

Lines of Response to tweets and retweets made by AIUSA Board member Rasha Abdel Latif between 2013 and 2022 and highlighted in recent articles [here](#) and by an organization critical of Amnesty and our position on IOPT in particular.

<https://www.jns.org/jns/terrorism/23/6/1/292206/>.

What is Amnesty International's reaction to the exposure of these tweets and RTs by AIUSA board member and do you stand by these tweets?

These tweets and retweets were done in a personal capacity and do not represent the positions of Amnesty International. Please see our extensive research published in 2022, which documents and clearly articulates Amnesty International's positions as they relate to the government of Israel and the Occupied Palestinian Territories.

We are not and have never called for dismantling the State of Israel. We take no position on political solutions to the conflict, and we condemn in the strongest possible terms attacks against all civilians.

We are also deeply concerned that these attacks against a Palestinian board member come after Amnesty International has publicly challenged the Israeli government's human rights record. All too often organizations, human rights defenders and journalists are targeted in an attempt to undermine their credibility and their human rights work.

Since you have determined that these tweets/RTs do not represent Amnesty International's positions, will AIUSA ask Rasha to step down from the Board?

This is a decision left to AIUSA's Board and we are unable to comment on it accordingly. As things stand, Rasha remains on AIUSA's Board and we understand is fulfilling her obligations to the organization.

What is Amnesty's selection and screening process for selecting Board members?

AIUSA's board members are elected, not appointed, by AIUSA's membership across the United States. As part of the voting process, members have access to candidates' bios.

The screening process is led by a non-staff volunteer Nominating Committee that is responsible for reviewing applications, interviewing applicants and their references, and ultimately recommending a candidate slate to a Board of Directors through a rigorous vetting process. That slate is then voted on by the membership to fill vacant board seats.

Were these tweets/re-tweets known and flagged earlier as part of the vetting process?

It has not been the past practice of our volunteer-run nominating committee to vet the entire social media history of every candidate before joining our board and so it is unlikely these were known about.

Do Board members play a role in determining or shaping Amnesty International research and positions?

Board members are not involved in any aspect of research for the organization, and they do not determine the policy recommendations the organization makes for country reports, briefings or statements.

How do you respond to accusations that Amnesty is an antisemitic organization?

Amnesty International stands against antisemitism, which is antithetical to human rights. We oppose discrimination and racism in all forms, including against Jewish people or people perceived as Jewish.

All Amnesty's criticism of the Israeli government is based in international law, and on evidence of the great harm and suffering the government's system of apartheid causes to Palestinians. This criticism is aimed at the Israeli authorities – not at the Israeli people or Jewish people. We condemn in the strongest possible terms attacks against civilians.

Antisemitism is a separate issue to apartheid. Conflating the two dismisses and simplifies the experiences of both Jewish people and Palestinians. Antisemitism is a serious allegation which has frequently been weaponized as a means of stifling criticism of the Israeli government's human rights violations.

Does Amnesty oppose Zionism?

Amnesty is a human rights organization and we do not take positions on ideologies and political systems such as Zionism. Our research does not assess or comment on Zionism as a political idea. Similarly, Amnesty takes no position on any state's right to exist. Our focus is solely on states' obligations under international law, especially human rights law.

While Amnesty recognizes that both the Jewish and Palestinian peoples claim the right to self-determination, we do not take a position on international political or legal arrangements that might be adopted to implement the right to self-determination. Our focus is solely on documenting human rights violations, wherever they may occur.

Do you think that the Israeli government is illegitimate and must be removed?

Amnesty's focus is on human rights violations committed by states, not the legitimacy of governments or states themselves. For example, as a matter of policy, we do not ever call for "regime change"; we instead provide recommendations on how governments can bring their actions in line with international law.

We have concluded that the crime against humanity of apartheid is being perpetrated by the Israeli state against Palestinians. The Israeli authorities have an obligation under international law to dismantle this system of apartheid, and to repeal or amend all laws, regulations, policies and practices that discriminate on racial, ethnic or religious grounds to bring them into line with international human rights law and standards.

What is Amnesty's position on the indiscriminate killing of Israeli civilians?

All attacks on civilians are violations of international law, and Amnesty International condemns them. For example, we clearly [condemned](#) an attack in January 2023 in which a Palestinian killed seven civilians - six Israelis and one Ukrainian citizen - in the settlement of Neve Ya'akov in occupied East Jerusalem. Attacks on civilians must be independently and impartially investigated and anyone against whom there is sufficient admissible evidence should be prosecuted in a fair trial.

Is Amnesty in favor of a one-state solution?

This is a political issue and, as such, Amnesty takes no position on this, or on a two-state solution, confederation or other possible arrangements. Our only call with regard to any political solution would be that it is based on respect for human rights.