



INFO REPORT ON H.R.2446 - STOP ANTISEMITISM ON COLLEGE CAMPUSES ACT OF 2025

The SPRING Group

Summer 2025

Prepared for:

Authors:

Varun Mukund, SPRING

Goni Wong, SPRING

Karina Yue, SPRING

Correspondence:

varun@thespringgroup.org

1. Antisemitism In The United States

1.1 Antisemitism In The United States Prior to October 7th

Antisemitism is a form of hate characterized by various conspiracy theories. “Antisemitism—much like conspiracy theories in general—tends to increase at moments of social or political anxiety, as people look for a source to blame for society’s ills.”¹ As such, it has evolved to match society’s ills as America has evolved as a society. Prior to the Civil Rights Era, various examples of antisemitism towards Jews manifested throughout American society, including redlining, university quotas, hate crimes, employment discrimination, and American Nazism. Organized antisemitism has hailed mainly from a white nationalist background. During the Civil Rights Era, antisemitism, along with other forms of discrimination, became less socially acceptable, ushering in a new era of extremist and conspiracy-based antisemitism. This has manifested in the algorithmic amplification and societal normalization of traditional antisemitic tropes by new neo-Nazi groups such as QAnon.²

1.2 Antisemitism In The United States Post October 7th

Between October 7, 2023, and January 7, 2024, the ADL recorded 3,291 antisemitic incidents—a 361% increase compared to the same three-month period the previous year. These unprecedented figures put 2023 on pace to become the worst year for antisemitic acts since the ADL began tracking such data in the late 1970s.³ However, 2024 surpassed even that, with the ADL documenting 9,354 antisemitic incidents across the United States—a 5% rise from the 8,873 incidents recorded in 2023, a 344% increase over five years, and an 893% increase over the past decade. For the first time in the history of the ADL’s annual audit, a majority (58%) of incidents involved references to Israel or Zionism. Many of these occurred in connection with anti-Israel protests: of the more than 5,000 such demonstrations tracked by the ADL in 2024, 2,596 featured antisemitic messaging, including signs, chants, or speeches.⁴ This trend of the blurring of the line between critiques of Israeli policy, anti-Zionism, and antisemitism reflects the impact of geopolitics on domestic antisemitism. Even in progressive or activist circles, rhetoric that connects Jews with conspiracy theories raised around Israel, erases Jewish indigeneity, or vilifies Zionism as inherently evil has created environments where Jews—particularly those who identify as Zionist—are marginalized or even targeted. While white supremacist groups still played a role,

¹ [JPA, 2024](#)

² [PLOS, 2025](#)

³ [ADL, 2025](#)

⁴ [ADL, 2025](#)

distributing antisemitic propaganda in 962 incidents (a 17% decrease from 2023), the bulk of the rise in antisemitism was tied to broader public sentiment and activism in response to geopolitical events.⁵ The rest was made up of harassment, vandalism, and assault with each category seeing notable increases. Harassment remained the most common, with thousands of Jews targeted in schools, public spaces, online, and in the workplace. Acts of vandalism, including the defacement of synagogues and Jewish-owned businesses with antisemitic symbols and slogans, surged in frequency and visibility. Physical assaults also increased, with several high-profile attacks drawing national attention. Together, these trends reflect the evolving nature of antisemitism, fueled not only by traditional sources of antisemitism but increasingly by politically charged environments that frame antisemitism as activism.⁶

1.3 Antisemitism On College Campuses

While antisemitism grew broadly in 2024, incidents on college and university campuses rose more steeply than those in any other location. In 2024, ADL recorded 1,694 antisemitic incidents on college campuses, which is 84% higher than in 2023. Campus incidents comprised 18% of all incidents, a larger proportion than in any previous audit.⁷ While that is an alarming statistic in itself, Hillel International—the premier Jewish on-campus organization that supports Jewish life at hundreds of colleges across the United States and abroad—recorded that since the terrorist attack on Israel by Hamas on October 7, 2023, antisemitic incidents against Jewish students on college campuses have reached alarmingly high rates, increasing by 700% from 2022 to 2023.⁸ These incidents span physical harassment, verbal slurs, vandalism of Hillel centers and dorms, social exclusion, and online hate. A joint ADL–Hillel survey found that 73% of Jewish college students experienced or witnessed antisemitism during the 2023–24 academic year, and reported feeling unsafe in Jewish spaces or public events due to their identity.⁹ To confound the issue, there is a lack of education against antisemitism, specifically in the context of DEI programming. While DEI programs address racism, Islamophobia, and anti-Blackness, antisemitism is often excluded from curricula or misunderstood, rendering students unable to identify it as readily as other forms of prejudice.

⁵ [ADL, 2025](#)

⁶ [ADL, 2025](#)

⁷ [ADL, 2025](#)

⁸ [Hillel, 2025](#)

⁹ [BerkleyBeacon, 2024](#)

2. Civil Rights On College Campuses

2.1 History Of Civil Rights On College Campuses

Universities have long been sites of debate over civil rights guarantees for broader social movements and balancing them with protection for marginalized groups. The Civil Rights Act of 1964, specifically Title VI, outlines the bedrock for anti-discriminatory movements across U.S. universities, prohibiting discrimination or harassment based on race, color, or national origin in any program or activity receiving federal funding.¹⁰ While the act does not specifically pertain to religion, the U.S. Department of Education's Office for Civil Rights (OCR) has interpreted instances of discrimination against Jewish students as potentially covered under national origin discrimination when the attacks intersect with ethnic or ancestral origins.¹¹ Another foundational statute is the Higher Education Act of 1965, which governs the distribution of federal funding to colleges and universities and establishes accountability requirements to ensure nondiscrimination in educational programs receiving federal assistance.¹² In the context of H.R. 2446, the HEA provides the legal basis for conditioning federal aid on institutional efforts to prevent and respond to antisemitism on campuses, reinforcing civil rights protections and promoting safer learning environments for Jewish students amid rising antisemitic incidents. These statutes, which require universities to intervene when speech creates a hostile environment or targets individuals based on protected characteristics, have played out on many stages throughout American history. During the Vietnam War era, students' right to protest was upheld in *Tinker v. Des Moines* (1969), affirming free expression unless it caused substantial disruption. However, in the civil rights and affirmative action eras, universities also enacted speech codes and anti-discrimination policies to protect marginalized groups, sometimes clashing with First Amendment advocates.¹³ In the 1990s and 2000s, legal challenges to campus speech codes highlighted the tension—such as *Doe v. University of Michigan* (1989)—where courts ruled overly broad policies unconstitutional.¹⁴

2.2 Contemporary Civil Rights On College Campuses Regarding Antisemitism

On campuses across the U.S., tension persists in debates over antisemitic and anti-Zionist rhetoric, with universities and government institutions navigating the difficult balance between freedom of speech and the protection of Jewish students. In 2023 and

¹⁰ [DOJ. 2025](#)

¹¹ [OCR. 2010](#)

¹² [DOE. 2025](#)

¹³ [Oyez. 2025](#)

¹⁴ [Justia. 2025](#)

2024, the OCR reaffirmed on multiple occasions that targeting Jewish students based on their shared ancestry and national origins qualifies as a violation of Title VI.¹⁵ Furthermore, the OCR initiated dozens of Title VI investigations into prominent universities and administrators to determine whether they demonstrated “deliberate indifference” to hostile environments—a standard derived from civil rights precedent that requires schools to take meaningful action to prevent and address discriminatory conduct.¹⁶ Federal investigations also took the form of various congressional hearings on antisemitism, led by committees ranging from the House Education and Workforce Committee to the House Judiciary Subcommittee. Multiple testimonies from university leaders, including Harvard’s Claudine Gay, UPenn’s Liz Magill, and MIT’s Sally Kornbluth, prompted resignations, the introduction of federal legislation, and heightened university accountability.¹⁷ Some institutions responded by forming antisemitism task forces, issuing statements condemning hate, or partnering with groups like Hillel or ADL to offer bias training. Some universities updated their harassment and discrimination policies to address antisemitism explicitly, often incorporating the International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance working definition of antisemitism (IHRA Definition). Others, like UC Berkeley and Princeton, resisted adopting it fully due to concerns about potential conflicts with free speech, particularly surrounding criticism of Israel.¹⁸ Most recently, the Trump administration undertook the first large-scale attempt to enforce civil rights law by leveraging federal funding, including freezing billions of dollars in grants to prestigious universities. This included a move to freeze \$2.2 billion in federal grant funding to Harvard after investigators found that the university had at times “acted as a willful participant in anti-Semitic harassment of Jewish students, faculty, and staff.”¹⁹ Reactions have varied from university to university: Columbia, which saw approximately \$400 million in federal grants revoked for similar reasons, made sweeping changes to regain support, including banning masks at protests, bolstering police authority, restructuring Middle Eastern studies, and revamping its judicial and disciplinary procedures.²⁰ By contrast, universities such as Harvard released additional antisemitism bias reports, explored opportunities to enhance viewpoint diversity, and joined legal efforts claiming that the federal actions “exceeded the government’s statutory limits.”

¹⁵ [White House, 2023](#)

¹⁶ [DOE, 2025](#)

¹⁷ [AccessLex, 2025](#)

¹⁸ [A.J.C., 2025](#)

¹⁹ [Trump administration freezes \\$2.2 billion in grants to Harvard](#)

²⁰ [Al Jazeera, 2025](#)

3. Defining Antisemitism

3.1 Historic Definitions of Antisemitism

Charles Asher Small, director of ISGAP, classifies antisemitism into three distinct phases. The religious phase was rooted in the Christian belief that Jewish people were responsible for delaying Christ's return and for undermining Christian society more broadly. The racial phase involved the classification of Jews as an inferior racial group, regardless of religious affiliation, ultimately culminating in the Holocaust. The current phase, referred to as the peoplehood phase, demonizes and dehumanizes the State of Israel, often by falsely portraying Jews and Israelis as non-indigenous white colonial expansionists.²¹

3.2 IHRA Definition of Antisemitism

The IHRA working definition of antisemitism is seen by many as a more comprehensive and expansive definition, intended to align our understanding of antisemitism with its evolving nature. Internationally, over 40 countries have adopted the IHRA definition, including Canada, the UK, and Germany.²² Domestically, the U.S. State Department has used the IHRA as an official framework since 2010, the OCR has acknowledged its usefulness in investigations, and over 35 U.S. states have either adopted or endorsed the definition through legislative or executive action.^{23,24} The definition itself reads: "Antisemitism is a certain perception of Jews, which may be expressed as hatred toward Jews. Rhetorical and physical manifestations of antisemitism are directed toward Jewish or non-Jewish individuals and/or their property, toward Jewish community institutions and religious facilities... Manifestations might include the targeting of the State of Israel, conceived as a Jewish collectivity. However, criticism of Israel similar to that leveled against any other country cannot be regarded as antisemitic. Antisemitism frequently charges Jews with conspiring to harm humanity, and it is often used to blame Jews for 'why things go wrong.'"²⁵ Along with this definition, IHRA provides a wide-ranging list of examples of what contemporary antisemitism might look like. These include: "Holding Jews collectively responsible for the actions of the State of Israel," "Drawing comparisons of contemporary Israeli policy to that of the Nazis," "Denying the Jewish people their right to self-determination, e.g., by claiming that the existence of the State of Israel is a racist endeavour," "Using symbols and images associated with classical antisemitism to characterize Israel or Israelis," and "Applying double standards

²¹ [DHHRM, 2025](#)

²² [IHRA, 2025](#)

²³ [Department of State, 2010](#)

²⁴ [AJC, 2025](#)

²⁵ [IHRA, 2025](#)

by requiring of it a behavior not expected or demanded of any other democratic nation,” among others.²⁶ While the IHRA definition is explicitly described as a non-legally binding working definition, critics argue that it is too vague to serve as a standard for civil rights enforcement and may limit legitimate criticisms of Israeli government policy.

4. Similar Legislation

4.1 H.R. 3773 - Stop Anti-Semitism on College Campuses Act (118th Congress 2023-2024)

Sponsored by Rep. Mike Lawler (R-NY), H.R. 3773 sought to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 by prohibiting any institution that “authorizes, facilitates, provides funding for, or otherwise supports an event promoting antisemitism on campus” from participating in Title IV student aid programs.²⁷ The bill references the IHRA working definition of antisemitism but, unlike H.R. 2446, does not direct the Department of Education to adopt it as a guiding framework for Title VI investigations.²⁸ Instead, the definition remains embedded in the bill’s language without enforcement criteria. Its broad enforcement provisions and limited interpretive guidance raised significant free speech concerns. Despite bipartisan sponsorship, these issues led to resistance from academic and civil liberties groups, and the bill ultimately stalled in committee.

4.2 Antisemitism Awareness Act of 2024 (S.4127 / H.R. 6090)

Introduced in the Senate by Senators Tim Scott (R-SC) and Jacky Rosen (D-NV) (and in the House by Rep. Mike Lawler among others), this bill “provides statutory authority for the requirement that the Department of Education’s Office for Civil Rights take into consideration the International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance’s working definition of antisemitism when reviewing or investigating complaints of discrimination in federally funded programs”.²⁹ The House passed it decisively (320–91) in May 2024. Critics, including the ACLU, hundreds of university faculty, and some Jewish Democrats, warned it could chill legitimate criticism of Israel, citing IHRA examples that could curtail political discourse.³⁰ The act remains in the Senate, awaiting final passage.

²⁶ [IHRA, 2025](#)

²⁷ [Congress, 2023](#)

²⁸ [Congress, 2023](#)

²⁹ [Congress, 2024](#)

³⁰ [POLITIFACTS, 2024](#)

4.3 S. 1182 - Stop Antisemitism on College Campuses Act (119th Congress, 2025)

S. 1182, introduced in the Senate on March 27, 2025, by Sen. Tim Scott (R-SC) and co-sponsored by Senators Moreno, Lankford, Blackburn, Britt, Daines, and Rick Scott, is the Senate companion to H.R. 2446, mirroring in language.³¹ S. 1182 was read twice and referred to the HELP Committee, and is positioned to move through the Senate in coordination with H.R. 2446.³²

5. H.R. 2446 Specifics

5.1 History

The Stop Antisemitism on College Campuses Act (H.R. 2446) was introduced in the 119th Congress on March 27, 2025, by Rep. Mike Lawler (R-NY-17), alongside 18 bipartisan cosponsors, comprising 16 Republicans and 2 Democrats.³³ On the same day, a Senate companion bill (S. 1182) was introduced by Sen. Tim Scott (R-SC) and referred to the Senate HELP Committee.³⁴ It was referred to the House Committee on Education and Workforce the same day of introduction, signaling the start of legislative debate.

5.2 Key Features

H.R. 2446 seeks to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 by conditioning federal Title IV student aid eligibility on colleges' and universities' efforts to prevent and respond to antisemitism on their campuses. The bill directs the Department of Education to use the IHRA working definition of antisemitism as a guiding framework when investigating allegations of discrimination under Title VI.³⁵ Unlike H.R. 6090, which mandates that the Office for Civil Rights (OCR) adopt the IHRA definition as binding policy, H.R. 2446 offers greater flexibility by using the definition as guidance rather than codifying it into law.³⁶ Additionally, while H.R. 6090 focused primarily on OCR enforcement practices, H.R. 2446 ties institutional compliance with antisemitism prevention to the receipt of Title IV funds, with structured oversight from the DOE. In effect, it blends the funding-conditional approach of the failed H.R. 3773 with the OCR guidance provisions of H.R. 6090. Crucially, however, it avoids some of the broad and inflexible enforcement

³¹ [Congress, 2025](#)

³² [Congress, 2025](#)

³³ [Congress, 2025](#)

³⁴ [Congress, 2025](#)

³⁵ [Congress, 2025](#)

³⁶ [Congress, 2023](#)

mechanisms that raised free speech concerns in H.R. 3773, allowing for more discretion by the DOE and OCR in implementation.

5.3 Objections

The main criticism of the legislation falls under the rationale of civil rights and free speech. Even without codification, opponents argue that referencing IHRA officially still empowers its influence in shaping investigations and university policy, falling under the same rationale which saw H.R. 6090 stall in committee. Organizations such as the AAUP (American Association of University Professors) argue that adopting IHRA risks labeling legitimate activism, such as support for BDS (Boycott, Divestment, Sanctions), as antisemitic, even when it is nonviolent and politically motivated.³⁷ Additionally, the mere use of IHRA as a “guiding framework” for enforcement under Title VI may leave too much discretion to the Department of Education (DOE), potentially resulting in inconsistent or politically influenced investigations. There are also concerns about due process for students and faculty accused of antisemitism based on vague or politicized criteria. One of the key criticisms of H.R. 2446 is that it represents a significant expansion of federal authority into university governance. By tying a school’s eligibility for Title IV federal student aid—a critical source of funding for nearly all U.S. colleges and universities—to how institutions respond to allegations of antisemitism (as interpreted through the IHRA definition), the bill could give the Department of Education (DOE) sweeping discretion to monitor, evaluate, and penalize campus speech climates. Additionally it opens the door for the federal government to intervene in subjective campus cultural and academic issues that risk being influenced by political agendas. Under such a precedent, many colleges may feel pressured to preemptively censor or regulate campus speech and academic discussion in order to protect their federal funding, even if that speech is constitutionally protected.

³⁷ [AAUP, 2025](#)

6. Recommendations and Next Steps

Policymakers should support the underlying intent of H.R. 2446 to combat the evolving nature of antisemitism, while also pursuing targeted amendments to strengthen its implementation. Although the bill instructs the Department of Education to use the IHRA working definition of antisemitism as a guiding framework, it still allows for considerable variability in how Title VI investigations are conducted by the Office for Civil Rights. To mitigate this uncertainty, the bill should be amended to incorporate due process protections for both institutions and individuals, limiting unilateral decision-making by the DOE or executive branch regarding funding and enforcement actions. Furthermore, while H.R. 2446 emphasizes reactive measures through conditional Title IV funding, it does little to address the root causes of campus antisemitism. Amendments should include increased funding for antisemitism education, particularly within DEI frameworks where it is often overlooked. In addition, both symbolic and financial support should be directed toward campus mediation and intergroup dialogue initiatives that foster mutual understanding among students. Finally, a comprehensive analysis of bipartisan support and opposition should be conducted to ensure that H.R. 2446 avoids the political gridlock that stalled its predecessor, H.R. 3773.