

INTRODUCTION

During the 1930s, America's most prominent colleges and universities, including Harvard, Yale, Columbia, and the Seven Sisters, helped legitimize antisemitism by warmly welcoming Nazi leaders to campus, enrolling German exchange students trained as Nazi propagandists, and encouraging their own students to study in the Third Reich under Nazi auspices, an experience that transformed many of them into partisans of Hitler's "New Germany." The University of Virginia, sponsor of the nation's most prestigious foreign policy symposium, energetically recruited pro-Nazi academics and diplomats from both sides of the Atlantic to ensure that the Third Reich was able to present its case to the American public. American university administrators almost never responded to the vitriolic antisemitic statements made on campus by Hitler's diplomatic and student representatives or American apologists for his regime.

The American campus has once again become a principal arena for the propagation of antisemitism, often now intertwined with a virulent anti-Zionism. During the last two decades, antisemitic speakers resembling Germany's Nazis have attracted enormous and enthusiastic student audiences. Contemporary university administrators have for the most part refrained from responding to this torrent of antisemitic invective. Such administrative indifference has contributed to a campus climate where opponents of Israel physically intimidate Jewish students and disrupt pro-Israel lectures.

WELCOMING THE MILITANT ANTISEMITE: HARVARD 1934, HOWARD 1994

In June 1934, Harvard University's administration, alumni, and the student newspaper, the *Crimson*, warmly welcomed Ernst Hanfstaengl, Nazi party foreign press chief and one of Adolf Hitler's earliest backers, when he arrived in Cambridge from Germany to attend his twenty-fifth class reunion. Hitler had taken refuge in Hanfstaengl's villa outside Munich after the 1923 Beer Hall Putsch. A militant antisemite, Hanfstaengl had in April 1933 told American diplomat James G. McDonald that "the Jews must be crushed." He described Germany's Jews as "the vampire sucking German blood," invoking the medieval blood libel that sparked pogroms through the centuries. McDonald wrote in his diary that Hanfstaengl had then "launched into a terrifying account

of Nazi plans.” The Nazis’ nationwide April 1, 1933 boycott of Jewish businesses and offices was only a beginning. Noting that Germany had taken one and a half million prisoners in the World War, Hanfstaengl declared that “600,000 Jews would be simple.” The Nazis would assign a storm trooper to each Jew, and “in a single night it could be finished.” McDonald was not certain whether this meant that the Nazi plan was to imprison Germany’s entire Jewish population, or its “wholesale slaughter.”

Shortly before Hanfstaengl arrived at Harvard, the student newspaper, the *Crimson*, urged the university administration to award him an honorary degree. Hanfstaengl deserved a mark “of honor,” the *Crimson* editorialized, “appropriate to his high position in the government of a friendly country.”

Fraternalizing with Hanfstaengl at the Class of 1909 party at Harvard were alumni occupying positions of great prominence in corporate business, banking, and higher education. Many looked on admiringly as the Nazi party leader spoke of the nights he and Hitler had spent at Hanfstaengl’s villa eagerly anticipating “the day” when the Nazis assumed power in Germany, and proudly proclaimed: “Now the day is here.” Throughout the dinner, alumni and their children flocked around Hanfstaengl seeking his autograph.

While Hanfstaengl basked in the adulation, Harvard police ripped down anti-Nazi signs protestors had posted on campus. Mocking the *Crimson*’s desire to honor him, they proposed that the administration bestow on him a “Doctor of Pogroms” degree.

During the commencement exercises, anti-Nazi protestors jammed Harvard Square adjacent to the campus in a massive demonstration against the university’s warm welcome for Hanfstaengl. Police arrested seven demonstrators, one after another, immediately after each rose to speak, charging them with speaking without a permit. When they were sentenced to six months’ imprisonment, Harvard president James Bryant Conant refused to intervene. He called the protests “ridiculous.” Conant’s lack of sympathy for the protestors was influenced in part by his own antisemitism. As Harvard’s president he maintained an informal quota to restrict Jewish admissions, and made antisemitic comments in private correspondence.

Delighted by the good will Hanfstaengl had generated for the Third Reich among members of the American business and educational elite during his Harvard visit, Hitler bestowed on him the honor of opening the Nazi party's sixth congress at Nuremberg in September 1934.¹

Six decades later, in February 1994, Howard University in Washington, D.C., long known as the "Black Harvard," accorded an enthusiastic welcome, resembling Hanfstaengl's, to another fanatical antisemite, Khalid Abdul Muhammad, a top aide to Nation of Islam (NOI) leader Louis Farrakhan. Muhammad's and Farrakhan's views eerily paralleled those of the Nazis. Virulently antisemitic and racist, the NOI taught that white people were an inferior race of devils created by a mad scientist with a Jewish name, Yacub. Jews were the most dangerous of the "white devils," responsible, according to the NOI, for the enslavement of blacks, and controlled Western finance and the media. Incapable of good behavior, whites were destined by Allah for annihilation in the near future in a massive bombardment by aerial saucers based in an immense spaceship, the Mother Wheel. Along with the United States, Britain would be a primary target for destruction in this attack because of its sponsorship of the Balfour Declaration in 1917, promising the Jews a homeland in Palestine. The NOI was a leading distributor of antisemitic literature in the United States, promoting such tracts as the *Protocols of the Elders of Zion* in its bookstores.²

Shortly before appearing at Howard, Khalid Abdul Muhammad attracted national attention by delivering a fiercely antisemitic lecture at Kean College in New Jersey, which the United States Senate denounced in a 97-0 vote. Like Hanfstaengl, Muhammad drew on medieval antisemitic imagery, proclaiming that Jews were "sucking [blacks'] blood daily."³ Muhammad suggested that Jews deserved annihilation in the Holocaust: "everybody always talks about Hitler exterminating six million Jews.... But don't nobody ever ask what did they do to Hitler? What did they do to them folks? They went in there, in Germany, the way they do everywhere they go, and they supplanted, they usurped."⁴

Over one thousand people, mostly Howard students, packed the campus auditorium to hear Muhammad; many more were unable to gain admittance because of insufficient space. The *Washington Post* reported that the audience

“strongly embraced” Muhammad’s message, frequently interrupting his speech with applause.⁵ Khalid Abdul Muhammad’s lecture was preceded by a series of speakers who, according to the *Washington Post*, “launched into scathing attacks against Jews as the crowd shouted its approval.” In introducing Muhammad, Malik Zulu Shabazz, a Howard law student, and leader of the student group sponsoring the event, parroted accusations advanced decades before by the Nazis and by Henry Ford. Shabazz claimed that Jews controlled the American entertainment industry and the Federal Reserve Board, and added bizarre new charges that Jews had murdered major African-American leaders such as Martin Luther King, Jr. and Nat Turner. He accused the Jews of murdering Jesus. Each time Shabazz called on the audience to repeat the name of the group he had just denounced as malevolent and criminal, it shouted back “Jews!”⁶

Reporting on Howard’s “little Nuremberg rally” several days later, *Washington Post* columnist Richard Cohen stated that “several hundred students acted like extras in a Leni Riefenstahl movie.” Cohen called Shabazz “a man we can only hope was born too late for his real calling: a pogrom.” He noted that the Howard University student government had donated \$500 to Muhammad that night, which would go to the NOI.⁷

Less than two months later, Khalid Abdul Muhammad was invited back to Howard, to deliver another antisemitic speech before an audience of nearly 2,000. David Friedman, the regional director of the Anti-Defamation League, a spectator in the auditorium, described the event as “the closest thing to a Nuremberg rally that I have ever seen.”⁸

Like Harvard’s campus police who suppressed anti-Nazi protest in 1934 by tearing down signs denouncing Hanfstaengl in Harvard Yard, Howard’s security police refused to protect four Jews who were peacefully demonstrating outside the auditorium against Khalid Abdul Muhammad. The four Jews, silently holding signs identifying the NOI as antisemitic and calling for an end to hate, were quickly besieged by “scores” of people who became increasingly menacing, shouting, “The only good Zionist is a dead Zionist!” and “One bullet, one Zionist! Two bullets, two Zionists!” An NOI official informed the Jews that if they did not depart within ten minutes, the NOI would not

guarantee their safety. Members of the crowd cried out, “Let’s finish them,” and ripped the protestors’ signs from their hands and tore them up. When the four Jews replaced those signs with new ones, a Howard security officer told them to put them down. Because they did not relinquish their right of peaceful protest, the officer grabbed the signs from their hands. In so doing, he struck Rabbi Avi Weiss, one of the protestors.⁹

Howard’s administrators and students seemed mostly concerned with complaining that the press had devoted excessive attention to Muhammad’s antisemitism, sometimes revealing their own anti-Jewish prejudice. Howard president Franklyn Jenifer, who was forced to resign because of the national outcry about the repeated displays of campus antisemitism, warned that students would view his departure “as the handiwork of Jews”—a “specious” assumption, he acknowledged, but one that nonetheless “could lead to a tremendous feeling of anti-Semitism.”¹⁰ He was warning that the Jews would be responsible for increased antisemitism. The Howard student newspaper, the *Hilltop*, even printed an antisemitic caricature of *Washington Post* columnist Richard Cohen, who had condemned Khalid Abdul Muhammad’s speeches, captioned, “So speaks the Jewish man.” Cohen noted that although the *Hilltop* devoted a front page story, an editorial, an op-ed article, and the caricature to the column he had written about the Muhammad speech, “Nowhere is the antisemitism of the speakers or the participating audience members denounced.” He maintained that the *Hilltop* itself trafficked in antisemitism.¹¹

A PLATFORM FOR BARBARISM: COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY IN 1933 AND 2007

Like Howard, Columbia University in 2007 revealed that it had not learned the lessons of the 1930s when it invited Iranian president Mahmoud Ahmadinejad to speak on campus almost three-quarters of a century after it had warmly welcomed Nazi Germany’s ambassador to the United States, Dr. Hans Luther, to present a similar address. Columbia president Lee Bollinger and his administration were well aware of Ahmadinejad’s virulently antisemitic views, his denial of the Holocaust, and his “genocidal threats against Israel,” which he called “Satan’s standard bearer.” In 2005 he had announced that “Israel must

be wiped off the map,” and the next year warned that Israelis “should know they were reaching the last days of their lives.”¹²

In December 1933, Columbia University’s administration proudly hosted Ambassador Luther, although many students and some faculty members fiercely protested the invitation. From the early months of Nazi rule, many American and British journalists were reporting that the Hitler regime was far more oppressive than anything the world had ever seen. There were already indications that its objective was the extermination of Germany’s Jews, as James G. McDonald had concluded from his talk with Hanfstaengl in April 1933. The American Jewish press immediately labeled Hitler the new Haman—the Persian official in the biblical book of Esther who had tried to destroy the Jewish people. The press made Americans aware that the Nazis had expelled Jews from the professions and university faculties, and savagely beat them in the streets. Many believed that the Nazis’ nationwide boycott of Jewish stores and offices on April 1, 1933 signaled their intention to destroy Germany’s Jewish population by economic strangulation. The Nazis had demonstrated that they could completely stifle Jewish trade. The yellow circle—a medieval symbol used to shame Jews—placed above the boycotted stores and offices by storm troopers announced the reversion to the vicious antisemitism of that era.¹³

American travelers returning from Germany warned that a “cold pogrom” was underway. Jews there were treated brutally and faced the prospect of physical extinction. Britain’s Manchester *Guardian* stated in April 1933 that “in city after city [in] village after village, [there is] such an abundance of barbarism . . . that modern analogies fail.” The same month, a *New York Times* correspondent wrote from Germany that the Jews there were “like toads under the harrow.” Journalists reported that the Nazis delighted in publicly humiliating Jews, parading them through towns in refuse carts, and imprisoning them in pigsties.¹⁴

In May 1933, Germany’s national student organization staged a series of book burnings at universities across the Reich, in which they destroyed many of the world’s greatest works of scholarship and literature, an event that should have drawn the attention of American academia. Some in the West reading of the German bonfires undoubtedly recalled Heinrich Heine’s prescient warning

more than a century before, “where books are burned, in the end people will be burned, too.”

There was significant student anti-Nazi protest at Columbia because, despite the quota system, it enrolled a larger proportion of Jews than other American elite universities, and was located in New York City, where demonstrations against Hitler were most conspicuous. Columbia’s Jewish students immediately mobilized against the Nazis, collecting 500 signatures in March 1933 on a petition denouncing persecution of Jews in Germany, which recalled “the blackest hours of the Dark Ages.” They also participated that month in a massive Madison Square Garden rally against Nazi antisemitism. The Columbia student newspaper, the *Spectator*, whose editorial board included many Jews, repeatedly denounced Nazism.

Columbia’s Nicholas Murray Butler, the nation’s best-known university president and winner of the 1931 Nobel Peace Prize, dismissed criticism of the invitation to Luther. He praised the Nazi ambassador as a “gentleman...honest and well-mannered.” As “the diplomatic representative . . . of a friendly people,” Luther was entitled to “the greatest courtesy and respect.” Butler did not express any concern that the Nazis had burned the books of one of Columbia’s most distinguished professors, Franz Boas, a Jew and the world’s most prominent anthropologist. Butler’s antisemitism, which he shared with most college and university administrators of the interwar period, certainly influenced him in warmly welcoming Ambassador Luther. Butler had pioneered in developing methods to sharply reduce Jewish enrollment, which most American colleges and universities adopted after World War I.¹⁵

During the early and mid-1930s, Butler expressed some sympathy for Hitler’s expansionist designs, arguing that it was unfair for the “saturated” powers—Britain, France, and the United States—to deprive Germany of the opportunity to acquire new territory it needed for economic development and to support its growing population. Other members of his administration similarly supported some Nazi objectives or programs; one even blamed the Jews for Hitler’s rise to power. Virginia Gildersleeve, dean of Barnard, Columbia’s women’s college, declared in 1935 that Germany’s desire to acquire new land for settlement was legitimate. Thomas Alexander, dean of Columbia’s

New College, unqualifiedly endorsed Nazi sterilization policy and even attempted to publish a translation he made of Hitler's speeches.¹⁶

New York University philosophy professor Sidney Hook recalled that F. J. E. Woodbridge, dean of Columbia's Graduate Faculties from 1912 to 1929, when he rejoined its philosophy faculty, had declared in 1932 or early 1933 that it was quite understandable why Hitler would come to power: the Jews owned all of Germany's department stores, and the professions were "full of them." Woodbridge was a friend of President Butler.¹⁷

The news that Columbia was sponsoring a speech by the Nazi ambassador precipitated a storm of protest, in sharp contrast to the response at Howard decades later to the "Black Nazis." The Columbia administration was entirely unmoved by the protests. The Columbia *Spectator*, reacting very differently from Howard's student newspaper, published a scathing editorial entitled "Silence Gives Consent, Dr. Butler," which condemned President Butler's failure to criticize the Nazis: "We know of no instance where Dr. Nicholas Murray Butler has forcefully taken a stand on the policies of the Hitler government." It pointed out that he had repeatedly criticized Soviet policies.

Butler not only ignored but openly violated the boycott of German goods and services that Jewish organizations had initiated soon after Hitler assumed power. Between 1934 and 1937, President Butler regularly booked passage for trans-Atlantic voyages on German ships that flew the swastika flag, and he encouraged Columbia to engage in academic exchanges with Nazi Germany.

Unlike the audience at Howard in 1994, which overwhelmingly supported the speakers' Nazi-like rants, most of those attending Ambassador Luther's address appeared hostile to Nazism. Many were outraged to hear Luther's major points, that "the Nazi government was not following a policy of oppression of any type" and that "Germany had exhibited the most peaceful attitude of any nation." Outside, where it was so cold that many were unable to hold signs, 1,000 demonstrators, mostly students from Columbia, Barnard, and other New York City colleges and universities, expressed vigorous opposition to Luther and Nazism. Despite Luther's ridiculous claims about the absence of oppression and militarism in Nazi Germany, no Columbia administrator criticized his remarks.¹⁸

Three-quarters of a century later, the Columbia administration chose to provide a platform to Mahmoud Ahmadinejad, leader of one of the world's most repressive regimes. Incredibly, John Coatsworth, dean of Columbia's School of International Affairs, who proposed to President Bollinger that Columbia extend an invitation to Ahmadinejad, declared on national television that he would "certainly" have invited Adolf Hitler to speak on campus in 1939. As with the Nazis in 1933, reports of Iran's savage mistreatment of Jews, and of its threats to annihilate Israel, circulated widely in the United States. Like Luther, Ahmadinejad in 2007 seized the platform Columbia provided to extol his regime's achievements, ridicule charges that it persecuted Jews, and deny its aggressive intentions.

In 1933, Columbia president Nicholas Murray Butler saw nothing wrong with inviting the spokesman of a movement that had conducted public book burnings at universities across Germany. In 2007, Columbia president Lee Bollinger saw nothing wrong with providing a platform for a similar display of anti-intellectualism, Ahmadinejad's denial of the Holocaust. Like the Nazi leadership, Ahmadinejad pushed for academic exchanges with the United States. Each was convinced that such exchanges would cause Americans to see its regime as civilized. In his Columbia address, Ahmadinejad, like Hitler, presented his society as lacking the decadence of the West. There is a parallelism in hosting those who planned the Holocaust, and one who proclaims the Holocaust is a myth, and then threatens to conduct another one.¹⁹

SHADES OF 1938: SUPPRESSING CAMPUS CRITICISM OF ISLAMIC ANTISEMITISM IN 2009

There are striking similarities as well between college and universities' suppression of speakers critical of Islamic antisemitism and authoritarianism today, and treatment accorded opponents of Nazism on the American campus during the 1930s. In November 2009, Princeton University and Columbia University cancelled lectures by Nonie Darwish, an Arab supporter of Israel who has strongly denounced Islamic intolerance and jihadism. The last-minute cancellation of Darwish's lectures by these Ivy League institutions closely

resembled the withdrawal of a lecture invitation to anti-Nazi German Jewish exile Ernst Toller by Queens College president Paul Klapper in April 1938.

Both Darwish and Toller had become pariahs in their homelands and came to the United States seeking freedom. Darwish, who grew up in Gaza and Egypt, became a staunch critic of radical Islam. She wrote a book about her experiences entitled *Now They Call Me Infidel*. Toller, one of the Weimar Republic's most renowned playwrights, called his autobiography, published in exile in 1934, *I Was a German*. The Nazis burned his books and confiscated almost all his property.

In both cases, the universities succumbed to pressure from groups that opposed the speaker's views. Princeton cancelled Darwish's presentation when a Muslim student group protested that she was "anti-Islam," and the sponsoring student group then withdrew the invitation. Columbia claimed that it suddenly withdrew her invitation to talk because the administration learned the lecture had been set up without sponsorship by a recognized student organization, only a faculty group. But it was undoubtedly responding to the same pressure. There was little or no protest on either campus about the abrupt cancellations.

Toller's case followed a similar pattern, although as a result of protests he was in the end able to speak. Queens College president Klapper suddenly cancelled Toller's lecture on "Social Drama," citing opposition from faculty and students. President Klapper claimed that Toller was an "ardent propagandist," meaning that his opposition to Nazism was too pronounced. Toller told the press that the professor who had extended the speaking invitation had informed him that Queens College, located in an outer borough of New York City, would not permit the lecture because "the majority of the faculty felt I was known internationally as an anti-Nazi, and because many students and constituents" of Queens were first and second-generation German-Americans.

A storm of public and press criticism caused Klapper to rescind his cancellation of Toller's lecture. Toller ultimately delivered his talk, on "The Theater as a Social Force," to a capacity audience of 600 at Queens College. He contrasted artistic freedom in the United States with the stifling of artistic expression in Nazi Germany.²⁰

HAILING THE JEW-BAITER; SCORNING THE JEW: HOWARD UNIVERSITY'S CONTEMPT FOR SCHOLARSHIP

In a case as disturbing as Darwish's, Howard University in April 1994 called off a scheduled lecture by David Brion Davis, Sterling Professor of History at Yale University, on the Haitian slave uprising of the 1790s, because he was Jewish. The editorial board of the St. Louis *Post-Dispatch* wondered "Why should a Jew-baiting speaker [Khalid Abdul Muhammad] appear twice and a Jewish professor be asked to stay away?"²¹ Again, the cancellation failed to elicit protest. Davis, a former president of the Organization of American Historians (OAH), was one of the world's leading authorities on slavery. The cancellation occurred between Khalid Abdul Muhammad's two spring semester 1994 appearances at Howard. A university would not permit a distinguished scholar to speak, but did provide a platform for antisemitic harangues.

The Howard administration explained that it would be unable to provide a secure environment for Davis, a Jew, if he came to campus, although it had no difficulty protecting the antisemitic representative of the NOI. Davis was thereby prevented from responding with fact to the NOI's bizarre antisemitic charges, which students would doubtless have voiced during the question period. No leader of the OAH or of the American Historical Association, or member of the Yale University administration or faculty publicly condemned the Howard administration for its refusal to defend the scholar's right to speak.²²

GERMAN DEPARTMENTS AND STUDENT EXCHANGES: AMERICAN UNIVERSITIES' COMPLICITY IN THE THIRD REICH'S PROPAGANDA CAMPAIGN

There are clear similarities between the well-organized Nazi propaganda campaign on American campuses in the 1930s and the concerted efforts in the last two decades by Muslim and Arab student associations and black nationalists to defame Jews and the state of Israel. During the 1930s, Nazi propaganda was spread across the United States by German officials, diplomats, and academicians, often on speaking tours, and by both German and American exchange students. To be sure, in that period American college and

university administrators, and many faculty members, were themselves often antisemitic, and schools maintained quota systems that severely restricted Jewish admissions. During the 1930s few colleges and universities were willing to employ Jews in faculty positions. Today, however, antisemitism remains significant on campus. The sizeable increase in numbers of Muslim and Arab students, mostly from abroad, at American universities, and the spread among many African-American students of a black nationalism that denigrates Jews, have contributed to the persistence of campus antisemitism. The indifference and insensitivity to the issue displayed by many administrators in recent decades has allowed the egregious antisemitic invective and harassment to flourish.

Ambassador Hans Luther propagandized for the Third Reich many times on American campuses, warmly received by university administrators who provided him with a platform to extol Hitler's "achievements," vigorously defend antisemitic policies, and defame Jews. During 1935, the administrations of the University of Wisconsin, the University of Minnesota, the University of Texas, and Catholic University received Luther as an honored guest. The chairman of Wisconsin's German department hosted a press conference where Luther outlined Nazi Germany's triple policy: "peace, good will, and cooperation." He denied that the Nazis mistreated Jews, explaining that because Jews were not citizens in Germany, they did not have the rights of citizens. (The Nuremberg Laws, introduced the previous month, had deprived Germany's Jews of their citizenship.) After the press conference, Luther proceeded to a luncheon with Wisconsin's president Glenn Frank. The Wisconsin student newspaper, angered that students picketed the house of the German department chairman who had introduced Luther at the press conference, refused to provide any coverage of the demonstration.

Traveling next to the Twin Cities, Luther turned "fiery" when reporters pressed him to answer questions about Nazi persecution of Jews, but the University of Minnesota administration extended a very friendly welcome to him. Because Luther had been subjected to an outpouring of protest both in Wisconsin and the Twin Cities, Minnesota's administration was determined to prevent its students from questioning him about Germany's antisemitic policies. He therefore spoke only at a tea the German department staged in his

honor, a very congenial environment. The administration denied admission to anyone without an invitation. Minnesota's dean of women personally barred entry to fifty students who arrived at the tea prepared to question Luther about Nazi policies, denouncing them as obnoxious.

Although there was a vigorous campus protest at the University of Texas, where Ambassador Luther was the luncheon guest of President H. Y. Benedict, none was staged during his Catholic University visit. Catholic University's rector, Msgr. James H. Ryan, received Luther at the school's annual alumni banquet. Students attending the banquet greeted the Nazi ambassador with resounding college cheers of "CU, CU, Luther."²³

German departments at American colleges and universities often operated as propaganda vehicles for the Third Reich, serving as liaisons between Nazi diplomats and the campus population, coordinating student exchange programs with Germany, and indoctrinating students in the classroom. Many German departments were staffed by pro-Nazi German nationals. During the last two decades, Middle East Studies departments at American universities have often played a similar propagandistic role.

German departments and campus German clubs not only entertained Ambassador Luther, but invited administrators to socialize with visiting Nazi diplomats at banquets and teas. Nazi Germany's consul-general in Boston, Baron Kurt von Tippelskirch, socialized with Radcliffe College president Ada Comstock at the German Club Christmas Party in 1933, and with Smith College president William Neilson's wife and faculty members at a reception and dinner sponsored by that school's German Club in 1935. Von Tippelskirch was the chief speaker at the Harvard German Club's *Abschiedsfeier* (farewell celebration) ending the 1935–1936 academic year. His successor as consul-general, Dr. Herbert Scholz, attended the Harvard German Club dinner-dance in 1939, to which members of the German Clubs at several New England women's colleges were also invited. The German Clubs at Yale University and Vassar College hosted talks by German embassy attaché Richard Sallet, who praised Nazi foreign and racial policies.

The Dartmouth College German Club, *Studenten Verbindung Germania*, committed to combating American groups that "defamed" the Third Reich,

sponsored a banquet for an officer and cadets from Nazi Germany's battle cruiser *Karlsruhe* when it docked in Boston for ten days in May 1934. *Studenten Verbindung Germania* invited women from the German clubs at Wellesley, Smith, Radcliffe, Bennington, and Middlebury Colleges to the festivities, where they dined and danced with Dartmouth's *Karlsruhe* guests.²⁴

The German departments were instrumental in recruiting American exchange students to study in the Third Reich, and arranging for them to reside with pro-Nazi families. At the German universities, the exchange students were enrolled in courses where professors presented the Nazi doctrines. German department faculty members in the United States were also heavily involved in organizing tours of the Third Reich for American students conducted by Nazi guides. They also arranged for American students to attend the special tercentenary performances of the virulently antisemitic Oberammergau Passion Play in Bavaria in 1934.

The Seven Sisters, America's elite women's colleges, spearheaded student exchanges with the Third Reich, joined by the University of Delaware, which received funds from the du Pont family for this purpose, and German departments at other institutions. The Seven Sisters colleges believed that study in Europe imparted cultural polish to their students, and they gave particular emphasis to foreign language training. The Seven Sisters German departments were heavily involved in the Junior Year Abroad program that American educators maintained with the University of Munich from 1931 until the outbreak of World War II. Delaware administered the Munich program during the early years of Nazi rule, but the majority of participating students were from the Seven Sisters. Many Americans also studied in summer programs at such German universities as Berlin and Heidelberg. When Delaware terminated its Munich program after the Night of the Long Knives (June 30–July 1, 1934) threw it into disarray, Seven Sisters administrators and faculty assumed a prominent role in directing the Junior Year Abroad in Munich, Inc. that succeeded it.²⁵

The Seven Sisters' determination to forge friendly ties with Nazi Germany is striking, because the Hitler regime severely curtailed women's access to a university education and to the professions. The Nazi government imposed a

strict ten percent quota on female university enrollment. It defined women's central role as that of mother and homemaker, and promoted the five-child family as the norm. As exiled Jewish Reichstag deputy Toni Sender stated on New York radio in 1935, women's only task in Nazi Germany was "to marry and get children—as many as possible."²⁶

A sizeable proportion of Seven Sisters students and those sent to Nazi Germany by German departments at other American colleges and universities became greatly enamored of the Third Reich. American exchange students wrote glowing accounts of Nazi Germany for their campus newspapers from abroad, and after returning to the United States. A Mount Holyoke student, writing from Munich in 1938, declared that "any account by any junior here is bound to turn into a testimonial." Four Vassar students published a lengthy feature in the *Vassar Review* explaining how living in the Third Reich led them to dismiss American press reports of "militarism, terrorism, and bloodshed" there, and to truly appreciate what Germans under Nazi rule had accomplished. One of them, speaking at a campus forum after returning to Vassar, praised Hitler for achieving what she called "religious unity" in Germany. She concluded her presentation by asserting: "Hitler is not militaristic. He is sincerely spoken for peace." Another Vassar senior, having spent her junior year at the University of Munich, declared her admiration for Nazi students' determination to "clean up Germany." The book burning they had carried out across the Reich in May 1933 impressed her as a "solemn, symbolic ceremony."²⁷

University presidents joined the exchange students in accusing the American press of bias against the Third Reich and in challenging reports of antisemitic persecution. Their indignation resembled that of American university administrators over the last two decades, who have repeatedly claimed that the press is exaggerating the extent of campus antisemitism. President Walter Hullahen of the University of Delaware declared in May 1933 that Americans had no right to protest how the Nazi government handled Germany's internal affairs. He informed the students that American press reports of Nazi persecution were "grossly exaggerated, in many cases utterly false." President Homer Shantz of the University of Arizona, leader of a summer 1934 tour of

the Third Reich arranged by the Nazi government, extolled Hitler's achievements on his return to the United States, while condemning the American press for anti-German bias.²⁸

German exchange students whom Hitler sent to the United States as "political soldiers of the Reich," also aggressively propagandized for the Third Reich in American college newspapers and at campus forums. The German government carefully screened these students to ensure that they were strongly committed to Nazism. The exchange students' antisemitic invective resembled that of Howard University speakers sixty years later. Barnard College's German exchange student for the academic year 1937–1938, for example, told the Barnard *Bulletin* that "Jewish blood" was different from that of Germans, and as a result Jews could only be "guests" in Germany. She explained that anti-Jewish discrimination was justified because Jews had acquired too much control over money.²⁹

In 1938, President William Neilson of Smith College, a leader in promoting student exchanges with both Nazi Germany and Fascist Italy, signaled American academic acceptance of Mussolini's viciously antisemitic "racial laws," modeled on Hitler's Nuremberg Laws, which forced out any Jewish professors and students remaining in universities. Neilson did not challenge the Italian consul when he sent Smith College forms asking for the ethnic origin of its exchange students studying in Italy. Smith College had sponsored its own student exchange program with the Fascist-controlled Universities of Florence and Perugia since 1931. The Smith program in Italy was directed by an avowed Fascist, Smith professor Emma Netti. President Neilson was also actively involved in the administration of the Junior Year in Munich, Inc., as a member of its Executive Council.

Neilson would not protest Italy's racial laws to either the Mussolini regime or the rectors of the Italian universities to which Smith sent students, and did not terminate the Smith Junior Year in Italy program. Instead he notified the fathers of the two Jewish students who had been accepted into the program not to send their daughters "without permission from the Italian authorities." Neilson also ignored calls to resign from the Junior Year in Munich, Inc. Executive Council after the Kristallnacht.³⁰

During the last decade, American universities have remained similarly indifferent to Arab antisemitism, and complicit in Arab efforts to isolate Israel and prevent American exchange students from studying there. After the year 2000, Harvard and other American institutions of higher learning denied university funding to students for travel to Israel, claiming they could not obtain adequate insurance coverage. This policy resulted in Harvard's cancellation in 2002 of a longstanding student archeological project in Israel, even as the university increasingly promoted study abroad. In a further effort to appease antisemitic Arab governments, American universities have told Jewish students enrolled in Arabic-language programs in the Arab world not to reveal that they are Jews, and provided them with fake identities. Ruth Wisse noted in 2002 that no American university administrator had officially protested this policy or informed the American public of it, commenting: "Thus do universities casually accede to policies of genocidal hatred, all the while proclaiming their dedication to multiculturalism."³¹

Hearings conducted in 1935 to examine the charges of Lienhard Bergel, a non-Jewish German instructor at New Jersey College for Women (NJC), the women's college at Rutgers University, that he was terminated because of his anti-Nazi views revealed that German department faculty members were using the classroom to propagandize for Nazism. The other four members of the NJC German department were pro-Nazi German nationals. Students testified that the NJC German House, in which German majors were required to live for a year, was a "Nazi nest," where residents sang the Nazi anthem, the *Horst Wessel Lied*. Assistant professor Alice Schlimbach, who presided over the German House, told her German class that Nazism was "wonderful" and denied that the Hitler regime was antisemitic. Schlimbach's German department colleague Emil Jordan, speaking at a campus forum in March 1933, extolled Hitler as a man of high moral character and denounced the American press for presenting distorted accounts of conditions in the Third Reich.

Students testified that NJC German department chairman Friedrich Hauptmann injected Nazi propaganda into classroom lectures and discussions and silenced those who tried to rebut it. When students protested his claims that Jews had ruled pre-Hitler Germany by controlling its financial system and

had no right to live in Germany, he abruptly “closed the discussion.” He praised what Hitler “was doing for the people.” A classics instructor testified that she heard Hauptmann and his wife, also a member of the German department, defend Nazi antisemitism. Shortly after resigning from NJC in 1940 Hauptmann departed for Nazi Germany, where he joined the Nazi party and became the national leader of the Deutsche Akademie (German Academy) for Slovakia, a front for Gestapo intelligence and espionage.³²

American professors of German participated enthusiastically in the 550th anniversary celebration of the Nazified University of Heidelberg in June 1936, a carefully orchestrated Nazi propaganda festival. The University of Heidelberg had been the site of a major book burning in 1933. The Hitler regime believed attracting Western academics to a festival highlighted by fiery Nazi speeches could favorably influence foreign impressions of Germany, as it embarked on a major rearmament program and stepped up its persecution of Jews. Their presence allowed the Nazi government to present itself as civilized, a respectable member of the family of nations. Over twenty American colleges and universities sent delegates, including Harvard, Yale, Columbia, Michigan, Cornell, and Vassar. Propaganda Minister Josef Goebbels hosted the foreign delegates, presiding at a special banquet for them.

The college and university presidents who sent delegates to the Nazi propaganda festival at the University of Heidelberg ignored calls for a boycott from Jewish leaders and organizations, individual Jews, some alumni, and such college newspapers as the *Columbia Spectator* and the *Vassar Miscellany News*. At Columbia, President Butler reacted savagely against campus protestors, as he had in 1934 when he terminated the appointment of a promising young fine arts instructor, Jerome Klein, who, he believed, had initiated a petition against Columbia’s invitation to Nazi ambassador Hans Luther. Butler expelled Columbia student Robert Burke for leading a peaceful picket line at his presidential mansion to protest Columbia’s sending a delegate to Heidelberg.³³

Columbia’s current president, Lee Bollinger, has ignored repeated calls for the university to admit wrongdoing in these cases and to present the two men, now dead, honorary degrees. He declined an invitation from the David S. Wyman Institute for Holocaust Studies to present his views on the cases at an

OAH convention panel in New York in 2008, where I spoke about Columbia's response to Nazism.³⁴

UNIVERSITY CONFERENCES AND THE LEGITIMATING OF ANTISEMITISM: PAST AND PRESENT

More recently, American universities have legitimated antisemitism by hosting conferences sponsored by hate groups and featuring speakers who denigrated Jews. American academia remained silent in 1995 when Texas Southern University, a historically black school in Houston, Texas, opened its campus to the National African American Leadership Summit (NAALS), a conference sponsored by a newly-founded black nationalist, antisemitic organization headed by Benjamin Chavis and dominated by Louis Farrakhan. Chavis had recently been forced to step down as president of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) after it was disclosed that he had used \$330,000 of the organization's funds to settle a sexual harassment charge against him, without consulting the NAACP executive board. Soon after, Chavis joined the Nation of Islam.³⁵

Literature tables in the Texas Southern gymnasium, presided over by the NOI's paramilitary Fruit of Islam brigades, offered conference attendees numerous viciously antisemitic tracts. These included *The Depravity of the Modern American Jew and its Origins* (author unknown) and Martin Luther's *The Jews and Their Lies*, a Nazi favorite which called for the burning of synagogues. It likely circulated at the 1936 University of Heidelberg anniversary celebration as well. The Texas Southern conference and literature tables also promoted the NOI's *The Secret Relationship Between Blacks and Jews*, and Wellesley College professor Tony Martin's *The Jewish Onslaught*, both virulently antisemitic screeds. During the conference Cornel West, a Harvard professor at the time, before returning to Princeton, embraced Louis Farrakhan, the nation's most prominent antisemite, in a Texas Southern classroom.³⁶

The same year the University of Oklahoma sponsored and promoted the Big Eight Conference on Black Student Government, featuring a keynote address by Chavis. Chavis devoted his speech to extolling Farrakhan and to vilifying "those forces out there" that were trying to separate blacks from "this

great man.” The conference was attended by student delegates from numerous universities in the Midwest. Two University of Oklahoma administrators sat with Chavis on the podium. Because one of them had alerted Chavis that two Jews would be monitoring his keynote address, he only hinted broadly at the identity of “those forces.” At various points during the speech, however, Chavis instructed the student leaders that American Jews had enormous power and African Americans none. He urged the 800 African-American students present to attend Farrakhan’s upcoming Million Man March, at which massive quantities of antisemitic hate literature were distributed. Chavis used his platform to denounce Carl Rowan, the respected African-American journalist who had condemned Farrakhan’s antisemitism, and to single out Farrakhan’s mentor, Elijah Muhammad, another fanatical antisemite, for special approval. When the author complained to the University of Oklahoma administrator who had assisted the Black Student Association in arranging the conference about the selection of Chavis as keynote speaker, the administrator responded that he was very proud of what the students had done.³⁷

Serving as a precedent for the Texas Southern and Oklahoma conferences were the University of Virginia Institute of Public Affairs roundtables during the 1930s, which regularly provided platforms for antisemitic speakers and for Nazi Germany to present itself as a nation with legitimate grievances and reasonable objectives. Held every summer from 1927 to 1941, the Institute of Public Affairs roundtables were considered America’s most prestigious symposia on national and international affairs. Working closely with the German embassy in Washington, the Institute often featured as speakers scholars and diplomats who defended Nazi Germany’s policies. These speakers at the Institute symposia and at Texas Southern and Oklahoma shared a common purpose—promoting antisemitism, with the university platforms providing them with the respectability they sought.

Speakers at the Institute’s 1935 roundtable on American-German Relations, for example, aggressively propagandized for the Third Reich. Roundtable chairman Professor Friedrich Auhagen of Columbia University’s Seth Low College vigorously defended Hitler’s policies and insisted that Germany could “no longer afford democracy.” Professor Frederick Krueger of Wittenberg

College delivered a vicious antisemitic diatribe. The Institute had invited him, fully aware of the inflammatory pro-Nazi statements he had made the previous year while lecturing in Berlin, where he had warned that “Some day America will be forced to deal with the problem presented by the Jew.” At the University of Virginia, Krueger claimed Jews largely controlled the American press, using this to turn American public opinion against the Third Reich, whose policies he defended. Professor Henry Hodges of the University of Cincinnati drew on the Christian antisemitic libel that Jews lacked compassion when he denounced the Jewish-led boycott of German goods as motivated by revenge, and therefore contrary to “Christian principle.”

In 1938 the Institute invited one of the nation’s most prominent antisemites, William J. Cameron, as a speaker on a roundtable on economic stability. Cameron had edited Henry Ford’s hate sheet, the *Dearborn Independent*, and helped supervise its antisemitic campaign in the 1920s. Decades later the Nation of Islam would find inspiration for its defamation of Jews in the *Dearborn Independent*.³⁸

THE NEW ANTISEMITIC VITRIOL ON CAMPUS

In recent decades, Arab, black nationalist, and far left groups, joined by many liberals and some conservatives, have waged an energetic campaign to demonize Israel, often using antisemitic imagery and invective.³⁹ As in the 1930s, university administrations have remained largely indifferent as campus antisemitism reached alarming proportions. The contemporary effort to defame Israel, strongly tinged with antisemitism, has involved demagogic speeches; a campaign to pressure schools to divest stock in corporations doing business with Israel; aggressive propagandizing on campus, often through Middle East Studies programs that perform the same role as German departments in the 1930s; disruption of pro-Israel speeches; and physical intimidation of student supporters of Israel.⁴⁰

Boycott and divestment petitions have gathered significant numbers of signatures on campuses across the country, with strong encouragement from professors prominent in the Middle East Studies Association (MESA), including presidents of the organization. Modeled in part on the earlier campus

movement targeting South Africa, the boycott and divestment campaigns are bent on equating Israel, one of the world's most democratic and multicultural societies, with the brutal apartheid dictatorship. The real precedent, however, is the Arab League boycott of Israel inspired by its leader, the Grand Mufti of Jerusalem, Haj Amin al-Husseini, who recruited Bosnian Muslims for the Waffen-SS during World War II, and collaborated with the Nazis in the genocide of Balkan Jews. After World War II, the Grand Mufti escaped war crimes prosecution in Europe by fleeing to Egypt, which welcomed him warmly. In 1936 he had initiated "a rigid boycott of everything Jewish" in Palestine as part of the violent Arab uprising against Jewish immigration.⁴¹ After the establishment of Israel in 1948, the Arab League enforced a boycott on corporations engaging in business with the Jewish state.

In April 2002, students at more than thirty colleges and universities, including Columbia, Georgetown, the University of California at Berkeley, the University of Massachusetts, and the University of Washington, initiated a coordinated divestment campaign with a national "day of action." At Berkeley, 1,500 supporters of divestment staged their campus demonstration while Jewish students were holding a Holocaust remembrance meeting. The supporters of divestment were redefining the Holocaust. Instead of mourning the annihilation of six million Jews, they transformed Jews into perpetrators, and the Palestinian Arabs into their victims. A few months later, the *New York Times* reported that nearly 600 professors, students, alumni, and staff members at Harvard and the Massachusetts Institute of Technology had signed a divestment petition.⁴²

Testimony from Jewish students at Columbia University in 2004 describing classroom indoctrination and intimidation by some faculty members of the Middle East and Asian Languages and Cultures Department (MEALAC) suggested striking parallels with the NJC German Department's propagandizing in the 1930s. A Jewish student stated, for example, that a MEALAC professor informed her that she was not qualified to debate the Israeli-Arab conflict because she was not a "Semite"—a category only racists like the Nazis used to classify people. Another testified that "her Islamic Studies professor told her that because she had green eyes she could not be Semitic" and therefore "had

no claim to the land of Israel.” A student who had served in the Israel Defense Force stated that Professor Joseph Massad responded to his questions by asking: “How many Palestinians have you killed?” Still another student reported that Massad angrily threatened to eject her from class for “denying [Israeli] atrocities.” (She had asked him if Israeli forces did not issue warnings before bombing in areas with civilians.)⁴³ Dan Miron, a professor of Hebrew literature, stated that “scores of Jewish students” at Columbia had “trooped into his office” to tell him that they had been “browbeaten, humiliated and treated disrespectfully for daring to challenge the idea that Israel has no right to exist as a Jewish nation.”⁴⁴

Columbia’s committee investigating anti-Israel indoctrination and intimidation of Jewish students in MEALAC classes resembled the Rutgers Special Trustees Committee that conducted the inquiry into Lienhard Bergel’s charges of Nazi propagandizing in NJC German classes in 1935. Both committees ruled that there was no evidence of faculty propagandizing in the classroom. But in each case, critics charged that the committee’s composition made objectivity impossible. At Rutgers, the committee was made up of Rutgers trustees, none of whom was a scholar or teacher. Although Columbia’s five-person committee consisted of scholars, all were affiliated with the university. Moreover, two committee members had signed Columbia’s divestment petition; another had written to President Bollinger before her selection defending MEALAC against what she called “a campaign of defamation.” Still another committee member had served as Massad’s dissertation advisor, a fourth was College of Arts and Sciences vice-president when the harassment of Jewish students occurred and failed to address it, and the fifth was “vocal in criticism against Israel.”⁴⁵

In the 1930s, Columbia had also been prepared to permit anti-Zionist propagandizing laced with antisemitism in the classroom. When the distinguished Jewish scholar Richard Gottheil, for almost half a century the only member of Columbia’s Semitics faculty, died in 1936, President Butler appointed the militant Arab propagandist George Antonius to the position for the 1936–1937 academic year, during which time the university would determine whether to continue him on the faculty. Gottheil, a prominent

Zionist, had never allowed politics to influence his teaching, and possessed impeccable academic credentials. Since receiving his Ph.D. from the University of Leipzig, he had published numerous books and articles and was considered one of the world's leading scholars of Near Eastern archeology and languages. Gottheil served as president of the American Oriental Society in 1933–1934, and since 1896 had headed the Oriental Department of the New York Public Library. Antonius, by contrast, was an amateur historian without a doctorate, only a bachelor's degree in mechanical science from Cambridge University. His book *The Arab Awakening*, which appeared in 1938, strongly opposed Jewish national aspirations in Palestine, arguing that Britain had promised the Arabs the land during World War I. Martin Kramer noted that Antonius had “systematically misrepresented documents to substantiate his claims.”⁴⁶ During the Arab uprising of 1936–1939, Antonius worked closely with its leader, the pro-Nazi Grand Mufti. He served on the Grand Mufti's Palestine Arab High Committee, which called for “abolition of the policy of a Jewish national home” and a “complete stoppage of Jewish immigration.”⁴⁷

Antonius was a protégé of wealthy Columbia alumnus Charles R. Crane, a pro-Arab Hitler sympathizer and militant antisemite, who persuaded President Butler to appoint him to Gottheil's position. Crane told Butler that Gottheil was “more of a rabbi than a professor.” Justifying his appointment of Antonius, Butler declared: “the pro-Zionist Jews would be well-advised if they listened to [Antonius's] point of view, for it seems to me that the present crisis [in Palestine] is in part due to a failure among the Jewish leaders to learn the other sides of the Palestinian problem.”⁴⁸

Butler had made his opposition to Zionism clear as early as 1926, when, as president of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, he made public a report he had commissioned by Endowment trustee Henry Pritchett on conditions in Egypt, Palestine, and Greece, and for which he wrote the preface. Pritchett's report stated that “Zionist plans for a Jewish home in Palestine have nothing to commend them.” Identifying Judaism with chauvinism—a longstanding antisemitic practice—it warned: “No greater misfortune can come to a people or to a nation than to cherish the illusion that it is a chosen people and enjoys the favor of the Almighty beyond all other peoples.”⁴⁹

Strong protest from New York's Jewish community, Gottheil's widow, and some Near Eastern scholars caused Antonius's appointment to be withdrawn. Rabbi Stephen S. Wise told Butler that Antonius was "a deadly foe to everything that is Jewish" and a danger to "the security and well-being of Palestine Jewry." William Albright, a leading biblical archeologist and a non-Jew, informed Columbia's president that Antonius was "a good propagandist...but no scholar." In explaining the withdrawal of the appointment to Antonius, Butler blamed "certain Jews [who] questioned your competence."⁵⁰

In 2002, the English department of the University of California at Berkeley went so far as to offer a course on "The Politics and Poetics of Palestinian Resistance," which it listed with the warning: "Conservative thinkers are encouraged to seek other sections." Prepared by the instructor, a leader in Berkeley's divestment campaign, the course description read: "The brutal Israeli military occupation...since 1948 has systematically displaced, killed, and maimed millions of Palestinian people. And yet, from under the brutal weight of the occupation, Palestinians have produced their own culture and poetry of resistance."⁵¹

By the first decade of the twenty-first century, Jewish students on many campuses were expressing concern and anger about repeated antisemitic verbal harassment by anti-Israel campus groups, often combined with physical intimidation that caused them to fear for their safety. Jonathan Sarna, Braun Professor of American Jewish History at Brandeis University, declared in 2005 that "Whereas in 1975, Jews who supported Israel didn't have to ask the question as to whether they'd feel comfortable at a [particular] university, just one generation later, many students are asking that question."⁵² The *New York Times* reported in 2002 that Jewish students at Berkeley, after the beating of a rabbi's son, "were advising one another to walk in groups" on campus.⁵³

Pro-Israel speakers on many campuses required heavy armed security, and were often prevented from completing their lectures, as was the case when Muslim students shouted down Michael Oren, Israel's ambassador to the United States, at the University of California at Irvine in February 2010.⁵⁴ A student who helped publicize Nonie Darwish's appearance at Seattle University

in 2009 reported that “the majority of the audience came in hostile,” so determined to disrupt Darwish’s lecture that “she couldn’t get through half a sentence.”⁵⁵

As at Howard, anti-Israel campus groups resorted to the coarsest antisemitism. A woman who attended NJC during the 1930s recalled her literature professor telling the class that Jews ritually murdered Christian children to extract blood to mix with matzo at Passover. In 2002, Muslim student groups at San Francisco State University similarly invoked the medieval blood libel, distributing fliers showing a can with a picture of a dead baby beneath a large drop of blood and two Israeli flags, captioned: “Made in Israel. Palestinian Children Meat. Slaughtered According to Jewish Rites Under American License.” On that campus a mob menaced Jewish students with taunts of “Hitler did not finish the job” and “Go back to Russia.” Laurie Zoloth, former professor of Jewish Studies at San Francisco State, described the climate on that campus as very frightening for Jews: “I cannot fully express what it feels like to walk across a campus daily, past maps of the Middle East that do not include Israel, past [the blood libel posters described above], past poster after poster calling out ‘Zionism = racism,’ and ‘Jews = Nazis.’”⁵⁶

CONCLUSION

Although universities consider themselves enlightened and tolerant, they have contributed significantly to the legitimatization of antisemitism in the United States. There are strong parallels between the conduct of today’s universities and those of the 1930s. After Hitler assumed power in Germany in 1933, American university administrations welcomed Nazi leaders to campus, treating the representatives of the most barbaric regime in world history as honored guests. They accorded the Third Reich respect by sending delegates to an infamous Nazi propaganda festival in 1936. More recently, it has been the students who repeatedly invite rabid antisemites to speak on campus and applaud them.

Like their counterparts of the 1930s, contemporary university administrators have enabled the spread of antisemitism by not responding to these harangues. Half a century and more after the Holocaust, they have

sponsored, and provided facilities for, conferences and speeches at which antisemitic propaganda resembling that of the Nazis has been presented to students. Performing a similar role to that of the German departments of the 1930s, Middle East Studies programs disseminate anti-Zionist propaganda laced with antisemitism. Middle East Studies faculty and the proliferating anti-Israel student groups routinely intimidate and harass student supporters of the Jewish state. Speakers deemed to be pro-Israel require armed protection on campus and their lectures are frequently disrupted or cancelled. American universities are thereby assuring the transmission of antisemitism to the next generation.

NOTES

¹ Stephen H. Norwood, *The Third Reich in the Ivory Tower: Complicity and Conflict on American Campuses* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2009), 47–55.

² Eunice G. Pollack, “African American Antisemitism in the 1990s” in *Encyclopedia of American Jewish History*, edited by Stephen H. Norwood and Eunice G. Pollack (Santa Barbara, CA: ABC-CLIO, 2008), 1: 195–200; Eunice G. Pollack and Stephen H. Norwood, “Louis Farrakhan: Bigot, Fraud, Nut,” *Daily Oklahoman*, 27 Oct. 1995.

³ *Washington Post*, 24 Feb. 1994. At Kean, Muhammad also accused Jews of crucifying Jesus “in a kangaroo court” and controlling the financial system. A few weeks before appearing at Howard, Muhammad spoke to an overflow crowd of 900 at the University of Florida. The Jewish newspaper *Forward* noted that Muhammad’s ability to consistently attract “large numbers of followers on college campuses is a testament to the widespread acceptance of his anti-Semitic...message.” *New York Times*, 25 Jan. and 6 Feb. 1994; *Forward*, February 4, 1994.

⁴ Gary A. Tobin, Aryeh K. Weinberg, and Jenna Ferer, *The Uncivil University: Intolerance on College Campuses* (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2009), 98.

⁵ *Washington Post*, 24 Feb. 1994.

⁶ Pollack, “African American Antisemitism in the 1990s,” 198; *Washington Post*, 24 Feb. 1994 and 1 Mar. 1994; Marvin Perry and Frederick M. Schweitzer, *Antisemitism: Myth and Hate From Antiquity to the Present* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2002), 234.

⁷ *Washington Post*, 1 Mar. 1994.

⁸ *Washington Post*, 20 Apr. 1994.

⁹ *Washington Post*, 20 Apr. and 8 May 1994; *Jewish Journal* (Deerfield Beach, Florida), 5 May 1994; *JWeekly* (San Francisco), 27 Feb. 1998.

¹⁰ *Atlanta Journal and Constitution*, 8 May 1994. Jenifer immediately became the president of the University of Texas at Dallas.

¹¹ *Washington Post*, 22 Mar. and 19 July 1994.

¹² Robert S. Wistrich, *A Lethal Obsession: Anti-Semitism From Antiquity to the Global Jihad* (New York: Random House, 2010), 878, 885, 901.

¹³ Medieval antisemites used yellow to associate Jews with avarice (gold) and carnality (the color yellow symbolized prostitution).

¹⁴ Norwood, *Third Reich in the Ivory Tower*, 3–5, 9–10.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, 75–80, n.12, 273.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, 83, 93.

¹⁷ “On Being a Jew,” Sidney Hook, interview by Norman Podhoretz, *Commentary* (Oct. 1989): 32.

¹⁸ Norwood, *Third Reich in the Ivory Tower*, 82–85.

¹⁹ Stephen H. Norwood, Letter to the Editor, “Showdown Over Free Speech at Columbia U.,” *Chronicle Review*, 19 Oct. 2007, A46.

²⁰ Stephen H. Norwood, “Shades of 1938: Colleges Quiet a Critic of Islam,” *New York Daily News*, 29 Nov. 2009; Norwood, *Third Reich in the Ivory Tower*, 223–26.

²¹ *St. Louis Post-Dispatch*, 27 Apr. 1994.

²² Pollack, "African American Antisemitism in the 1990s," 199; Stephen H. Norwood, Letter to the Editor, "Address by Powell," *New York Times*, 23 May 1994.

²³ Norwood, *Third Reich in the Ivory Tower*, 160–162 (Wisconsin), 163–64 (Minnesota), 202 (Catholic University), n. 8, 286 (Texas).

²⁴ *Ibid.*, 159, 164–65.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, 105–8, 119–24.

²⁶ Sender, who had edited the German Social Democratic Party women's magazine *Frauenwelt* before the Nazis came to power, recalled that the Nazis in the Reichstag made her a prime target of their verbal abuse, as a woman, a Jew, and a Social Democrat, during the years from 1930 to 1933, when they constituted a sizeable bloc there. She fled in disguise to Czechoslovakia soon after Hitler came to power, barely eluding Nazi pursuers intent on murdering her. Stephen H. Norwood, "Toni Sender" in Norwood and Pollack, eds., *Encyclopedia of American Jewish History*, 1: 388–90; Norwood, *Third Reich in the Ivory Tower*, 103, 115. The prominent American journalist Dorothy Thompson, who had written extensively about Nazi rule in Germany before Hitler expelled her in August 1934, also provided Americans with detailed accounts of the oppression of women there.

²⁷ Norwood, *Third Reich in the Ivory Tower*, 111–13, 124–25, 130–31.

²⁸ *Ibid.*, 118–21, 176.

²⁹ *Ibid.*, 59, 108, 114–16.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, 107, 126–28.

³¹ Ruth R. Wisse, "On Ignoring Anti-Semitism," *Commentary* (Oct. 2002): 32.

³² Norwood, *Third Reich in the Ivory Tower*, 168–94. The Special Trustees Committee investigating Bergel's case in its final report called the Horst Wessel Lied "a present-day popular patriotic song of Germany."

³³ *Ibid.*, 83–87, 93–100, 166.

³⁴ Stephen H. Norwood, "Burke's Expulsion: Columbia's Shame," *Columbia Spectator*, 11 Dec. 2006 and "Columbia University and Free Speech," *Chronicle Review*, 2 Apr. 2010, B18; Etgar Lefkovits, "Columbia Skips NYC Conference on University's Nazi Ties in 1930s," *Jerusalem Post*, 3 Apr. 2008.

³⁵ Eunice G. Pollack and Stephen H. Norwood, "Chavis a Poor Choice for OU Event," *Daily Oklahoman*, 28 Mar. 1995; Douglas Feiden, "Whites and Jews Unwelcome as Chavis' Summit Convenes," *Forward*, 16 June 1995.

³⁶ Feiden, "Whites and Jews Unwelcome."

³⁷ Pollack and Norwood, "Chavis a Poor Choice."

³⁸ Norwood, *Third Reich in the Ivory Tower*, 133, 139–45, 149–50.

³⁹ On the development of far left anti-Israel alliances with black nationalists and Arab student groups during the 1960s and early 1970s, see Stephen H. Norwood, "Old Wine in New Bottles: Antisemitism in the American Far Left, 1917–1973" in *Antisemitism on the Campus: Past and Present*, edited by Eunice G. Pollack (Boston: Academic Studies Press, 2011), 163–70, 200–1, 204–5.

⁴⁰ For discussion of these cases, see Pollack, *Antisemitism on the Campus*, *passim*.

⁴¹ Matthias Küntzel, "Islamic Antisemitism and Its Nazi Roots," *Antisemitism International* (2004): 46–47; *New York Times*, 8 May 1936.

⁴² Tobin, Weinberg, and Ferer, *Uncivil University*, 146–47; *New York Times*, 8 Apr., 16 May and 21 Sept. 2002.

⁴³ *New York Times*, 23 Jan., 31 Mar., and 8 Apr. 2005; *Cleveland Jewish News*, 8 Apr. 2005; *Pittsburgh Jewish Chronicle*, 26 May 2005; Tobin, Weinberg, and Ferer, *Uncivil University*, xxviii.

⁴⁴ *New York Daily News*, 21 Nov. 2004.

⁴⁵ Norwood, *Third Reich in the Ivory Tower*, 181–90; *Jewish Advocate* [Boston], 21–27 Jan. 2005; *New York Sun*, 15 Apr. 2005.

⁴⁶ Hillel Halkin, “Déjà Vu at Columbia,” *New York Sun*, 23 Oct. 2007; Elliott A. Green, “Reader comment on: Déjà Vu at Columbia,” *New York Sun*, 24 Oct. 2007; Martin Kramer, *Arab Awakening and Islamic Revival: The Politics of Ideas in the Middle East* (New Brunswick, N.J.: Transaction, 1996), 113; idem, Review of Susan Silsby Boyle, *Betrayal of Palestine: The Story of George Antonius*, *Middle East Quarterly* 9 (Spring 2002): 78; obituary of Richard Gottheil, *New York Times*, 23 May 1936. Antonius, of Syrian background, was born and raised in Egypt. Elliott A. Green, “The Curious Careers of Two Advocates of Arab Nationalism: A Sidelight on the History of An Idea,” *Crossroads* 33 (1991): 85.

⁴⁷ *New York Times*, 18 Jan. 1939.

⁴⁸ Halkin, “Déjà Vu at Columbia.” About 1933, William E. Dodd, who served as U.S. ambassador to Germany from 1933 until 1938, described Crane as intensely antisemitic: “Jews are anathema to him and he wants to see them put in their place. His advice to me was of course: ‘Let Hitler have his way.’” Green, “Curious Careers,” 88. In 1938, Crane probably provided the Grand Mufti with funds for arms purchases for the Arab uprising in Palestine. F. W. Brecher, “Charles R. Crane’s Crusade for the Arabs, 1919–1939,” *Middle Eastern Studies* 24 (Jan. 1988): 42, 47.

⁴⁹ *New York Times*, 29 Nov. 1926.

⁵⁰ Halkin, “Déjà Vu at Columbia”; Kramer, *Arab Awakening*, 114.

⁵¹ *Daily Californian*, 10 May 2002; *New York Times*, 16 May 2002.

⁵² *Jewish Journal* [Los Angeles], 10 Mar. 2005.

⁵³ *New York Times*, 8 Apr. 2002.

⁵⁴ “Students Arrested at UC-Irvine After Protest of Israeli Ambassador’s Speech,” *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 9 Feb. 2010; Josh Keller, “UC-Irvine Suspends Muslim Student Group for Disrupting Speech,” *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 14 June 2010.

⁵⁵ *Spectator* (Seattle University), 4 Nov. 2009.

⁵⁶ Norwood, *Third Reich in the Ivory Tower*, 171; Max Gross, “S.F. Clash Pits Hillel Against ‘Hate Mob,’” *Forward*, 17 May 2002; Tobin, Weinberg, and Ferer, *Uncivil University*, 90; Gabriel Schoenfeld, *The Return of Anti-Semitism* (San Francisco: Encounter Books, 2004), 121–22