



January 5, 2026

David D. Meyer
Office of the President
Brooklyn Law School
250 Joralemon Street
Brooklyn, New York 11201

Sent via U.S. Mail and Electronic Mail (david.meyer@brooklaw.edu)

Dear President Meyer:

FIRE, a nonpartisan nonprofit that defends free speech,¹ is concerned about Brooklyn Law School's effective cancellation of the Jewish Law Student Association's event featuring Israeli blogger Hillel Fuld. BLS may not curtail its commitment to free speech simply because some oppose Fuld and his views. We therefore urge BLS to honor its commitment by allowing students and faculty to host speakers despite public backlash.

Our concerns stem from BLS's reaction to JLSA's plans to host Fuld on October 27, 2025,² for a speech on the Israeli tech industry and workplace antisemitism.³ On October 15, the BLS chapter of Students for Justice in Palestine demanded BLS move the event off-campus, characterizing Fuld as "a known and vehement Islamophobe" who allegedly posed "a significant safety risk to all Muslim, Arab, and Palestinian students on campus."⁴ On October 23, SJP and BLS's Student Justice Coalition announced a protest opposing Fuld to occur at the same time as the JLSA event in both the courtyard and the sixth floor of the law building.⁵

Shortly after SJC and SCP announced the protest, BLS informed JLSA it could no longer hold Fuld's speech on the 27th, due to alleged resource constraints with the law school accreditation

¹ For more than 25 years, FIRE has defended free expression and other individual rights on America's university and college campuses. You can learn more about our mission and activities at thefire.org.

² Robert Dweck, *Pro-Israel Event Was Cancelled at Brooklyn Law School, While Palestinian 'Celebration' Was Allowed to Proceed*, THE ALGEMEINER (Dec. 1, 2025, 12:24 PM), <https://www.algemeiner.com/2025/12/01/pro-israel-event-was-cancelled-at-brooklyn-law-school-while-palestinian-celebration-was-allowed-to-proceed/>. The recitation of facts is based on publicly available information. We appreciate that you may have additional information and invite you to share it with us.

³ JLSA @BLS (@brooklynlaw.jlsa), INSTAGRAM (Oct. 25, 2025), <https://www.instagram.com/p/DQQHbDyjGB3/?hl=en> [<https://perma.cc/VX6T-Q3SW>].

⁴ Email from BLS Students for Justice in Palestine to redacted (Oct. 15, 2025, 8:33 PM) (on file with author).

⁵ Student Justice Coalition (@studentjusticecoalition), INSTAGRAM (Oct. 23, 2025), <https://www.instagram.com/p/DQKr6YTD4tL/> [<https://perma.cc/ZH3Y-HJMF>] (the post included the text, "FULD OFF CAMPUS").

committee visiting the same day. BLS requested JLSA reschedule the event,⁶ but Fuld was unable to reschedule, and JLSA was forced to cancel the event two days in advance.⁷

SJP and SJC, however, proceeded with their event, though only in the courtyard. The event, which now had Fuld’s cancellation to celebrate,⁸ lasted 90 minutes, included “[m]usic and community time,” and had BLS-provided security and BLS administrators present to monitor.⁹

BLS proudly boasts that it is a community “characterized by free expression, free inquiry, intellectual honesty, respect for the dignity of others and openness to constructive change.”¹⁰ It commits itself to “affirm[ing], assur[ing] and protect[ing] the rights of its members to organize and join associations, and to convene and conduct meetings and public events in an orderly fashion.”¹¹ Additionally, the American Bar Association requires that BLS, as an ABA-accredited institution, “[p]rotect the rights of faculty, students, and staff to communicate ideas that may be controversial or unpopular, including through robust debate, demonstrations, or protests.”¹² These commitments to free speech—and a reasonable student’s interpretation of these commitments—are informed by decades of First Amendment jurisprudence and New York contract law.¹³

Adhering to free speech principles means that BLS’s students have the broad expressive right to both invite and hear speakers free from limitations based on “orthodoxy or popularity of their political or social views[.]”¹⁴ This right “includes and exceeds the presence of controversial speakers on college and university campuses[.]”¹⁵ Simply put, colleges and universities cannot limit these expressive rights because of a speaker’s viewpoint,¹⁶ even if the

⁶ Dweck, *supra* note 2; see also Judith Falk, *Did Brooklyn Law School ‘Cancel’ Hillel Fuld?*, JEWISHLINK (Nov. 3, 2025), <https://jewishlink.news/did-brooklyn-law-school-cancel-hillel-fuld/>.

⁷ JLSA @BLS, *supra* note 3.

⁸ Brooklyn Law Students for Justice in Palestine (@brooklynlawsjp), INSTAGRAM (Oct. 26, 2025), https://www.instagram.com/p/DQS-WTejiBf/?img_index=1 [<https://perma.cc/8JBE-MXTJ>] (“We are relieved that Hillel Fuld will not be coming on campus.”).

⁹ Dweck, *supra* note 2.

¹⁰ *Statement on Rights and Responsibilities*, BROOKLYN LAW SCH. (REISSUED July 27, 2015), <https://www.brooklaw.edu/media/g32hoqml/bls-statement-of-rights-and-responsibilities.pdf> [<https://perma.cc/EV8R-XLAG>].

¹¹ *Id.*

¹² *Standards and Rules of Procedure for Approval of Law Schools*, Organization and Administration, Standard 208. Academic Freedom and Freedom of Expression, AM. BAR ASS’N, 18–19 (2025-2026), https://www.americanbar.org/content/dam/aba/administrative/legal_education_and_admissions_to_the_bar/standards/2025-2026/2025-2026-standards-and-rules-of-procedure-for-approval-of-law-schools.pdf [<https://perma.cc/25M2-MQCG>].

¹³ See *Novio v. N.Y. Acad. of Art*, 317 F. Supp. 3d 803, 805 (S.D.N.Y. 2018) (“New York State courts have permitted a student to bring a breach of implied contract action against an institution of higher education.”) (quoting *Keefe v. N.Y. Law Sch.*, 906 N.Y.S.2d 773 (Sup. Ct. 2009)).

¹⁴ *Brooks v. Auburn Univ.*, 296 F. Supp. 188, 194 (M.D. Ala. 1969), *aff’d*, 412 F.2d 1171 (5th Cir. 1969); cf. *Stanley v. Georgia*, 394 U.S. 557, 564 (1969) (recognizing it as “well established” that the First Amendment confers and protects the right to speak as well as “the right to receive information and ideas”).

¹⁵ *Academic Freedom and Outside Speakers*, AM. ASS’N OF UNIV. PROFESSORS (updated 2024), <https://www.aaup.org/report/academic-freedom-and-outside-speakers-0#1>; see also *Keyishian v. Bd. of Regents*, 385 U.S. 589, 603 (1967).

¹⁶ *Rosenberger v. Rector & Visitors of the Univ. of Va.*, 515 U.S. 819, 829 (1995).

views are offensive or hateful.¹⁷ This is especially true of political speech, the protection of which lies at the core of the value of free speech and is especially necessary in times of intense disagreement on global affairs¹⁸ and other “sensitive topics” like ethnicity or religion, “where the risk of conflict and insult is high.”¹⁹

That BLS alleges JLSA’s event was cancelled because of “resource constraints” seems wholly pretextual given the temporal proximity of BLS’s decisions. BLS surely would have known about the accreditation committee’s visit before it approved JLSA’s event. Even if the accreditation visit was sudden or unexpected, BLS’s response should have been to find alternative accommodations to prevent a last-minute change or cancellation for JLSA, especially with a foreign guest speaker who might be expected to have limited ability to change his travel plans. And to the extent that “resource constraints” refers to anything aside from physical accommodations, the fact that SJP and SJC held a 90-minute event with security and administrative monitors demonstrates that BLS’s “resources constraints” were insufficient to justify cancellation.

While BLS has an important interest in ensuring the institution can operate properly, it may not frivolously invoke “resource constraints” to squelch debate and discussion. If its commitment to free speech is to have any meaning, BLS must be principled in resisting demands for censorship, even when it is difficult or unpopular to do so. Otherwise, BLS engages in viewpoint discrimination—an egregious act of “censorship in its purest form” that violates BLS’s commitment to free speech.²⁰

As such, we request a substantive response to this letter no later than the close of business on January 20, confirming BLS will honor its commitment to free speech by allowing students to host speakers despite public backlash.

Sincerely,



Garrett Gravley
Program Counsel, Campus Rights Advocacy

Cc: Sarah Jean Kelly, Executive Vice President
Sarah Luke, General Counsel

¹⁷ *Texas v. Johnson*, 491 U.S. 397, 414 (1989) (burning the American flag is protected by free speech based on the “bedrock principle” that government actors “may not prohibit the expression of an idea simply because society finds the idea itself offensive or disagreeable”); *see also Matal v. Tam*, 582 U.S. 218, 247 (2017) (free speech protects expression viewed as “hateful” or demeaning “on the basis of gender, religion, age, disability, or any other similar ground”).

¹⁸ *Buckley v. Am. Const. Law Found.*, 525 U.S. 182, 186–87 (1999).

¹⁹ *Rodriguez v. Maricopa Cnty. Comm. Coll. Dist.*, 605 F.3d 703, 708 (9th Cir. 2010).

²⁰ *Rosenberger*, 515 U.S. at 829.