

**Report from the CPUC Resources Committee –  
A Review of the Dissociation Proposal  
submitted by Princeton Israeli Apartheid Divest**

**March 5, 2025**

**I. Summary**

The Resources Committee has decided not to recommend dissociation to the Board of Trustees. This report summarizes the considerations that led the committee to this decision.

**II. Background**

The Resources Committee’s deliberation on the [proposal](#) submitted by Princeton Israeli Apartheid Divest (PIAD) began with the receipt of the group’s proposal on June 19, 2024, which followed the committee’s first meeting with PIAD on May 23, 2024. From June 2024 to January 2025, the committee met regularly to review and discuss the proposal, to identify which elements of the proposal were within the committee’s purview, and to establish a process for collecting and evaluating input from the broader campus community. Consistent with its guidelines, the committee considered which aspects of the dissociation request related to the actions of specific companies that could justify dissociation.<sup>1</sup>

Throughout this period the committee reviewed and discussed the content of the extensive input and feedback that it received from the campus community. In the months following the receipt of the dissociation request, the committee received over 2,000 emails and correspondence on the topic. Additionally, in September 2024, the committee launched a community input process whereby it invited members of the Princeton community – students, faculty, staff, and alumni – to offer input via a form on the Resources Committee’s website. The input period was active from September 30 to October 11 and gathered over 2,300 unique responses.

The committee acknowledged requests from the community for in-person meetings. In the fall, the committee met again with members from PIAD and met separately with a group of Princeton faculty members. This in-person input, coupled with an abundance of written correspondence, helped to inform the committee’s review of PIAD’s dissociation request.

---

<sup>1</sup> Throughout this report, the use of “dissociation” implies dissociation and divestment.

## Overview of the Resources Committee

Established in 1970, the Resources Committee is a committee of the Council of the Princeton University Community (CPUC) and is charged with considering questions of general policy concerning the procurement and management of the University's financial resources.

The committee – composed of faculty, students, and staff – is the only body charged to determine whether and when to recommend that Princeton's Board of Trustees dissociate from a particular company or set of companies. The ultimate authority for making dissociation decisions is vested in the board. It is the practice of the committee to consider all dissociation requests submitted directly to the committee and to undertake a deliberative process in reviewing and evaluating each request. This process aims to answer a set of guiding questions centered around core University values and the global interest of the campus community. It is intentionally disconnected from the committee members' individual values and personal viewpoints on the underlying issue.

Additional information about the Resources Committee can be found on the committee's [website](#).

## Summary of the Trustee Guidelines on Dissociation

When considering dissociation proposals, the Resources Committee acts under a set of [guidelines](#) established by the Board of Trustees in 1997. Within these guidelines are three criteria that the committee must consider as it evaluates the “magnitude, scope, and representativeness of the expressions of campus opinion” on a particular issue:

- evidence of considerable, thoughtful, and sustained campus interest in an issue involving the actions of a company or companies in the University's investment portfolio;
- a central University value being clearly at stake; and
- consensus within the University community on how to respond to the issue.

The guidelines set a “high bar” for dissociation and articulate a “strong presumption against the University as an institution taking a position or playing an active role with respect to external issues of political, economic, social, moral, or legal character.” This stance is consistent with the University's core mission, which is to transmit and expand knowledge through scholarship, research, and teaching. The purpose of the endowment is to support that core mission through the investment of the University's financial resources. As Resources Committee Chairperson and Hugh Stott Taylor Chair of Chemistry John Groves noted in his May 2024 [opinion piece](#) in *The Daily Princetonian*, “the rationale for this strong presumption is to preserve the University's independence as a place for free inquiry.”

### III. Assessment of the PIAD Proposal

The PIAD proposal argues that there is a strong interest in dissociation from the Princeton community, with campus campaigns dating back to 2002, leading to an initial dissociation petition in 2014, and intensifying interest in the fall of 2023 and spring of 2024. The proposal also argues that Israel's actions contradict the University's core values, citing declarations from human rights organizations and rulings from the International Court of Justice. Additionally, the proposal suggests ways to identify companies to be considered for dissociation, categorized as follows: settlement industry; exploitation of natural resources; walls, checkpoints, and surveillance; weapons and military equipment; discrimination; financing; and companies domiciled in Israel.

In reviewing the history of concerns and conversations on campus related to this proposal, the Resources Committee recognized several elements related to the criteria of considerable, thoughtful, and sustained interest: for example – the Resources Committee's [report from 2015](#) wherein this issue was also addressed; the timeline of activity referenced in the PIAD proposal, which included a description of the protest activity on Princeton's campus in academic year 2023-2024; and the University's thoughtful consideration of this topic in scholarly discussions. The committee acknowledges that the issue has garnered significant attention from the campus community starting about two decades ago and escalating in recent years. Accordingly, the committee proceeded with its deliberation on the other two criteria outlined in the trustee guidelines.

The extensive community input gathered by the Resources Committee highlighted a number of University values pertinent to the situation in the Middle East. Many of these core values – such as ethical responsibility, human rights, and academic freedom – were referenced by both supporters and opponents of the PIAD proposal. However, by applying these values to different aspects of the situation, members of the community arrived at diametrically opposed conclusions about dissociation.

The divergent input received by the committee was consistent with the broader division in perspectives that the committee recognized in the events that took place on campus, including political demonstrations, opinion pieces published in University outlets, and discussions on the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. What became evident to the committee is that both supporters and opponents of dissociation stood firm in their commitments. Taken together, these factors make it clear that there are strong and deeply rooted disagreements within the University community on how to respond to the issues raised by the PIAD proposal. Hence, the committee believes that consensus – the third criterion for dissociation – has not been met.

#### **IV. Conclusion of the Resources Committee**

Given the stark divide in perspectives on campus, and the corresponding divergence in the application of the University's values, the Resources Committee has concluded that widespread, deliberative agreement and consensus related to the content outlined in the PIAD proposal has not been achieved. Therefore, the committee will not be making a dissociation recommendation to the Board of Trustees.

The committee is grateful to all members of the campus community who provided input and engaged in dialogue and constructive advocacy on this topic. Additionally, the committee supports the continuation of meaningful and productive discussions on this subject matter.