# Table of Contents

Table of Contents

- Executive Summary .......................................................... 2
- Introduction .................................................................. 2
- Why is it important to stay away from these organizations? .... 3
- If they’re so bad, why do they reach out? ......................... 4
- Criteria By Which to Assess Whether an Organization Should Be Worked With ......................................................... 6
- Examples of Organizations ............................................... 8
- Note ........................................................................... 11
- Sources ....................................................................... 12
Executive Summary

This memo is intended to provide the American-Muslim community with a set of criteria by which to determine whether or not to work with various Jewish organizations, to determine whether or not these organizations have Zionist and Islamophobic history, to provide the rationale for which it is necessary to avoid working with these organizations, and to provide a list of prominent organizations in both the good and bad categories—both to inform the community that they should stay away from these organizations and to use them as a benchmark.

Introduction

The American-Muslim community has long organized around shared opposition to the Israeli occupation of Palestinian land. For many, Palestine has been a cornerstone of any political advocacy and a central tenet in the demands made to politicians seeking the support of the Muslim community. Despite this general consensus, the Muslim community’s commitment to Palestine has been increasingly undermined by the collaboration—sometimes knowingly and sometimes unknowingly—of Muslim and Muslim-led organizations with Zionist organizations.

This collaboration occurs at the organizational and community levels as well as at the individual level. These are not isolated incidents, but rather they are part of a trend of “creeping normalcy” previously documented by AMP.1 Within this pattern, interfaith and inter-community initiatives are used as a “trojan horse.” Rather than building understanding between various faith-based communities, Zionist organizations use these partnerships as a vehicle to further their agenda with regards to Israel and its occupation of the Palestinian people.

This report endeavors to outline the reasons that the American Muslim community must avoid falling into this trap. It then goes on to provide a criteria and strategy by which Muslim leaders are able to identify which organizations are suitable partners and which ones to avoid, regardless of whether they are included by name here in the report. If the Muslim community hopes to truly wield political power and effectively advocate for Palestinian rights, it must be able to present a united front on this issue.

Why is it important to stay away from these organizations?

There are several reasons why it is important for Muslim organizations to avoid working with Zionist organizations that directly and indirectly provide support to the occupation. While these organizations often cloak themselves as simply Jewish organizations or representing Judaism, one of their underlying purposes and one of the primary purposes of their engagement with the Muslim community is to further the political cause of Israel and the occupation. These groups make up what IfNotNow terms the “American Jewish Establishment.”

While collaboration with Muslim communities sometimes happens at the national level and between national organizations, the majority of these interactions occur at a local level and are led by groups such as the Jewish Community Relations Councils (JCRC) and Jewish Federations. As a result, it is imperative that we prepare our local Muslim leaders - including those who lead masjids and those running Muslim groups outside of the masjid - to deal with these issues as they will be the ones facing them head on and making decisions that impact their communities.

When Muslims cooperate with these organizations our engagement with them as a community provides them with legitimacy. It is a well-documented fact that the Israeli government and particularly the Israeli Ministry of Foreign Affairs operates through “front groups” who work to whitewash Israeli crimes and human rights abuses. When Muslim organizations engage with these groups, even with the intention of interfaith dialogue, they participate in what has been termed faithwashing; using religion to whitewash Israeli crimes and dilute the severity of the occupation.

Refusing to partner with organizations whose political beliefs are considered by the community to be beyond the pale is something that these organizations themselves do. For example, Hillel refuses to partner with any individual or group that supports BDS. It is imperative that as a community we have standards of partnership of our own and refuse to work with those groups that legitimize the occupation.

Finally, if the Muslim community is to truly stand with the Palestinians, it must follow the policies of the BDS- Boycott, Divest, and Sanction- movement. This global, peaceful solidarity movement sponsored led by 170 Palestinian civil society institutions calls for institutional economic divestment from Israeli companies and the boycotting of their consumer goods, a cultural boycott, and an academic boycott of Israeli institutions that normalize or whitewash the crimes of the occupation. In short, the focus of BDS is not just on Israeli businesses and products, but also organizations lending their support to the project of occupation. The principles of BDS clearly call for a withdrawal of support from institutions engaged in the violation of Palestinian human rights. This must necessarily include Jewish Zionist organizations who lend material, financial, and political support to the occupation.

---

Unfortunately, some Muslims feel that expanding their relationships with Zionists is a door to access positions of importance and gain broader acceptance. In order to do so they leverage Palestine, making concessions on the cause’s principles and ignoring activists. One salient example of this is the Muslim Leaders Initiative (MLI) sponsored by the Shalom Hartman Institute, an Israel-based Zionist educational organization. MLI organized trips to Israel for Muslim leaders, and their collaboration with a Zionist organization was not only a clear violation of the principals of BDS, but also legitimized the activities of that organization and sowed division in the Muslim community. Shalom Hartman itself used the MLI program as an example of the success of its anti-BDS efforts.\(^6\)

Despite what efforts such as MLI may claim, these activities only serve to prolong the political empowerment of the Muslim community. It occupies Muslim political aspirations and subverts them to Israel’s policy and program in the US. At best it leads to division within the community, preventing Muslims from focusing their efforts on concentrated organizing and advocacy, and at worst it leads to a normalization of the crimes of the occupation. A former participant in MLI described the program as being “divisive and harmful” for American Muslims. In explaining why she left the initiative, she remarked that project such as MLI “embodies values that privilege state-centered narratives of power and structurally exclude the voices of those who are most harmed by these narratives” and that MLI “excludes the voices of Palestinians (save the most carefully curated ones) and tokenizes communities of color and feminist and activist communities in Israel.”\(^7\)

While it may be true that some of the participants will achieve their own individual political aspirations, it is no longer the community carrying them forward. They have instead struck an ecumenical deal with Zionism based on acceptance and recognition of the Zionist political project, in defiance of the shared principles of the Muslim community. Our modern political moment has several examples of prominent Muslim public figures who rose to political prominence with the backing of the community not just despite their support for Palestine but in large part because of it. Two salient examples of this are Ilhan Omar and Rashida Tlaib, both of whom have risen to national political importance while advocating for Palestinians.

If they’re so bad, why do they reach out?

The above then begs the obvious question: if these organizations are so sinister, why is it that they reach out to the Muslim community in the first place? There are a few reasons for their continued attempt at collaboration- all of which involve using the Muslim community to further their own political agendas.

One of the core reasons that Zionist organizations continue to engage the Muslim community is that it provides these organizations with cover for their bigotry. When accused of Islamophobia for example, they can point to previous work with the Muslim community as evidence against those claims. When the Islamophobic tweets of Rutgers Hillel director Andrew Getraet were leaked, he pointed to what he termed as past “positive Jewish-Muslim coexistence initiatives” held by Rutgers’ Hillel under his leadership.\(^8\)

---


doing so both he and Hillel were able to escape accountability, and he remained at the University until stepping down of his own accord in the summer of 2021.

In addition to providing themselves with cover, Zionist organizations use these opportunities to infiltrate the Muslim community. Doing so serves several purposes. Firstly, it allows them to pursue a policy of “containment through other means.” By having to engage with these organizations, the Muslim community’s time and resources are deployed away from more serious efforts and from the real issues, in turn preventing the community from achieving its real priorities. Additionally, by generating a conversation around topics such as Israel’s right to exist or terrorism, they’re generating a conversation that was otherwise not present and infusing the community with an agenda item that was not there in the first place- further dividing and redistributing precious resources and muddling the narrative.

Additionally, infiltration of the Muslim community gives bad actors the opportunity to work towards defusing American Muslim commitment to Palestine. A report by the Israeli think tank, Reut Institute, specifically calls for dividing communities and creating a “political firewall” around pro-Palestinian advocacy. One way these organizations can succeed in dividing the community is through the propagation of the common Islamophobic “moderate Muslim” fallacy- tying “moderate Muslims” not only to a lack of outward religiosity but also to a lack of Palestinian advocacy and anti-Zionism. An effort is then made to label those who espouse these beliefs as being extremists and radicals, a paralyzing claim in a hyper-securitized war-on-terror world. These claims are further perpetuated by tying Palestinian resistance efforts to claims of terrorism.

These efforts are especially pronounced at the university level where campus groups target young activists, placing them on blacklists, and take advantage of the myriad Muslim organizations to run a “divide and conquer” strategy. They face significant pushback from a well-organized and well-resourced Zionist opposition, which accuses them of anti-Semitism and uses tools such as “canary mission” to name and shame them into silence. Working with these groups, who are already targeting Muslim youth, and allowing them into our community spaces, only serves to increase the risk of harm.

This being said, sometimes Muslim leaders and especially masajid find themselves in a “gray area” in which local religious establishments, such as synagogues, with unclear political ideologies approach the community and it is deemed counterproductive or even bad for community relations to reject such overtures. In cases such as these, interfaith should solely be focused on amicable relationships for the community without reference to Israel or Zionism. Rather engagement should be based on communal issues of common concern. The community must also ensure that no restrictions are placed on it with regards to who from among the Muslim community can be involved. If a synagogue is clearly pushing a pro-Israel or Zionist agenda, the community can turn to alternative establishments. JVP has compiled a list of “JVP-friendly” congregations across the country that the Muslim community can turn to.

---

Criteria By Which to Assess Whether an Organization Should Be Worked With

Thankfully, there are several ways by which we can identify organizations that fall into the above category and so should be avoided.

**Criteria 1:** The first is to ensure that the organization in question does not have a history of Islamophobic comments. This can include public support for structural Islamophobia such as CVE policies, the Patriot Act, and other forms of state sanctioned Islamophobia. This can also include Islamophobic efforts on a local level such as objections to Muslim community efforts including procuring zoning approval for masajid. Support for such policies is evidence of support for structural Islamophobia and while some organizations may try to mask it behind policies against hate speech, support for structural Islamophobia undermines any effort at symbolic shows of support. Furthermore, it serves to undermine the social and political empowerment of the Muslim community. Any symbolic support in these cases becomes tangential to the larger systemic issues.

Islamophobia can also include attacks on Muslim leaders. Even if members of the organization in question appear to be friendly on an individual level, if they’re vitriolic against Muslim public figures, especially pro-Palestinian ones, this is proof that they cannot be true allies.

**Criteria 2:** In addition to specifically Islamophobic comments, a history of anti-Palestinian rhetoric is also a telling sign. This may include things such as a defense of the various bombing campaigns waged against Gaza, peddling the narrative that Israeli actions are justified and that they have a “right to defend themselves”, public support for settlements, and public support for anti-BDS legislation. It can also manifest itself in inter-community relations such as “Standards of Partnership” that disallow pro-Palestinian speakers for engaging in partnerships.

Fortunately, much of the relevant information on the activities of these organizations is publicly available. Many of these groups host pages hosting their positions on their websites and advertisements for the various events and activities that they put on themselves or are involved in. Before partnering with an organization, it is important to check to see if they publicly promote Israel in their mission statements or if their websites contain advertisements for normalization efforts such as sending delegations to Israel. Other easily available public information will include issued statements in opposition to Muslim priorities such as mosque permits and educational programs (examples of the structural Islamophobia listed above). Is the rhetoric they use in their statements charged with propaganda and conflation of Palestinians and Palestinian resistance efforts with terrorism?

**Criteria 3:** Funding is also another effective litmus test by which to determine an organization’s political and ideological loyalties. What type of resources do they fund? This applies not only to the resources and programs they fund here in America but also the ones that they support overseas. Investigations into the funding sources of Islamophobic groups both in the United States and abroad have found that they also serve as some of the principal funders of right-wing militant groups and settlements in Israel. For example, pro-Israeli think tank, the Middle East Forum, funded Dutch Islamophobe Gareth Wilder’s legal

---

defense. Additionally it’s important to assess who they receive funding from. Are they sponsored by individuals or groups who have direct ties to the Israeli occupation or well-known Zionist organizations? This is a key question, not only for Palestine advocacy but for the overall political and social wellbeing of American Muslims, as previous investigations have discovered significant overlap between funders of Islamophobic organizations and of Zionist organizations.

Criteria 4: Similarly, it is important to assess the makeup of their executive leadership and the membership of their board. Much of this funding information and information about the board and top staff members can be found in tax filings—particularly an organization’s 990 forms. An investigation of these documents from the early 2010s found that in just a 4-year period 501(c)(3) organizations gave $220 million in funding to settlements and other right-wing Zionist organizations.

Criteria 5: Finally, what kinds of organizations do they work with? Hosting other Islamophobic organizations such as the Hindutva or the American Hindu Foundation is evidence of a tolerance for and promotion of such hateful rhetoric. Similarly, what types of material do they promote and what kind of individuals do they give a platform to? Are they inviting Islamophobic speakers to their events and promoting Islamophobic and anti-Palestine literature? Do they bring members of the IOF to give speeches?

---


Examples of Organizations

In order to further elucidate the points made above, the following is a set of examples of organizations who fit into both the “good” and “bad” categories. It’s important to note here that this is not an exhaustive list nor is it static - organizational positions can change but it is meant as an example that can be referenced to see how the criteria outlined above can be applied.

**Organizations that According to the Criteria are Safe to Work With**

**Jewish Voice for Peace (JVP)**

Jewish Voice for Peace (JVP) is a national Jewish organization working to counter Israel’s narrative that it is representative of Jewish people. In their mission statement, JVP explicitly states that it opposes anti-Muslim and anti-Arab bigotry, while also calling for an end to the Israeli occupation. Their positions page endorses both the right of return and BDS, to key areas in Palestinian advocacy. On their website they also explicitly state that they oppose Zionism, calling it counter to the ideals of equality and freedom for all people.15

**IfNotNow**

IfNotNow is an American Jewish organization which seeks to “shift the American Jewish public and our political leaders” and explicitly calls for an end to the Israeli occupation. They have run campaigns to limit US military funding to Israel and to use funding as a tool to end the occupation. They have also run campaigns drawing an explicit connection between Zionism and apartheid.16

**International Jewish Anti-Zionist Network**

The International Jewish Anti-Zionist Network (IJAN) describes themselves as an “international network of Jews who are uncompromisingly committed to struggles for human survival and emancipation, of which the liberation of the Palestinian people and land is an indispensable part.”17 They explicitly support the right of return on their website and commit to following the lead of Palestinian and Palestinian-led organizations. The organization has chapters in several countries around the world, including a US chapter with members across the country.

**Independent Local Organizations**

In addition to the larger national and international organizations listed above, there are a plethora of smaller local Jewish organizations that meet these criteria. For example, in an effort to create a Jewish university space outside of Hillel, undergraduate students at Harvard University formed the Harvard Jewish Coalition for Peace, an anti-Zionist student organization which aims to express solidarity with

---

17 http://www.ijan.org/who-we-are/
Palestinians and supports the BDS movement. The Boston Workers Circle—a multigenerational Jewish Community Center—explicitly calls for the end of the occupation, states that the “Israeli occupation of the West Bank and the systematic violation of Palestinian right” dishonors Jewish ideals, and opposes legal sanctions on BDS. By applying the criteria outlined in this memo, community leaders can find similar organizations to collaborate with in cities and localities across the country.

**Organizations that should be avoided based on the criteria**

**Anti-Defamation League (ADL)**

The ADL professes itself to be a civil rights organization fighting against bigotry and hate speech, but instead uses this position to further its Zionist agenda and to undermine the rights of marginalized groups in the United States. While claiming to be focused on civil rights they have opposed the building of mosques in New York and attempted to discredit the Movement for Black Lives. The ADL has been involved in and perpetuated the defamation of pro-Palestine groups including SJP and AMP, labeling them as antisemitic and tying Palestinian advocacy generally to anti-Semitism. It has taken anti-Palestinian positions such as being explicitly anti-BDS — going as far as putting out talking points against the BDS movement — and has sponsored free trips to Israel for non-Jews as part of an effort to further the process of normalization. The ADL has also been directly involved in the surveillance of Muslim and Arab-American communities, and was fined and directed by a federal judge to cease “illegal spying against Arab-American and other civil rights groups.”

**American Jewish Committee (AJC)**

The American Jewish Committee is a Jewish advocacy organization that explicitly advocates for Israel as one of its top priorities. They actively support the occupation not just through political advocacy but also by bringing delegations of leaders from around the world on normalization trips to Israel. They have been at the forefront of spearheading anti-BDS legislation and have actively supported Islamophobic policies such as the Patriot Act. Additionally, they have elevated the platforms of Islamophobes such as Ayan Hirsi Ali, to whom they gave their annual courage award.

**Jewish Federations of North America**

The Jewish Federations of North America operate as an umbrella organization for federations across the country. These federations have donated money to Israeli organizations supporting the occupation and allow donors to funnel money through donor-advised funds to right-wing organizations that are funding settlements. At the same time, they bar their members from donating to organizations deemed to be pro-

---

20 Open letter to progressives: The ADL is not an ally. Drop the ADL. https://drotheadl.org
21 https://electronicintifada.net/content/how-israel-lobby-court-us-latinos/13207
23 BDS. American Jewish Committee. https://www.ajc.org/issues/bds
Palestine and that have expressed support for the Palestinian people and their rights. At a national level, they explicitly pledge to “keep Israel strong” and highlight the fact that they have facilitated at least 255,000 Jews move to Israel in the last decade.24

**Jewish Community Relations Councils (JCRC)**

Jewish Community Relations Councils are either part of local Jewish Federations or are independent agencies affiliated with the Federation. JCRCs are run at a local level but are linked organizationally and connected through the Jewish Council for Public Affairs, which is vehemently pro-Israel. JCRCs are often used to “combat the delegitimization of Israel.”25 A number of JCRCs have supported Islamophobic campaigns and participated in structural Islamophobia. For example, in New York City, the local JCRC publicly defended the NYPD’s spying and infiltration of Muslim communities.26 Meanwhile in Boston, the JCRC has banned its members from working with any “self-identified Jewish organization that declares itself to be anti-Zionist,” on the grounds that such a stance “is not compatible with and is in conflict with JCRC’s mission.”27

**Hillel International**

Hillel is the largest Jewish campus organization in the world. The organization’s guidelines explicitly state that it is “committed to the support of Israel” and that it actively seeks to have every Jewish student “build an enduring relationship with Israel.”28 To this end, Hillel explicitly advocates for Israel and sets up Israel trips. While taking this pro-Israel stance, they refuse to allow the Palestinian perspective to be heard, denying participation in their events to anyone who supports the BDS movement or actively advocates for an end to the Occupation.

Additionally, Hillel’s Leadership has made explicitly Islamophobic remarks as represented above. The Hillel U University Center is the David Project rebranded under another name- which under no basis attacked Palestinian professors such as Joseph Massad. In addition, the David Project was an outspoken opponent of the construction of the Roxbury masjid by the Islamic Society of Boston, going so far as to sue the Boston Redevelopment Authority in court.

---

25 https://ejewishphilanthropy.com/four-reasons-jewish-federations-should-bolster-their-jcrs/
Note

The American Muslims for Palestine is an education and advocacy organization that organizes and mobilizes for the Palestinian cause. In step with other movement partners and organizations from all backgrounds, we have been able to reach many communities and inspire them to advocate for Palestine and respect its cause in the work they do. Our opponents are trying to divide us from within and portray Palestine as a "controversial" issue within our community - when it’s far from it. While our opponents try to divide us from within, it is our obligation to stand for Palestinian human rights as advocates for freedom and justice.

If you would like any additional resources or guidance, please reach out to info@ampalestine.org. We are here to help you navigate this sensitive terrain, and differentiate between legitimate interfaith and intersectional work, and infiltration and creeping normalcy with the oppressor or its apologists.
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