1. Standard procedure (13 min total)
   - i. Hannah: Re-affirmation of community values, reminder of strict times
   b. Roll Call (Charlotte Selover, 3 minutes)
   c. President's Report (Mayu Takeuchi, 5 minutes)
      - i. Referendum proposals regarding campus safety:
         1. Security cameras questions raised by members of the senate, admin have moved forward with this, now addressing questions of where and when we should implement security cameras, future coordination of student input, considering supply chain issues
         2. Campus lighting: conversations with health and safety offices
         3. safety walks initiated by admin, campus safety, students, opportunities for members to participate, blue light system room for improvement, safety
      - ii. Dining pilot website up, working group still continues, recommendations to use feedback channels there
      - iii. MHI luncheons with the office of campus life, next tentatively set to focus on academics and mental health on December 8
      - iv. Upcoming meetings:
         1. Austin: Dean Peeples and Fowler will be available alongside Dean Dolan to have lunch with
      - v. Dillion: When is the campus safety walk?
         1. Mayu: Tuesday 5-7:30pm, raised a suggestion to have walkers later at night because the experience is different, in convos with public housing about scheduling more walks
      - vi. Student visitor: plans for conversations with students about securitization and use of cameras, expressing a lot of dissent between students
      - vii. Mayu: There will be opportunities for feedback with a senate-hosted forum or other channel
   d. Questions and Comments (5 minutes)
      - i. None

2. Referendum requesting senate sponsorship (Adam Hoffman, 10 minutes)

a. Hannah: The purpose of initiating a senate referendum is not to debate the sponsor or ask them why they're putting something forward–more to have a collaborative discussion/critique of the language put forth.

b. Adam: We're seeing record levels of antisemitic incidents, especially in the U.S. Also seeing anti-semitism creep in to popular culture. A few weeks ago, synagogues in NJ were shut down due to an active threat. Jewish people don't fall into any protected class at the moment.

    i. Call upon the University to adopt International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance (IHRA) of Antisemitism. This is the consensus definition in the Jewish community–widespread adoption from the Jewish fraternity to the National Jewish Women's Association to campus groups and Jewish chaplains.

    ii. Call to add this definition of antisemitism to DEI trainings and asks University to incorporate definition into annual bias reports.

    iii. Not intended to stifle free speech or debate on any question. Re-affirms commitment to free speech. Avoid language like harassment in this referendum to avoid having people think this is supposed to stiff free speech.

    iv. This is the definition that the University has already leaned on in some existing trainings.

    v. VP Calhoun has said they're not opposed to this, but the referendum is calling on the University to energize and include it in more contexts, bias reports.

    vi. Calls for USG to support this referendum.

c. Hannah Kapoor: The question is whether this referendum should appear as a senate sponsored or student sponsored referendum. If the senate initiates the referendum, it means that a certain fraction of the senate wants this to appear on the ballot, the sponsor wouldn't have to go through the student petitioning process.

d. Braiden: A vote against this referendum being senate-initiated means that this label could appear on the student ballot?

    i. Hannah: Correct.

    ii. Braiden: In the potential case that this referendum is not senate initiated, is there still an opportunity for it to appear on the ballot

    iii. Hannah: Yes if the sponsor chooses to; otherwise no, because of deadlines around the student-sponsored process have passed.

        iv. Adam: There is no longer language about adding this referendum to the DEI Committee Charter.

e. Walker: What is the rationale behind withdrawing this from the student sponsored process?

        i. Adam: There's a lot of anxiety in the Jewish community. Doesn't think this is healthy for this to come forth as something that the senate doesn't support but that they have to push through. Saw this as the best option for the Jewish community.

f. Isabella: Why should this be a referendum instead of something that the senate just asks to adopt?

        i. Adam: We could ask this of any senate-sponsored referendum. I thought the mental health referendum was very powerful.

g. Hannah: extends time for ten minutes after objection from Stephen

h. Daniel: Aks about how Adam realized there was consensus in the Jewish community about this definition

        i. Adam: Where is the national Jewish community? Conference of Presidents of Major Jewish Organizations brings together leaders from different Jewish communities. At the national level, they adopted this. At the campus level, they asked which partners would be working to craft language on this and working against antisemitism: the Jewish chaplains. Rabbi Gil (CJL) and Rabbi Webb (Chabad). Both were 100% supportive of this. One expressed support via CJL listserv.

i. Judah: Seconds antisemitism being on the rise nationally. Are the examples present in the referendum?

        i. Adam: He included the definition of antisemitism in the body of the referendum instead of the appendix. Examples are not present in the referendum.

j. Judah: Regarding the examples in the appendix. "Denying the Jewish people their right to self-determination, e.g. by claiming that the existence of a state …" Wondering about how this might stifle conversation about Zionism. If our campus leaders are being taught to treat expressions of anti-Zionism as anti-semitism, are you concerned about how that will impact campus discussion?

        i. Adam: In the Jewish tradition/religion there's a call for Jews to have self-determination. In the prayer service, there's a call. To deny that call, is a call to deform part of what the Jewish religion is. Also puts Jews into a box of race that has been historically used to oppress Jews. As to the

question of free speech, this exists on a different plane from the language that people use with one another. This is not an attempt to stifle free speech. In meetings with University admin, they did not express stifling free speech as a concern. How can we ask what language the Princeton Jewish community feels is wrong, is dangerous?

k. Avi: Avi Echoes Judah's question. Concerns around associating anti-Zionism and anti-semitism. Speaking from his perspective as a Jewish person: There's a difference between Zionism and the right of the Jewish people to self-determination. Back when the UN was deciding what to do with the Jewish people after the Haulocaust, they considered putting people in Uganda. Self-determination can be divorced from a claim on Israel. Avi's thought hard about this himself as a reformed Jewish person. Doesn't see a conflation of anti-Zionism and anti-semitism here. Called his grandparents after getting into Princeton; His grandfather had an impression of Princeton as an antisemetic place: only admitted to Princeton until mid-century; Certain eating clubs were hosing people because they were Jewish. This is an opportunity to take Princeton in the right direction against anti-semitism. This is an opportunity for student action. Encourages people to take the responsibility seriously.

    i. Hannah: asks people to clarify whether they are in favor or not. Discussion continues for another 10 minutes.

l. Braiden: I will abstain from the vote. Just so you know, I still see the language about the DEI committee in the proposal.

    i. Adam: Yes.

m. Hannah: If there are other suggestions that would make this proposal amenable to you, please bring those up.

n. Mayu: Would you be open to including examples in the body language of the referendum because the examples have been referenced so much?

    i. Adam: Yes.

o. Mayu: Could you articulate why the University hasn't adopted this definition so far? How would you see this referendum continuing this conversation? Have there been active efforts by Rabbis to push the university to adopt these referendum:

    i. Adam: Regarding the University not adopting this; There is support from VP Calhoun. From the Vice Provost of Institutional Equity and Diversity Michele Minter, there didn't seem like there was a reason why they hadn't moved on this. When anti-semitism comes to their desk, they lean on protected classes. Currently protected classes don't capture the nuances of

what anti-semitism looks like. Rabbi Julie from last year had conversations around this but didn't find any energy. Also, now is the time to pass this because anti-semitism has never reached the levels it has today.

p. Walker: I share the concerns that, while the referendum is not intended to impact free speech, in practice, it might impact free speech. I support inclusion of language that explicitly separates this referendum from Israel-Palestine discussions, especially given previous campus discussions.

    i. Adam: I am conscious of this concern. I don't want to qualify or add conditions to the referendum. I to be able to say that we condemn anti-semitism full stop. If we were to bring Israel into this discussion of anti-semitism, that would perpetuate a wrongful tie between the Jewish community and Israel.

q. Campus community member: What do you view as the changes that the University would make if this referendum is accepted?

    i. Adam: Section one contains the actual calls. 1) including statistics on anti-semitism in the annual bias reports 2) including anti-semitism in bias and racism trainings 3) DEI section in human resources should cover anti-semitism

r. Hannah: motion time by 10 minutes, Stephen seconds

s. Audrey: For the trainings, what would those new additions on anti-semitism look like? Who would receive these training sessions?

    i. Adam: the university already engaging in anti-semitism materials in collaboration with Center for Jewish life. I hope that this would be included in any training on types of hate.

t. Judah: Previous question about a conflation of anti-semitism and anti-Zionism. Previous answer talked about how identities are intertwined with anti-Zionism. What is the clarity around whether we're talking about Jewish self-determination in general or within the land of Israel? Agrees that we should condemn anti-semitism full-stop without qualifications. Sees the problem being that one of the examples links self-determination to Zionism.

    i. Hannah: Can you clarify how this relates to whether the senate initiates this referendum?

    ii. Judah: He's in favor of making sure that the proper resources are given to train everyone in response to anti-semitism. His concern is that this referendum references political Zionism. The Uganda example was 40

years before the Haulocaust. Previous debates about Zionism have been difficult on campus, especially personally or for the Jewish community. Still wants to promote the university values of free speech.

      iii. Adam: There is no mention of the word Zionism in this referendum. The text was created by experts on anti-semitism from the Jewish community. To the point of free speech: this is not going to stifle free speech because the referendum doesn't use the language of harassment. The referendum wouldn't stop people from saying anything or from protesting.

u. Daniel: Raises concerns that the definition proposed is overly broad for non-academic use? References the author and ALCU. Would speech alone be enough to lead to disciplinary conduct? Would the adoption of this resolution lead to the USG taking an official position on the arguments laid out in it?

      i. Adam: No, this would not stifle free speech.

v. Hannah: Clarification, if the referendum does pass, everything still goes to the University to decide what actions to take. We are not crafting University policy.

w. Adam: This is not an overly-broad definition. It's the most widely used definition. This is not USG taking any position on the Iraeli-Palestinian conflict. This is the USG calling on the University to adopt the IHRA definition of anti-semitism.

x. Hannah: Objection from Stephen to continue for 10 minutes.

y. Mayu: Thinks it's the USG's role to stand against anti-semitism. She will abstain because she doesn't know if this referendum would do anything to push the university to action. VP Calhoun oversees the training. She does not oversee definitions. We have not been able to have a full conversation with Michelle Minter about why the University hasn't chosen to put this definition forward before. There are many other ways that the USG can pursue advocacy to pursue anti-semitism.

z. Stephen: There are differences between this referendum and the Mental Health Resources Referendum. Both might show student momentum. However, the senate saw the text a little earlier than this referendum. While the text does not specifically focus on Israel, some of the examples do. Can you speak more about how we can ensure that the two conversations are separate?

      i. Adam: This has been in ExComm for two weeks. To the question of the specific example, 1) putting Isreal in frame of a racial question puts Jewish people in the frame of a race, which leads to persecution and genocide. Not all criticism of Israel is anti-semetic. This text recognizes

      that criticism of Israel that uses certain language and targets certain people can be racist.

aa. Ned: If a ⅓ vote passes a senate resolution, what does a ⅓ vote mean? How does this relate to abstaining votes?

      i. Kate: according to Robert's rules, an abstention does not count as a vote. If someone is not here, that's an abstention.

      ii. Mayu: could you clarify what number of votes is required to pass? Could we reference appendix D of the constitution?

bb. Braiden: Procedural question: wants to know how the vote operates before motion to vote.

cc. Hannah: 3 minute break

dd. Hannah: You are entitled to object if you feel it's necessary. Any voting member does have the power to motion for a vote.

ee. Kate: Language for senate-initiated referendum in Appendix D: ⅓ of entire group membership means a fraction of the entire voting membership. Nine members have to back the vote for the referendum to pass as a senate-initiated referendum.

ff. Stephen: Still thinks there is a concern around chilling speech. Would you be willing to add language separating anti-Zionism and anti-semitism.

      i. Adam: Thinks it's problematic that any discussions of anti-semitism lead immediately to discussion of Israel. Does not want to add qualifications.

gg. Judah: Can we return to the IHRA examples as listed? Many examples talk about anti-semitism related to the state of Isreal. They are anti-semitic and upsetting. Thinks that the right of self-determination is often related to Israel.

      i. Adam: These examples bring up language about when conversations around Israel bleed into anti-semtism. This is not a conversation around Israeli politics.

hh. Ned: Currently abstaining because there isn't explicit language explaining that this is not conflating anti-semitism and anti-Zionism.

ii. Austin: Out of respect for the time of everyone here, motions to go into voting period. Madi seconds.

      i. Kate: Clarifies that you need at least nine votes for this to be a senate-initiated referendum. Without the nine votes, it will fail.

      ii. Braiden: You mean nine votes in favor?

      iii. Kate: Correct.

      iv. Isabella: An abstention essentially counts as a no vote?

v. Judah: If this fails, there is not an option for this to be a student sponsored vote?

vi. Hannah: Correct. The deadline for student proposals has passed. Alternatively, this could be a voting group or a committee.

vii. Stephen: In the constitution, there is an option for a different completely senate initiated referendum to be put forth by November 18th at 11:30pm.

viii.   18 in favor to go into the voting period

ix. 4 in favor of this being a senate-initiated, 1 opposed, 21 abstain

x. *The vote does not pass*