

Discourse that can be offensive, dangerous or supportive of indiscriminate violence, even if not necessarily antisemitic

In the midst and aftermath of the campus protests of 2023–24, attention was focused on a number of slogans or chants that some deemed unmistakably antisemitic. The Guide recognizes that these terms can be considered or, in fact, are offensive or encouraging of dangerous or violent action. But it also emphasizes that they are not necessarily directed against Jews per se, and thus should be considered in a category of speech other than antisemitic.

A number of these terms have been used in the context of efforts at decolonization, when an oppressed colonized group rises up against its perceived colonizing oppressor. These efforts have often included explicit calls for violence that do not distinguish between armed combatants and non-combatants. Slogans that fall into this category include:

- **By any means necessary:** a term used by Jean-Paul Sartre and Frantz Fanon in the context of the struggle over decolonization in Algeria, as well as by Malcolm X in the Black liberation struggle.
- **Resistance is justified when the people are occupied:** This slogan draws from the claim that the struggle for decolonization requires resistance to colonial power. For many, the form of resistance that is justified is the path of violence. This was certainly the intent of some who invoked the slogan after October 7—namely, that the Hamas attack on Israel was a legitimate form of violence directed against Israeli colonizers. But it is important to note that the justification of resistance was not directed against Jews as Jews.
- **All Israelis are settler colonizers.** This statement has the potential to encourage violence against all Israelis by failing to distinguish between armed combatants and non-combatants. (When not linked to calls for violence, the claim of settler colonialism is not dangerous speech.)

In addition, there are a number of slogans or terms invoked in contemporary debates that have been applied to Zionism or the state of Israel; they relate to Zionism's and Israel's perceived excesses or crimes and prompt accusations of an unfair double standard against Israel. But they do not target Jews nor do they draw on antisemitic tropes.

An example of this is the claim that Israel is an apartheid state. This assertion, which has been made both by opponents of Israel and by leading human rights organizations (including in Israel), can focus either on Israel's occupation of the West Bank or on the entire Israeli political system. It does not appear to be directed against Jews or rely on antisemitic tropes of stereotypes.

Similar points can be made about terms discussed in the body of the Guide such as "From the River to the Sea" and Intifada.

The examples of dangerous speech that have been identified above are forms of speech that threaten Israelis, not Jews as such, and are therefore not to be deemed antisemitic, though they may be proscribed on other grounds. Conversely, when such statements are applied to Jews qua Jews, they can be antisemitic. In practice, it can be exceedingly difficult to distinguish between these two cases, which is precisely why addressing these issues through dialogue and education is preferable to an adjudicative process that might lead to suppression of speech.