across our country, and around the world, and much as I truly believe that college is a place where young people learn to think critically, I also have some concerns about whether students are getting enough guidance on this issue from administrations.

So I want to start, President Schill, seven members of your Advisory Committee on Preventing Antisemitism and Hate, including the Co-Chair resigned after the university

brokered an agreement with encampment organizers. In a follow-up statement the university claimed that the Committee's charge and its work remain incredibly important to our community.

Our commitment to protecting Jewish students, faculty and staff is unwavering. My question is why did Northwestern fail to consult with that Committee before yielding to the demands of the protestors?

Mr. Schill. That was never in the purview of that Committee. That Committee was designed to assess the extent of antisemitism on campus, and then to propose educational and other ways to deal with it. It wasn't to deal with an existing encampment. And quite honestly, there were I believe 16 members, 17 members, most of whom didn't have expertise in this area.

And you know, there is a limit to how many people one can consult when one is talking to students around the clock.

Ms. Wild. Well, I understand that there's a limitation on time, and that kind of thing, but it seems to me that you had a ready-made committee that could have been asked to weigh in on this, and obviously 7 of the members of that committee felt the same because they stepped down.

Have you taken steps to replace those faculty and staff members?

Mr. Schill. So, we are going to constitute a task force, and that task force is going to be designed to come up with new strategies to combat antisemitism. What we are going to do is ask that committee to look at the wisdom of other antisemitism committees around the country.

Indeed, this committee wrote a report last -- two weeks ago in which it summarized the Harvard antisemitism committee, and I will be asking them to look at the recommendations.

Ms. Wild. Okay. Well, I hope that you will consult with that task force or committee in the future when you've got this kind of situation. I've got limited time, and I do want to ask, and this can be to any of you, hopefully all of you, with short answers. As we are looking forward to the fall semester, obviously we have the potential for ongoing challenges in this regard with respect to campus protests and encampments, and potential violence.

What are your administrations doing now, or planning to do over the summer to prepare for the next school year? Why don't we start with you Chancellor Block?

Mr. Block. Yes. So, I will not be there this fall, but I would seriously recommend that during our orientation this coming summer, we spend extra time discussing these issues about respectful protests, time, place and manner, and we make sure that our students are prepared for what the rules are with regard to the protests.

Ms. Wild. Mr. Lawrence?

Mr. Lawrence. I think these are always learning opportunities on our campuses, and we shouldn't be surprised in a polarized time, in a challenging time to the nation that we see that exhibited on campus, so I think this is an opportunity to talk about protests, but also about a conversation over differences, and all of us on campus and throughout the society can play a role of role modeling for students how we have conversations between and among people who have very strong differences of opinion on fundamental issues.

Ms. Wild. Exactly. That's exactly my point. And I know my time has run out, so what I would ask of all of you is that you give very careful consideration to how you're going to approach this in the upcoming school year, and perhaps submit to the Committee your ideas, which I hope will be some sort of template for other schools. Thank you very much. I yield back, Madam Chair, and thank you for the accommodation.

Chairwoman Foxx. Thank you, Ms. Wild. I think you've asked a very good question. Ms. Steel, you're recognized for five minutes.

Mrs. Steel. Thank you, Dr. Foxx, and thank you all the witnesses coming out today. And Chancellor Block, you've been talking about this was really peaceful protest, and UC system, under UC's system on this absolutely needed that you cannot really use law enforcements.

But you know what? If you watch the video that person physically slapped a Jewish student, and removed the Jewish student's head covering, and pull out a taser and followed that person. I hope that you found out who that person is, belong to your university or students, and whoever that was, and I hope that you found out, and you did certain, you know, you dealt with him, I hope.

And you know what? That should not happen for the Jewish students. And your school that had the, you know, I'm going to just move on to that. Hamas leaning faculty members offered extra credit and better grades for those who took part in chaos and disruption caused by campus -- the terrorists. This is just really not heard of, and what did you do?

Did you do discipline this professor, or did you really do something, or you're investigating and then what's going on? You know what? This should not happen on a university's campuses, such as UCLA. It's a prominent university in California. Not just California, but in the nation, so what did you do about it?

Mr. Block. Congresswoman, thank you for your question. I am unaware of the incident of offering extra credit. I'm just not clear of that incident. I'm happy to look into it, but that particular incident.

Mrs. Steel. I really cannot hear you. Could you pull your microphone?

Mr. Block. I'm sorry. That particular incident I'm not fully aware of the one you

are talking about. We do know there have been cases where a faculty member has offered extra credit to go to a tutorial on Gaza but offered the same credit to go to other events on campus, including an event at our Nazarian study for Jewish studies.

But the incident you're talking about, I'm sorry I'm not familiar with. I will make sure I'm aware of it and see how it was disposed of. It may have been handled by Student Affairs, I'm not certain.

Mrs. Steel. Well, Chancellor Block, I am aware of that, and you don't, that's really, really odd because you are a head of your university. And then you know what? Antisemitism class is not mandatory, but I have a little problem with your syllabus, your school's syllabus here that on March 27th an activist gave a mandatory lecture to your first year UCLA medical student.

It's part of the mandatory structure, racism and health equity class. During this lecture, the medical students, the lecturer led the students in a free, free Palestine chant, and demanded the students kneel down and kept repeating for mama Earth to pray. And when you do mandatory, why medical students are required to stand up and chant, "Free, free Palestine," in a mandatory lecture?

And some faculty have called for a course to be suspended and investigated. So have you opened an investigation and committed to an investigation today?

Mr. Block. So, we've undertaken factfinding to find out exactly what happened at that class. I'm not familiar with the exact details, it's through our Office of Compliance, and I do believe that the School of Medicine is relooking over its first year program generally, to look at faculty committee is looking at the course content of the first year program, of which this was a part of.

So, as a review of the first-year program that I understand, and we are actually now trying to confirm the facts of what has been claimed during that course.

Mrs. Steel. How are you going to fix that it's never going to happen again though?

Mr. Block. I think this is when we're again, let's find the facts out first, of exactly what happened, and then we'll figure out what the remedy should be to make sure that appropriate behavior occurs in classrooms.

Mrs. Steel. So UCLA receives a lot of federal funding. In fact, over 1 billion dollars per year just for research. It is a good use of taxpayer funds taken by -- for the October 7th massacre as justice. Do you condemn the facts that someone at your university before the October 7th attack on Israel that killed 1,200 people and hundreds of people were kidnapped as justice?

Mr. Block. Well again, I'm not familiar with exactly the individual you are talking about. I think that would be a personnel issue. I am deeply offended by statements like that. That's personally offensive to me, particularly hurtful, and I just would like to learn more about it.

Mrs. Steel. Chancellor Block, it seems like I'm not really getting any answers from you, but you know what, I hope these public universities, especially getting federal fundings, and you know what, you really have to teach our kids how to think, not just brainwashing these kids, so thank you very much, Dr. Foxx.

Mr. Block. I appreciate that. I am -- thank you.

Chairwoman Foxx. Dr. Adams, you are recognized for five minutes.

Ms. Adams. Thank you, Madam Chairman, and I want to thank the Presidents and Chancellors for being here today. Thank you for what you do at your institutions. I served 40 years at Bennett College in Greensboro, and so Dr. Holloway, I want you to know I did have the opportunity to know Dr. Trent, your grandfather, and to work with him during my 40 years there at the college.

Let me just say for the record that I am certainly opposed to any unsafe conditions

on campuses, antisemitism, hatred and bigotry, all of those things in my opinion are inappropriate. I was a professor. I worked with faculty and students, so I certainly understand what all of you do.

And because today we're talking about antisemitism, I am as I said before, opposed to that, and to any unsafe conditions. Every student who comes to campus and spends their time there, their money, need to feel safe, and need to have the kind of academic enrichment that is appropriate.

I do have a couple of questions. I think some of you - I'm going between Committees, so I apologize that I have had to step out but let me ask we've been talking about the summer now coming. I think most of you have probably had commencement, if not, you're having it. And so, to what extent have you had conversations with students about protests, before they left the campus, or during the upsets that we've seen on the campus-.

You can be real brief in your answers because I have another question. So we'll start, Dr. Holloway, we'll start with you.

Mr. Holloway. Thank you, Congresswoman. I speak with students, faculty and staff, particularly in the Jewish community in this case quite often. It's been ongoing. We've talked a lot about different elements on campus, and what we're going to be doing going forward in the summer is implementing new training by partnering with the Anti-Defamation League, in particular.

They have already been a good partner. We'll dive in deeper to that to make sure that we're doing everything we can to ensure a safe environment for our students.

Ms. Adams. Okay. Yes. Anyone else want to speak to that?

Mr. Schill. I'm happy to jump in. So what we are doing, we are always talking with our students, and trying to help them both our Jewish students, as well as some of the

students who are advocates for the current conflict in Gaza. But the important thing that we're going to be doing over the summer, Congressman Adams, is we're going to be revising our conduct code, which was just not appropriate for this moment.

And so, we're going to be working on that, both our Office of Student Affairs in conjunction with our Board Committee on Student Affairs.

Ms. Adams. So let me interrupt. That's going to apply to all students?

Mr. Schill. That would apply to all students, right.

Ms. Adams. Let me -- I have a question. I really want to get this one in. As university Presidents, Chancellors, how have you supported the freedom of speech, and the right to peacefully protest of your students, as well as your faculty? Because of the views, or political positions that we know, have been expressed may differ from that of your Trustees, or even your own personal views.

So how have you ensured that the institutional mission of the university remains intact, and each of you can respond very quickly if you would.

Mr. Schill. I believe that free speech and free expression and academic freedom are the core values of our university. And we will protect them. At the same time, academic freedom and free expression do not allow discrimination, harassment, or intimidation of students, other faculty, or community members.

Ms. Adams. Right. Okay. Let's move on down the line, Dr. Holloway?

Mr. Holloway. Academic freedom and free speech are at the very core of what we do. I think that the core of what we do in the work of serving the common good and protecting democracy. I absolutely agree with President Schill, any language that threatens violence, harassment and intimidation goes beyond the pale, and we work very hard to make sure that we hold people accountable.

Ms. Adams. Thank you. Mr. Lawrence?

Mr. Lawrence. As I said in my opening statement that we have to have strong protections of free expression, academic freedom, free inquiry as the foundation of the open dialogue discussion debate that takes place on a university campus, where does that run out? Where does that reach its limit?

Whether threats of violence, harassment, intimidations, and interruptions.

Ms. Adams. Chancellor Block?

Mr. Block. I would say the same thing. What we have to do is, we want to encourage free speech. We want to make sure time, place, manner, the students understand how to do it within the context of the university environment.

Ms. Adams. Thank you, gentlemen. Madam Chair, I yield back.

Chairwoman Foxx. Thank you, Dr. Adams. Mr. Kiley, you're recognized for five minutes.

Mr. Kiley. President Holloway, is physically blocking students from entering your campus based on their race, religion, or ethnicity an expellable offense?

Mr. Holloway. I'm sorry. The very beginning of the question?

Mr. Kiley. Is physically blocking students from entering your campus based on their race, religion or ethnicity an expellable offense?

Mr. Holloway. That's certainly a violation of our university standards, sir.

Mr. Kiley. Is it an expellable offense?

Mr. Holloway. Potentially it would be, sir. It would depend on the circumstance of that specific instance.

Mr. Kiley. President Schill, is excluding students, blocking students from entering campus based on their race, religion or ethnicity an expellable offense at your university?

Mr. Schill. I would imagine it is a violation of our conduct code.

Mr. Kiley. Is it an expellable offense?

Mr. Schill. I'm sorry?

Mr. Kiley. Is it an expellable offense to physically obstruct students from their campus?

Mr. Schill. There is a range of disciplines up to and including being expelled for violations.

Mr. Kiley. Chancellor Block, is physically stopping students from entering your campus based on their race, religion, or ethnicity, an expellable offense?

Mr. Block. Again, there's a disciplinary process for students. It could be.

Mr. Kiley. Can we please play a video?

[Video played.]

Mr. Kiley. Students who formed the blockade, do you know?

Mr. Block. Excuse me? I'm sorry.

Mr. Kiley. Were those students who formed that blockade?

Mr. Block. I don't know whether they're students or non affiliates. I don't know.

Mr. Kiley. You don't know?

Mr. Block. I do not know.

Mr. Kiley. Have any of them been disciplined?

Mr. Block. Have any been disciplined yet?

Mr. Kiley. Those people on the video who formed the blockade. Have they been disciplined?

Mr. Block. After the response, after we learned about that, I sent a message to all of our student affairs people to make sure that the pathways were opened for everyone. And I sent a message out to our community.

Mr. Kiley. So I'm going to take that as a no. We have the evidence right here on video. A student being blocked from entering your campus based on his Jewish identity,

and there's been no consequence whatsoever. Is that what you're telling us?

Mr. Block. No. I did not say that. I said this is being investigated, and we'll see what happens with the disciplinary process. I did not say that.

Mr. Kiley. President Schill, if the Deering Meadows agreement, if the university does not live up to its end of the bargain, do the protestors have a right to re-establish the encampment?

Mr. Schill. The protest on Deering Meadow, any encampment on Deering Meadow is a violation of the university's conduct code.

Mr. Kiley. Yes, but you reached an agreement where you said that you're going to -- that the encampment will disband if, and you agreed, to certain conditions. So if you don't follow those conditions can the encampment re-establish itself?

Mr. Schill. We are planning on following those conditions.

Mr. Kiley. But if you don't, would they be within their rights to re-establish the encampment?

Mr. Schill. That is a hypothetical issue. If I commit to something I do it.

Mr. Kiley. You said you have great respect for the Anti-Defamation League. Is that correct?

Mr. Schill. I do.

Mr. Kiley. And as I'm sure you're aware, the Anti-Defamation League has called for your resignation. They said President Schill capitulated to hatred and bigotry, and empowered and emboldened those who have used intimidation, harassment, and violence to achieve their ends, rather than hold them accountable as you pledged you would.

President Schill gave them a seat at the table and normalized their hatred against Jewish students. Why is the ADL wrong?

Mr. Schill. I believe that at this moment leaders need to make hard decisions. I believe that we got a good result. We were able to get rid of the major antisemitic event on our campus with no violence.

Mr. Kiley. By institutionalizing antisemitism and agreeing to the demands of antisemites. Mr. -- President Schill, in my view you are the easiest case that we have dealt with. You agreed to the demands of those who are trying to change university policy in an antisemitic way, and you rewarded their tactics of using force.

This is what the ADL has said. It's not what I have said, excuse me sir, that was not a question. Excuse me, sir.

Mr. Schill. We agreed to none of the demands that were presented to us.

Mr. Kiley. And here today you announced that the Deering Meadows agreement, here today you've made preposterous statements like it wasn't practical to consult with the Jewish students prior to acceding to those demands. So I would associate myself with the comments of the ADL, and I think that if the university does not move to change its leadership, then it will be endorsing that institutionalization, that normalization of antisemitism on campus.

President Holloway, are you currently under consideration to be the President of Yale University?

Mr. Holloway. No. I am not.

Mr. Kiley. You are not? So you're planning to stay at Rutgers?

Mr. Holloway. Yes I am.

Mr. Kiley. Okay. Thank you, sir. I yield back.

Chairwoman Foxx. Thank you, Mr. Kiley. Ms. Stevens, you're recognized for five minutes.

Ms. Stevens. As some of you might be aware last term in Congress, in 2022, when

the democrats were in the majority we moved to pass a variety of mental health bills. Many that passed, some that languished in the Senate, and I just wanted to ask you in terms of your purview, and the pressures and the stresses on students, what you believe is contributing to the mental health crisis among young people?

Would you surmise that a gun violence epidemic that is the number one killer of young people in America is contributing to rising mental health issues, President Schill?

Mr. Schill. You know, I'm not an expert in mental health. I agree with you that it is growing these problems.

Ms. Stevens. You surmise that it's yes. That it's a yes?

Mr. Schill. I would imagine gun violence along with there's been a recent book by a psychologist that says cellphones are a major aspect because the kids are getting social media all the time, and are not interacting with each other. There's probably a myriad of reasons why we have a mental health crisis on campus, and your assumption is probably one element of that.

Ms. Stevens. We have a gun violence crisis. We have cuts to higher education. We have unregulated social media, so to speak, and don't know how to take a break. And I'm sure you might be aware that this Committee as we were playing a role in marking up legislation to address mental health issues on college campuses, had an amendment from the other side of the aisle that was introduced by a Congresswoman from Illinois that would strip LGBTQ students from receiving mental health resources.

And I am curious if that amendment hadn't failed because the democratic majority voted it down, would that have violated any equity, code of conduct, violations, that we are talking about here today? Would you have issues implementing mental health resources that excluded a segment of students on your campuses, Mr. Holloway?

Mr. Holloway. I want our mental health resources to be available to everybody.

Ms. Stevens. Yeah. It needs to be available to everybody, and so we're here for the third time talking about - , and I know this hearing is important to many stakeholders, and many individuals. I come from Michigan. We're in the heart - of this rising challenge of an ongoing and brutal and terrible war.

But as a democrat on this Committee who is focused on increasing and expanding Pell, lowering the cost of higher education, and trying to build equity, it is deeply frustrating and concerning that this is the third hearing that we've had complaining about protecting students equally, when every single one of my colleagues last term in Congress, voted to exclude a group of students from receiving mental health resources.

And I sincerely hope that you wouldn't vote to exclude Muslim students from mental health resources, Jewish students from mental health resources, students of color, non-binary students, and the like. We have tons of issues before us in this country, and frankly, those who pretend to care about equity as we have seen time and time again in this Committee is an outrage.

It is an absolute outrage. Go ahead and cut the Civil Rights Office out of the Department of Ed, so you can't get yelled at by my colleagues on the other side of the aisle about how you can stand up and not stand up for students, litigating all these matters of free speech.

But when we don't put our money where our mouth is, and our policies, we are failing this nation. We are failing Muslim students, we are failing Jewish students, we are failing Christian students, and frankly, we are failing the future of this country. We know what it costs to go to your schools. It's unbelievable how much it costs.

That's what we should be focusing on, not this pretend argument about equity when really, they are just pretending here. So thank you, Madam Chair, and I yield back.

Chairwoman Foxx. Thank you, Ms. Stevens. Mr. Bean, you're recognized for five

minutes.

Mr. Bean. Thank you very much, Madam Chair. A good morning to you, and good morning to the Committee. Gentlemen, thank you so much for being here. I know it's a big deal to run a university, and I was just making a list of all the things you have to do running a university, including recruiting applicants to go to your school, hiring professors and staff, running the plant, raising money, promoting your school.

You would think on that list, which is a very long list, you would think at the very, very top is keeping students, staff and faculty safe on your university. Why we're questioning where you put that on your list is because we see a lack of consequences. We see the answer is always it's under investigation, or we put that group on double secret probation, which really isn't holding anybody accountable.

Chancellor Block, on November 15, 2023, a Jewish UCLA professor and her husband went to a counter protest at a UCLA Students for Justice in Palestine rally, wearing pro-Israel t-shirts. They heard students chant, "Slaughter the Jews," in Arabic, and were threatened by students who said we will find you. We will take care of you.

The next day a UCLA graduate student from the rally stalked her husband at his office. Two weeks later more and more hatred and antisemitism, including garbage topped with a Swastika and the words "Loudmouth Jew," were left outside the door stop. All this was reported to you, and other UCLA officials, including the identity of who is doing it.

What disciplinary actions did UCLA take in response?

Mr. Block. Thank you for the question. We immediately alerted the police, and the police did an investigation, and I don't know if that's ongoing or not, but police were involved immediately in this incident.

Mr. Bean. Did anybody get kicked off campus? Did anybody get kicked out of

school?

Mr. Block. I don't know what the outcome was, but they were immediately - police were immediately notified of this issue, and interviewed individuals, and attempted to identify -who was responsible --.

Mr. Bean. On November 28th, mass protestors cutting down hostage posters threatened and chased a Jewish student while brandishing knives. They chased him on campus. The incident was reported to police, and to UCLA officials. Can you tell us what disciplinary action, including anybody get kicked off campus? Anybody get expelled?

Mr. Block. I don't know in that particular case, but the police were notified, and they attempted to identify the individuals holding the knives.

Mr. Bean. So, you can see gentleman, this is why we question where it is on the list because we see the videos, we see everything, and we just we meet with students who say that it's -- and we see the video just now. It breaks my heart. You can't even go to class. It's hard enough going to one of your schools, but to have to worry about it.

President Schill, I know that you're rewriting the code of conduct at Northwestern. It sounds like you're going to start. You probably already started on it. Is calling for the death of Jews. Is that going to be against your code of conduct?

Mr. Schill. It already is.

Mr. Bean. It already is. So you can't yell words that we all know Intifada and others that are hateful to the Jewish, and calling for the death and destruction, that's going to be --

Mr. Schill. Anything that calls for the death and destruction of Jewish people, whether here or abroad, is a code of conduct violation, and the code of conduct will be investigated, and there's a variety of disciplinary possibilities that will follow from that.

Mr. Bean. Very good. It's an open question. Here's your chance, Presidents, to

prove to this Committee, to the American people, the Congress, your teams back home that you rank the safety of students and faculty, have you expelled anybody? Have you fired people? These hate groups on your campus?

I know there's free speech, but this is clearly as a President Schill has already commented on, it's a clear crossing of the line. President Holloway, what say you?

Mr. Holloway. Any exploitation of violence threatening students, or community, or harassment is a violation of our code of conduct.

Mr. Bean. And you've expelled students, and you've banned groups from your campus to say this will not be tolerated at Rutgers?

Mr. Holloway. That is correct.

Mr. Bean. So I know my time is about up, but I was in Israel this past -- a few months ago, and eating dinner with a family. And we were talking about how scary it is to live in Israel. The family says what we're really worried about is our daughter, and ironically, our daughter is starting Rutgers in the fall.

We were really fearful of her safety coming to America. Should she have anything to fear at Rutgers?

Mr. Holloway. I'm very sorry to hear that the family feels this way.

Mr. Bean. Well, they're scared. They're scared. See, they see the video that we see of students, which is what happened at UCLA and others across America, and they see very little consequences of breaking the laws and the policy because no one seems to be held accountable. Are you going to hold people accountable, Mr. President?

Mr. Holloway. May I answer? Thank you, ma'am. Yes, sir. Absolutely. One thing I want to make clear is that in any instance of the kind of language and behavior we've been talking about, we've responded immediately with whether it's Students Affairs, police, sometimes campus police, sometimes State Police, even the FBI to help us bring to

conclusion.

Mr. Bean. Thank you, President. Madam Chair, I yield back. Thank you.

Chairwoman Foxx. Thank you. Mr. DeSaulnier, you're recognized for five minutes.

Mr. DeSaulnier. Thank you, Madam Chair. I want to thank the panelists for being here. Thank you for your life's work. We're all at an age where I'm sure I'm guessing, I know myself, but I'm looking at you, where you sort of reflect on where life took you. So welcome to an institution that has an 11 percent approval rating.

Chancellor Block, UCLA has a history of supporting Jewish students, and taking proactive measures against antisemitism. Your school established a research hub on antisemitism in October of 2023. October 6th, I'm told in fact. Could you speak to that a little bit?

Mr. Block. That's correct. So, we've established a number of new programs, and that's part of a new program. Actually, we have a study of group hate better to understand overall with many groups, group hate, but specifically we have a program, a hub to look at antisemitism, because we do see it as a real challenge throughout the world and on our campuses, so that's one of our initiatives.

We have a number of initiatives going on basically to educate our students better about people's history and understanding the dangers of discrimination. One of them that I'm involved in, as I take students to Washington each year, a group of our student leaders, and we visit Congress, but we visit museums, and of course we visit the Holocaust Museum.

And for many of our students it's an eye opener, and they begin to understand something about the history of their fellow Jewish students, and why those students, why it's so important to be sensitive to their needs, and make sure that you're not discriminatory towards those students.

We visit other museums as well, the African American Museum. So education is critical here, and we're trying to develop more and more programs to educate students, so that at least we don't see discrimination that's based on ignorance. It's always going to be, unfortunately, people with bad behavior. We recognize that, but we want to make certain that students are well educated in these areas, and that we can minimize the amount of discrimination that occurs on campus.

Mr. DeSaulnier. That is one of the issues I find representing a District surrounding the University of California, the mothership, I'm sorry. We think of you as the younger sibling, is these are areas with a lot of diversity. Rutgers, so there is some tension there, because there is more diversity. Our openness in this instance sometimes creates more friction, in my view, as an urban California representative.

Do you feel - I'm not bringing it as a prerogative, but there's a reality to that openness that sometimes contributes more to the challenges, that maybe less diverse parts of the country don't- experience.

Mr. Block. That's exactly right. We're very proud. UCLA is a very diverse campus, and I worked hard over 17 years to make sure it's representative, that we really work hard to make sure that students from all backgrounds, all socioeconomic backgrounds can attend this university, so we're very proud of that.

People come with different, you know, different life experiences, with different prejudices, but we work hard, actually to bring students together to better understand their common humanity. And I think this is something I think the UC system does very well. I think it brings students together with different backgrounds, and we try to form a bond of what we all have in common, and that's where are programs are designed to really do

We've got some very effective - and we also have very effective- organizations like

our Hillel organization, which is actually nationally recognized, outstanding place for Jewish students to find a home, and other students have other organizations they can go to.

Mr. DeSaulnier. And they have been part of this program, Hillel. They've been very involved in it.

Mr. Block. Yeah. And Hillel has been really a great partner, actually with Jewish students.

Mr. DeSaulnier. So how do we keep building on that? That started October 6th. How do we continue to build on that given the reality that we're experiencing right now? This is a teaching moment, maybe more of a learning moment.

Mr. Block. I think we have to build more programs because as was mentioned, you know, faculty programs -- they can be held for faculty to recognize what their students are going through in terms of the challenges of students in this very divided world.

But also, faculty, this new student program, that really can help address issues of discrimination, and I think those are really important.

Mr. DeSaulnier. Just a personal note. I became friends some years ago with Nathan Chappell, who is now deceased, the 405 is named after him, a survivor of Auschwitz. Last night I was thinking about what he would think about these hearings, and he was a very frank human being. He came here with nothing and ended up being one of the wealthiest people in the United States.

Mr. Lawrence, I was criticized a little bit last hearing because I quoted Justice Brandeis in the opinion with Justice Holmes that defined the First Amendment. Could you talk about that a little bit? It's sort of odd to have people get mad at me for talking, using a quote from Justice Brandeis, and talking about the First Amendment.

Mr. Lawrence. Well, I wouldn't think one could get hurt for quoting Justice Brandeis.

Mr. DeSaulnier. I didn't think so either.

Mr. Lawrence. Justice Brandeis is a personal hero of mine, and probably many in the room. Justice Brandeis famously said that in the absence of incitement of imminent lawless activity, the answer to bad speech is not enforced silence, it's more speech, and I think that he was right then, and I think he's right today.

Mr. DeSaulnier. Thank you all. I yield back.

Chairwoman Foxx. Thank you, Mr. DeSaulnier. Mr. Smucker, you are recognized for five minutes.

Mr. Smucker. Thank you, Chairwoman Foxx. I'd like to start my comments by addressing comments made during the Ranking Member's opening statements where he criticized the majority for holding this hearing, and then talked about the Civil Rights movement, and invoked Martin Luther King, Jr.

Talked about how he was once unpopular, but then moved public opinion. And I'd just like to say that his life was defined by peaceful protests, and I think drawing any comparison between him and these un-American, antisemitic protestors is totally inappropriate, totally unacceptable, and I think the purpose of holding this hearing is to ensure that this antisemitism never becomes accepted by Americans.

The antisemitic behavior that we've seen on your college campuses is reprehensible. It's un-American, it's against your own policies, and in many cases it's criminal. And I'm deeply concerned by the fact that President Schill, and President Holloway, you gave in to the protestor's demands at the expense of the rest of your student bodies.

Mr. Holloway, you promised, as part of giving in to explore expanding Rutgers

relationship with the Palestinian University, Birzeit, at least that's alleged, and which included considering student exchange and study abroad programs. Is that true?

Mr. Holloway. For Birzeit University, we already have a relationship with that university.

Mr. Smucker. Birzeit has buildings named after convicted terrorists. It has glorified terrorism in official social media posts. Hamas won a majority of the school's student government. Eight of its students were arrested for planning terror attacks just weeks before October 7th. And as of 2014, Birzeit had an official policy of barring Jews from its campus. Is this really an institution Rutgers should be partnering with?

Mr. Holloway. Sir, we partner with institutions all around the world, the information --

Mr. Smucker. Will you commit to ending the relationship with Birzeit University?

Mr. Holloway. The information you just shared with me is new to me, sir, and I'll commit to reviewing it.

Mr. Smucker. Thank you. Earlier this month you, as I said, gave into the demands of the mob on your campus. You agreed to eight of their ten demands in a matter of days. However, you have refused to act on the requests of Rutgers Jewish faculty administrators and staff group called JFAS from this past December.

They asked that you provide a full public accounting of antisemitic incidents on campus, suspend students and student organizations that repeatedly violate the code of conduct, prohibit academic departments from institutionally take controversial political stances, and convene a standing university-wide committee on antisemitism and the Jewish experience.

Why have you ignored JFAS, but acted immediately to appease pro-Hamas and anti-American protestors?

Mr. Holloway. Thank you for the question. The first thing I'll say, I was not negotiating with the mob but talking with students. To your question specifically, the Jewish faculty administration and staff, JFAS organization, the requests that they sent to us are being acted on post haste .

Mr. Smucker. So will you commit today to fulfilling all the requests?

Mr. Holloway. I will, in fact, part of the plan for the summer we've already shared, drafted out our action plans, addresses most of those concerns, sir. Most of their concerns.

Mr. Smucker. Will you commit to providing a full public accounting of antisemitic incidents on campus to them?

Mr. Holloway. We are -- we've been scrubbing our own information to make sure that we can get that information elevated.

Mr. Smucker. So, you'll commit to doing that?

Mr. Holloway. We are doing that work, sir.

Mr. Smucker. Will you commit to suspending students and student organizations that repeatedly violate the code of conduct?

Mr. Holloway. When students violate the code of conduct, they go into disciplinary process. The results could look like many different things.

Mr. Smucker. Will you commit to suspending them if that happens?

Mr. Holloway. If the review committee deems that it merits suspension, yes. They will be suspended.

Mr. Smucker. Will you commit to prohibiting academic departments from institutionally taking controversial political stances?

Mr. Holloway. This is something that we're reviewing this summer, sir. I recognize that when departments make these kinds of blankets, I'll call them blanket

statements, on any topic, it is an assertion of speech, but also has a chance to make it harder for members of the Department who don't agree with it.

Mr. Smucker. Will you commit to convening a standing university-wide committee on antisemitism, and the Jewish experience?

Mr. Holloway. So, we immediately convened in response to the JFAS request, we created such a committee in our New Brunswick campus. We have several campuses. And this summer one of the things that we're looking at is trying to figure out how to pull together representatives from each of our campuses.

Mr. Smucker. So, you're still -- it's taking a long time to respond to them. You responded to the other immediately. Will JFAS need to threaten to disrupt exams for you to listen to them?

Mr. Holloway. No, sir. That would not be the case. We were acting in the state of emergency in the case of the in the encampment. With JFAS I will absolutely say that we could respond more quickly and more robustly, and we always will be trying to do better, so.

Mr. Smucker. Thank you, President Holloway.

Chairwoman Foxx. Thank you. Ms. Omar, you're recognized for five minutes.

Ms. Omar. Thank you, Chairwoman. Thank you all for being here. Chancellor Block, just for clarification, the video that we just watched, we saw people going - moving around. Was it possible, do you think, for that student to be able to get into campus? Was that student actually being- blocked from entering campus?

Mr. Block. Well, that was in the middle of, excuse me, that was in the middle of campus, so not being blocked from being on campus, maybe being blocked from a pathway on campus, which you shouldn't be allowed, you know, he should be allowed to pass. I mean any part of campus is open to students, so blocking him was really

inappropriate

Ms. Omar. I appreciate that. The recent images from UCLA are appalling. What is more appalling is that there was complete - it was completely preventable. You could have prevented this by protecting the diverse groups of pro--Palestinian students that were peacefully gathered on campus to share meals, stand in solidarity against a brutal genocide. -You could have prevented this by protecting these students' First Amendment right to assemble.

You could have prevented this when you learned about rats being released into the encampment. You could have prevented this when there was an anonymous group funded and constructed a giant video with loudspeakers to play vile and disturbing footage, you could have prevented this when you saw an angry mob on campus on the night of April 30th, but you did not.

Instead, you, the UCLA leadership, and law enforcement stood by for hours as the mob of agitators gathered near the encampment, with the clear intention to cause violence. And because of your inaction, they acted on the intention and brutally attacked students you were responsible for.

This happened in front of your eyes, on your campus, and it was livestreamed for the whole world to see. So, I would like to know if you are truly committed to keeping your students safe, how did you fail these students at many critical points where you could have intervened?

Mr. Block. Thank you for the question, but I'm sorry, but I reject the premises. These students --

Ms. Omar. How do you reject the premise? Are these pictures lying? Are these pictures lying? Any of these people in jail?

Mr. Block. Can I finish my statement?

Ms. Omar. No. Are any of these people in jail? Are any of these people arrested?

Mr. Block. LAPD is working on trying to identify the people who were assailants that evening. We were committed to finding out the people that were involved.

Ms. Omar. It's been over a month. I submit for the record an article that starts that CNN has produced.

Chairwoman Foxx. Without objection.

[The Information of Ms. Omar follows:]

*****COMMITTEE INSERT*****

Ms. Omar. Why did you not immediately send the police that were standing by, your campus police, law enforcement, to intervene?

Mr. Block. We tried. We notified as soon as we saw the violence, we notified all of our mutual aid partners. We tried to get police there as quickly as possible. But going back to my original point, so this encampment was against policy. This violated time, place and manner--

Ms. Omar. Chancellor, if I may, the footage from that night reveals that some of the most dramatic attacks were carried out by individuals not affiliated with UCLA. Not the university students, faculty, that were arrested.

Why have the violent agitators, who you know have been identified, not been held accountable for assaulting over 150 of your students? You should be ashamed in the fact that you failed your students, you should be ashamed for letting a peaceful protest gathering get hijacked by an angry mob.

You should be ashamed for allowing such violence to take place on your campus, which will now be weaponized by republicans in this Committee.

You played right into the hands in laying the ground for attacking institutions of public education, stripping students of their rights, and broader repression of movements. I know that my time is up. I would like to submit these images into the record.

Chairwoman Foxx. Without objection.

[The Information of Ms. Omar follows:]

*****COMMITTEE INSERT*****

Ms. Omar. And an open letter to the UCLA community from the UCLA Jewish faculty and staff.

[The Information of Ms. Omar follows:]

*****COMMITTEE INSERT*****

Chairwoman Foxx. Thank you. Mr. Williams, you're recognized for five minutes.

Mr. Williams. Thank you, Madam Chairwoman. A question for each of the university leaders here. When students return to campus in just a few months, will there be new rules, policies, procedures and enforcement mechanisms in place to keep Jewish students safe and welcomed?

Mr. Schill. All of our students, yes.

Mr. Holloway. All of our students, yes.

Mr. Block. Same answer.

Mr. Williams. Thank you. President Schill, I assume that these new rules, policies, procedures and enforcement mechanisms will be informed and guided by the events of the law few months on your campus. Is that correct?

Mr. Schill. Absolutely.

Mr. Williams. Thank you. That would mean that your investigations are complete. Is that correct?

Mr. Schill. Our investigations are ongoing.

Mr. Williams. But you didn't commit to that earlier, but you just committed to having policies, procedures, et cetera, ready in time for the new school year. I assume that's based on your investigations. That makes sense to me. Is that true?

Mr. Schill. It's based on what we have learned about what has happened over the past year, and it's based on best practices, and it is based I'm sure on some investigation that is investigations that have already taken place, but it is that our investigations are an ongoing process. We will be getting violations presumably over time, and we're not going to hold up.

Mr. Williams. If I may, just to keep this line of questioning. You know, when

Jewish students return this fall will students and faculty who have been found to have made violent threats to Jewish students, will they be barred from campus this fall? This is your commitment to have these policies and procedures in place.

So, can Jewish students returning to your campus anticipate that the violators who have been found by your investigations be barred from campus? Is that a fair assumption?

Mr. Schill. There is a disciplinary process.

Mr. Williams. This is a straightforward question.

Mr. Schill. No it isn't actually. There is a disciplinary process. In the disciplinary process we'll grant hearings and due process to the students and will mete out what the appropriate penalty is. I can't say.

Mr. Williams. Should they be suspended from campus then, perhaps while this due process is under, you know, being undertaken, perhaps to protect the Jewish students, the parents that are sending them to their schools, perhaps then you would commit that they are barred from campus, that they are suspended until the outcome of these investigations?

Mr. Schill. That is not how due process works.

Mr. Williams. Okay. How about for you, Mr. Holloway, the same question, sir?

Mr. Holloway. Yes.

Mr. Williams. Okay. Thank you.

Mr. Holloway. We are - now we have graduated our class, and so we are now in the process of shifting gears, some are planning to do the work of exploring our policies and building plans.

Mr. Williams. I'm talking about the specific violators that are being investigated for these heinous crimes, will they be at your campus when new students, Jewish

students return in the fall, yes or no? Okay. This is a question for each of you again. Would you say that the emergence of encampments on your campus, was this a spontaneous event, or was it orchestrated and planned? President Schill? Did it surprise you?

Mr. Schill. It surprised me.

Mr. Williams. Mr. Holloway?

Mr. Schill. With about an hour's notice, it surprised me as well.

Mr. Williams. Mr. Block?

Mr. Block. I would say planned or copycat, but certainly a number of encampments went up very quickly, which was surprising.

Mr. Williams. If I may, then who is behind these encampments? What are the groups, faculty, faculty groups, maybe which departments, student organizations, who is behind these encampments in your opinion, specifically groups on your campus, Mr. Schill?

Mr. Schill. I don't know.

Mr. Williams. Wow. Mr. Holloway?

Mr. Holloway. I've had a public university with a lot of outside organizations involved. I know some we're funding. I can't -- I'm unable to tell you which organizations.

Mr. Williams. Mr. Block?

Mr. Block. I'm uncertain because there were quite a --

Mr. Williams. Absolutely shocking. You allowed these encampments to persist on your campus, but you don't know who was behind them. You don't know what was there, but they're occupying and causing violence and chaos on your campus. That is an astonishing admission to me, and I think probably disingenuous.

Again, for each of you, do you acknowledge that giving guidance to campus police

to refuse to take police reports of crimes could be a violation of the Clery Act? President Schill, are you aware of that?

Mr. Schill. I'm not aware of anyone --

Mr. Williams. Are you aware that this is a violation of Clery Act?

Mr. Schill. I haven't looked at the Clery act recently, but it could be. I don't know.

Mr. Williams. Mr. Holloway?

Mr. Holloway. If you're suggesting something like that happened at Rutgers, that's news to me.

Mr. Williams. Mr. Block, are you aware?

Mr. Block. I'm not a lawyer. I assume that's a violation.

Mr. Williams. Okay. I yield back.

Chairwoman Foxx. Thank you Mr. Williams. Ms. Leger Fernandez, you are recognized for five minutes.

Ms. Leger Fernandez. Thank you Madam Chair and Ranking Member, and thank you witnesses for joining us today. In the past seven months since antisemitic incidents have spiked across the country, this Committee has held five hearings, roundtables similar to this, but sadly -- sadly, we've not had a single hearing to actually consider the legislation to address this epidemic of hate.

And we have bills that we could hear, like Congresswoman Kathy Manning's bipartisan, Countering Antisemitism Act, which I'm a proud cosponsor, along with 45 of my colleagues. I will point out that that bill has an equal number of democrat and republican cosponsors. There is a bipartisan effort to actually adopt legislation to cover these issues.

Unfortunately, antisemitism as we know, is a form of hate also rampant in our politics. For example, the current republican nominee for Governor of North Carolina has

repeatedly made antisemitic statements, including downplaying the atrocities of the Holocaust.

Madam Chair, I would like unanimous consent to enter into the record the article from the Times of Israel titled, "Trump backs GOP Candidate for North Carolina Governor Accused of Antisemitic Remarks."

Chairwoman Foxx. Without objection.

[The Information of Ms. Leger Fernandez follows:]

*****COMMITTEE INSERT*****

Ms. Leger Fernandez. Also, just last week the Minnesota Republican party endorsed a candidate for the U.S. Senate who once self-identified as an antisemite. Madam Chair, I'd like unanimous consent to enter into the record the article from the Times of Israel titled, "Royce White, Podcaster who Railed Against Jews Wins Republican Nod in Minnesota."

Chairwoman Foxx. Without objection.

[The information of Ms. Leger Fernandez follows:]

*****COMMITTEE INSERT*****

Ms. Leger Fernandez. And these are not isolated incidences, they follow a disturbing trend of the far right that embraces antisemitic conspiracies like the Great Replacement Theory. Just Monday afternoon, there was a video posted on former President Donald Trump's site that features images of hypothetical newspaper articles celebrating a 2024 victory for him, and referring to "The creation of a unified Reich," under the headline, "What's Next for America?"

This Committee has the authority over something that's really important and key for combatting hate across America, and that's education. Because we know that education is one of the great methods of bringing people together, of having students, Americans, all people, start to understand religions, people, viewpoints that are different from their own, to start to understand the history of antisemitism that has plagued not only this country, but our world for centuries upon centuries.

To understand that history, to understand that it must be treated with the care and attention that it deserves. Unfortunately, I don't think that hearing after hearing where we're simply addressing sad, and disturbing incidents, but not addressing legislation to combat them, is what our nation needs at this time.

Once again, I call on the Committee to hold a hearing on the legislation to actually address antisemitism, like the Combating Antisemitism Act, and with that I yield back. Thank you very much, Madam Chair.

Chairwoman Foxx. Thank you, Ms. Leger Fernandez. Mr. Grothman, you're recognized for five minutes.

Mr. Grothman. Yeah. First of all, just a little bit of a comment on some of these agreements that have been entered into. When we do these hearings, we're given something called a prehearing memorandum. And in the prehearing memorandum it

mentions in one sentence John Hopkins University, Harvard University, and the University of Wisconsin in Milwaukee.

I think if you told the University of Milwaukee a year ago that they would appear in the same sentence as Harvard and Johns Hopkins, they would have been quite elated. I'll point out that it wasn't such a great honor to be put in with those two institutions. In any event, I'll talk to Mr. Holloway.

In your agreement with the Rutgers encampment, you promised to, "Implement support for ten displaced Palestinian students to finish their education at Rutgers." Do you acknowledge, or will you admit that setting aside ten spaces at Rutgers for Palestinians that you've agreed to, apparently in return for them stopping causing trouble, and you know just being awful would be a violation of federal antidiscrimination law? Did you consider that?

Mr. Holloway. Supporting refugee students is a violation of antidiscrimination law?

Mr. Grothman. Well, you set aside ten spaces for Palestine --

Mr. Holloway. Oh. I understand. I understand. We have existing programs to support refugee students and scholars, and we would lean on those programs. And we absolutely don't believe in quotas sir.

Mr. Grothman. Do you see a problem here? I mean first of all on this whole Gaza situation, the Palestinians could not have taken a more outlandish position. But secondly, it appears in response for the trouble they're causing, and the hate that they're encouraging, their little ethnic group here is rewarded with ten spaces, and I am sure there are all sorts of other foreigners around the world who would be happy to grab those ten spaces.

Do you think that was a wise thing to do, or do you think it's something you ought

to maybe revoke or rethink?

Mr. Holloway. Are you speaking specifically about the number ten, sir? Is that what you're asking?

Mr. Grothman. Well yeah, it could be fifteen, it could be five, whatever, but it appears as though you're giving the Palestinian students support that perhaps you're not giving other students, and it appears like you're doing it as a reward, or whatever for participating in this demonstration in support of Hamas?

Mr. Holloway. I understand your question. I think it's a mischaracterization, but to your specific point about the ten students. We have, as I said before, existing programs already that allow students, refugee students. Getting to those threshold numbers, in this case ten, is a tremendous amount of work, and may not happen, sir.

Mr. Grothman. Well, you understand there are only so many slots in a university. I mean I don't know what's going on in New Jersey. You could have given the slides to people in New Jersey if you wanted to increase the diversity of your program. I'm sure there are many legitimate countries around the world in which students would be happy to come here.

I guess the thing that bothers me is first of all you're violating federal antidiscrimination law, and secondly, you feel compelled to reward the Palestinians who were causing a disruption, and not to mention appear to be siding with an ideology that's completely offensive, but they get a reward.

Mr. Holloway. To the various points you put in there, sir, Rutgers is one of the most diverse campuses, universities in the country, and we reflect --

Mr. Grothman. There's a good question. I hate to cut you off, but I only have five minutes. You said it's a diverse campus. I think part of the problem with this whole thing is a lack of diversity on campuses. Right now, this country is about 50/50 republican,

democratic, conservative, liberal or whatever. Do you think your campus is about 50/50, or 60/40 if I look at the faculty, republican, democrat, liberal, conservative? Is it diverse like that?

Mr. Holloway. Sir, I don't know. We don't have a political litmus test when we hire people.

Mr. Grothman. You have no clue. I mean when I talked to my local professors, they can give me scary stories about the infinitesimal number of conservative students. Well, okay, I'll go on here to the gentleman from Northwestern. It appears to me as though you have also entered into some sort of agreement in response to the troublemakers, giving them -- saying you're going to support visiting Palestinian faculty and students at risk.

So in other words, you also have responded to these protests, obviously antisemitic protests, or anti-Israel protests by giving, by rewarding a subgroup here with special treatment. Do you regret that, or do you think that's inappropriate?

Mr. Schill. This is an existing program. It's not something new. We have an existing program, and it has served Ukraine, Afghanistan and other countries.

Mr. Grothman. The university will support visiting Palestinian faculty, that's what it says here.

Chairwoman Foxx. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. Grothman. Oh thanks for cutting me off.

Chairwoman Foxx. Mr. Scott? Mr. Burlison, you're recognized for five minutes.

Mr. Burlison. Thank you, Madam Chair. I have a video that I want to start with.

[Video played.]

Mr. Burlison. After seeing that, you know, and I don't want to say it's comical, but it's really not comical, the outcome of that. That ignorance is not comical. I'm concerned

for young people, and it concerns me what they are not learning, and their willingness to participate in hate. There is an article that came out from Fortune. Madam Chair, I'd like to submit that for the record.

Chairwoman Foxx. Without objection.

[The Information of Mr. Burlison follows:]

*****COMMITTEE INSERT*****

Mr. Burlison. That talks about a survey of HR experts, and there's definitely a culture within the hiring within small businesses who are choosing not to hire from universities that have protests on them, which is unfortunate for students who don't participate in the protests. Are you -- you each can answer this. Are you concerned about the business communities, the private sector's community, the employers that are hiring your students?

Are you concerned? Do you have any communications with those businesses?

Mr. Schill. I have not had any communications from businesses that have said they're not going to hire Northwestern students, but I will say, and it's not directly on point. You are absolutely right. We need to educate students. The ignorance that you saw in that video, and that you displayed is part of the problem, and it's something that we, and I'm sure all of us agree we need to be better at.

Mr. Burlison. Thank you. Mr. Holloway?

Mr. Holloway. The video is shocking and depressing. And I absolutely believe that we all need to do a better job in pre-K through 12 education and higher education to make sure we have more better informed students, and frankly better informed citizens. -The - I'm- sorry, oh, as far as --

Mr. Burlison. You can see why employers would -- everyone has seen these

videos.

Mr. Holloway. Yes.

Mr. Burlison. You can see why, and the protests, you can see why employers would say I'm not hiring from that school, right?

Mr. Holloway. I do understand that. You asked a question specifically on that issue. We have a very large career services program, and I know they worked diligently to prepare our students to be ready to be hired, and not look like the students on the video, sir.

Mr. Burlison. Thank you. Mr. Block, or Chancellor Block?

Mr. Block. Thank you. More education. I mean I'm surprised. We need to better educate our students in some of these areas, and we do have a task force actually that's looking directly at this issue.

Mr. Burlison. It was asked earlier, and I want to give a second chance to answer this. The question was do you believe that Israel is a genocidal state, because that is the propaganda, and so I'll ask you, begin with you Mr. Schill, do you believe that Israel is a geocidal state?

Mr. Schill. No I do not.

Mr. Burlison. Okay. Mr. Holloway?

Mr. Holloway. I do not.

Mr. Burlison. Okay. Mr. Block, Chancellor Block?

Mr. Block. I do not.

Mr. Burlison. It's not. Okay. Thank you. Would you acknowledge that, "From the river to the sea, and intifada Revolution," that these phrases are antisemitic calls for the destruction of Israel and the slaughter of Jews? Mr. Schill?

Mr. Schill. I believe that over time those statements have become dog whistles

for antisemitism.

Mr. Burlison. Mr. Holloway?

Mr. Holloway. I think any time those phrases such like that is used to incite violence and threaten harass, is a violation of conduct, and is antisemitic.

Mr. Burlison. Chancellor Block?

Mr. Block. I also think they're antisemitic, although surveys show interesting, many people do not.

Mr. Burlison. Real quick, yes or no? It's not just antisemitic, it's dangerous. Yes? No?

Mr. Schill. Potentially yes.

Mr. Holloway. I agree.

Mr. Block. I would say the same, potentially.

Mr. Burlison. Thank you.

Chairwoman Foxx. Thank you, Mr. Burlison. Ms. Chavez-DeRemer, you're recognized for five minutes.

Ms. Chavez-DeRemer. Thank you, Madam Chair. This has to be a record for racist protests thriving at universities in the post Jim Crow America. I mean seriously, a lot of these schools now feel like they're being riled up by George Wallace. The target this time not being black Americans, but Jewish Americans.

Before us today, yet again, are leaders of universities with rampant antisemitism. Madam Chair, these witnesses have countless academic accolades, and yet I'm sorry, pure ignorance of their actions is on the same level as other schools. Do you three think you operate in a vacuum?

Every Jew, at home and abroad is raised with stories of the Holocaust, and how it could happen again. And now we find ourselves drowning in the same cultural rot, which

led up to the most horrific genocide in human history. The world knew what was happening to Jews in Nazi occupied Europe, by why didn't they care?

Because there was a culture of indifference and hatred towards Jews. Culture drives everything, and the world is now being directly influenced by the culture of hatred on American campuses, your campuses. Mr. Schill, Dr. Holloway, Dr. Block, evil does not rear its cowardly head unless given permission.

Through an unwillingness to successfully end these protests, you have given permission to the evil we are witnessing. According to the Anti-Defamation League, this past year was the worst year for antisemitic incidences since ADL began recording more than four decades ago.

There was a total of 8,873 incidents reported across the United States in 2023, an increase of 140 percent compared to 2022, which was also a record setting year. This is an average of 24 incidents per day, one per hour. 922 of these incidents took place on college and university campuses, a 321 percent increase. Through your incompetence, this evil is growing stronger throughout the world.

As university students around the world are copying what they see so easily thrives on American campuses. In no uncertain terms, you and your counterparts across the nation are directly responsible for the dangers Jews across the world now face.

Chancellor Block, the encampment at UCLA, including messaging and Arabic reading, "Oh Kusham, burn Tel Aviv." These protests are protected by the First Amendment, and our vital expressions in democracy.

However, this is an explicit glorification and endorsement of a U.S. designated terrorist group, which massacred 1,200 innocent Israel civilians on October 7th. Is this language acceptable at UCLA?

Mr. Block. Language was unacceptable. I'm unaware of that, and the

encampment of course has been removed.

Ms. Chavez-DeRemer. What will be the consequences for racists calling for genocide?

Mr. Block. Student disciplinary processes if there's complaints, and they can identify they go through a disciplinary process.

Ms. Chavez-DeRemer. But anything less than a suspension in my opinion is insufficient. Madam Chair, I'd like to submit ADL's report card of UCLA into the record?

Chairwoman Foxx. Without objection.

[The Information of Ms. Chavez-DeRemer follows:]

*****COMMITTEE INSERT*****.

Ms. Chavez-DeRemer: UCLA received a D. I hope you will review their metrics carefully, and do a better job moving forward. President Schill, you updated Northwestern's codes of conducts in anticipation of the encampments that were being erected on various other college and university campuses across the country.

Yet when the encampment went up on April 25th, and throughout its lifetime, you failed to enforce those codes of conduct, providing a false legitimacy to the encampment and its actions. It is also true that you said explicitly on the day the encampment started that any violation of the code of conduct, or university policies could lead to disciplinary actions, such as suspension or expulsion, and possibly criminal sanctions.

The encampment has clearly violated both your code of conduct and your policies. What's the point of having rules if they don't matter? Let me ask, and I know you've given Dr. Foxx an answer, but let's run it back. Exactly how many citations have Northwestern University issued to both student and non-student participants?

Mr. Schill. I don't have the exact figure.

Ms. Chavez-DeRemer. Got it. These encampments may fizzle out over the summer, but they will like return, and the lessons your students are taking away is that this is an acceptable form of protest, even if they are in violation of university policies. That may even lead to concessions by their universities. This is a failure, and yours alone.

And to everyone who will see this, I ask that you visit the Holocaust Museum here in D.C. I want you to kneel down and touch the stone which paved the grounds of Auschwitz. I want you to peer over the countless shoes of murdered Jews. Allow the silence of that room to remind you that this is the silence of death.

Death enabled by global culture indifference and hatred, a culture which each of us has a role in either enabling or ending. And I would remind you, Mr. Schill, Dr. Block, and Dr. Holloway, of who you are. You are leaders of culture. At this present moment you have abandoned that role. I hope you reclaim it because we will certainly be watching, and with that, Madam Chair, I yield back.

Chairwoman Foxx. The gentlewoman's time has expired. Mr. Scott, you're recognized for five minutes.

Mr. Scott. Thank you, Madam Chair. I'd like to ask the university Presidents the first question that you were asked had the premise that something along the lines of in so far as your campuses are hot beds of antisemitism, how many people have you disciplined? And you went on to just answer how many people you disciplined, without questioning whether or not your campuses whether or not your campuses were in fact hot beds of antisemitism?

Are your campuses also hot beds of racism, homophobia and Islamophobia, Dr. Schill?

Mr. Schill. I would not say that we are hot beds of any of those things. I do believe that we have a problem, like all universities, and it's becoming more and more

apparent that antisemitism is a problem on campus, and it's one that we need to deal with. The vast majority --

Mr. Scott. I don't have -- I have a lot of different questions, so let me just get an answer from President Holloway?

Mr. Holloway. I certainly disagree that with the characterization of Rutgers being a hot bed of antisemitism. We do everything we can to promote the security and safety of all of our students, and to have a community of character.

Mr. Scott. Okay. Chancellor Block?

Mr. Block. I believe the same. I don't believe we're a hot bed of antisemitism. I think we've had incidents of it that are disturbing, that we're trying to address, but I think overall --

Mr. Scott. Okay. Well, I mean you let the premise go by, and didn't address it, so I didn't want that to be the record of the hearing. Does your code of conduct - is your code of student conduct based on whether or not the conduct involves antisemitism, or Islamophobia, racism, homophobia, or other gender--b-ased hatred?

Mr. Schill. We treat each of those equally.

Mr. Scott. And President Holloway?

Mr. Holloway. We are in the same space, sir.

Mr. Block. Same here.

Mr. Scott. Okay. And can you develop a campus free of antisemitism that does not address other forms of hate?

Mr. Schill. Hate is hate, and we need to address all of it.

Mr. Scott. President Holloway?

Mr. Holloway. The kind of work you're talking about is the ongoing work of the university. We must address hate in all of its forms.

Mr. Scott. Okay, Chancellor Block?

Mr. Block. The same here, and we have an initiative specifically to look at group hate, looking at different types of group hate.

Mr. Scott. Okay. And I say that because this, as I indicated in my opening remarks, this is multiple hearings just on antisemitism, but under Title 6, there are other forms of hatred. If you're going to have a campus free of hate, it seems to me difficult to do that just looking at one form.

President Schill, a question was raised about Qatar. I'm aware of another university that I used to represent before redistricting, that has a campus in Qatar. What's the value of having a university located in Qatar?

Mr. Schill. It provides benefits to faculty and students who want to go back and forth. It also, I believe, this was decided 17 years ago, and I'm only there for two years. I believe part of the point was to introduce American concepts of journalism, free speech, and to provide in journalism, and to provide avenues for women to be more successful in those societies. I think those were the reasons.

Mr. Scott. Thank you. Mr. Lawrence, can you remind us how you can balance free speech and protests?

Mr. Lawrence. Mr. Ranking Member, you begin with a presumption that speech, including protests, is protected because that is the core of the First Amendment with respect to public universities, but the principles of academic freedom and free expression, free inquiry on our private university campuses as well.

Where that runs out is where that activity turns into threats of violence, harassment, or in undue disruptions of the operations of the university. Those are the kinds of decisions that university Presidents around the country are making on a daily basis, taking all of the factors into account that they have to deal with.

Mr. Scott. Thank you. And I just have a few seconds left. Are there any additional steps that this Committee can actually do to help promote enforcement of Title 6? Mr. Lawrence?

Mr. Lawrence. I think the Committee could play a major role in working with and funding the efforts of the Department of Education in that regard, and in all the ways in which the Department of Education facilitates the work of universities around the country on all of the issues we've been talking about, and a range of other issues, including mental health issues that are major challenges for our colleges and universities today.

Mr. Scott. Thank you. Thank you, my time is gone.

Chairwoman Foxx. Thank you, Mr. Scott, for being right on time.

Mr. Scott. I try.

Chairwoman Foxx. You and I were trying to be good role models. Mr. Scott, I recognize you now for a closing statement.

Mr. Scott. First, Madam Chair, I'd ask unanimous consent to enter the following items into the record. A letter from Professor t John Farmer, former Attorney General of New Jersey, who states that he finds accusations of pervasive climate of antisemitism at Rutgers to be both inaccurate and offensive.

A letter from over 500 law school professors condemning the Committee's accusations against the Rutgers Law Center for security, race and rights; a letter published in the Daily Northwestern on May 2nd of 186 faculty members from Northwestern commending the President and students from Northwestern for coming to a peaceful resolution involving the encampment.

An article from May 15th, the Chicago Times entitled "Northwestern Ended its Encampment Without Cops or Violence. Why is Congress Upset; a letter from Northwestern American Association of University Professors, Executive Committee, letter

to Representative Foxx and members of the Committee in support of President Schill.

An article from LA Times written entitled, "After Violent Night at UCLA, Class is Cancelled. UC President Launches Investigation and a Response, documenting the organized attack on the UCLA encampment the night of April 30th; a joint statement from unions representing educators at Rutgers, Northwestern and UCLA.

A letter from the National Coalition against censorship decrying ; the May 14th letter from the Chair and Chair Comer of the Oversight Committee to Treasury Secretary Yellen, and an article from Boise State University's Office of Student Life, 5 and a half Things you Might Not Know About Martin Luther King, which includes the fact that the King Center that Dr. King went to jail 29 times.

It was pointed out that his protests were non-violent, but they were usually against the law, and part of the non-violent strategy is that you not only break the law, but you accept the consequences. Unanimous consent for those?

Chairwoman Foxx. That's the end of it. Without objection.

[The Information of Mr. Scott follows:]

*****COMMITTEE INSERT*****

Mr. Scott. Thank you. I want to thank our witnesses for participating. Without a doubt, there's more that we can do to combat antisemitism, not only on college campuses, but everywhere. No one should be intimidated, harassed or assaulted just simply for who they are, or who they worship.

And it's been noted the students cannot learn if they feel threatened. Yet today, for the fifth time in six months the majority is holding another hearing just to complain about antisemitism, without providing a meaningful solution to address animus on college campuses, or any of the other forms of hatred.

So, it was great to have an opportunity to hear from our campus leaders on what they are doing to proactively prevent incidences of violence and harassment. However, in Congress as leaders, students deserve more. We have the responsibility to criticize discrimination whenever we see it, even if it comes from one's own party.

Our students deserve solutions, they deserve thoughtful, deliberate conversations about the Constitutional questions before us, and that would mean the difference between free speech and violating the criminal code, Title 6, or the campus policies. We have the responsibility to condemn discrimination when we see it. And We should be doing it every time we have an opportunity.

So thank you, Madam Chair, and I yield back.

Chairwoman Foxx. Thank you, Mr. Scott. We certainly do agree that students cannot learn when they feel threatened, and it's part of our responsibility, I think, to see that the students who do feel threatened are relieved of that fear. One of Congress's Constitutional powers is to conduct investigations. These are an important mechanism for transparency, bringing bad things to light, informing new legislation to address the problems they uncover, and yielding accountability.

Today's testimony certainly brought bad things to light beyond the craven deals and shocking inaction we already knew about. President Schill, we've heard accounts of horrific violence and harassment of Jewish students on your campus. But you admitted that you have not suspended a single student since October 7th for antisemitic conduct.

Moreover, I'm appalled by the condescension and contempt you've shown for the Committee, and towards your own Jewish students today. You've refused to answer basic questions on topics. This includes your decision to appoint antisemites, including one who supported the October 7 attack through your antisemitism advisory committee, and whether you will terminate faculty and staff who fought with police in the encampment.

You've given misleading answers that contradict the words of the agreement that you signed. President Holloway, over a month ago the Committee sent you a document, a document request, detailing pages of horrifying antisemitic incidents. And that was before the antisemitic pro-terror encampment, yet you've only suspended four students since October 7th.

The Center for Security, Race and Rights uses taxpayer dollars to engage in political advocacy, promote terrorism, and delegitimize Israel. Just this week it was revealed that one of the advisory board members in the Center was posting videos of Hamas murdering Israeli soldiers to Instagram, with words of praise.

If you're unwilling to close and defund the cesspool of hate, the State of New Jersey should. Chancellor Block, we saw horrifying footage of encampment members setting up illegal checkpoints denying Jewish students access to central parts of campus, and accounts of assault, harassment, threats and intimidation.

You stood by and let this happen. Today's hearing is the beginning, not the end of the Committee's investigation of your institutions. You will be held accountable for your

records. Congress will not stand by while you violate your obligations to uphold Title 6 of the Civil Rights Act, fail to protect Jewish students, cut deals advancing divestment, and promote terrorism and radical, antisemitic ideologies.

There being no further business to come before the Committee, the Committee stands adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 1:03 p.m., the Committee was adjourned.]