

Our response to The Moral Deliberation Advice Report: “Sensitive collaboration relating to Israel-Gaza”

This letter is a summary of our response to TU Delft’s Moral Deliberation outcome and process regarding **TU Delft’s institutional collaborations with Israeli entities implicated in war crimes, apartheid, and plausible genocide, as identified in the context of the Israel-Gaza conflict**. For a deeper analysis of the process, its ethical shortcomings, and what a responsible alternative should look like, we invite you to [read our full document](#).

TU Delft has acknowledged the “possibility of genocidal violence” in Gaza, but continues collaborations with Israeli institutions credibly linked to the military apparatus carrying it out. The university’s recent policy shift—announcing a partial moratorium—is a result of organized, sustained and costly social pressure. The advice is that no new partnerships or projects with Israeli universities or organizations should be allowed, unless they are shown not to contribute to complicity. However, the same assessment process used for new proposals should also be applied to existing ones in order to stop benefiting those parties engaged in human rights violations.

The Precautionary Imperative

We welcome the outcome, but it **does not go far enough**.

When there is a credible risk of contributing to atrocity crimes, institutions have a legal and moral duty to act—even in the absence of full certainty. This is the core of the **precautionary principle**, embedded in The UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights, OECD due diligence frameworks, and Dutch and international law on genocide and war crimes. A clearer line must be drawn, integrity requires urgent action, not delay.

What the precautionary policy means for TU Delft is clear:

- **Freeze high-risk collaborations** until partners prove they do not contribute to oppression and human rights violations;
- **Reverse the burden of proof** — It should not be the victims of human rights violations who bear the burden of proving harm. Instead, institutions and collaborators must demonstrate that their projects do not contribute to those violations in order to proceed. This principle, already reflected in the stance taken by the moral deliberation chamber at Tilburg University, should be adopted at TU Delft as well.
- **Adopt the PACBI guidelines** for academic institutional boycott, a principled and nonviolent framework based on international human rights law.

Why the Moral Deliberation Report Is Not Enough

Lack of Protection for Ethical Refusal and Due Diligence

The current moral deliberation outcome fails to provide any guidance or protection for students, staff and researchers who have already taken steps to disengage from collaborations with Israeli institutions credibly linked to war crimes and genocide. These acts of ethical refusal—grounded in legal obligations under the Genocide Convention and International Human Rights law—are already happening. Yet the report offers no protocols, no safeguards, nor any institutional support for those exercising conscientious objection as a result of their due diligence.

A response grounded in integrity should have been immediate, principled, and precautionary. Instead, the university’s delayed and ambiguous approach reflects a profound failure to meet the urgency and the legal and moral gravity of the moment.

It took the university **nearly 17 months** after the **International Court of Justice's ruling on January 26, 2024**—which found South Africa's genocide case against Israel **plausible** and issued binding provisional measures—to even acknowledge the possibility of genocide. It took the university nearly **17 months** after **sustained global protests, open letters and statements**, and the **legitimate efforts of local students and staff** demanding institutional accountability and divestment, to even utter the word.

Let us not forget the context in which this moral deliberation arises. As of **June 2025**, it has been a full year since the Executive Board received a detailed **Dossier of Complicity**, prepared by a committee of TU Delft staff and students. This bottom-up research documented the university's collaborations with Israeli institutions and called for public acknowledgement and corrective action. That call went **unanswered**.

By **March 18, 2025**, **at least 55,493 people had been confirmed killed in Palestine**, including over **17,400 children**, and **at least 129,320** had been injured. Death toll estimates are higher **than 100,000**. In the last months, the systematic killing of civilians through starvation, targeted bombings, and mass shootings has escalated dramatically.

Who we are and what we are doing

TU Delft for Integrity is a grassroots initiative composed of academic staff, researchers, and students. We are responding to a **systemic and structural flaw** in how our institution deals with complicity in atrocity crimes. We are united by a shared commitment: to uphold the TU Delft Code of Conduct, to support each other in resisting complicity, and to compel the university to live up to its own values — as well as its obligations under international law. This initiative is rooted in that integrity, and in a belief that safety, justice, and accountability must be collectively defended.

We are proud of the diverse and principled composition of our group. It includes PhD candidates, professors, staff, and lecturers — people across roles and responsibilities. We come from both the Global South and the Global North, and our experiences span ethics, Holocaust scholarship, and academic research in the Department of Technology, Policy and Management. Among members of the group there are war survivors. Our group is gender-diverse, among us some have personally faced unsafe or repressive situations within the university — and have responded with courage and integrity.

We are taking the initiative to do what is right, without delay. We are building a community that refuses to stay silent. We are organizing to support **ethical refusal, conscientious objection**, and **bottom-up accountability**. We are refusing to normalize the unacceptable.

And we invite you to join us.

TU Delft for Integrity

Authors:

(Four of the authors names are withheld for personal safety reasons)

Andrea Gammon, Assistant Professor of Ethics and Philosophy of Technology, TU Delft

Camilo Andres Benitez Avila, Lecturer of Delft Centre for Entrepreneurship, TU Delft

Dario Perfigli, PhD Candidate at the Faculty of Technology Policy and Management, TU Delft

Era Dorta Perez (PhD), Research Software Engineer at the Faculty of Electrical Engineering, Mathematics and Computer Science, TU Delft

Gina Stavropoulou, Data Engineer at the Faculty of Architecture and the Built Environment, TU Delft

Jagoda Cupać, Assistant Professor at the Faculty of Civil Engineering & Geosciences, TU Delft

Jackson Campolattaro, PhD Candidate at the Faculty of Electrical Engineering, Mathematics and Computer Science

Jasper Groen, PhD Candidate at the Faculty of Aerospace Engineering, TU Delft

Jose Carlos Urrea Llanusa, Research Software Engineer at the TU Delft Digital Competence Center

Kritika Maheshwari, Assistant Professor in Ethics and Philosophy of Technology, TU Delft

Santosh Ilamparuthi (PhD), Data Steward at Faculty of Electrical Engineering, Mathematics and Computer Science, TU Delft