

Cornell University Student Assembly

Spring 2024 Referendum Con Statements

1. Should Cornell University call for a permanent ceasefire in Gaza?

Cornell should not be taking positions on political issues. It is a university, not an activist group.

Not until the hostages are returned and Hamas is out of power. Israel needs to be a safe place for Jews.

Hamas started this war by committing a genocide of Israelis in which over 1200 people were killed. They are still holding over 230 people hostage including the elderly, women, and children. There can be no ceasefire until all the hostages are returned safely. It's quite offensive that this question is being presented as Hamas has been offered multiple ceasefires and has rejected every single one of them.

I do not believe that Cornell should call for a ceasefire in Gaza because Israel has the right to defend themselves. There are so many hostages and innocents whose lives were ruined as a result of the gruesome attacks. Israel has every right to fight for their citizens back. Additionally, Cornell does not have a place in this decision. Cornell declaring for a ceasefire would only upset students and would not solve any issues in the Middle East.

A ceasefire is contingent upon the release of all hostages being held in Gaza.

After the attack on Israel and the Jewish people on October 7th, Israel deserves the right to defend itself. While I do not entirely agree with how the war has been conducted thus far, by agreeing to this statement we state the belief that terrorist actions, such as the murder of civilians, rape of Israeli women, and the rest of the ones committed on October 7th are justified and do not deserve consequence. A permanent ceasefire prevents appropriate punishment and makes the nation of Israel vulnerable to future attacks.

As much as I personally support a quintessential ceasefire in Gaza, it should not be based off the intuition of college students/faculty. Instead, I believe that thorough votes from global organizations (e.g., UN, EU, WTO) should occur.

Universities should be politically neutral.

On one hand many Cornell constituents were directly impacted by the war and stand by Israel, and on the other, Cornell has no business engaging in calling for stances on any international politics. As a research and teaching institution they are responsible for noting causes and results, and teaching the connections. They are not to judge. They're job is to allow students to understand nuanced perspectives to then make their own decisions on how it aligns with their moral belief systems not to tell students about how to craft their systems.

Cornell University should abstain from political commentary.

Cornell calling for a ceasefire will not do anything to affect politics in the Middle East. Israel has the right to defend itself especially when they still are fighting to save the hostages held in Gaza.

Not until the hostages are returned and Hamas is defeated

This is a complicated geopolitical matter that has been unresolved for 75 years. Cornell has no business weighing in. Further, a call for a ceasefire without simultaneously demanding a return of the hostages is disgraceful and immoral.

It is not the responsibility of a university to take political stands. To maintain a healthy environment of expression academically, Cornell must make every possible attempt to be neutral on political issues to encourage on-campus discourse.

Please note that I very much want a ceasefire in Gaza, but I'm not convinced that a "call for ceasefire" by Cornell will have any meaningful effect on the situation in Gaza.

This public comment will set a precedent for politically-biased commentary from administration if pressured by an especially vocal student body (one whose side I'm on). Although the "freedom of expression" year is an idea I support, my experience is that students are extremely polarized and universally unwilling to share their opinions if disagreement is expected.

I do not believe in Universities getting roped in to politics as it detracts from their goal of educating and fostering healthy,

meaningful discussion. A call for ceasefire will communicate that Cornell University believes in an objective moral solution to a complex issue that many students disagree on.

This issue could be debated forever with no common ground ever being found. However, if you break the present war down into three potential outcomes it becomes more clear. 1. Hamas could win the war resulting in the total destruction of Israel and the displacement or death of half the global Jewish population. 2. No one wins and everything remains the same as it has been since the establishment of the state of Israel: Constant terror attacks followed by counter attacks from Israel resulting in nothing being accomplished and violence from both sides continuing with no end in sight. Or 3. Israel gets rid of Hamas and a new government is established in the Gaza Strip and there is hope for peace. The only way there can ever be a chance of peace is without Hamas.

A school in a small town of New York thousands of miles away from the war has no impact. Additionally, a ceasefire would allow the terror group Hamas to regain power and inflict damage on innocent civilians. A ceasefire is undermining the active decision Hamas made to attack Israel. Israel did not start the war and will not be attacked without consequence.

There are still over 100 civilian hostages remaining in Gaza that were taken by Hamas over 6 months ago. Israel has proposed multiple ceasefire deals for hostages in return, and Hamas has refused them. Although suffering in Gaza is real, we cannot live on a planet in which people are permitted to enter another country, kill and rape innocent civilians, and take hostages. What occurred on October 7th is true evil, and eradicating this severe and inhumane type of evil is the only way to create peace for the future.

This is ridiculous, Cornell having a referendum based on the personal political agenda of uninformed students will not change the situation in the Middle East and will only increase the antisemitism on campus.

The Cornell student assembly has absolutely no business opining on foreign affairs and international relations. The war is virtually impactless on the student body other than polarizing students on an issue that is objectively way more complex than this referendum purports. As a student of international relations and defense policy, my opinion on this issue is way more nuanced than what this referendum asks, necessarily so. It's a centuries-long ethnic, religious and geopolitical conflict that requires significant background knowledge to fully comprehend. Stick to campus related issues and leave foreign affairs to the federal foreign policy apparatus.

I do not believe that Cornell should be calling for a permanent ceasefire.

Cornell is not a political institution and the SA is just playing pretend government

This resolution is deeply disturbing, emotionally taxing, and distressing for me as a Jewish and Israeli student--and I know I am not alone in this feeling. I hope Cornell's administration and the Student Assembly consider the toll that this resolution would cause among their constituents, members of the student body and quickly reject it.

No ceasefire

Israel must defend itself.

The Palestinian leadership has oppressed Israel for millennia. It has never, ever let up. Every peace agreement ends in the same way: Palestine attacks Israel again. Why would we believe them this time? Why would we call for a ceasefire now?

By calling for a permanent cease-fire Cornell would be imposing a double standard upon Israel subjecting irrational standards to the nation. Why not call for the release of hostages being held?

It is not Cornell's place to make statements on international conflicts that affect its students in different ways. Any such statement would alienate a particular group, making them feel unwelcome in the Cornell community. This question is also flawed in certain key ways. Calling for a permanent ceasefire without calling for the immediate release of all hostages only enables Hamas and other terrorist groups. It shows them that they could be rewarded for committing atrocities and crimes against humanity. Israel's military pressure on Hamas is absolutely the one and only reason why they returned some of the hostages in previous deals. Hamas has no regard for the lives of Palestinians in Gaza and did not negotiate hostage-for-ceasefire deals in the past to alleviate the suffering of Gazans, but rather negotiated these deals in order to better prepare their military strategies. It is true that Gazans are suffering horribly during this war, but we need to remember who is to blame for this suffering. Hamas started this war and Hamas is

prolonging this war by refusing to surrender, refusing to release the hostages, and refusing to negotiate on realistic terms with Israel. Hamas is an existential threat to the people of Israel and the people of Gaza alike. By using innocent Gazans as human shields, employing Mosques, hospitals, schools, and residential areas as military bases, and embedding themselves in the civilian population, Hamas has caused the death of thousands of innocent Gazans and will cause the death of thousands more if not stopped. An immediate ceasefire may save innocent Gazans today, but would damn thousands more in the future to the cruelty and the inhumanity of Hamas. Calling for a ceasefire would be incredibly dangerous for Israel. There was a ceasefire Oct. 6th which Hamas broke in a barbaric attack that killed about 1,200 Israelis. Hamas does not respect ceasefires or international law. Without Hamas' complete destruction, Israel will always be in danger

This seems to be a surefire way to divide the student body over a topic for which the university will have no real impact. A resolution does not achieve anything but the process of passing it will cause massive unrest from both sides of the issue.

This topic is way too intricate and involved to simplify it down to a "permanent ceasefire in Gaza" with no repercussions.

I think that Cornell needs to focus on actual issues prevalent to students and campus itself, as there are plenty of problems here that need addressing, such as mental health, underfunded programs, such as AIISP. On top of that, what actual power does Cornell have over international conflict, as far as I am concerned the United Nations is not asking specifically for Ivy League input on these issues. If you are going to call for a ceasefire in Gaza, does that mean Cornell will also condemn other genocides happening around the world and input a university wide stance

on every issue going forward? I think our resources and time should be spent taking care of the issues here, not spending money and time figuring out if Cornell should use basic morals and condemn a genocide. Actual innocent lives are being lost every second, and you still need approval to condemn that? disregarding the fact that a call for a ceasefire will never have any meaningful impact if it comes from Cornell, it shouldn't need to be asked if condemning genocide is okay or not.

There should not be a ceasefire until ALL of the hostages are free.

I don't support any ceasefire until every single hostage is returned to Israel. I believe that Israel has every right based on the atrocities committed by Hamas to continue their war efforts against terrorists undeterred by other nations' interference. I'm fully opposed to any actual or symbolic divestment from Israeli investments or corporate financial involvement. I believe your actions, and those of Cornell protestors, stem from antisemitic positions and I oppose all of the conduct of terrorist Hamas sympathizers on campus.

First of all, I find it ridiculous for a college to make a stance about any conflict, nevertheless a conflict that has gone on for hundreds of years that historians, political scientists, and politicians do not have a clear consensus on how to solve. Cornell making a statement will do nothing to help either side. Secondly, a ceasefire only helps Hamas, a designated terrorist group. Cornell should not be aiding terrorists in propaganda. Finally, what would the effect be on campus? No matter what the administration says, people will be unhappy. It will only lead to more protests, vandalism, and threats to the Jewish community on campus. I am scared. I am scared to be Jewish on campus.

Not all hostages are released from Gaza and returned to Israel. Israel has the right to defend itself from terrorism.

A permanent ceasefire in Gaza will only serve to harm the political situation in the strip. Hamas must be dismantled, as it is a stated goal of the organization that Israel must be destroyed. This is not limited to Jews in Israel, as Bedouins and Arabs have also been taken hostage, and remain in the strip today. America is not safe either. As Hamas official Sheik Ahmad Bahr said on Hamas TV on August 20, 2012, "Oh Allah, destroy the Jews and their supporters. Oh Allah, destroy the Americans and their supporters. Oh Allah, count them one by one, and kill them all, without leaving a single one." It must be made clear that an attack on Israel and its right to defend itself is an attack on Western civilization as a whole, whose benefits and comforts every single member of the student assembly enjoys. Being able to study and say what one wishes is one of these comforts, and in a totalitarian state such as the Gaza strip under Hamas, a significant portion of our student population would likely be put to death. So, to reiterate, a world in which Hamas exists is a world in which no one is safe. The only way in which this threat can be removed is with the total destruction of Hamas, and this can only be accomplished if Israel is allowed to continue the war in Gaza. While this assembly's vote will not change anything on the international scale, it represents an ideological position, and voting for a ceasefire is self-destructive ideologically. Israel is the only country in the Middle East that is truly democratic, and at the moment, is over 21% Arab by population (the vast majority of which are citizens of the country). This nullifies the idea of a genocide, and Israel repeatedly sends in sounding charges before bombing residential areas where Hamas agents operate to warn all those inside the buildings to move out. While Hamas continues to use civilians as human shields, Israel attempts to save them. In short, voting for a ceasefire is voting for self-destruction.

Cornell University should not call for a permanent ceasefire in Gaza until all of the innocent Israelis taken from their homes and held hostage in Gaza are returned! I strongly vote con.

It is not the role of an university to hold positions on such matters, especially if they are overseas.

Cornell's perspective will have no effect on the region--it seems silly to pretend like we do. This is also seems like moral posturing to me.

While it is reasonable to have issues with the current war in Gaza, calling for an immediate, permanent ceasefire ignores the larger political forces at play. Firstly, this resolution does not seem to call for the release of innocent, civilian hostages taken during the October 7 terror attacks. Furthermore, ending the war now would allow Hamas, a recognized terrorist group that calls for the destruction of Israel and the genocide of all Jews in its founding charter, to potentially reconstitute and take back power. While the government of Benjamin Netanyahu has undoubtedly been an impediment to peace (and has built illegal settlements in the West Bank), Hamas is equally an impediment to peace in the region. During the Camp David accords Hamas launched multiple suicide bombings against innocent Israelis and has not acknowledge that Israel should exist. Because of this, a two state solution cannot be achieved while they are still around. A call for a permanent ceasefire ignores the long term political stability of the region.

Thank you for bringing the humanitarian crisis in Gaza to the attention of the Cornell Community and for your interest in stopping genocidal entities. I think the world must know that Cornell will not stand idly by as Israeli citizens are used as sex slaves in the tunnels of Gaza, and moved from location to location against their will. Rape must never be allowed to occur in silence. We must speak out against the barbaric evil that is currently being perpetrated against innocent civilians. It is a tragedy that many Palestinians living in Gaza are suffering due to the war that Hamas started. The quickest resolution to this conflict and the quickest way to get safe humanitarian aid to the people of Gaza is for Hamas to hand over all of the remaining hostages, including the more than 30 dead whose bodies are being held as ransom and are being denied proper Jewish burials. Six months into this conflict, more than 130 families have had to sit at home with empty tables and broken hearts as their loved ones languish in the tunnels of Gaza as unspeakable harms are inflicted upon them. If Hamas hands over the hostages and fully surrenders, all aid routes will open up tomorrow. If the Cornell wishes to help the people of Gaza like I we decide must start and end with finding the quickest way to end the conflict. That is calling upon the handing over of all hostages and the immediate, unconditional surrender of those who perpetrated the worst crime against Jews in the land of Israel since the destruction of the Second Temple. Hamas must go so we can help the people of Gaza.

Statements by universities infringe upon the important idea of institutional neutrality, whereby institutions such as universities refrain from issuing statements on current events. The goal of insitutional neutrality is to encourage activism by students of different perspectives, not to agree with anything. Calling for a permanent ceasefire in Gaza would amount to choosing sides. Although I personally believe that a permanent ceasefire is the moral mandate, it is not the university's role to have social opinions as an institution.

Dear President Pollack,

I strongly disagree with the basis and substance of the proposed referendum, and would vote no for both questions.

In the first case, posing such a referendum will have no actual impact save to marginalize many pro-Israel and Jewish students on campus. One can argue that the referendum is making a statement to the world or the Board of Trustees, but it only perpetuates a one-sided approach to this issue that is at once intimidating on campus and ineffectual outside of it. Education and dialogue would serve our educational mission much more appropriately.

Secondly, the fact that the Student Assembly has chosen only these two issues on which to vote strikes me as antisemitic and anti-Zionist and will label the University as such. The world will see Cornell as antisemitic and it will be detrimental to our standing. Why is there no mention in the referendum of returning hostages from the tunnels of Gaza? Why is there no condemnation of sexual assault, rape and mutilation perpetrated by Hamas and other terrorists on October 7? Why is there no censure of Hamas for appropriating millions of dollars from civilians in Gaza? How about a referendum on investigating UNRWA for supporting Jihadist and antisemitic ideology or employing individuals who took part in the October 7 massacre?

Perhaps there should be an investigation of why Egypt has closed its border with Gaza? Instead of condemning Israel for genocide (which it is NOT committing), there should be dialogue on what really constitutes a genocide and how there are many countries (Russia, Syria, China, Qatar, Sudan, etc.,) who employ violence and repression. Not to mention Hamas itself whose own charter calls for the destruction of our people.

It is not Cornell University's place to vote on a path forward towards an extremely complex issue. A university is certainly a place to hold meaningful discussion on the issues of geopolitics. But to make a blanket statement on Cornell's stance is nonsensical and does not promote meaningful discussion.

Let's look at some history. In 2005, Israel pulled out of the Gaza Strip, removing every soldier and settler, and allowing the Palestinians to form their own government. Instead of a Western-style democracy forming, Hamas violently seized power in 2007. Since then, it has attacked Israel with tens of thousands of rockets fired indiscriminately at Israeli civilian centers, and launched cross-border raids that killed and captured Israeli soldiers and civilians. Until now, Israel resisted the urge to launch a large-scale ground invasion against Hamas, largely due to the toll that such a war would bring. However, on October 7th, Hamas forced Israel's hand - the group launched a massive cross-border raid, killing over 1,200 people (800 of whom were civilians), raping dozens of women, mutilating the bodies of those who were killed, and taking 250+ hostages, over 130 of whom (including civilians, babies and the elderly) continue to be held in Gaza. In addition, Hamas spokesmen have stated that the group intends to regroup and commit similar attacks in the future, meaning that if Israel allows Hamas to survive, they are intent on performing similar attacks again and again against Israel.

With this context, I'm asking you: what else do you suggest Israel should be doing? Like any other country, Israel will not tolerate such a severe security threat on its borders. Furthermore, the Israeli army must do all that is possible to return their hostages - it is disingenuous to suggest that Israel would not launch a military campaign to work toward their freedom. Israel must eliminate Hamas--a group Joe Biden described as ""pure evil"" and ""worse than ISIS""--and return the Gaza Strip to a form of pre-2007 moderate Palestinian civilian control. At this stage, a

permanent ceasefire leaves Hamas in power; that is unacceptable.

There are many reasons why Cornell should NOT call for a permanent ceasefire in Gaza. First, this referendum has no impact on the war. Second, Israel proposed many ceasefires, and Hamas rejected them all. Before October 7th, there was a permanent ceasefire; unfortunately, the terrorist organization Hamas butchered, raped, burned, shot, and tortured 1,200 men, women, and children. This was the most amount of Jews murdered since the Holocaust. Additionally, Hamas said they would break any future ceasefire - We must teach Israel a lesson. And we will do this again and again. On October 7th, and October 10th, and October 1,000,000th. Everything we do is justified." So, as any country has the right to defend itself when terrorists attack, so does Israel. Third, this resolution ignores the 130+ hostages in Hamas captivity, so you cannot have a ceasefire when you ignore one of the most crucial parts of the compromise. As a Jew, it is disturbing that the referendum does not even mention that Hamas is a terrorist organization with the goal of murdering EVERY Jewish and Christian person. Additionally, this resolution falsely paints Israel as the aggressor when Israel is focused on saving their hostages and fighting against Hamas (not the Palestinian people). One of Israel's goals while fighting Hamas is preventing Palestinian civilian casualties. The IDF has made over 79,000 phone calls, sent over 13.7 million text messages, dropped over 7.2 million leaflets, and made over 15 million recorded calls to Palestinians in Gaza with evacuation warnings to prevent Palestinian civilian deaths. This resolution does not hold Hamas accountable and focuses on villainizing Israel for defending itself.

Calling for a ceasefire for a country who just went through a pogrom is not only blatantly antisemitic but tells Jewish

students on this campus that our needs and opinions do not matter.

While I, as well as most other pro-Israel students, support a ceasefire, just calling for a ceasefire is one-sided and ignores the reason there is a war in the first place. Israel is fighting to return the hostages taken by Hamas and show Hamas that they cannot be a threat to the one and only Jewish state. Should Cornell make a statement, they should call for BOTH a ceasefire and a return of the hostages. Again, I support a ceasefire, but it only benefits one side. A ceasefire must be accompanied with the return of innocent hostages taken by Hamas.

Being a Jewish student at Cornell ever since October 7 has been one of the biggest challenges of my life. Jewish students have been scared to walk around campus, wear a Star of David, or show any indication that they are Jewish. If any statement is made, please make sure it is not one-sided. A ceasefire with the return of hostages is something most people should agree on. Jews already feel scared, and this would only be made worse if Cornell and the Student Assembly do not respect our wishes.

Hamas is a genocidal regime. They butchered 1,200 men, women, and children. They used sexual violence as a weapon. There was a permanent ceasefire before October 7th, which Hamas broke. The ceasefire leaves Hamas in power. They have said they will break any future cease fire – “We must teach Israel a lesson. And we will do this again and again. On October 7th, and October 10th, and October 1,000,000th. Everything we do is justified” Ghazi Amhad LBC TV, October 24th 2023. Israel is fighting a war of necessity to bring the hostages home and dismantle Hamas, an organization whose stated goal is to rid the world of Jews.. Israel is a nation built by the survivors of genocide, and it is again forced to fight a genocidal terrorist organization dedicated to its destruction. Accusing Israel of

genocide is not only false; it is also a modern-day iteration of the age-old antisemitic blood libel. The language included in Resolution falsely paints Israel as the aggressor in the current Israel-Hamas war, which is factually incorrect and ignores the Hamas terrorist organization's brutal attack against Israeli civilians on October 7, 2023. On that day, the deadliest day for Jews since the Holocaust, Hamas tortured, raped, and murdered 1,200 people and took hundreds more hostage, including American citizens. Overall, This referendum will not have any tangible impacts on the conflict.

If Cornell wants to call for a ceasefire it must also call for a return of the hostages and a surrender by Hamas. There is no ceasefire without every single hostage home.

1. this ignores the ~130 hostages STILL held by Hamas that are being tortured and sexually assaulted.
2. This does not call for the surrender of Hamas, which has sworn to commit the atrocities of 10/7. Hamas has used funds meant for Gazans for terrorist activity for years, breaking ceasefires and attacking Israelis indiscriminately. A unilateral ceasefire that leaves Hamas in power is NOT a ceasefire, it is a double standard. Hamas will not stop until Israel is free of Jews.
3. A unilateral Israeli ceasefire is how Hamas came to power in the first place in 2007. Any calls for ceasefire by Israel WITHOUT calls for the release of hostages and the cessation of Hamas terror are anti-Israel double standards.
4. This referendum will have ZERO impact on the conflict. It is purely virtue signaling laced with antisemitic double-standards.
5. There have been many ceasefires already. HAMAS repeatedly breaks them and rejects others.

6. Israel accepted a week-long ceasefire in November, has facilitated the construction of field hospitals, reopened the Kerem Shalom border crossing to allow additional humanitarian aid into Gaza, paused fighting to open humanitarian corridors for Gazan civilians to evacuate, made over 79,000 phone calls, sent over 13.7 million text messages, dropped over 7.2 million leaflets, and made over 15 million recorded calls to Palestinians in Gaza with evacuation warnings. On the other hand, Hamas is an internationally recognized terrorist organization with genocidal intentions clearly stated in its founding charter, and which have been repeated since October 7th. These referendum questions do nothing to hold Hamas accountable, and instead focus on demonizing Israel for acting in self defense.

Why is it Cornell's place to call for a ceasefire when there are still hostages in captivity. These hostages are more than likely being sexually assaulted every day.

There was a ceasefire on October 6. The only thing that changed that fact was Hamas launching its massacre of over 1000 civilians. There would be a ceasefire if Hamas released the hostages. There would be a ceasefire if no hostages had been taking.

This referendum was brought forth by an organization that referred to Hamas as an "armed resistance group" in the aftermath of the October 7 massacres. Are we truly to believe that this is actually about a ceasefire, when the only issue is that Israel is defending itself, and there is nothing to say about how this war started?

Israel has one of the most precise military operations with an incredible low number of civilian casualties for a place that uses

human shields. They also have the right to defend itself against a group that terrorized its people.

There was a ceasefire in place on October 6th and Hamas broke it. A ceasefire now means for Israel to give up and accept the death and destruction of the Jewish people.

Hamas still holds several Israeli hostages at this time (negotiations indicate this number to be around 40 hostages). As such the Israeli government has an OBLIGATION to continue its military operations until it has recovered all of its citizens. The attacks on October 7th were attacks aimed to terrorize a civilian population, with the aim at achieving a political goal - the definition of a terrorist attack. No government can simply leave their citizens hostage in the hands of terrorists.

Additionally, Hamas is the political entity controlling Gaza. Since Hamas committed an act of state-sponsored terrorism with the October 7th attacks, Israel should remove the Hamas government from administering Gaza. This is similar to the need for the United States to remove the Taliban government from power in Afghanistan after they rejected to turn over leaders of Al-Qaeda following 9/11. The removal of the terrorist sympathetic Taliban government allowed the United States to eliminate Al-Qaeda, and prevent Al-Qaeda terrorism. The same action is needed in the Israel-Hamas case. If Israel does not remove the terrorist-sympathetic Hamas government from power, further attacks will continue, and it is a matter of not IF, but WHEN, the next tragedy such as the October 7th attacks occurs.

While Israel has conducted their military operations recklessly, which has resulted in casualties among Palestinian civilians, one must remember that this is a hostage situation Israel is dealing with. By nature, hostage situations are time-critical. As a result,

Israeli Defense Forces must act quickly, which as a byproduct unfortunately yields greater civilian loss of life.

Cornell University should not call for a ceasefire in Gaza at this time. A ceasefire is not appropriate unless 2 conditions are met:

- All Israeli hostages are returned (including the bodies of the deceased).

- Hamas steps down from power.

If Hamas does not comply, Israel is obligated to militarily achieve these objectives.

This is rhetoric that only emboldens antisemitism. Instead, Cornell should focus on protecting Jewish students from such hatred and importantly stand for releasing the hostages kidnapped by Hamas on October 7th.

Ceasefire in Gaza will not bring the hostages home, will not allow israel the right to defend itself, and would be simply putting a band aid on an extremely multifaceted problem being faced in the war.

There are over 130 hostages still in captivity - some of whom have been sexually abused. The resolution does not mention the return of hostages. Any ceasefire without calling for their return is immoral.

The ongoing captivity of over 130 hostages, some of whom have endured sexual abuse, remains a grave concern. Notably absent

from the resolution is any mention of their release. A ceasefire lacking a demand for their return is morally deficient.

Additionally, the resolution fails to address the necessity for Hamas to surrender. Their heinous crimes on October 7th were premeditated, showcasing their disregard for human life. Over the past fifteen years, Hamas has consistently violated ceasefires, launching tens of thousands of rockets at Israeli civilians and utilizing ceasefires to rearm themselves.

Hamas's genocidal agenda is evident in their actions and rhetoric. Their stated goal of eradicating Jews from Israel echoes a dark history of anti-Semitism and genocide. Painting Israel as the aggressor disregards the brutal attack perpetrated by Hamas on October 7, 2023, where they tortured, raped, and murdered innocent civilians.

Israel's response to this existential threat is a necessary defense of its citizens and values. Accusations of genocide against Israel are not only false but also perpetuate age-old anti-Semitic tropes.

The referendum's lack of tangible impact on the conflict further undermines its credibility. Hamas's unprovoked attack on Israel, marked by atrocities committed against innocent civilians, emphasizes the urgency of the situation. Any call for ceasefire must prioritize the release of hostages, ensuring that no one is left behind in the pursuit of peace.

The referendum does not call for the surrender of Hamas, nor does it address the over 130 hostages still in captivity, many of whom have been sexually abused. Any ceasefire without advocating for the return of the hostages and Hamas's surrender is inherently immoral. Hamas's premeditated crimes on October 7th, which included the heinous acts of raping, murdering, and kidnapping innocent civilians, demonstrate their genocidal nature. Over the past fifteen years, Hamas has repeatedly broken ceasefires,

utilized respites to rearm, and indiscriminately fired tens of thousands of rockets at Israeli civilian centers, constituting war crimes. Their declaration of intent to continue such atrocities renders any ceasefire futile. Through their actions and rhetoric, Hamas has made clear their goal of eliminating Israel and its Jewish population, regardless of a "ceasefire." Accusing Israel of aggression in the face of Hamas's brutal attacks, including the deadliest day for Jews since the Holocaust, is not only false but further perpetuates antisemitism and rewards terrorists for their crimes. Israel, a nation founded by survivors of an actual genocide, is fighting a necessary war to bring its citizens home and dismantle a genocidal terrorist organization. The referendum's failure to address these fundamental issues renders it ineffectual in bringing about meaningful change in the conflict.

Hamas broke the ceasefire that existed on October 6th when the next day they tortured, raped and murdered thousands of innocent Israelis simply because they were citizens of Israel. It is well-documented that these attacks were celebrated throughout much of Gaza and among the non-Israeli populations of Judea and Samaria. Facing such a numerous, hostile and barbaric enemy, it is no wonder that Israel responded to such existential threats with force. Nevertheless, despite the complexity of these threats, the Israeli Defense Forces has managed to maintain a civilian to combatant death ratio lower than any other modern army in an urban environment like Gaza. May the inspiring self-sacrifice of Israel's soldiers to both annihilate evil while upholding the highest of moral standards inspire the entire world to do the same, that the vision of Isaiah be realized that "they shall beat their swords into plowshares, and their spears into pruninghooks: nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more.

The referendum calls for a ceasefire in Gaza with no mention of the hostages still being held by Hamas. It is a cruel double standard to expect Israel to abandon its citizens and allow Hamas to gain power. Furthermore, there have been several previous attempts at ceasefire, all of which were refused by Hamas. Why should Hamas not be held accountable for all of the lives they have destroyed and the terror they have caused to Israelis and Palestinians alike?

Hamas invaded and attacked Israel on October 7th, 2023, on the holiday of Simchat Torah, beginning with an onslaught of rocket fire. They invaded socialist farming communities in southern Israel, called kibbutzim, and raped, murdered, and kidnapped innocent civilians. They burned entire families alive in their homes, raped daughters in front of their parents, beheaded babies, and took over 200 people hostage. While some of the hostages have been rescued by the IDF or released, there are still 134 people being held against their will in Gaza. To call for a ceasefire without calling for their release is antithetical to peace. No country, Israel included, should be expected to abandon its people.

A blanket call for a ceasefire prior to the return of the hostages or any meaningful change in the governance of the Gaza strip is irresponsible and morally reprehensible. The existing regime within Gaza has made it abundantly clear, through both their actions and their statements, that they intend to continue in their agenda of violence against civilians in Israel and dissidents within Gaza. A ceasefire that makes no attempts to rectify this issue will simply lead to more deaths.

There was a ceasefire on October 6th, which Hamas broke on October 7th. During the October 7th terrorist attack, Hamas destroyed Israeli villages, committed countless acts of sexual

violence to innocent women, tortured innocent families including children and the elderly, and took over 230 innocent civilian hostages. Since then, Hamas has turned down many proposed ceasefires by Israel and refuses to return the remaining 133 innocent civilian Israeli hostages, most recently because they could not locate 40 living hostages. Taking, threatening, and killing hostages is against international law and is considered a war crime. Calls for a ceasefire are one-sided unless they are accompanied by an unequivocal call to bring the hostages home, and for Hamas to not break the ceasefire through further terrorist acts as they've done in the past. Calling for a ceasefire without the release of hostages is essentially telling Israel to lay down their arms and stop protecting their citizens and the hostages in Gaza. The acts of violence and terrorism committed by Hamas on October 7th sparked a war in which Israel seeks to defend its civilians from future terrorist attacks by Hamas and bring the hostages home. Unfortunately, war is brutal, but sometimes it is necessary to ensure long-lasting peace in the region. Israel and the IDF do all they can to protect civilian lives, going beyond what is required by international law by alerting civilians to future attacks and sending aid into enemy territory, as Hamas hides behind their own Gazan civilians. There is no chance for long-lasting peace with Hamas, as their charter clearly states their goal to completely eradicate the Jewish people. This war is now larger than Israel and Hamas – there's been involvement from Hezbollah in Lebanon throughout, and now also direct attacks from Iran. In order to save the lives of Jews and Israelis alike, it is imperative that Israel continues to fight the war that was started by Hamas on October 7th.

A permanent ceasefire was in place on October 6th, 2023. On October 7th, Hamas launched a barbaric attack on Israel butchering entire families, abducting babies, and raping women. These savages did this with glee, reporting back to their relatives how many Jews and Israelis they managed to kill. This is Hamas, a genocidal organization whose stated goal is to see the death and

destruction of all Jews. Despite what they say are their goals to "liberate" Palestinians, they do nothing to help the civilian population of Gaza. Instead, Hamas uses the billions of dollars in aid that they receive to build rockets to attack civilians in Israel and then build tunnels to hide from the Israeli response. These cowards leave innocent civilians outside to act as human shields as the terrorists of Hamas are safe in tunnels underground. This is all part of Hamas's playbook, including this very referendum being held right now. Hamas attacks innocent civilians in Israel and then immediately calls for a ceasefire. They bank on the fact that people around the world will forget about the barbarism they committed on October 7th and the 130+ hostages, including men, women, and children, that are still being held by Hamas in Gaza. There is a clear path to a permanent ceasefire, and it is all in the hands of Hamas. Hamas can release the hostages and surrender, and there would be a ceasefire immediately. Hamas has also had nearly a dozen temporary ceasefire offers from Israel, the US, Qatar, and Egypt in exchange for the release of hostages, and every single one since

December has been rejected by Hamas. Hamas does not want a ceasefire; they want the extermination of Israel and the Jewish people. Voting yes to this referendum does nothing but give propaganda for Hamas to use, allowing them to say that American college students support their terrorism. Vote no if you are on the side of humanity and saving innocent lives, which starts with the release of hostages and the removal of Hamas.

Thank you for bringing the humanitarian crisis in Gaza to the attention of the Cornell Community and for your interest in stopping genocidal entities. I think the world must know that Cornell will not stand idly by as Israeli citizens are used as sex slaves in the tunnels of Gaza, and moved from location to location against their will. Rape must never be allowed to occur in silence. We must speak out against the barbaric evil that is currently being perpetrated against innocent civilians.

Calling for a permanent ceasefire without a subsequent call for the surrender of Hamas and the release of all Israelis kept captive is utterly shameful. As it stands, Hamas still holds 136 hostages in captivity. Hostages who have been released have spoken about the horrors they endured. How can one call for a permanent ceasefire without the release of said hostages? Moreover, Hamas is a genocidal regime that has focused on wiping Israel off the map since its inception. On October 7th, they committed (and documented) some of the worst atrocities the Jews have endured since the Holocaust. I traveled to Israel to see the damage from that day and spoke to many survivors of the massacres. Words cannot describe the nightmare every Israeli has endured since that day. Hamas killed 1200 that day but has altered the life of every single Israeli as well. Hamas has turned down countless offers for a ceasefire, as recently as just a couple of days ago. If anyone wants a ceasefire, they should also be calling for the surrender of Hamas.

This referendum can only be damaging to the student body at Cornell. For one, it addresses an issue that is on the other side of the world, and it makes a general and unilateral conclusion for a conflict that is deeply personal, nuanced, and sensitive for students on this campus. This referendum takes a stance on the conflict in the Middle East without any mention of the following: the hostages, the initiation of this war by an invasion from Hamas, the hateful speech and behavior to stakeholders in this conflict, etc. This oversimplified effort to call for a ceasefire is deeply problematic in that it fails to address Hamas' responsibility and incapability to contribute to a peaceful end to this conflict. Israel has put forth a number of ceasefire offers to Hamas with requests for hostages in return, and those have been denied due to Hamas' inability to locate and return those innocent hostages. Besides the deeply biased language in this referendum, it makes an oversimplified call for a ceasefire without mention of the specific terms needed for this war to end.

By calling for a ceasefire without mention of the hostages or Israel's right to defend itself against a terrorist organization that initiated this war, this referendum is deeply problematic.

This referendum calls for a ceasefire. To be clear, there was a ceasefire in place on October 6th. On October 7th, Hamas broke the ceasefire when they murdered, raped, and kidnapped innocent Israeli civilians. This referendum does not mention the return of the 130 Israeli hostages still being held captive in Gaza by Hamas. Britannica Law defines a ceasefire as a "total cessation of armed hostilities." This would require both sides to stop fighting and to agree to a deal. A ceasefire was rejected by Hamas again today (4.14.24) because it would require that Hamas return the hostages. Israel has proposed many deals over the last few months and, yet Hamas has not agreed to a single one. It is unethical to call for a ceasefire that only wants one side to lay down their weapons.

Cornell University has no business calling for a ceasefire in Gaza. Israel maintains the right to defend itself just like any other nation and Hamas, a known terrorist organization, is keeping its people hostage. Calling for a ceasefire ignores the atrocities committed by Hamas, the horror Hamas has invoked on both Israelis and Gazans alike, and shows Jewish students they do not belong at Cornell. A ceasefire will occur under the correct circumstances when the hostages are returned and Hamas is no longer in power and ruining the lives of the Palestinian people.

It would be morally unsound and ignorant of Cornell University to call for a permanent ceasefire in Gaza. The fact that this can be voted on in as simple as a question as it is stated above is morally depraved. Currently, there are over 130 hostages still in captivity - some of whom have been sexually abused. The resolution does not mention the return of hostages. Calling for a ceasefire without

calling for their return is immoral and bigoted. Just this last week, Israel offered an exchange of hostages for prisoners who were charged with life sentences because of first degree murders and terrorist attacks. The hostages in Gaza did nothing wrong and yet this resolution fails to recognize that nuance. Israel accepted a week-long ceasefire in November, has facilitated the construction of field hospitals, reopened the Kerem Shalom border crossing to allow additional humanitarian aid into Gaza, paused fighting to open humanitarian corridors for Gazan civilians to evacuate, made over 79,000 phone calls, sent over 13.7 million text messages, dropped over 7.2 million leaflets, and made over 15 million recorded calls to Palestinians in Gaza with evacuation warnings. On the other hand, Hamas is an internationally recognized terrorist organization with genocidal intentions clearly stated in its founding charter, and which have been repeated since October 7th. Neither of these referendum questions do anything to hold Hamas accountable, and instead demonize Israel for defending itself.

Cornell should not tarnish its name by taking the unequivocally un-American stance of restraining an ally in its resistance after it witnessed the most gruesome attack in its history by a proxy of an American adversary in the region, Iran. On October 7th, the ruling and overwhelmingly popular party of Gaza, Hamas, murdered 1,200 civilians in a highly orchestrated attack funded and coordinated by the IRGC. This was done purposefully to disrupt peace in the region following the Abraham accords and possible relations between Saudi Arabia and Israel. These countries acting together rightfully threatens on our enemy, Iran which by the way is non-democratic, anti-LGBTQ, and misogynistic and would like to see the entirety of the West destroyed adding to its attempt to drive a wedge between those nations. Israel's response is about showing the Iranian Mullahs that their tactics will not disrupt Western interests and that any attempts on civilians will be punished. Hamas is but a proxy of Iran, and yes, those in Gaza are just as much victims of Hamas

and the Iranians perhaps even more as is Israel. Their millionaire leaders live lavishly in 5-Star hotels as their people starve and use Israel as a scapegoat for their people's suffering. If Israel stops its pursuit of Hamas, it will allow it to recoup and one day attack Israel again, leading to a repeat of these events. If Israel is allowed to pursue and eliminate Hamas, it can allow its newfound allies, the moderate Muslim nations of the Middle East, to resurrect Gaza into a model that will inspire change in Palestine entirely. If you are concerned about life, if you would like to weaken America's enemies, if you would like to see a future for Palestine, please vote NO on this resolution.

The referendum asks for a permanent ceasefire in Gaza. The information is public that Israel offered a ceasefire on December 20th, December 25th, January 23rd, January 29th, February 9th, February 28th, March 6th, and March 25th. And Hamas has rejected each of these eight compromises because they know they have the best bargaining chip in the world and that's 134 hostages that they refuse to free.

People see Israel's negotiations and their hard stance on ensuring the safe return of its hostages, and it's difficult for them to understand why Israel cares so much about the hostages.

Throughout the Jews' 3000 years + of existence, they have survived countless persecutions by remaining a loving and united family. They have always had communal responsibility for one another, and it does not stop when they get the chance to release these hostages.

Knowing all that we know about Hamas, should we trust them to maintain a ceasefire? On October 7th, they invaded kibbutzim and raped, murdered, and kidnapped innocent civilians. If you were in Hamas' position and attempting to liberate the Palestinian people, do you think the best idea would be to massacre 1400 Jews, after raping them, desecrating their corpses and taking over 240 people hostage. Is that going to cause the Palestinian liberation? I'm no

military scientist, but that doesn't seem like such a great idea. If you had 134 children held captive, subject to sexual abuse and starvation, you'd be a shitty parent for not doing what you could to bring them back. Please ask Israel to ceasefire, and they will make an offer to Hamas who will then reject it.

This question in and of itself lacks validity.

Spring 2024 Referendum Con Statements

- 2. Cornell has investments in companies supporting the ongoing war in Gaza, which has been deemed as a “plausible genocide” by the International Court of Justice in South Africa v. Israel. Should Cornell University follow their 2016 Guidelines for Divestment and divest from the following weapons manufacturers: BAE Systems, Boeing, Elbit Systems, General Dynamics, L3Harris Technologies, Leonardo, Lockheed Martin, Northrop Grumman, RTX, and ThyssenKrupp?**

Defense manufacturers function to produce weapons and equipment. They are not responsible for every plausible use of these weapons. Regardless, the IDF is exceptionally professional and disciplined in adhering to the laws of war.

These companies tremendously benefit society. Divesting is absolutely ridiculous.

There is no genocide in Gaza. Israel is one of the United States' strongest allies; I don't think it should be an issue that Cornell is funding companies that help Israel. Additionally, Israel and Cornell have a strong relationship in terms of tech which is another reason their assets are heavily intertwined.

I do not believe that Cornell should divest in these companies because Cornell should support Israel. Israel needs all the help they can get. Additionally, Israel needs these investments in order to defend themselves. It is crucial that Cornell does not divest from these companies and keeps supporting Israel in their right to defend themselves and get their hostages back.

The goal of an endowment is to maintain and grow the endowment so that students can oh less to receive more. It is not their job to use the money in a political manner, otherwise they essentially become a lobbying group for the interests of the student assembly, not even for the interests of all students because while every student may have the right to vote for the reps, the referendums pushed are always done by the reps and can be very independent of student wants and voter turnout is often low. Secondly, these companies will continue to profit and make money whether or not Cornell invests, price discovery will assure that if we don't get in early eventually someone will spot that the company is undervalued and make money off of the investment. The only difference will be that Cornell students will receive less benefits for a higher tuition if the endowment underperforms and the returns to the school programs is less. It is wrong to punish students and turn the endowment into a lobby group at the same time.

The companies mentioned in Question 2 develop and manufacture weapons and technologies which can be used both offensively and defensively. Cornell invests in many such companies, whose products can be used for good or for evil. I therefore see no cause for divestment. Indeed, divestment in this case unfairly targets companies that support Israel's ability to defend itself against attack.

Double down and buy more shares of Lockheed Martin and sell Boeing

Cornell is invested in these companies for a reason. These companies help Israel to defend itself and contribute on the world stage as the only Democracy in the Middle East. Without Israel, that region would fall into complete terror and chaos fueled by Western hatred.

These companies have a large positive impact on society and divesting in these companies would hinder technological advancement.

By targeting Israel, the one and only Jewish state, for boycott and divestment, you are differentiating its treatment vs. how every other country in the world is treated. That is anti-Semitic, and Cornell should reject any and all calls for this behavior. Let's pretend that Israel is guilty of human rights abuses (which I do not believe, but just assume it is true for this argument). Why is there an active boycott movement against Israel and not other human rights abusers? China has the Uyghurs in concentration camps. Where is the movement to boycott/divest from China. Many middle eastern countries, such as Saudi Arabia, Qatar, Egypt and Iran, are serial abusers of human rights. Why is there no action to divest from these countries? It is shameful this question is being asked about Israel, and it is an embarrassment for Cornell and its students.

Israel needs all the support it can get to depose Hamas.

The International Court of Justice has historically been antisemitic and antizionist (which is indeed the same thing).

There is one Jewish nation in the world. While the government might be different than the interests of their constituency, they are still representative of the Jewish people. Divesting from them is a masked form of antisemitism. One cannot be antizionist without being antisemitic. Divesting from these companies would prove the state of politics on college campuses: Jews are unwelcome.

The Gaza Ministry of Health says that 32,000 people have been killed in Gaza, without differentiating between combatants and civilians. According to Israel, the IDF has killed 13,000 members of Hamas. While both these numbers could be inflated (especially Gaza's given that the data is provided by Hamas, a self-proclaimed terrorist organization), the ratio of civilians to combatants killed is completely normal in terms of Middle Eastern urban warfare and is actually better (in terms of minimizing civilian casualties) than that of previous wars, revealing that Israel is not committing a genocide and, rather, that they are actually being mindful and are successful at minimizing civilian casualties.

Further, the unfortunate civilian casualties are largely at the fault of Hamas who regularly commits war crimes by using hospitals, schools, and mosques as military operation sites. The Laws of War indicate one cannot intentionally target mosques, schools, or hospitals; however, if the enemy turns these sites into military operation sites, which has been proven to be a routine tactic for Hamas, then they can become legitimate war sites. Given that there is abundant proof that Hamas uses civilian-designated locations as military operation sites (i.e., holding hostages in hospitals, etc.) and through their network of underground tunnels that extend over 350 miles through all of Gaza city, which inherently puts civilians in danger, it is clear that Israel is not committing genocide but is challenged to fight evil that is unfortunately deeply embedded within Gaza's civilian

population, leading to Palestinian civilian casualties at the hands of Hamas.

Israel won the International Court of Justice case as they are not committing genocide. Death is an outcome of war which was started by the terrorist attacks of October 7th. Why are we creating a referendum against Israel who wants this war to end but there is no cooperation nor blame being put on Hamas? The way students on our campus have been acting with disruptive protests and using antisemitic terms is completely unacceptable and should be addressed instead of this. Stop your personal agenda SA.

This broadly seeks to dismantle the Israeli and American military-industrial complex fueling the current IDF campaign. I can certainly see why some see that as the best option for preventing further harm of Palestinian civilians, but we all know this is not a two sided conflict. Hamas is one leg of what scholars now refer to as the Axis of Resistance, otherwise known as the Axis of Terror. With the Islamic Regime of Iran as the financial and military key stone, this axis recruits violent Islamic and jihadist organizations like Hamas, Hezbollah in Lebanon, and the Houthis in Yemen, among other smaller ones scattered around the region. The axis of resistance is what scholars refer to as a revisionist power, seeking to challenge and reverse regional power structures and impose their ideological agenda. This agenda includes oppression of women, erasure of LGBTQ citizens, hatred of Israel and all Jews, and hatred of America and all the people in it. These governments are also notorious for using their own people as pawns for their own personal gain, no matter the cost.

If this resolution comes to fruition, if Israel is disarmed, the rest of the world loses their frontline against pure evil. If this resolution comes to fruition, you open the door for misogynistic, homophobic, chaos seeking people to control the Levant and

everyone in it. If you support that, you are not the freedom fighters you claim to be. Disarming Israel will not free Palestine, it will not rebuild Gaza, it will only empower some of the most fundamentally evil people on earth. Let me be clear: the basic human rights we all enjoy here in America, the right to dress how you want and go where you want and love who you want and be who you want, will no longer exist in the Middle East.

I do not believe that Cornell should divest from its current investments involved in the war.

Cornell is not a political institution and the SA is just playing pretend government

This resolution is deeply disturbing, emotionally taxing, and distressing for me as a Jewish and Israeli student--and I know I am not alone in this feeling. I hope Cornell's administration and the Student Assembly consider the toll that this resolution would cause among their constituents, members of the student body and quickly reject it.

Cornell should invest in whatever company's they want

Israel can invest anyway it sees fit. These are also largely American companies.

Divesting from pro-Israel companies is essentially telling Jews they don't matter. Israel is the only place in the entire world- in the entire history of the world- where Jews can freely and openly practice their religion among peers and not have any fear of being persecuted, ostracized, outcast, or even just being

different. It is the Jewish homeland; every other major religion has a similar place. Why are Jews different? Why are they somehow the oppressors when they are always attacked first? Anyone who supports this referendum is an antisemite and is highly offensive to Jews everywhere. People who support this referendum want the Jewish people to cease to exist. Don't let them fool you into thinking they mean anything else. This referendum itself is an act of antisemitism. Jews have become used to this due to its ongoing presence throughout history, but why do we tolerate it now, in an era of acceptance and woke? Why aren't Jews worthy?

Calling out the only Jewish state on the planet for divestment is hypocritical and anti-Semitic. If we decide that Cornell must divest in Israel, then we must also pass resolutions to equally divest in corporations that have ties to Iran, Syria, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, and other countries that have terrible human rights track records and that treat women and people in the LGBTQ community as second class citizens. We must also equally divest in corporations that have ties to Russia because of their atrocities in the Ukraine War and China because of their repressive dictatorial regime. We must divest from Afghanistan, Equatorial Guinea, Angola, Chad, Cameroon, Venezuela, Nicaragua, Cuba, etc. because they are controlled by dictators or theocratic regimes. Only divesting in Israel is thus extremely hypocritical as Israel is a representative democracy that has freedom of religion, speech, and gender/sexuality expression, freedoms lacking from the majority of the nations named above. Furthermore, divestment from Israel represents a violation of New York law. Singling out Israel is a form of discrimination based on national origin. Also, divestment in Israel would add Cornell to a long tradition of anti-Semitism. Anti-Semitic movements (including Nazism) have used divestment strategies to alienate and demonize Jews for centuries. Finally, and most importantly, divestment would

create an unsafe space for Jews on campus in a period of heightened anti-Semitism.

The companies are merely contractors affiliated with a nation complicit with plausible genocide. Divestment would affect many more countries and customers that are not at all affiliated with the offending nation such as Ukraine.

Cornell University should continue to make smart investments regardless of the ethical or moral implications of those investments. Cornell should be an apolitical organization that aims to bring in as much money as possible to facilitate education.

As with the previous question, I think pursuing this course of action would be overly divisive while not achieving very much at all. These companies don't solely work as suppliers of weapons for the IDF, they much more prominently serve as potential employers for many Cornell students, and they may help support the university with its expansive research which benefits science at large.

Boycotting Jewish businesses is what transpired at the beginning of the Holocaust. Cornell would be unable to invest in any company if the criteria was that the company agreed with everyone's personal political beliefs. Boycotts towards Israeli companies are an inherently antisemitic approach. Responding "pro" to these statements will directly put Cornell's Jewish students in harm's way and also risk the University's tax-exempt status as they will be participating in discrimination.

Cornell University's decision to divest from companies involved in the ongoing conflict in Gaza is a complex issue. On the one

hand, the university's 2016 Guidelines for Divestment establish that divestment should be considered when a company's actions are morally reprehensible, including cases of genocide. However, the university's primary responsibility is to ensure its endowment's financial stability and growth, which supports its educational mission. Due to their significant role in the global economy, divestment from major defense contractors could potentially lead to financial repercussions. Additionally, divesting would not directly impact the conflict or lead to a resolution.

This is not a genocide. Hamas is a TERRORIST Organization, Israel is protecting itself as it is surrounded by countries that hate it (while at the moment it seems like everyone hates it). Israel is a huge asset and source of technology, education, etc. Cornell should not divest.

There companies are just selling products, and they do according to state and federal policies and international relationships. There's no point to divest. The root of the problem is always about change how federal behave.

The reasoning for divestment in the first place is flawed. The ICJ has not made a ruling, and will likely not make a ruling for several years. Israel has no intention of committing genocide, and has an extremely low civilian casualty rate for modern urban warfare. The effects of divesting would be disastrous for Cornell as well. BDS is illegal in NY, and whether or not you want to classify this boycott and divestment as BDS or not, it will be seen as a BDS movement by outsiders. Cornell could lose government funding. Programs, scholarships, research, and other resources would have to be cut in order to take that loss, if the university could survive that loss. Cornell would lose large industry connections that make Cornell desirable in the first

place. And those industry connections put a lot of money into Cornell, which would further exacerbate the financial problems I've already talked about. I also think this would set a bad precedent. I've heard people want to stop all research on technology used by the IDF. This would include radios, fiber optics, defense systems, factory machinery, heavy machines such as tanks and bulldozers, electronic parts, and much more. This research is for the good of humanity.

Israel is NOT committing genocide. It is disgusting that it would be compare to that considering the Jewish people have experienced a REAL genocide during the Holocaust less than a century ago. What is happening in Gaza is not a genocide, it is counterterrorism and they are NOT targeting civilians; Hamas hides behind civilians.

Once again, the idea of the war in Gaza being a plausible genocide is ridiculous. There is nothing genocidal about self-defense, and Israel has no rational reason to genocide the population of the Gaza Strip. Israel continuously defends humanitarian corridors with its own troops, putting their lives in danger to supply aid and safe passage. It has continued to supply almost free food, water, and electricity to the strip. Imagine if the WW2 Allies supplied aid to the Axis powers, or vice versa, even if only to citizens. Israel repeatedly deposits fliers in areas where bombing raids will occur, and uses sounding charges which warn residents of buildings that it will be bombed without causing any structural damage. This is the only way for Israel to defeat Hamas, who wages a guerilla war. Hamas uses civilians as human shields and bargaining chips, as can be seen with the current hostage situation. Providing aid, safety corridors, free medical supplies, and warnings is not genocide, and can not even be reasonably misconstrued as such. Was the bombing of Nazi controlled cities such as Dresden or Hamburg genocide? No, because we understand that

defeating the Nazis was top priority, and a matter of national and ethnic survival for many countries, and indeed the United States. Israel faces a similar situation, and to hinder its war on Hamas, or the companies which support it, is to take an undefendable and despicable moral position. Defense contractors are also crucial to the national defense of this country, and while many are not morally perfect, their products are part of the reason that global order has been maintained on a general scale. Conflicts still arise, but it is these countries that help the United States to advance its geopolitical positions. As citizens of this country, we should support this country's ability to defend itself, lest we lose it, and then members of the assembly that vote for divestment will understand what they were truly voting for.

Cornell should not divest. Each and every one of us on this campus use Israeli innovations in our daily lives. I strongly vote con.

Why would it?

This is not a decision that should be decided or commented on by the Student Assembly.

Firstly, I believe this question is worded in a very leading fashion. To accuse Israel of genocide ignores the fact that they have achieved civilian to combatant death ratios similar to America and its Western allies during the War on Terror. Furthermore, while Israel does make mistakes, unlike most countries, Israel does warn civilians to leave areas it is going to strike quite often. I believe sanctioning and divesting from Israel treats the Jewish state with a double standard that this university has not applied to any other country. When Saudi Arabia launched its War

against the Houthis, there was no similar effort. Likewise there was no effort on campus to divest from Ethiopia during its war in the Tigray region.

My point here is to say that Israel is at war with Hamas, which is the government of Gaza. This means people will die and other tragic events will happen. To hold Israel complicit for all of this suffering ignores Hamas's instigating role in the conflict. If you would like to sanction all wars, be my guest. But to single out Israel (which has conducted its war similar to Western standards) is simple a double standard.

I think allowing the student body to vote on these issue is a good thing. I hope my peers will not be cowed by a vocal minority and support the Jewish state at this moment.

In terms of Divestment, if Cornell wishes to proceed with this boycotting, divesting, and sanctioning Israeli product and technology, I'll help everyone donate their cell phones to impoverished communities, and I'll start printing out maps for every person on the council and for every Cornell student who wishes to stop using Google Maps and Waze to navigate around campus and off campus. There is no genocide, there never has been and there never will be, therefore there is no call for this so called divestment and anyone who says differently should educate themselves and fly over to Israel. This is antisemitism masking as anti-Zionism, and this immense Jewish hatred at Cornell is a very big issue that is being ignored and masked.

This is clearly a targeted attack on the state of Israel. The BDS movement has historically subjected the state of Israel to an extreme double standard with its called to divest from companies that work with Israel. Attempting to capitalize on the war to further BDS's agenda is wrong. By taking stances that are clearly meant to be anti-Israel, we alienate Jewish students and

take firm stances on complex geopolitical issues that should be discussed and analyzed rather than used to just take sides.

BDS is a precursor to antisemitism. If we want a campus free of this type of hate, we must say no unequivocally

Israel's leadership has been clear that this is a war against Hamas, not the Palestinian people. When looking at the casualty data coming out of Gaza, Israel has, on a proportional level, reduced civilian casualties well beyond any other army fighting in an urban terrain. According to Hamas, 32,000 people have been killed in Gaza, of which Israel estimates 13,000 are militants; the ratio of civilians to militants killed is 1.4:1. The UN average of civilian-to-militant deaths in urban warfare is 9:1. According to the data, Israel has done better than any other army at preserving civilian life in the complicated terrain of urban warfare. Far from being a genocide against the Palestinians, Israel's military has tried to reduce civilian harm while going after Hamas.

As described above, this resolution is pointless because there has never been one example of American Universities changing their investment strategies because of anti-Israel campaigns like this. Additionally, this is the second time BDS was brought to the Student Assembly, and it was defeated. BDS campaigns are extremely dangerous because they normalize antisemitism on campus and introduce hatred. The BDS resolution calls for divestment in study abroad programs in Israel and Birthright, which is antisemitic because it prevents Jewish students from studying in their homeland. Over the last six months, Jewish students have felt fear and concern for our safety because of the loud protests that call for the genocide of Israelis and Jews. The campus culture is now toxic, and Jewish students like myself feel fearful to speak up. If this resolution is implemented, the

intolerant and fearful energy on campus will increase. I am very worried about my safety and ability to express myself freely if this resolution is implemented.

Israel's leadership has been clear that this is a war against Hamas, not the Palestinian people. When looking at the casualty data coming out of Gaza, Israel has, on a proportional level, reduced civilian casualties well beyond any other army fighting in an urban terrain. According to Hamas, 32,000 people have been killed in Gaza, of which Israel estimates 13,000 are militants; the ratio of civilians to militants killed is 1.4:1. The UN average of civilian-to-militant deaths in urban warfare is 9:1. According to the data, Israel has done better than any other army at preserving civilian life in the complicated terrain of urban warfare. Far from being a genocide against the Palestinians, Israel's military has tried to reduce civilian harm while going after Hamas.

Cornell cannot just choose Israel to divest from if it is going to take an ethical stance on divestment it needs to do so across the board (ie. including countries like china and Qatar). Also working with Israel provides students with so many opportunities and studying abroad there was a highlight of my time in Cornell.

This statement clearly singles out Israel using exaggerated terms to describe a deadly war. This is not genocide, this is war. The tragedy of any war is the death of innocent civilians. Israel is not deliberately going in and killing innocent civilians, rather, they are fighting against a terrorist organization that does not wear uniforms, which is a war crime. Is Israel doing the best job at preserving innocent life? No. However, they are fighting to return their innocent civilians and defend itself from Hamas killing more innocent Israelis. Hamas deliberately attempted

genocide on October 7, and the IDF is defending themselves to prevent an event like this from happening again. Despite all the tragic deaths, many countries are supporting Israel in their right to defend themselves because they understand that the Jewish population is fragile, and without an Israel, there are no Jews.

Imagine this war from a different perspective. Imagine Israel as a weak, unstable nation, while Hamas rules a strong Palestine with a powerful military. Hamas would have completely dissolved the state of Israel, and the Jewish population would cease to exist. If Hamas had any more power, the debate about genocide would be a lot more clear.

We need to view this war on what it actually is. It is war. It is not genocide. Israel is defending itself against a terrorist group in power in Gaza. Israel is not perfect in preserving innocent lives, but it is made even more challenging when Hamas using civilians as a human shield.

All this statement does is take one side of a controversial and polarizing issue. Campus is already so divided, and this will just make things worse. Do not single out Israel and Jewish students for a debated accusation that I believe are exaggerated and untrue.

On its surface, the legislation targets [details, i.e. defense contractor Lockheed Martin or study abroad programs in Israel] but the campaign is truly intended to normalize extreme hatred of Israel and target Jewish students and organizations on our campus. In more than a decade of anti-Israel student government campaigns, not one single university in the United States has ever altered their investment strategy, ended contracts with Israeli vendors, or canceled academic partnerships with universities in Israel. BDS campaigns are not about shaping university policy, they are about normalizing antisemitism and introducing hate and division on campus. In

2019, President Martha Pollack spoke out against BDS. She did so as BDS unfairly singles out one country in the world for sanction when there are many countries around the world whose governments policies may be viewed as controversial among other reasons. The sponsors of the referendum know that this will not lead to divestment. Yet, almost every week for the last six months the proponents of this resolution have created a toxic environment for Jewish students. By disrupting classes and chanting antisemitic slogans calling for the genocide of Israelis and Jewish people. They have taken away the speech of Jewish students by creating a climate of fear and intolerance on campus. This referendum will not result in peace in between Israel and Gaza: it is a performative gesture with no real impact other than alienating and marginalizing Jewish students on campus. A BDS Referendum further divides our fractured campus community and makes clear that Jews are not welcomed or equally valued as members of the Cornell University. We urge you to protect your Jewish students, reject antisemitism, and vote no.

1. It is a FACT that this referendum will NOT lead to divestment because it is against state law to single out countries in divestment. CML knows this, and President Pollack has made it clear. CML has refused to call up the SAME resolutions with the possibility of not singling out Israel while still calling to divest from weapons manufacturers. They know this is performative.

2. A similar campaign for divesting was already defeated in the Student Assembly 16-4 this year.

3. This is a BDS referendum that demonizes and sets double standards on the one Jewish state.

4. The sponsors of this referendum have created a toxic and dangerous environment for Cornell's Jewish community in disrupting classes, chanting antisemitic slogans, and calling for

genocide of Israelis and Jews while refusing to listen to reasons their rhetoric is harmful. Jewish students feel UNSAFE on campus.

5. A BDS Referendum further divides our fractured campus community and makes clear that Jews are not welcomed or equally valued as members of the Cornell University. We urge you to protect your Jewish students, reject antisemitism, and vote no.

Divesting from american weapons manufacturers doesn't do anything in terms of the war and just hinders Cornell's investments.

In South Africa v. Israel, South Africa's primary evidence of Israel's "genocide" is that Israel's blockade since 2007 has allegedly aimed to stop births in Gaza. This is a poor argument as Gaza's population has nearly DOUBLED since 2007. This indicates Israel is not actively attempting to genocide the Palestinians, as with the blockade clearly not stopping births, If Israel's intent was genocide, Israel would have instituted additional measures. This makes Israel's claims of attempting to stop the flow of weapons into Gaza (a concern given ongoing events) a more plausible explanation for the joint Egyptian-Israeli blockade.

Israel's military actions also are not genocidal, as (prior to the war) Israel has repeatedly warned civilians to evacuate targets prior to Israeli attacks. This is indicative of an Israeli desire to MINIMIZE civilian deaths, whereas genocides aim to MAXIMIZE civilian deaths.

Additionally, the listed corporations have sizable civilian sectors. Boeing is a large producer of space vehicles and commercial aircraft. Leonardo produces the popular AgustaWestland

helicopter for the civilian market. Lockheed Martin and Northrop Grumman both greatly contribute to NASA spaceflight. RTX owns Pratt and Whitney, which makes up 35% of the commercial aircraft engine market. These are just some of the civilian programs included in these corporations, and divestment from these companies includes divestment from these civilian programs.

Lastly, the weapons that these companies produce are used by many nations, not just Israel. War is an unfortunate part of society, but it is a part which we must be prepared for. Whenever war inevitably breaks out, it is critical our brave service members have the best tools available to keep them safe. These tools can only be made possible by the financial and intellectual contributions of the best and brightest, including those at Cornell University.

As such, Cornell should NOT divest from the listed weapons manufacturers.

Divestment is illegal under the state of New York. Passing this referendum only ostracizes Jewish students-it will not accomplish anything more.

Divesting will do absolutely nothing except discourage potential future Jewish students from applying to Cornell, and decreasing necessary resources.

The sponsors of the referendum know that this will not lead to divestment. Yet, almost every week for the last six months the proponents of this resolution have created a toxic environment for Jewish students. By disrupting classes and chanting antisemitic slogans calling for the genocide of Israelis and Jewish people. They have taken away the speech of Jewish students by

creating a climate of fear and intolerance on campus. This referendum will not result in peace in between Israel and Gaza: it is a performative gesture with no real impact other than alienating and marginalizing Jewish students on campus.

Hamas invaded and attacked Israel on October 7th, 2023, on the holiday of Simchat Torah, beginning with an onslaught of rocket fire. They invaded socialist farming communities in southern Israel, called kibbutzim, and raped, murdered, and kidnapped innocent civilians. They burned entire families alive in their homes, raped daughters in front of their parents, beheaded babies, and took over 200 people hostage. While some of the hostages have been rescued by the IDF or released, there are still 134 people being held against their will in Gaza. To call for a ceasefire without calling for their release is antithetical to peace. No country, Israel included, should be expected to abandon its people.

The legislation ostensibly targets specific entities, such as defense contractor Lockheed Martin or study abroad programs in Israel. However, its true aim is to foster a culture of extreme hatred toward Israel and to target Jewish students and organizations on our campus. Despite more than a decade of anti-Israel campaigns within student governments across the United States, not a single university has altered its investment strategy, terminated contracts with Israeli vendors, or canceled academic partnerships with Israeli universities. These BDS campaigns are not about influencing university policies; rather, they seek to normalize anti-Semitism and sow discord on campus.

In 2019, President Martha Pollack spoke out against BDS, highlighting its unfair singling out of one country for sanction when numerous other countries have controversial government policies. This referendum represents a classic BDS tactic,

marking the second time it has appeared on our campus this semester, only to be defeated by a significant 16-4 vote in the Student Assembly.

Instead of engaging in this futile exercise, we should be directing our efforts toward creating a bipartisan committee, as outlined in Resolution 50. The sponsors of the referendum are fully aware that it will not lead to divestment. Yet, their persistence has created a toxic environment for Jewish students, characterized by disruptions, chants of anti-Semitic slogans, and the spread of fear and intolerance on campus.

BDS referendums serve only to normalize anti-Semitism and target Jewish students and organizations. They undermine campus unity and erode the sense of belonging for Jewish students, who have faced escalating threats of anti-Semitism. By rejecting anti-Israel and anti-Semitic initiatives, we can protect the rights and dignity of all members of our campus community.

This statement is rooted in antisemitic blood libel narratives and falsities, creating an environment in which Jewish students feel unsafe on campus.

The underlying agenda of BDS is rooted in normalizing extreme hostility towards Israel and targeting Jewish individuals and groups on campus. Over the years, similar campaigns have emerged across campuses in the United States, yet none have resulted in significant changes to investment strategies or academic partnerships. This current BDS push is the second such attempt this semester, following a previous defeat in the Student Assembly. Rather than engaging in what seems like a symbolic exercise, efforts could be better directed towards constructive initiatives, such as forming a bipartisan committee as outlined in Resolution 50. The sponsors of the referendum seem aware of its unlikely impact on divestment, yet their

persistence has fostered a toxic environment for Jewish students, with disruptions, antisemitic chants, and an atmosphere of fear and intolerance. BDS referendums ultimately fail to promote peace and instead exacerbate divisions on campus, marginalizing Jewish students and fostering an unwelcoming atmosphere. It's imperative to reject antisemitism, protect the well-being of Jewish students, and prioritize genuine efforts towards building a more inclusive and constructive campus community.

Cornell not only should not divest from these companies, but has a positive moral obligation to support all companies that aid in the fight to uproot terrorist organizations and defend the American-led international order.

The push for BDS on Cornell's campus is largely performative and will not result in any positive change in university policy. Instead, what it does it make Jewish students feel unsafe and targeted. BDS as a movement is against the existence of a Jewish state. BDS unfairly targets Israel when there are so many other countries with controversial governmental policies. It is pure antisemitism and should not be welcome on Cornell's campus.

The sponsors of the referendum know that this will not lead to divestment. Yet, almost every week for the last six months the proponents of this resolution have created a toxic environment for Jewish students. By disrupting classes and chanting antisemitic slogans calling for the genocide of Israelis and Jewish people. They have taken away the speech of Jewish students by creating a climate of fear and intolerance on campus. This referendum will not result in peace in between Israel and Gaza: it is a performative gesture with no real impact other than alienating and marginalizing Jewish students on campus.

Weapons manufacturers do not make money by killing as many innocent civilians as possible. On the contrary, weapons manufacturers make the lion's share of their profit with "smart" munitions, which are sold to armies for outrageous sums. Far from minimizing civilian deaths, undermining weapons manufacturers (and presumably forcing armies to use cheaper and simpler munitions) will lead to poorly controlled military operations that lead to needless death.

This statement is coming from the Boycott, Divestment, and Sanction movement (BDS) which unfairly holds Israel to a higher standard than any other country in the world. The goal of BDS is to foster intense hatred towards Israel and single out Jewish students and organizations on our campus. BDS normalizes antisemitism and one of the founders of BDS has said that ""We oppose a Jewish state.

At first glance, this referendum seems to call for divestment from companies for their association to Israel. For one, this should be an issue of free choice: people choose to garner support or a lack of support for companies based on their individual value orientations and preferences. Clearly, as this is even an issue that is being voted on, there are individual differences in perspectives and should thus not be adopted into university policy. Additionally, as discussed when the issue of BDS arose in years past and in a student assembly meeting, BDS is an antisemitic movement that singles out the state of Israel and alienates Jewish students on campus. The likelihood of these companies actually being divested from are slim, and this referendum only aims to send a message to Jewish students that there is no effort to unite Cornell's evidently divided community. Rather than continuing to beat the dead horse of bringing BDS to Cornell, our efforts should be devoted to

creating and fostering unity and conversation in a bi-partisan committee as outlined in Resolution 50.

This referendum calls for a divestment from Israeli companies. The sponsors of this referendum know that this will not lead the university to divest from these companies but will just cause more disruption on campus. This campus has become an intolerable environment for many Jewish students, including myself. This referendum will not have any impacts on the conflict between Israel and Gaza, yet it will continue to cause Jewish students to feel alienated and uncomfortable on Cornell's campus. Divesting from Israeli companies would be an improper step in a larger debate on who is right and who is wrong. As an academic institution we should not be allowing students to disrupt our learning and safety just for the sake of disruption. This disruption would only serve to rile up the student population and compound the safety and security threat that Jewish students are already feeling. If Hamas were to surrender today - in an aggression they started - and release the hostages, no one would be dying from Israeli fire.

After South Africa's proposal of war crimes committed by Israel to the International Court, these claims were proven unfounded. Every other nation has had the right to defend itself. There is no reason anyone should believe that Israel should not defend itself from Hamas, a terrorist organization that vows to kill all Jews unless one is an antisemite who believes Jews do not have a right to live. Additionally, the IDF has done nothing but avoid civilian casualty in Gaza in fact, after the Hamas-run Gaza Health Ministry over reported their estimated deaths, they recently reported that deaths thus far have been 22,000 meaning that with 12,000 combatants killed, there is a LESS than 1:1 ratio of civilians killed to terrorists. Compared to a 9:1 ratio of civilians killed vs. combatants in most modern warfare, the IDF's attempts to protect Palestinian

people has been nothing but clear. This is anything but a genocide. If anyone supporting this referendum wanted to fight genocide, why don't they fight against the genocide of the Darfuri peoples in Sudan, who are being massacred by the RSF and SAF? It is because they are antisemitic, and do not believe in Israel's or Jews' right to safety. In fact, by divesting from Israeli companies, we are only showing hatred to the Jews who run and work for Israeli companies, not the Israeli government. Please support our Jewish students, their right to safety in the US and in Israel, and their right to livelihood among students who don't wish for their demise.

In 2019, President Martha Pollack spoke against BDS. She explained that BDS unfairly singles out one country in the world for sanction when there are many countries around the world whose governments policies may be viewed as controversial among other reasons. The SA has never discussed the situation in Ukraine, the Uyghur Muslim genocide, or any other political situation where Cornell may have vague, distant, and not germane connections to. Yet, when Israel is criticized it is somehow normalized and justified. The International Court of Justice ruled that Israel is in fact not committing a genocide in Gaza, and that Israel should continue to do what it can to prevent a genocide from happening. Therefore, if the highest-ranking judicial body has ruled that it is not a genocide, then claiming that a genocide is happening is disingenuous and is not an accurate depiction of the situation on the ground.

Not only are the Military enterprises of America are a massive sector of and employer in the America economy, but they are integral to Scientific innovation and the protection of our people. As many of have realized, global tensions with our primary adversaries are increasing: Russia-Ukraine, Israel-Hamas/Iran, and China-Taiwan. In all cases, allies or close friends of the United States are being threatened, likely

preluding a potential conflict involving us. It's no question, our military is the strongest to ever exist on the planet, but our adversaries are constantly trying to subvert this advantage with innovations of their own. As such, the US should not cede and should continually innovate through its corporations. This is not a point of winning a war but preventing it. If our enemies know how capable we are of destroying them, they will think thrice about continued pursuits on our interests. These are essential companies to protecting our American way of life. If Cornell, with its large pension, chooses to continue the precedent of Universities selling off shares of these companies, the US military industry will loose on its valuation and ability to raise the same level of capital necessary to maintain its edge. For the sake of America's and your own safety, vote NO.

Is it morally wrong to be more successful than any army in modern warfare at preserving civilian life? Nevermind, I meant to ask if it's morally wrong to rape, torture, and murder. It's obvious which of these is morally reprehensible, as stated in the language of Cornell's 2016 Guidelines for Divestment. According to Hamas, 32,000 people have been killed in Gaza, of which Israel estimates 13,000 are militants; the ratio of civilians to militants killed is 1.4:1. The UN average of civilian-to-militant deaths in urban warfare is 9:1. This shows that Israel has done better than any other army at preserving civilian life in urban warfare.

The 2016 Guidelines for Divestment state that the board will consider divestment only when A company's actions or inactions are morally reprehensible. The statistics show that Israel's war has not been morally wrong, as it has not achieved such a low civilian death ratio without giving excessive warnings to civilians prior to attacks on Hamas.

The board will consider divestment only when The divestiture will likely have a meaningful impact toward correcting the specified harm and will not result in disproportionate offsetting

societal consequences. In more than a decade of anti-Israel student government campaigns, not one single university in the United States has ever altered their investment strategy, ended contracts with Israeli vendors, or canceled academic partnerships with universities in Israel. So no, this divestiture likely won't even pass, and if it does America will support its efforts to obtain new arms to combat Hamas.

The board will consider divestment only when The company contributes to harm so grave that it would be inconsistent with the goals and principles of the university. I am yet to hear an argument proving this and I'd be happy to listen to those attempting to prove those companies guilty.

This is a question of whether or not to support the BDS movement. This movement is an attempt to mask antisemitism through the targeting of the only Jewish state in the world. The International Court of Justice has ruled that Israel is NOT committing genocide in Gaza and has urged Israel to prevent one through the delivery of aid and protection of civilians. These are both things that Israel has done and continues to do, despite the fact that they are still under attack by Hamas. Israel has built new crossings into Gaza and has sent aid into Gaza through crossings used by the very terrorists that stormed Israel on October 7th and slaughtered babies and pregnant mothers. Israel also does everything within their power to limit the civilian casualties from the war that Hamas started. Israel uses phone calls, leaflets, and other methods to alert people in areas before they are targeted, allowing civilians to escape. These are tactics that are used by no other military in the world. According to the United Nations, the average civilian-to-militant ratio in warfare is 14:1. In this war, the ratio is close to 1.4:1. Military historians and experts have repeatedly said that Israel's war against Hamas is the most moral and humane war ever fought in an urban environment. This question does not target Hamas, a terrorist group, but Israel, which is attempting to free its hostages and destroy a terrorist group. Now, ask yourself why.

It is because Israel is a Jewish state, the only Jewish state. There has been no referendum called to condemn Russia, Belarus, Myanmar, Ethiopia or Syria. Only Israel. This is a simply antisemitic resolution, looking to punish Israel, the ONLY Jewish state, for carefully defending its citizens from terrorism. It targets Jews and Jews alone. Saying yes to this will do nothing for the civilians in Gaza, but it will unfairly target the Jewish population on this campus and aid the BDS movement, whose goal is the destruction of Israel through terrorism.

The International Court of Justice (ICJ) rejected demands for a ceasefire, called for the unconditional and immediate release of hostages (which Hamas has not obliged with), and urged Israel to take several provisional measures to prevent genocide. Genocide, as defined by the 1948 Genocide Convention, requires an intent to destroy, in whole or in part, a group of people, alongside the physical actions of killing individuals in that group. This intentionality requirement cannot be satisfied by Israel's actions in their war with Hamas. Israel did not start this war, as it began on October 7th with the brutal Hamas terrorist attack on Israel. Israel is fighting only in response in order to free the innocent hostages taken on that fateful day and protect Israeli civilians from future terrorist attacks. Additionally, innocent Gazan civilians are not being targeted by Israel. In order to avoid killing civilians, Israel has made over 79,000 phone calls, sent over 13.7 million text messages, dropped over 7.2 million leaflets, and made over 15 million recorded calls to Palestinians in Gaza with evacuation warnings, far beyond the requirements of international law. Any and all casualties are the result of Hamas decisions to hide amongst innocent Gazan civilians by wearing civilian clothes instead of uniforms and building bases inside or underneath civilian buildings such as schools and hospitals. Thus, we cannot conclude that Israel's actions are a coordinated and planned destruction of the Palestinian people. The fact that there are civilian casualties does not by itself prove that the civilians are military targets, it simply exemplifies the

horrible brutality but harsh reality of a war. Instead of publicly stating that they have no responsibility to protect their civilians, as was stated by Hamas regarding Gazan civilians, Israel has instead made it their duty to protect all Israeli civilians and bring the hostages home by continuing to fight this war started by Hamas.

Trying to pass a BDS resolution on this campus is only causing harm to Jewish students. The last time a BDS resolution came up, it was overwhelmingly shut down by the student assembly. Since October 7th, the same students who brought up this resolution have marched around campus calling for Intifadas and the eradication of the state of Israel. Moreover, they spend their time posting disgusting antisemitic rhetoric on social media sites like Sidechat, where their identity remains anonymous. These students make me and my Jewish peers feel extremely unsafe. This is to the point where I don't even wear my yarmulke in public for fear of the hate I may receive. Passing a BDS resolution will only further this hate.