

**Advisory Committee on Corporate Responsibility in Investment Policy (ACCRIP)
Minutes on the Meeting of February 20th, 2013**

Present:

Christopher Bull (Chair)
Naoko Shibusawa
David Muller
Anne Sharpe*
Sandra Seibel*
Ian Trupin
Daniel Moraff
Sean Dinces
Julie Vaner
James Dunn
Stanley Griffith
Karyn Sosinski*

Absent:

Vazira Zamindar
Gary Padula*

*Non-voting Staff to the Committee

Agenda:

1. Approval of Minutes from the Feb. 6, 2013 Meeting

Minutes from the ACCRIP meeting on Feb. 6th, 2013 were unanimously approved.

2. 9:00 – Presentation J Street U and Brown Students for Israel, Q & A

–Brown Students for Israel (BSI) Representatives:

Zach Ingber (President)
David Gordon
Judah Schvimer
Ross Lerner

–J Street U Representatives:

Harpo Jaeger (President)

Representatives from the Brown Student's for Israel (BSI) and J Street U presented to the Committee on why they are against recommending divestment from companies listed as implicit in human rights abuses in the Palestinian Territories. Specifically, both groups viewed divestment as detrimental to the success of a two-state solution. They also agreed that the Boycott, Divestment and Sanctions Movement ignored the U.S. Government's unique relationship with Israel. Although, in contrast to BSI's stance, J Street U recognizes Israel's presence in the Palestinian Territories as an occupation.

3. 9:45 – Presentation by Student's for Justice in Palestine Representatives, Q & A

Representatives from the Brown Student's for Justice in Palestine (BSJP) reiterated their stance that Israel is engaged in systemic human rights abuses in the Palestinian Territories. Certain U.S.-based multi-national corporations, BSJP claimed, are directly implicated in egregious social harms through conducting business with the Israeli state. The criteria for the list of twelve companies compiled by the BSJP are based on citations from international law as well as recommendations previously made by other divestment campaigns. BSJP representatives asserted that their call to divest does not endorse the one or two-state solution but, rather, endorses the right of Palestinians to self-determination. Underscoring the BSJP's proposal is their belief that university divestment is predominantly a symbolic act which can have practical impacts on influencing companies to disengage from unethical business relationships.

–Students for Justice in Palestine Representatives:

- Ayane Ezaki
- Reem Abdel-Haq
- Eduarda Araujo
- Maria Guglielmo

Representatives from the Brown Students for Justice in Palestine (BSJP) reiterated their stance that Israel, as an exclusive ethno-religious state, is involved in systemic gross human rights abuses in the Palestinian territories and that certain U.S.-based multi-national corporations are directly implicated in the conflict. The criteria for the list of twelve companies targeted by the BSJP were based on citations from international law as well as recommendations previously made by other divestment campaigns. The BSJP call to divest does not, its representatives claimed, endorse the one or two-state solution but is, instead, focused on defending the rights of Palestinians to live with dignity and justice. Underscoring the BSJP's proposal is the belief that university divestment is a largely symbolic act can have a practical impact on influencing companies to change potential harmful practices.

The Next ACCRIP Meeting is scheduled to take place on March 6th, 2013

- BSI Presentation Script:

Good morning. Faculty, staff, alumni, members of ACCRIP, students, and community members, thank you for this opportunity to present in front of you all today. My name is Zachary Ingber, and I currently serve on the executive board of Brown RISD Hillel and I am the President of Brown Students for Israel. Brown Students for Israel is an educational group on campus that seeks promote healthy discourse that acknowledges Israel's right to exist as a Jewish state, the right of both Israelis and Palestinians to self-determination, as well as further Brown's understanding of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict and the Middle East as a whole.

You will later hear from my peer Harpo Jaeger, Director of J Street U Brown. While our groups both fall under the umbrella of Brown RISD Hillel, we have expressly different missions and purposes. That being said, the spirit of free discussion and discourse that permeates Brown's campus emanating from Brown's mission statement itself, has allowed us to collaborate on a presentation that will fundamentally argue that **this committee should not recommend to the corporation any kind of divestment from companies that operate in Israel.**

Harpo and I, as well as members of our respected groups, created this presentation together not only to prove that dialogue on campus exists – surely you know that – but also to demonstrate the broad coalition of campus thinkers that oppose divestment measures. Brown Students for Israel and J Street U Brown, while both avowedly Zionist groups, are extremely different and I encourage anyone interested to come have a conversation with Harpo and myself.

I'd like to start this morning by reading a line from the United Nations charter, the organization that represents the core values of international community, human rights, and coexistence:

(Article 1, Section 2)

“To develop friendly relations among nations based on respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples”

The right to self-determination for all peoples is a fundamental principle that the world has accepted whole-heartedly. And in the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, the only way for both the Israelis and Palestinians to recognize this fundamental right is in a two-state solution. This is nothing new. Two states for two peoples dates back to the original partition plan put forth by the United Nations in 1947. Every single American administration has endorsed this basic platform, every single summit at Camp David has worked off of this premise, and the international community as a whole has accepted it as well. We fundamentally believe that both the Israelis and Palestinians deserve to fulfill their right to self-determination.

That being said, **the Boycott Divestment Sanctions movement, also known as BDS, which the divestment being considered falls squarely into, actively undermines the possibility of a two-state solution.**

Some will say that divestment does not run counter to the idea of a two-state solution, that it simply aims to end human rights abuses. But don't let those specious claims go unchecked. A core claim of the BDS movement is **“Respecting, protecting and promoting the rights of Palestinian refugees to return to their homes and properties as stipulated in UN Resolution 194.”** Also known as the “Right of Return” this would undoubtedly end Israel's character as a Jewish state and thus deny the Jewish people the right to self-determination. In fact, the Right of Return and Jewish self-determination in Israel are mutually exclusive. It is dishonest to argue that you favor the right of return as well as two states for two peoples. I encourage you all to read Mira Sucharov's piece for the Daily Beast, entitled “Why BDS Isn't Compatible with Two States.”

By endorsing divestment and BDS, Brown would be ignoring decades of international precedent for how this conflict needs to be resolved in a way that respects both the Israeli and Palestinian right to self determination.

Divestment from the companies in question does not further the two-state solution, improve the conditions of the Israelis and Palestinians affected by the conflict, and most importantly, does not reinforce the idea of self-determination/two-states for two peoples.

I want to take a moment to dispel any myths and misunderstandings surrounding the dubious connection between Apartheid-era South Africa and the current situation in Israel and the Palestinian territories. While I could go on for hours, as other scholars have, about the extreme political differences between the two governments, I would like to discuss desired outcomes. In South Africa, there was never a yearning for two-states. International efforts attempted to forge a South Africa where one man had one vote regardless of race. In the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, the desired outcome for the mainstream international community is in fact TWO states for TWO peoples. While South Africa was filled with South Africans who deserved equal political status, the land between the Mediterranean Sea and the Jordan River is filled with two disparate peoples that deserve two states living next to each other harmoniously. Any attempt to compare the two situations is intellectually fallacious and slanderous.

There are many reasons to oppose this divestment measure, from practical to moral to financial. I would like to demonstrate to the committee the breadth of campus leaders who would oppose a recommendation to the corporation to divest.

These 24 names, compiled in just a few short days, represent leaders in student government, campus publications, cultural arts, political groups, spiritual life, Greek life and more. They have all considered the idea of divestment, and have rendered it to be counterproductive.

I'd like to end my brief presentation by quoting an editorial published by the Brown Daily Herald editorial board entitled, "Israel Divestment is Hypocritical" (November 27, 2012)

"Investment in companies that do business with Israel should be debated in a forum that incorporates those supporting both sides of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. The act of divestment should be the result of further reflection, and the single-minded focus on this particular conflict is intensely hypocritical and should be reconsidered."

This concept echoes liberal writers such as Thomas Friedman, who consistently argues in the NY Times that divestment from Israel is an improper action to address the Israel-Palestinian conflict.

Divestment, as a means of political action, is not inherently a bad tactic. However, the world and we at Brown know that the two-state solution is the way forward. It would be a grave error for ACCRIP to recommend to the corporation to ignore the two-state solution as the means for progress and a lasting peace.

We in Brown Students for Israel stand for human rights. We stand for self-determination. And we stand for improving the conditions of both Palestinians and Israelis. However, divestment does not advance any one of these causes because it both levies the burden of this conflict solely on one side and inhibits the possibility of a two-state solution.

It is with great sincerity that I recommend to ACCRIP not to endorse divestment or the BDS movement, and to keep the hope for a two-state solution alive and in the minds of the Brown community. Thank you.

-
- J Street U Presentation Script:

Good morning. My name is Harpo Jaeger – I’m proud to be the Director of J Street U Brown, a chapter of a national student movement that organizes the American Jewish Community towards a two-state solution to the conflict in Israel-Palestine.

I’d like to echo what Zach has mentioned (although with the disclaimer that Brown Students for Israel and J Street U Brown have many areas of disagreement – I would caution everyone here not to assume that everything I say reflects BSI’s beliefs, and vice versa – please feel free to ask either of us for clarification), and before I add a few points of my own, I want to tell you about why I’m involved in this struggle. I’ve dedicated much of my time at Brown to organizing Jews and others to end the conflict in Israel-Palestine, and I plan to spend much of my professional life on this work as well.

I believe deeply that the work J Street U does advances the causes of human rights, dignity and self-determination for Palestinians and Israelis. It is because of that understanding that I’m so passionate about this organization and the work we do. I try to challenge myself to keep my eye on how everything I do with J Street U makes tangible steps towards the better world we envision. Sometimes that’s hard – anyone who’s been involved in a political campaign can certainly attest to how easy it is to get caught up in the minutiae and lose sight of the big picture. But if a time comes when I can no longer connect the actions I run on campus and take part in nationally to the broader goals of peace and security for all Israelis and Palestinians, I’ll be the first to admit it and the first to change my tactics. I do what I do because I believe it’s right and because I believe it’s effective. I’m proud of the impact that this chapter and the national movement have had.

Similarly, I want to recognize the important work done by SJP and the BDS movement more broadly. Although we disagree strongly on how to end the conflict in Israel-Palestine, I want to make sure the disagreements I’m going to raise are not interpreted as condescension towards SJP for caring about the issues and having the courage to advocate for their beliefs. Of course, I have a preferred outcome to this Committee’s discussion that is different from SJP’s, but I’m not here to chastise them. As a democratic movement of Brown students (much like J Street U), I have a great deal of respect for them and their work.

There are two areas of concrete disagreement that I’d like to highlight. One is the importance of American political leadership in ending the conflict, and the other is the negative effect that a divestment recommendation from ACCRIP would have on the campus conversation around this issue.

For a long time, the US has been the spiritual and cultural center of diaspora Judaism. Given some of the inherent questions of Jewish peoplehood and national identity that are at stake here, it seems clear that the US Jewish community is immensely powerful in shaping US political conversations around Israel. This is why I believe J Street U’s work is so important – and it’s also why I don’t support BDS. As I see it, any tactic aiming to end the conflict that doesn’t attempt to harness the power of the Jewish community in support of ending the occupation is also doomed to fail. I work in Jewish community organizing because I see no other effective way to solve this problem. So far, we’ve seen some pretty ugly reactions to BDS from within the Jewish community. I have profound ideological differences with those who would seek to exclude BDS advocates from the discourse, but I also recognize that such people have a great deal of political power, whether I like it or not. BDS causes them to go into a defensive crouch, mobilizing the Jewish community against an end to the conflict. My work is to turn that dynamic on its head – make the political power of the Jewish community work for the two-state solution, not against it. BDS does not emerge from a thorough understanding

of the apportionment and dynamics of political power on this issue. This is why I believe the movement to be ineffective at best.

Because of the political power of the Jewish community, the way we talk about the conflict internally has an amplified effect on US policy. And historical precedent shows that progress in the peace process has come through active American leadership. Examples of this include the Camp David Accords, which laid the foundation for negotiations between Israel and surrounding Arab countries for decades to come, as well as the Oslo Accords, which set the precedent of face-to-face talks between Israel and the Palestinian Authority, the governmental body of the occupied Palestinian territories. In both of these instances, American leadership was crucial to get the two parties to sit down together and actually work out concrete solutions to their problems, rather than issuing the vague platitudes of “missed opportunities” and “illegitimacy” that they usually resort to. We see a similar dynamic today – a lack of strong American leadership has led to the peace process becoming completely deprioritized in Israel.

History shows that American leadership is vital to making concrete and practical advances in the peace process. In that the BDS movement specifically eschews the political system as a viable way of making progress on this issue, it does not account for the important progress that has come from that system in the past, and it obviates any such future gains. Furthermore, the world looks to the US for cues on how to approach this issue. For example, it is the US that can reliably be counted upon to veto any resolution in the UN Security Council that is even the slightest bit critical of Israel. Without going into how deeply problematic this dynamic is, I do think it’s fair to say that the US commands an immense amount of power in shaping world understandings of possible paths to a resolution of the conflict.

So the world looks to the US for its political cues on this issue. The US looks to the Jewish community. And the Jewish community looks to its youngest members. Our institutions and thought leaders are obsessed with what Jews my age think about everything – and Israel looms large in that question. Birthright brings uncountable numbers of young Jews to Israel – half of all Jews who have been eligible for a Birthright trip during the thirteen years of its existence have gone on one. That’s a level of market penetration you’d be hard pressed to find anywhere else. It’s clear that the Jewish community is quite deeply invested in what young Jews think about Israel. That’s why I’ve devoted my efforts to organizing young Jews at Brown and across the country to end the occupation through a two-state solution – because I see no other way to achieve the goals of peace, self-determination and human rights for Palestinians and Israelis.

I mentioned earlier that I believe a divestment recommendation from ACCRIP would have a negative effect on the campus conversation. I’m well aware of the potential for normalization in any campus dialogue about an issue where there exists a structural power imbalance. I try to bring that awareness to the events and actions that J Street U Brown runs. If only on a practical level, I see that the dialogue on campus has been a source of energy for many of us who are involved in this issue. There are four groups on campus that deal with the conflict, three of whom are represented here today. J Street U Brown and Brown Students for Israel chose to make this presentation together not because we agree on everything, but precisely because we don’t. We oppose a divestment recommendation for different reasons and from different analytical perspectives. This diversity of perspectives on not only the causes of but the ideal resolution to the conflict is a major strength of our campus. A divestment recommendation would seek to paint this issue in black-and-white terms that clearly do not represent the range of informed views on campus.

To be sure, there are many moral issues on which there is no consensus. For example, Brown pursues a race based affirmative action policy despite disagreement on campus over whether race based affirmative action is just. I would not advocate that Brown abandon this policy until the student body reaches a conclusion. I'm not here to try to muddy the waters of what seems like a clear moral issue with obtuse technical details and privileged complaints about "the dialogue." I'm here to argue that BDS as a tactic undermines more than sixty years of international precedent, works completely counter to what we know to be the best available method for improving an incredibly complicated and dire situation, and is founded in a mistaken understanding of both the campus dialogue and the allocation of power in the system it seeks to change. It is for these reasons that I, as an activist and organizer committed to equal rights and the dismantling of oppressive structures at home and abroad, oppose BDS and ask this Committee not to endorse it. Thank you.

- SJP Presentation Script:

We would like to express our gratitude to ACCRIP for allowing us to present here once again. As some of you may know, we have been in conversation with ACCRIP for several years. We first presented our divestment campaign in the Spring of 2011 and again in the Fall of the same year. As a result of this dialogue, ACCRIP sent an open letter to the President, acknowledging first of all the human rights violations inflicted upon Palestinians in the occupied territories, and second asking for consideration of further action we could take as a community.

As a result of this letter, members of our group met with President Paxson last November and with Professor Bull in December. We are excited to continue this path towards ending Brown's support for companies that profit from and facilitate human rights violations in the Occupied Palestinian Territories.

For those of you who haven't met us, Brown Students for Justice in Palestine is one of the most active student organizations on campus. We are predominantly made up of undergraduate students, although graduate students and alumni are also represented. Our active members today include men and women of various ages, religions and ethnicities, and this diversity contributes immensely to the work our group does on campus.

- Brown Students for Justice in Palestine

In the three years since we started our campaign, we have collected close to a 1,000 signatures from members of the Brown Community supporting our petition for selective divestment from the companies we will talk to you about this morning.

Much has taken place since ACCRIP first issued the letter to the President. Shortly after its release, nearly 300 Brown alumni signed a letter of support for ACCRIP's recognition of the systemic human rights violations in Palestine, and asked that the University "consistently apply Brown's socially responsible investment principles to companies that use their products to serve the ongoing occupation and violence against Palestinians".

This past November, days after ACCRIP publicly acknowledged Israel's human rights violations, a widely condemned assault on the Gaza strip killed 183 Palestinians

in the span of 8 days. We gathered Brown students and members of the Providence community to call attention to the deteriorating situation of Palestinians in Gaza in a march followed by a rally in our campus. On that day we collected more than 80 individual statements supporting ACCRIP's letter and demanding divestment. All these letters and signatures were delivered to President Paxson in December of last year.

In light of all these events, we request ACCRIP to recommend divestment from 12 companies that have knowingly facilitated and profited from the military occupation of Gaza, the West Bank and East Jerusalem. Divesting from these companies means divesting from the human rights violations they help perpetuate.

Before we go into the specifics of our divestment proposal, we would like to emphasize that our campaign does not demand Brown University to divest from the State of Israel or from Israeli companies. Our campaign does not target any particular state or state actor, but rather urges targeted divestment from corporations that are profiting from and facilitating violations of human rights.

Our campaign targets twelve companies for divestment. These companies fulfill one or more of the five criteria for divestment that we established through the framework of international law. These criteria directly relate to the way the practices of these companies facilitate and inflict major social harm in the Occupied Palestinian Territories.

We, Brown Students for Justice in Palestine, call on Brown University to divest from companies that:

1. Provide products or services that contribute to the maintenance of the Israeli military occupation of Gaza, the West Bank and East Jerusalem
2. Provide products or services that contribute to the maintenance and expansion of Israeli settlements in the Occupied Palestinian Territories
3. Establish facilities or operations in Israeli settlements in the Occupied Palestinian Territories
4. Provide products or services that contribute to the maintenance and construction of the Separation Wall
5. Provide products or services that contribute to violent acts against Palestinian and Israeli civilians.

Criterion 1 targets companies that provide products or services that contribute to the maintenance of the illegal Israeli military occupation of Gaza, the West Bank and East Jerusalem. This divestment criterion is grounded in realities of the Israeli military occupation, which constitute widespread systematic violations of basic human rights and international law.

First we have the situation in Gaza. The Gaza strip is in permanent state of siege from land, air and sea. This means Israel controls the inflow and outflow of food, electricity, water, fuel, import/export goods and humanitarian aid, as well as other resources.

This has had devastating consequences on the health, education and human rights of the Palestinians in Gaza, and constitutes a form of collective punishment - explicitly prohibited by article 33 of the Fourth Geneva Convention and article 50 of the Hague Regulations.

In the West Bank, Palestinian towns, cities and villages also face the imposition of collective punishment in the form of extended curfews, closures, military raids and more, either following an alleged act of violence, or for no reason at all. Finally, there is

a dual legal system in the territories. Palestinians who live in the West bank are controlled by the Israeli *military* law; Israeli settlers are governed by Israeli *civil* laws. Palestinians face severe restrictions on movement enforced by a sweeping system of fixed checkpoints, surprise flying checkpoints, physical obstructions, settler-only roads, and the Separation Wall. Israeli settlers move freely throughout the land they illegally occupy.

ALL 12 of the targeted companies you see listed on the screen contribute to the maintenance of the Israeli military occupation of Gaza, the West Bank, and East Jerusalem, and thereby fulfill our first criterion for divestment.

Our second and third criteria for divestment together address the issue of settlements. Criterion number 2 targets companies that contribute to the maintenance and expansion of Israeli settlements in the Occupied Palestinian Territories, while criterion number 3 targets companies that establish facilities or operations in settlements.

Article 49 of the Fourth Geneva Convention clearly states, "The occupying power shall not deport or transfer parts of its own civilian population into territories it occupies." Over the years, Israel has consistently built illegal settlements in Palestinian territories. At the end of 2011, there were 124 Israeli settlements in the West Bank, not including East Jerusalem. Last month, the number of settlers stood at 360,000.

In order to create these settlements, hundreds of thousands of dunams of land populated by Palestinians have been expropriated, and Palestinian homes have been - and continue to be - systematically demolished in flagrant violation of article 53 of the Fourth Geneva Convention, which prohibits this sort of destruction of property. Furthermore, there are 232 kilometers of settler-only roads in the West Bank, and vehicles pertaining to Palestinians are distinguished from Israeli-owned cars by differently-colored license plates.

On February 7th of this month, the UN Human Rights Council sent a fact finding mission to investigate the effects of illegal settlement building. It found that "despite all the pertinent United Nations resolutions declaring that the existence of the settlements is illegal and calling for their cessation, the planning and growth of the settlements continues both of existing as well as new structures." Settlements involve a multiplicity of violations of human rights and international law, including dispossession, displacement, violations of the right to self-determination, equality and non-discrimination.

Two of our targeted companies, Caterpillar and Motorola, facilitate the maintenance and expansion of settlements, thereby fulfilling our second criterion for divestment.

The fourth criterion targets companies that contribute to the maintenance and construction of the Separation Wall.

In June 2002, the government of Israel decided to erect a physical barrier to separate Israel and the West Bank. Eighty-five percent of the route of the Wall runs through the West Bank and not along the Green Line, annexing 9.5% of the West Bank and 60 settlements to Israel Proper.

On July 9, 2004, the International Court of Justice ruled that the construction of the Wall is a breach of international law on three main grounds:

First, the Wall violates the Palestinian right to self-determination because its route leads to the de-facto annexation of Palestinian territory.

Second, the Wall violates international humanitarian law because of its assistance to illegal settlements and because of injury to private property owners who live near the route of the Wall or are trapped between the Wall and the Green Line.

Finally, the Wall violates international human rights law not only because of restrictions on movement but also because of what these restrictions mean for rights to basic standards of living, health, education, and work. The Wall divides families from one another, children from their schools, farmers from their agricultural lands, workers from their jobs, and people from access to health services. It sneaks around water wells, confiscating valuable underground water aquifers that are used to irrigate lawns and fill swimming pools of illegal settlements while many Palestinians do not have water for basic drinking needs, let alone for bathing or farming.

The International Court of Justice stated that Israel must cease construction of the barrier, dismantle the parts of the barrier that were built inside the West Bank, revoke the orders issued relating to its construction, and compensate Palestinians who suffered losses as a result of the barrier. To date, none of these demands have been met, as construction of the illegal Wall continues.

Three of our four companies, Motorola, Terex, and Caterpillar, contribute to the maintenance and construction of the Separation Wall, thereby fulfilling our fourth criterion for divestment.

Violence against civilians has been well documented. For example, according to the Israeli human rights organization B'Tselem, between 2000 and 2007, the Israeli army killed 4,332 Palestinians in the occupied territories, including 865 children. In addition, starting December 27, 2008, Operation Cast Lead, also known as the Gaza massacre, lasted 22 days and killed some 1,400 Palestinians. Amnesty International highlighted Israel's egregious violations of international humanitarian law during this operation, concluding that "much of the destruction was wanton and resulted from direct attacks on civilian objects as well as indiscriminate attacks... Such attacks violated fundamental provisions of international humanitarian law, notably the principle of distinction, the prohibition on indiscriminate or disproportionate attacks, and the prohibition on collective punishment."

Alliant Tech Systems, Boeing, Caterpillar, General Dynamics, General Electric, ITT Corporation, Lockheed Martin, Northrop Grumman, Raytheon, Terex and United Technologies have contributed - and in fact still do - to the systematic perpetration of violent acts by the Israeli state towards Palestinian civilians.

The specific ways in which these 12 companies have contributed to the five activities listed above are explained in detail in the document that we have provided. However, we wanted to briefly go over the actions of 3 companies here and demonstrate how they relate to our criteria.

Caterpillar

- Caterpillar is responsible for knowingly selling equipment for war crimes and military use against civilian populations, despite calls to cease sales by Amnesty International, Human Rights Watch, and other human rights organizations.
- It also supplies bulldozers and earth-moving equipment to the Israeli military. The IDF uses them to destroy Palestinian homes, orchards and olive groves in the Occupied Territories oftentimes in order to clear Palestinian land for illegal Israeli settlements.

- In 2004, Amnesty International urged Caterpillar to take action in response to the documented use of its bulldozers in the occupied territories, noting that “thousands of families have had their homes and possessions destroyed under the blades of the Israeli army’s US-made Caterpillar bulldozers.”
- The American Presbyterian Church previously tried to communicate with Caterpillar before calling to divest its assets from the company. However, the committee which attempted to contact Caterpillar noted that “despite significant support for the shareholder resolution calling for a review of its human rights policy, Caterpillar has become even more intransigent. It has cut off all communication with the religious shareholders. Caterpillar continues to accept no responsibility for the end use of their products.”
- **Caterpillar satisfies criteria 1, 2, 4 and 5.**

Motorola

- Motorola is heavily involved in providing surveillance systems to Israeli settlements that guarantee not only their maintenance, but also their ability to attack the Palestinians whose land is being illegally occupied. • Motorola is also heavily involved in providing services to Israeli settlements. It provides illegal settlements with virtual fences and radar detector systems.
- **Motorola satisfies divestment criteria 1, 2, 3, and 4.**

Lockheed Martin

- Lockheed Martin, is the single biggest overseas supplier for the Israeli armaments industry. It has received billions of dollars for supplying missile bombers, f-35 joint strike fighter jets, the Hellfire missile system for Apache attack helicopters, and the Merkava MK4, Israel’s main battle tank. These tanks, missiles and fighter planes were used in Israel’s 2008-09 assaults on Gaza, during which more than 1400 Palestinians and 13 Israelis (including 10 soldiers) were killed. As of 2010, Lockheed Martin began selling F-35 Joint Strike Fighter Jets to the Israeli military.
- **Lockheed Martin fulfills divestment criteria 1 and 5.**

You can read further about the 9 other companies in the document that we have provided you. To recap, we are requesting divestment from these companies because they have continued to profit and facilitate human rights violations and violations of international law in the Occupied Palestinian Territories.

In conclusion, our campaign is just one among hundreds of other similar campaigns both in the United States and around the world that are speaking out against financial complicity in the systematic violations of human rights. If ACCRIP recommends Brown Students for Justice in Palestine divestment, Brown will join a growing group of universities and other civil society groups who have advocated for responsible investment policies in corporations that do not inflict social harm.

These actions are from 2012 alone:

- The Undergraduate Student Government at the University of Massachusetts Boston unanimously passed a bill demanding that the university's investment

fund divest from Boeing and other companies profiting from human rights violations.

- The Associated Students of UC Irvine voted unanimously to call for divestment from companies that profit from the Israeli occupation.
- Arizona State University Undergraduate Student Government unanimously passed a bill supporting on-campus divestment from and blacklisting of corporations that are complicit in human rights abuses in the occupied Palestinian Territories
- The International Quaker Friends Fiduciary Corporation announced that it will divest from Caterpillar. This amounted to \$900,000 worth of Caterpillar shares.
- Pension fund giant TIAA-CREF removed Caterpillar from its Social Choice Funds portfolio. It previously had almost \$73 million dollars worth of shares in Caterpillar Inc.

As ACCRIP noted in its letter to President Paxson, "Israel is indisputably engaged in ongoing systemic abuses of human rights and violations of international law, as documented by the United Nations Human Rights Council and the International Court of Justice."

We believe that continuing to invest in such companies is a direct and explicit contradiction of our university's values. Once again, we as Brown Students for Justice in Palestine ask that Brown refuse to play a role in the systematic oppression of a people, as other universities and civil society organizations the world over have already done.