

GOVERNMENT ACTIONS TO COMBAT ANTI-SEMITISM IN THE OSCE REGION

HEARING BEFORE THE COMMISSION ON SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE ONE HUNDRED EIGHTH CONGRESS SECOND SESSION

JUNE 16, 2004

Printed for the use of the
Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe
[CSCE 108–2–6]



Available via the World Wide Web: <http://www.csce.gov>

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON : 2004

20-155.PDF

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office
Internet: bookstore.gpo.gov Phone: (202) 512-1800 Fax: (202) 512-2250
Mail Stop SSOP, Washington, DC 20402-0001

COMMISSION ON SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH COMMISSIONERS

HOUSE	SENATE
CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH, New Jersey Chairman	BEN NIGHTHORSE CAMPBELL, Colorado Co-Chairman
FRANK R. WOLF, Virginia	SAM BROWNBACK, Kansas
JOSEPH R. PITTS, Pennsylvania	GORDON H. SMITH, Oregon
ROBERT B. ADERHOLT, Alabama	KAY BAILEY HUTCHISON, Texas
ANNE M. NORTHUP, Kentucky	SAXBY CHAMBLISS, Georgia
BENJAMIN L. CARDIN, Maryland	CHRISTOPHER J. DODD, Connecticut
LOUISE McINTOSH SLAUGHTER, New York	BOB GRAHAM, Florida
ALCEE L. HASTINGS, Florida	RUSSELL D. FEINGOLD, Wisconsin
MIKE McINTYRE, North Carolina	HILLARY RODHAM CLINTON, New York

EXECUTIVE BRANCH COMMISSIONERS

LORNE CRANER, Department of State
VACANT, Department of Defense
WILLIAM HENRY LASH III, Department of Commerce

**GOVERNMENT ACTIONS
TO COMBAT ANTI-SEMITISM
IN THE OSCE REGION**

JUNE 16, 2004

COMMISSIONERS

	PAGE
Hon. Christopher H. Smith, Chairman, Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe	1
Hon. Benjamin L. Cardin, Ranking Member, Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe	3
Hon. Hillary Rodham Clinton, Commissioner, Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe	4

WITNESSES

Hon. Tom Lantos, Ranking Member, Committee on International Relations and Holocaust Survivor	7
His Excellency Natan Sharansky, Israeli Minister for Diaspora Affairs; and Head, Israeli Delegation to the Berlin OSCE Conference on Anti-Semitism	15
Betty Ehrenberg, Director, Institute for Public Affairs, Orthodox Union of Jewish Congregations	26
Paul Goldenberg, National Security Consultant, American Jewish Committee	28
Jay Lefkowitz, Partner, Kirkland & Ellis, LLP	32
Fred Zeidman, Chairman, U.S. Holocaust Memorial Council	36
Mark Weitzmann, Director, Task Force Against Hate, Simon Wiesenthal Center	47
Stacy Burdett, Associate Director, Government & National Affairs, Anti-Defamation League	49
Shai Franklin, Director, Government Relations, NCSJ, Advocates on Behalf of Jews in Russia, Ukraine, The Baltic States and Eurasia	53
Dan Mariaschin, Executive Vice President, B'nai B'rith International	56
James S. Tisch, Chairman, Conference of Presidents of Major American Jewish Organizations	59
His Excellency Ed O'Donnell, Special Envoy for Holocaust Issues, U.S. Department of State	65

APPENDICES

Material Submitted for the Record by Hon. Christopher H. Smith	
• Prepared Statement of Hon. Christopher H. Smith	67
• "Reflections on Anti-Semitism and the Church" by Cardinal William H. Keeler	73
Prepared Statement of Hon. Ben Nighthorse Campbell, Co-Chairman, Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe	71
Prepared Statement of Hon. Benjamin L. Cardin	82
Prepared Statement of Hon. Mike McIntyre, Commissioner, Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe	84

APPENDICES (CONT'D)

	PAGE
Prepared Statement of Hon. Gordon H. Smith, Commissioner, Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe	85
Prepared Statement of Hon. Gert Weisskirchen, Vice-President, OSCE Parliamentary Assembly	86
Materials Submitted for the Record by Stacy Burdett	
• Prepared Statement of Stacy Burdett	88
• Global Anti-Semitism: Selected Incidents around the World in 2004	95
• U.S. Hate Crime Monitoring Models and Best Practices	99
Materials Submitted for the Record by Shai Franklin	
• Prepared Statement of Shai Franklin	104
• Proceedings of NCSJ Side Event, “Post-Soviet States Respond to Anti-Semitism”	111
Prepared Statement of Israel Singer, Chairman, World Jewish Congress	120
Prepared Statement of Jack Rosen, American Jewish Congress	123
OSCE Parliamentary Assembly Berlin Declaration on Anti-Semitic Violence in the OSCE Region Adopted at the Eleventh Annual Session	125
OSCE Parliamentary Assembly Rotterdam Declaration on Anti- Semitic Violence in the OSCE Region Adopted at the Twelfth Annual Session	127

GOVERNMENT ACTIONS TO COMBAT ANTI-SEMITISM IN THE OSCE REGION

JUNE 16, 2004

COMMISSION ON SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE
WASHINGTON, DC

The Commission met in Room 334, Cannon House Office Building, Washington, DC, at 10:05 a.m., Hon. Christopher H. Smith, Chairman, Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe, presiding.

Commissioners present: Hon. Christopher H. Smith, Chairman, Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe; Hon. Benjamin L. Cardin, Ranking Member, Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe; and Hon. Hillary Rodham Clinton, Commissioner, Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe.

Witnesses present: Hon. Tom Lantos, Ranking Member, Committee on International Relations and Holocaust survivor; Natan Sharansky, Israeli Minister for Diaspora Affairs; Betty Ehrenberg, Director, Institute for Public Affairs, Orthodox Union of Jewish Congregations; Paul Goldenberg, National Security Consultant, American Jewish Committee; Jay Lefkowitz, Attorney, Partner, Kirkland & Ellis, LLP; Fred Zeidman, Chairman, U.S. Holocaust Memorial Council; Mark Weitzmann, Director, Task Force Against Hate, Simon Wiesenthal Center; Stacy Burdett, Associate Director, Government and National Affairs, Anti-Defamation League; Shai A. Franklin, Director of Government Relations, NCSJ, Advocates on Behalf of Jews in Russia, Ukraine, The Baltic States and Eurasia; Dan Mariaschin, Executive Vice President, B'nai B'rith International; James S. Tisch, Chairman, Conference of Presidents of Major American Jewish Organizations; and Amb. Edward B. O'Donnell, Special Envoy for Holocaust Issues, U.S. Department of State.

**HON. CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH, CHAIRMAN,
COMMISSION ON SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE**

Mr. SMITH. This Commission on Security and Cooperation hearing will come to order.

I want to thank all of our very distinguished guests for being here. Let me just say in opening that I want to welcome you to this U.S. Helsinki Commission hearing on government actions to combat anti-Semitism in the OSCE region.

I am very pleased that we have many distinguished panelists present here today who will provide, I am sure, very useful insights and will give us additional information upon which we can act.

As all of you know, roughly 2 years ago a wave of anti-Semitic violence swept through much of the OSCE region. Unparalleled since the dark days of WWII, Jewish communities throughout Europe and North America faced repeated attacks against Jewish cultural sites, cemeteries and individuals.

In the eastern portions of the OSCE region, anti-Semitic acts occurred in places long devoid of Jewish life, as hate-filled individuals tried to extinguish the last whispers of history testifying to a once vibrant Jewish community.

Despite efforts by some governments, sporadic incidents continued to arise throughout the region, both east and west. This convulsion of violence has sent a clear message that our societies still suffer from the latent disease of anti-Semitism.

We are gathered here today to see what we can do, what actions we can take, to ensure that incidents of anti-Semitism become forever a thing of the past.

This hearing comes on the heels of the April 1 OSCE Berlin Conference on Anti-Semitism. At the historic Berlin Conference, held in a city that was once the epicenter of hate and is of unquestioned significance, 55 participating States gathered together in the fight against anti-Semitism. The U.S. delegation was ably led by Mayor Ed Koch who, I am sorry to say, cannot be with us today but sends his regards. I want to publicly thank Secretary Powell on behalf of our Commission for making his personal attendance at the Conference and for his powerful statement that he made to the delegates.

In short, the Conference was a success. U.S. Ambassador to the OSCE Stephan M. Minikes and his staff worked tirelessly to bring our Berlin achievements to fruition. A welcomed surprise was the Spanish offer to host a follow-up conference meeting on anti-Semitism next year in Cordoba. We certainly appreciate the offer and look forward to working with our friends in the Spanish Government.

Particularly significant was the Berlin Declaration presented by the Bulgarian Chairman-in-Office, Foreign Minister Solomon Passy. Despite serious objections from some European countries and the Mediterranean partner States, the Declaration stated, and I quote, "International developments on political issue or political issues, including those in Israel or elsewhere in the Middle East, never justify anti-Semitism." The Declaration also highlighted increased commitments by all participating States to monitor anti-Semitic crimes and hate crimes.

The historic Berlin meeting was a highlight of our ongoing efforts to fight anti-Semitism, but it is not to be our high-water mark; it is to be the beginning and not the end of our efforts. Governmental and elected leaders must continue to speak out publicly when instances of anti-Semitism arise. Law enforcement officials must vigorously investigate and prosecute acts of anti-Semitic hate whenever and wherever they occur. Lastly, if we are to protect our children from the seductive evil of anti-Semitism, we must inoculate future generations from all of its mutations and insidious forms through education and Holocaust remembrance.

Since May 2002, I and other Members of Congress have spoken out repeatedly, and we have done so throughout our careers, but especially since we have seen this spike in anti-Semitic violence. Last month Ben Cardin and I introduced a resolution furthering the successes of the Berlin Conference. In our resolution, H.Con.Res 425, we called on the Bulgarian Chairman-in-Office to appoint a Special Envoy to ensure continued and sustained attention with respect to fulfilling OSCE commitments on the reporting of anti-Semitic crimes.

In closing, many said segregation in the United States would never end. Many laughed at the notion that the Soviet Union would simply crumble and vanish. Many simply scoffed at the idea that anti-Semitism will ever be eradicated. In fact, 2 years ago when we first raised concerns about anti-Semitic violence, no one would have believed the Berlin Conference could ever happen.

We must be resolute. If we are not working to erase anti-Semitism completely, what are we working for? No amount of anti-Semitism can be tolerated—not now, not ever.

Let me yield to my good friend, Ben Cardin, for any opening comments that he might have, then Senator Clinton, and then go to our first panel, the distinguished Rep. Tom Lantos from California.

**HON. BENJAMIN L. CARDIN, RANKING MEMBER,
COMMISSION ON SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE**

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Chairman, first, let me thank you for your leadership and for convening this hearing. You have been an extraordinary leader, not only here in the Congress of the United States, but in the OSCE, to advance the cause for fighting anti-Semitism.

We have a very distinguished panel of witnesses today. Two of our witnesses, Mr. Chairman, have witnessed firsthand the wrath of anti-Semitism; one a victim of the Nazi anti-Semitism, the other a victim of the Soviet Union anti-Semitism. They are our heroes, they are our motivators, and they are our friends.

Tom Lantos is the leader in this Congress in raising the issues of human rights and human dimension in all parts of the world, and it is an honor to have our colleague as our leadoff witness on what we need to do, as a Congress, on anti-Semitism. We could not have a better person to lead our discussion.

Natan Sharansky is the symbol in the world of one person who can make a difference in the way that this world looks at human rights issues, and it is an honor to have such a distinguished world citizen here before our Commission today on the subject of fighting anti-Semitism.

Mr. Chairman, I notice that in our third panel we will have our colleagues who worked with us in the Berlin Conference. It is nice to have a reunion of the people who were instrumental in the success that you mentioned happening in Berlin.

Then our fourth panel will be the NGO community. Frankly, we could not have had the success in Berlin and we could not have advanced the issues of anti-Semitism if we did not have the strong NGO community. Frankly, the follow-up will depend largely on how well the participating States engage the NGO community in developing and monitoring progress against anti-Semitism.

Mr. Chairman, I also would like to point out that what we do here matters. It makes a difference. The work of the OSCE and our Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe advanced this issue. We know that this conference would not have taken place but for the leadership in the United States, the leadership in the Congress, the leadership in the administration. We know that.

We also know that we could never have achieved the consensus, which means all 55 states had to agree or not object to the final products—that could not have taken place without the commitment and priority of our nation. I also want to acknowledge Ambassador Minikes and his strong role that he played in accomplishing those results.

So we should be very proud of what we have been able to accomplish in raising the issue of anti-Semitism at the highest levels, at the highest attention of government officials, and to let the countries know that it is not just attending a conference, but it is what you do after the conference in which we will be judged. That is why the follow-up is so important. That is why this hearing is important, because it is part of our commitment of the U.S. delegation that the Congress is going to continue to monitor what is happening and to get the best information we can to follow up.

Mr. Chairman, we are disappointed that so many participating States have yet to make available to the Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights [ODIHR], the enforcing agency, the statistical information that they agreed to make available. We need to take action to make sure that is done. We need to make sure ODIHR has the resources necessary to follow up on the commitments. We need to make sure that there is a high, visible representative of the Chair-in-Office of OSCE that can visit the participating States, help develop the right strategy in each of these countries and share best practices. We need to do that.

So I look forward to hearing from our witnesses today so that we can plan a strategy to make sure that Berlin is the beginning and not the end of the world attention to make sure that we stamp out anti-Semitism wherever it may be found.

It will also help us in our next opportunity, which will take place next month in Edinburgh at the OSCE Parliamentary Assembly. The Chair has already brought forward a major statement from the OSCE PA to make sure that we continue every opportunity we have to advance this issue.

So, Mr. Chairman, I look forward to continuing to work with you and my colleagues as we make sure that we live up to our commitment in the OSCE and our commitment to humanity that we will devote ourselves to rid our societies of the vestiges of anti-Semitism.

Thank you.

Mr. SMITH. Thank you very much, Commissioner Cardin.

The chair recognizes the distinguished Senator from New York, Senator Clinton.

**HON. HILLARY RODHAM CLINTON, COMMISSIONER,
COMMISSION ON SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE**

Ms. CLINTON. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, and I thank you and Commissioner Cardin for your leadership on this issue.

I well remember attending the Commission's last hearing on anti-Semitism in May 2002, a little more than 2 years ago now, and quite a bit has happened. For that, I give the two of you, the Commission staff

and the allies in both nongovernmental organizations as well as the rest of Congress and the administration a tremendous amount of credit, because this ongoing spotlight turned on anti-Semitism has burned bright and it has burned hot. Had it not been there, I agree with both Commissioner Smith and Commissioner Cardin—we would not have seen the Berlin Conference and we would not have seen the results obtained there.

But, of course, as with any ongoing struggle with respect to human rights and dignity and the ongoing challenges of discrimination and bigotry, when it comes to anti-Semitism unfortunately there's no time to rest on our laurels. The work has to continue, and the challenge is great.

You know, at the Commission 2 years ago May, I noted that in France alone, authorities reported nearly 360 crimes against Jews and Jewish institutions in just the first 2 weeks of April 2002. Some of the most numerous and notorious attacks involved young people—involved students, involved children on their way to and from teen soccer games. It was so horrific to account the burnings and brutal beatings that occurred that it really helped to focus our attention on what was at stake. It was not some abstract discussion about a horrible ongoing threat known as anti-Semitism, but it was the lives of young people. It was the lives and right to worship of Jewish worshipers in a Ukraine synagogue or vandals who desecrated synagogues in Russia and throughout the OSCE region.

Now 2 years later we are still seeing attacks, and some of them are close to home. In Montreal, Canada, on April 5 of this year a Jewish school was firebombed. The firebomb damaged the United Talmud Torah School building and destroyed the school's library collection, and it followed a string of anti-Semitic acts in Toronto where cemeteries and homes were vandalized. In the first 5 months of this year, French officials reported 180 anti-Jewish attacks, more than one attack a day, including assaults, arson and verbal insults. On Friday, June 4, 2004, a 17-year-old Jewish student was stabbed in the chest as he left a Jewish school in a Paris suburb.

So despite the progress that we rightly can point to in bringing the attention of the governments and the people of the OSCE countries to bear on this issue, we have much work ahead of us, which is why I am delighted that we have the witnesses you will hear from today, starting with my dear friend and extraordinary advocate, Tom Lantos, someone who has been the conscience of the House ever since he arrived and I hope will be so for another 50–100 years at least. We are also pleased to have Minister Sharansky here. We welcome him.

These two men, Tom Lantos and Natan Sharansky, are two of the people that not only here in our country and in Israel but people throughout the world think of when they consider who stands up for the rights of all people, particularly though the Jewish people, the people of Israel and the people who deserve and need the support and attention that we are bringing today.

Now, the recent conference in Berlin, I agree, was a very positive step, but we cannot assume that a conference and a statement and a promise of follow-up is enough. We have to continue to meet the increase in anti-Semitic statements and actions with clear and immediate condemnation.

That is why I support efforts to adopt a stand-alone resolution in the United Nations General Assembly condemning anti-Semitism, to go ahead and have the fight on the floor of the General Assembly on that specific issue and that issue alone, to raise public awareness, to have people all over the world really focused on the debate that would occur there; and, frankly, to give leaders, not just in the OSCE nations, but throughout the world, a chance to condemn anti-Semitic hatred publicly, and to give people the chance to understand more clearly what is at stake in anti-Semitism and why it is not just an issue for the Jewish people.

You know, recently I was in Borough Park, Brooklyn, and I met with a large group of people, many of whom are Holocaust survivors, for whom the Holocaust is just as real today as it was 50, 60 years ago. Then I went to Brighton Beach in Brooklyn, where I visited a large group of Russian-Jewish immigrants who gave prizes to students who wrote about the Holocaust and anti-Semitism. The students were of all backgrounds, all races, all creeds, all religions. One of the most moving essays was written by a young Muslim girl who wrote an essay about what she had learned by studying the Holocaust and how it was not just about what happened to Jews, but it was about what happens to people when hatred and bigotry and violence is allowed any room in our world.

So when we introduce this resolution of the United Nations, which I hope will be done soon, I think it can help us educate the next generation. Similarly, I think we should introduce another bipartisan resolution in our own U.S. Senate condemning anti-Semitism and those who perpetuate it. It may be symbolic, but symbols are important. It says loudly and clearly that purveyors of hate are the enemies of freedom, and I think that is what is called for: to rally the world on behalf of stamping out anti-Semitism.

So, Mr. Chairman, I thank you for your stalwart support of this Commission and your work on this issue and the follow-up that you are committed to doing.

Mr. SMITH. Senator, thank you very much for your kind remarks, and thank you for your leadership on this very important human rights issue.

We do have, beginning our first panel, a very distinguished member of Congress. In fact, you mentioned that you hope he has another 100 years, as do I; that would make Tom Lantos 176.

[Laughter.]

So, Tom, may you continue doing your good work.

Congressman Tom Lantos is the only Holocaust survivor ever to serve in the U.S. Congress. An American by choice, he was born in Budapest, Hungary, on February 1, 1928. Tom was only 16 when Nazi Germany occupied Hungary in March 1944. With German troops came Adolf Eichmann's orders to exterminate the Jewish population in Hungary. By the end of the summer, most of the Jews outside Budapest had been rounded up and sent to Auschwitz, and the extermination of those in the capital began in earnest.

In Budapest, many young men were sent to forced-labor camps, and Tom was no exception. Once, he managed to escape from the war camp, but he was caught, and he was severely beaten. Conditions were so dire that he doubted that he would ever survive. Feeling he had nothing to lose, Tom attempted another escape, and this time he succeeded in re-

turning to Budapest. He sought refuge with an aunt and lived in a Wallenberg safehouse, one of the apartment buildings, as we all know, that the Swedish diplomat, Raoul Wallenberg, had rented and nominally placed under Swedish diplomatic protection.

Tom's wife Annette, then a young friend, also was in hiding, in the safekeeping of her mother. When the two were separated, after the war they were able to reconnect, and of course, now they have been married for more than 50 years.

Tom's experiences in the Holocaust and afterward were included in the Academy Award winning documentary, *The Last Days*, produced by Steven Spielberg. Tom is one of the five who were highlighted in the film.

Tom was elected in 1980; he took office, as did I, in 1981. He has been a great friend of human rights, not just on the ongoing efforts to eradicate anti-Semitism, but on a plethora of issues that deal with humanitarian and human rights issues. He is the ranking member of the International Relations Committee, and a good friend. I had served under him when he was Chairman of the Human Rights Subcommittee, and we are good friends, and a good friend of human rights, and a good friend of this Commission.

Mr. Lantos?

**HON. TOM LANTOS,
RANKING MEMBER, COMMITTEE ON
INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS**

Mr. LANTOS. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Allow me to say a few personal words about a couple of ladies and one gentleman before I get to my formal statement.

Hillary Clinton has been not only our dearest friend in this body, but our friend and ally and comrade-in-arms in the fight for human rights globally. I am thrilled and honored to have Senator Clinton here at this hearing, and I am profoundly grateful for her leadership on all human rights issues.

I would like to say a word about my wife, Annette, Mr. Chairman, who has devoted her entire life, *pro bono*, to the cause of human rights, for the last 24 years as the person responsible for human rights in my office, the moving spirit of the Congressional Human Rights Caucus. She has been my inspiration on this issue, and all of the credit I have been given truly belongs to her.

There was an unreal, almost surreal, atmosphere two nights ago at the Swedish Embassy, when Annette received one of Sweden's highest decorations for her work on behalf of human rights and, specifically, for her efforts on behalf of Raoul Wallenberg. There are four activities where Annette played the key role, or a major role, in honoring this human rights champion during WWII. The most important was the naming of Raoul Wallenberg as the second honorary citizen of the United States, following Winston Churchill. It was a piece of legislation she envisioned and carried through to victory.

As we walk over to the Capitol, the statute of Raoul Wallenberg is the result of her legislative efforts approving the placement of the Wallenberg statute in perpetuity in our Capitol. She played the key role in renaming the street which is the location of the Holocaust Museum as "Raoul Wallenberg Place," and finally, the issuance by the U.S. Postal Service of a Wallenberg stamp. But her human rights concerns, like Hillary's,

cover the globe and range from Aung San Suu Kyi in Burma to the persecuted Jewish community in the Soviet Union with whom we met on so many occasions.

So I want to express my deep appreciation to both Hillary and Annette for the inspiration they have provided me and millions of others on this issue.

I want to say a word about my friend Anatoly Sharansky. His lovely wife, Avital, Annette, and I held press conference after press conference calling for his release from the Gulag. It was a rather unreal occurrence—the last meeting of a congressional delegation with the East German communist dictator, Erich Honecker—which culminated in Anatoly's release.

I was leading that delegation, and during the course of our meeting with dictator Honecker, it became clear to me how wonderful their intelligence was. There was a whole series of name cards for the communist leadership of East Germany, a whole series of name cards for members of Congress, and next to me there was a name card for Annette because Honecker, or his people, knew she was always with me on these occasions.

During the course of that meeting, we were called out and taken to a hideaway, where we played a modest role in the final negotiations which led to Natan Sharansky's release. And it's a joy to see him now here as a cabinet member of the free and democratic ally we have in the state of Israel.

I should mention, by the way, that his first visit to the Congress was to our very modest office where I have a marvelous picture of him and a very tiny grandson of ours, who, in seven days, will join the U.S. Air Force at Colorado Springs as a member of the Air Force Academy.

Your leadership, Mr. Chairman, on behalf of human rights globally is legendary. And as one who disagrees with you on many other issues, may I pay public tribute to you for your commitment to human rights, as I want to do the same to my friend, Ben Cardin, whose domestic voting record is considerably closer to mine.

[Laughter.]

One more word about Sharansky: Every single time I see my friend, Natan Sharansky, he gets a necktie from me. He gets a necktie from me because he has never in his life worn a necktie. And in his closet in Israel now there is a tremendous plethora of neckties of all tastes, colors and configurations. And he told me that if, in fact, he loses his cabinet post, he will open a shop selling my neckties for many years to come.

[Laughter.]

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank you for inviting me to testify before the Helsinki Commission today on the alarming scourge of anti-Semitism that has engulfed the Pan-European region in recent years. There is a diabolic confluence of many factors and many forces which explains the intensity and the danger of this phenomenon.

I also want to thank you, Mr. Chairman, for your tireless effort to force the 55 member States of the OSCE to recognize the nature and extent of this current wave of hatred against Jews.

For the past few years, the U.S. delegations that you and my friends, Steny Hoyer and Ben Cardin, have led to the OSCE Parliamentary Assemblies have simply refused to let the organization ignore this threat. This year's Berlin Conference and its Declaration against anti-Semitism-

ism represent the culmination of your efforts. The Declaration commits European leaders not only to look at the reasons for anti-Semitism, but to take concrete action against hate with education and anti-bias programs.

Mr. Chairman, the importance of this achievement cannot be overstated. The current eruption of this age-old disease—and I will go to my grave not understanding the persistence and the omnipresence of this phenomenon—is totally unacceptable.

Some years ago, I had occasion to call in the Japanese ambassador at the time, because in every Japanese bookstore there was a large section of anti-Semitic books when there was no Jewish population in Japan. It was one of the most poignant and one of the most incomprehensible waves of anti-Semitism globally that I have followed and been baffled by.

The current eruption of this age-old disease of European anti-Semitism is much more pernicious than anything we have seen since the Holocaust. What is particularly alarming about this outbreak is that it has developed entirely new strains of anti-Semitism. No longer is anti-Semitism in Europe, Russian, former Soviet states solely the manifestation, or even principally the manifestation, of right-wing, neo-fascist, old-type anti-Semitism.

Today the most virulent expressions of hatred of Jews emanate from Europe's radicalized Arab and Muslim communities and from the political elites—NGOs, media and “human rights” activists—“human rights” in quotation marks—on the left who accept their characterization of the democratic state of Israel as a monstrous violator of human rights.

I had the—I can't call it the pleasure—I had the responsibility at Durbin in late August of 2001 to be part of the American delegation at the U.N. Conference called to put an end at long last to all kinds of persecution, discrimination, racism. There is no U.N. Conference, Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Cardin, which had as noble a purpose as the Durbin Conference.

The Durbin Conference was hijacked by a cabal of anti-Israel and anti-Semitic forces, so much so that after several days of witnessing this outpouring of venom in an atmosphere of lynching, I felt I had to call our Secretary of State, Colin Powell, and recommend to him that the American delegation be withdrawn from Durbin.

Colin told me that he would have to consult the President, and when he called me back an hour and a half later, he said, “The President and I are in full accord with you. We want the American delegation withdrawn, and we want to ask you and Annette to personally lead the walkout and to hold a press Conference explaining why the United States is withdrawing from this event which had been hijacked by anti-Semitic, anti-American, anti-Israel forces.” We did that.

Today the widely accepted dogma in much of Europe is that Israel, through its supposed persecution of the Palestinians, not because of its struggle against terrorism, but through its alleged persecution of Palestinians, is responsible for the broad instability that plagues the Middle East.

It is appalling to me that the United Nations' principal operative in Iraq, Mr. Brahimi, instead of sticking to his task—that is, to try to create a more stable and more democratic government there—enjoys

his new position by blaming the state of Israel for the turmoil in Iraq. I had occasion to write to Kofi Annan about this, and I encourage all of my colleagues to do so.

The caricature of an Israeli as an aggressive and racist human rights violator is easily conflated with all Jews, making it politically acceptable, even proper, to denounce Jews for the world's current ills. The restoration of the old blood-libel rumor, with zero substance to it, of course, is now being seen across the globe—in an Egyptian television series sponsored by the Egyptian Government's television station to articles, radio programs across the globe.

A special chapter needs to be written about anti-Semitism on the American campus. A place where I used to teach economics, San Francisco State University, and the place where I received my Ph.D. in economics, the University of California, Berkeley, are hotbeds of violent campus anti-Semitism. And I have called on both of those institutions and numbers of others to take effective actions to not only protect Jewish and Israeli students, but to put an end through educational programs to this nightmare which has re-emerged in the 21st century.

Political cartoons printed in mainstream European newspapers picture Israeli leaders as parasites or devils in the manner of the vicious Nazi portrayal of Jews perpetrated by both Goebels and Hitler. These cartoons, Mr. Chairman, depict Israel's targeted security measures against terrorism as akin to Hitler's policy to annihilate the Jews of Europe, in a sickening effort to equate Zionism with the Holocaust.

Thankfully, the Berlin Declaration recognizes that anti-Semitism must not be allowed to be masked as a legitimate expression of opposition to Israel's security policies by stating clearly that international developments or political issues in Israel or elsewhere in the Middle East can never justify anti-Semitism.

Mr. Chairman, building on your work in the OSCE and in support of the Berlin Declaration, I have been working with you and with your Helsinki Commission colleague, Senator Voinovich, on legislation to require our own government to focus its effort to fight anti-Semitism.

Mr. Chairman, my legislation, H.R. 4230, which is cosponsored by many members of the Congressional Task Force Against Anti-Semitism—including the Chairman of the Middle East Subcommittee, Ms. Ros-Lehtinen, and Mr. Waxman, Mr. Kirk, my friend John Lewis of Georgia, who co-chairs the Task Force with me—would amend the Foreign Assistance Act to require the Department of State, in its annual country reports on human rights practices, to make a specific report on acts of anti-Semitism in each country in which they occur and to describe any action taken by governments to respond to such outrages.

My legislation would also authorize the creation of an office at the Department of State to monitor and combat anti-Semitism. That office would be headed by a director who would have responsibility for coordinating U.S. Government efforts against anti-Semitism.

Mr. Chairman, it is my hope that my legislation could be merged with your bill and that of Senator Voinovich, and that, once passed by the House, we can send it back to the Senate for their approval before the end of the current session of Congress.

Mr. Chairman, at my stage in life, one should no longer be surprised at anything. But I must admit that this absolute upsurge wave of anti-Semitism in Europe and elsewhere has come as a surprise to me. We see the strains of old church-related anti-Semitism merging with the

old political far-right anti-Semitism of neo-Nazi groups, merged with the new European anti-Semitism of Arab and Muslim groups, merged with the new left, that finds, for reasons that only it can explain, why anti-Semitism is now the most dominant influence in the intellectual arena in Europe.

I am reminded of the old story I heard in the mid-1930s when a young Nazi is asked in school who is responsible for all our problems—low-living standards, lack of jobs and so on—and his answer is, “The Jews and the bicyclists.” The question comes up, “Why the bicyclists?” The response is, “Why the Jews?”

It is incomprehensible that, from Japan to Germany to Belgium to France to Austria, in the year 2004, we have the degree of primitive anti-Semitism, Jew hatred, which characterized my experience as a boy and as a young man in the anti-Nazi underground.

No one can be too strong in praising your efforts in fighting this international disease, and I want to thank you and my friend, Ben Cardin, once more for leading this struggle.

Needless to say, I would be delighted to answer any questions you may have.

Mr. SMITH. Thank you very much, Mr. Lantos, for your very eloquent remarks and for standing so strong and so tall on behalf of human rights, especially this cancer called anti-Semitism.

You know, you mentioned the church, and without objection, I would like to include in the record a speech by Cardinal Keeler of Baltimore entitled, “Reflections on Anti-Semitism in the Church: A Jewish-Catholic Dialogue,” that he gave in Brazil on June 6.

But you made the point, and I think it was a very good one, about some in church that have had, especially historically, an abominable record when it came to anti-Semitic acts.

He points out, and I will just read one paragraph, “The Catholic Church takes the rise in anti-Semitism very seriously. When some 3 years ago the situation appeared to be on the verge of getting out of hand in France and the politicians were silent because it was an election year and they seemed unwilling to alienate Muslim voters, the French Bishops Conference issued a terse, strongly worded statement condemning anti-Semitism that broke the logjam and allowed the politicians to find their own voices and actions.”

He also pointed out (and it was a very well-written statement) that “one very distressing feature of the new anti-Semitism is the use in Muslim countries of the remnants of Christian anti-Semitism, such as the widespread distribution of the translations of the thoroughly discredited classics, *The Protocols of the Elders of Zion* and *The Talmud Unmasked*.”

Without objection, this will be part of the record.

I do thank you, Tom, for your eloquent statement and for your leadership.

Mr. LANTOS. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. Cardin?

Mr. CARDIN. Let me first just comment on Cardinal Keeler. We are blessed in Baltimore with the Archbishops of Baltimore, over the last several decades, having been very progressive in dealing with anti-Semitism, and Cardinal Keeler is following in that tradition as one of the

great world leaders in dealing with the bridges to differing communities. So I appreciate, Mr. Chairman, your mentioning my good friend, Cardinal Keeler.

Tom, let me just one more time say this. You were the victim of persecution during WWII, and you had every right after you were liberated to be able to try to put your life together and enjoy your marriage and your family, but instead you decided, in addition to that, to take an active role in changing human rights.

Mr. Sharansky, the same situation: Suffering 9 years in a prison with torture and intimidation, and instead of just quietly enjoying life, you decided that you had a mission—both of you.

On behalf of the people I represent, and on behalf of the world community that has been impacted by what the two of you have done on humanitarian issues, we just say thank you for being involved and being so effective in running for the Parliaments and doing what you both have done.

I need to say that because I know it was not an easy decision, and we thank you for stepping forward because you have been so effective.

I want to just say a little bit more about the Durbin issue and the United States versus what OSCE has done, because I think there is a lesson to be learned here. In Durbin the preparation that was done in different regions of the world—and I know the one of the Middle East excluded Israel because they could not participate—and we saw what happened in Durbin, an opportunity which was lost.

In the OSCE Conference in Berlin we also had many preliminary meetings, but we took an affirmative action. There is one section in the document that needs to be underscored, where we say that—declare unambiguously that “international developments or political issues, including those in Israel or elsewhere in the Middle East, never justify anti-Semitism.”

It was not easy to get that permission in a consensus document. In fact, we had several threats by some of our so-called friends that if we had that reference to Israel, they could not support our efforts. Yet, we stood tall in that because we knew it was important that the anti-Semitic cartoons that we find in too many papers in the world that are not criticisms of a government but are anti-Semitic actions need to be addressed.

So, I just want to underscore the point that you made. Certainly, legitimate criticisms of government, including when we criticize our own government, is legitimate. But we have seen too frequently the use of anti-Semitic actions as it relates to the state of Israel, and I appreciate the way that you mentioned it.

I have one question for you, if I might, Mr. Chairman, and that is, when you said that you cannot understand anti-Semitism today considering that in most of these parts of Europe there are so few Jews, and you mentioned Asia. I agree with you. I visit many, as you do, European countries where there is just a handful of Jews that live there. There's not many, and there may be one synagogue. I like to go to the synagogue just to try to make a connection to the Jewish community, and I could always find the synagogue because there is always a police car in front of it. It is not safe for the synagogue to be unprotected because there will be violence and acts of anti-Semitism against that. I am talking about Western Europe. I am not even talking about Central or East-

ern Europe. We are told and warned that it is not safe to wear a kippah, a yarmulke, because you are liable to be subject to violence in these communities.

My question to you: Is that what we have to live with in Europe? Or can we achieve a European society where institutions, Jewish institutions, can survive and not be desecrated without 24-hour protection and people can walk the streets observing their religion without fear of violence?

Mr. LANTOS. Well, Mr. Cardin, there are two kinds of answers that can be given to your very excellent question. One would take many hours, but I will take the other option and just take two minutes.

If there is one item I would recommend, and I have recommended, it is the following. You may remember a few years ago a number of Black churches were set on fire in the United States, and the next day our President and Vice President at the time, Bill Clinton and Al Gore, did not only denounce it forcefully and eloquently and publicly, but were on the scene rebuilding those churches physically themselves.

What is missing in these societies, in addition to a dozen other factors—but the key factor that is missing is the unqualified, courageous, public denunciation of acts of anti-Semitism by political leadership. If political leadership makes such acts, such statements, such cartoons unacceptable, then while it will not totally eliminate the problem, it will go a long ways toward doing so.

Let me just give you two specific examples, but maybe just one.

Annette and I recently attended the opening of the Holocaust Museum in our native city of Budapest. It took 60 years for that museum to be opened, but it was opened by the prime minister of Hungary, who stated clearly, without any equivocation, “Mea culpa, mea maxima culpa, Hungarians killed other Hungarians because they were of the Jewish faith. It is not the Nazis from Germany who did it to us; we did it ourselves. And we are profoundly and deeply regretful for our crimes.”

That night I listened to talk radio on Radio Budapest, and scores of very young people were calling in saying, “We really didn’t know what our parents and what our grandparents did. And we are so grateful for this coming clean by the government, accepting guilt, accepting responsibility and dedicating ourselves”—in this case, the current Government of Hungary—“to fighting anti-Semitism in all its forms.”

This was not the case with the previous Hungarian Government, which was in power just three years ago. It is certainly not the case with many of the governments of Central and Eastern Europe, and it is clearly not the case with many of the governments in Western Europe.

Political leadership, standing up and stating publicly that this insane illness running back through the centuries, is inappropriate for the 21st century, and putting their own credibility and prestige on the line, is the key. It is not enough to be a bystander. During the Holocaust, most people were bystanders. The persons who perpetrated the Holocaust were a minority, but the bystanders were not much less guilty than the perpetrators.

Political leadership requires standing up and demonstrating that the political leader is prepared to lose some votes, put his reputation and prestige on the line, to fight such outrages.

And there is nothing in the eight years of the Clinton presidency that I approved of more strongly than Clinton going down to the South and physically participating in the rebuilding of black churches which some bigots set on fire.

Mr. CARDIN. I thank you for that answer. I think there is hope based upon what you just said, on political leadership. We certainly admire the leadership in Germany to host this Conference and the president of Germany inviting the president of Israel to a state dinner.

Mr. LANTOS. Exactly.

Mr. CARDIN. I think it is that type of leadership that does give us hope that one day it will be safe for Jews to travel wherever they want to in Europe without fear that they have to take their yarmulke off in order to be safe.

Thank you very much.

Mr. LANTOS. Thank you very much.

Mr. SMITH. Thank you, Mr. Cardin.

Thank you very much, Mr. Lantos.

I would like to now welcome to the witness table His Excellency, Natan Sharansky. It is a great pleasure to introduce him again to the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe.

As we all know, Mr. Sharansky is the Israeli minister for Diaspora Affairs and head of the Israeli delegation to the Berlin OSCE Conference on Anti-Semitism.

We are very grateful for your willingness to testify not just today but yesterday as well, when we held a hearing on the issue of whether or not the OSCE should be expanded and Mediterranean partners become part of the process much more robustly than they are today, as to whether or not that might lead to some of the breakthroughs, particularly in the area of human rights and democratization. And Mr. Sharansky provided some very useful insights on that issue yesterday, and we thank you.

Mr. Sharansky was one of the leaders, as we all know, of the Jewish immigration movement in the former Soviet Union, and in 1976 helped found the Helsinki monitoring group. During these human rights activities, however, Mr. Sharansky was arrested by the KGB in 1977. Subjected to lengthy interrogations and a show trial, Mr. Sharansky was sentenced to 13 years of hard labor in prison. After serving 9 years, marked by numerous hunger strikes and protests, years of locked away in solitary confinement and a total of 405 days in punishment cells, Mr. Sharansky was finally released. That same day he rejoined his wife, from whom he had been separated for 11 years, since the day after their wedding.

I would just note parenthetically that in my first trip to the Soviet Union on behalf of Soviet Jews in January 1982 with the National Conference on Soviet Jewry, I was with Mark Levin and others who were part of that effort. We met with Mr. Sharansky's mother, who made an impassioned plea for her son, whom she thought was very close to dying because of the maltreatment by the Soviets.

I would also note that Frank Wolf and I, a member of this Commission, made a trip in the mid-1980s to Perm Camp 35, where Mr. Sharansky spent so much of his time resisting the atrocities of the Soviet regime. And never in my life have I seen a place more bleak,

more desolate—a thousand miles outside of Moscow in the Ural mountains. I saw the actual place, the shizu, where Mr. Sharansky spent time in solitary, and it was an appalling sight.

And I just want to congratulate you on your courage and your tenacity in overcoming such brutality against yourself and rising to be such a world leader.

Mr. Sharansky?

**HIS EXCELLENCY NATAN SHARANSKY,
ISRAELI MINISTER FOR DIASPORA AFFAIRS AND
HEAD OF THE ISRAELI DELEGATION TO THE BERLIN
OSCE CONFERENCE ON ANTI-SEMITISM**

Min. SHARANSKY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman and distinguished members of the Commission. Thank you for the opportunity to speak to your Commission here today.

Thirty years ago, I was a dissident in the former Soviet Union, and among the other things, I was collecting information about anti-Semitism and smuggling this information abroad to Jewish organizations, to human rights organizations, to this Commission, to political leaders of the West, of the free world. Because it was so clear for us that the free world is our ally; that anti-Semitism exists in the Soviet Union only because it is a totalitarian regime; that, after the Holocaust, democratic countries will never permit to have anti-Semitism among themselves.

The irony is that, 30 years later, I am in the same job; I am now collecting information about anti-Semitism as a cabinet minister in the Israeli Government. And in this capacity, I do not have to smuggle this information, of course; I simply invite the ambassadors of those countries that are starting these reports.

And the irony is that it is not the countries from Eastern Europe or the former dictatorial regimes; it is the leading countries of democratic Europe, because today it is in Europe that synagogues have been burned, rabbis have been abused in the streets, Jewish children on their way to schools have been physically attacked and Jewish cemeteries have been desecrated.

This new unprecedented wave of anti-Semitism became a real threat not only to Jews, but to the very stability of the European society. And as a result to the objecting of the Organization on Security and Cooperation in Europe, that is why it was so important that they all see priority placed on this issue by convening a conference in Berlin.

This new wave of anti-Semitism is characterized by two components: The first one is so-called new anti-Semitism, and the lines between anti-Israeli propaganda and anti-Semitic propaganda are blurred; when Israel becomes a symbol of rogue Jew, when criticism of Israel turns into a vehicle to strengthen rabid anti-Semitism.

Of course, if you want to be successful in the struggle against anti-Semitism, as against any other evil, there must be moral clarity of the issue: what we are talking about. It is important to define the line between legitimate criticism of Israel and anti-Semitism. Israel is a strong democracy, and the only democracy in the Middle East, and it is built on the criticism from within and without. Of course, we support all forms of legitimate criticism, but it is very important to see the difference, draw the line between this legitimate criticism and anti-Semitism.

At the conference, I proposed a special—I would say a very easy—formula for exactly this purpose. I call it 3D: demonization, double standard and delegitimization. In fact, I did not have to invent the formula. I simply took the methods used, approaches used by anti-Semites for thousands of years toward Jews and wanted to see if the same approach is applied toward Jewish states.

I will not go into details, because I will present to the Commission my speech in Berlin and some other materials on this issue, but I will only say that, like a pair of glasses in a 3-D movie that allows us to see everything with perfect clarity, the 3D test that I propose will ensure that those lines remain clear.

I was very happy to hear that the leadership of the secretary of state, Mr. Powell, who, in his Berlin speech, was speaking against demonization of the state of Israel. He and the other leaders were speaking against using extreme forms of criticism of Israel for encouraging anti-Semitism. As it was already mentioned here, that was one of the most important and most difficult achievements of the conference in Berlin. There was made the line that will set clear that not all types of criticism of Israel are legal—the demonization of Israel, delegitimization of Israel—different approach to a Jewish state that is not applied to any other state, that is also a form of anti-Semitism.

But as I said, there are two important components in this new phenomenon of anti-Semitism. One is using an anti-Israeli campaign for strengthening anti-Semitism and the other is classical—classical anti-Semitism, when the old, deep, primitive prejudices against Jews are again used in the very powerful way. This time mainly they are coming through the state-sponsored/supported media in the Middle East.

The Berlin Conference that played such an important role in putting anti-Semitism on the international community's radar screen, unfortunately almost ignored the most vicious, persistent and genocidal forms of anti-Semitism emanating from radical elements in the Arab and Muslim world today.

I brought with me today, and I present to the Commission, a 150-page study entitled "Anti-Semitism in the Contemporary Middle East." The study, prepared by our office, surveys anti-Semitic reporting, editorials, editorial caricatures in the government-controlled press of Egypt, Iran, Jordan, Lebanon, the Palestinian Authority, Syria, Saudi Arabia and the Gulf states. In the more than 100 editorial cartoons included in this report, Jews and Israelis are invariably represented as poisonous snakes, murderous Nazis and bloodthirsty Crusaders. Please look at it. I am sure that even a cursory glance will prove quite shocking.

We found that vicious anti-Semitism that expressly calls for massive terrorism and genocide against Jews, Zionists and the state of Israel is becoming ever more commonplace across the Arab Middle East.

Please note, the overwhelming majority of this propaganda is issued from the government-controlled media and from supposedly respectable publishing houses closely tied to these regimes.

Here is a brief review of the main findings of the report:

Classic European anti-Semitic imagery is widespread in the Middle East, as is Holocaust denial and the identification of Israel as a Nazi state.

The borders between anti-Semitism, anti-Americanism and anti-Westernism have become almost completely blurred.

Islamic religious themes, quotations and sayings are being widely mobilized to demonize Jews and Israelis and to justify the outright annihilation of the state of Israel and all its Jewish and non-Jewish supporters.

The Arab-Israeli conflict is increasingly portrayed as part of an eternal confrontation between the pan-Islamic nation and the infidels—Jews and Christians alike—who embody all evil.

All Israelis—men, women and children—and Jews around the world, as well as their Crusader allies, are held responsible for the crimes of the Jews and Zionists and considered legitimate targets.

[Inaudible] ... on June 4, that means, what, 10 days ago, on a Palestinian Authority TV broadcast, a live ceremony of very popular Sheik Ramid Ahira who said that he accused Jews of attempting to kill the prophet Mohammad and then said, “The reason for the problems of the Islamic nations, of the world and of the entire planet are Jews and only Jews. There can be no agreement with Jews.”

Here are the words of one of the foremost Saudi clerics, a very popular one, Sheikh Abdel Rahman al-Sudais, in the central mosque of Mecca, the center of the Islamic world, and he gave a ceremony that was [inaudible] ... he described Jewish people in such a way: “The infidels, worshipers of ... [inaudible] ... murderers of prophets, who attempted to murder the prophet Mohammad.” He goes on to say that the “Jews ... [Inaudible] ... prophecies of ... [Inaudible] ... are corrupt, vicious, and treacherous. He ended his sermon beseeching Allah that the Jews, along with all of the other idol worshipers, be utterly destroyed and that God use his sharp instruments upon them.

Here the school textbook from the Palestinian Authority, that ... [inaudible] ... and that supports suicide bombing, encouraging the youth to blow themselves as *shaheeds* [martyrs] and kill civilians in the heart of Israel. Here are the words—I quote from the textbook approved by the Palestinian Authority’s minister of education: “The Muslim sacrificed himself for his belief and rages *jihad* for us. He is not swayed, for he knows that the date of his death has been predetermined and that his death as a *shaheed* on the field of the battle is preferable to death in his bed.”

So of course, you can say, “But how can ... [inaudible] ... anti-Semitism in Europe?” And ... [inaudible] ... very simple way: Through very powerful technology of today, when anti-Semitic film produced in Syria can be seen by hundreds of millions of people all over the world, including millions of new citizens of Europe.

Let me show you now only 5 minutes from a 15-hour film. For 15 hours, for 30 days, hundreds of millions of people all over the world have seen this vicious anti-Semitic film, including millions in Europe, and I will show you only five minutes of this film.

This series appeared last Ramadan, in November, every evening at 9 o’clock in the evening, when all the family after the feast is sitting together, three, four generations of family and enjoying this film.

[Video clip is played.]

Min. SHARANSKY. So blood libel is not something new. In fact, it has existed for thousands of years. But never before in the history of humanity it could be put in such a powerful visual way and sent simultaneously to hundreds of millions of people. Among those who are demonstrating in Europe, in Paris, in London, in Brussels and chanting, “Death to Jews,” there are many people who saw this film, all 15 hours of this film.

In fact, when I tried to show this clip on the Israeli TV, it was refused. Israeli television would not permit the film to be shown with these episodes when so many children could view it, but millions of children saw it all over the world, including Europe.

Mr. Chairman, I recognize that there have been very positive developments in the fight against anti-Semitism over the last year or so. The OSCE has held several good meetings on this issue, and of course, as I said, I applaud Secretary Powell's leadership and all the efforts done with this Commission in this regard.

Last month the United Nations Commission on Human Rights condemned anti-Semitism in three separate resolutions that were adopted by consensus.

But all these important initiatives, unfortunately, are not sufficient to combat state-sponsored anti-Semitism, especially the Arab and Islamic state sponsored anti-Semitism of which I have spoken today. For real progress to be made, the free world must be willing not only publicly and forcefully to condemn this anti-Semitism, but also to pursue a policy of linkage against states that support anti-Semitism.

The effectiveness of a policy based on linkage was powerfully demonstrated a generation ago after a group of dissidents inside the Soviet Union, including myself, decided to form the Helsinki Group in the wake of the Helsinki accords and after this group, this Commission was created in Washington, this very agreement that led to the establishment of the OSCE.

With the help of courageous leaders in the West who were willing to link their relations with the Soviets to their treatment of their own people, the Helsinki Group helped ensure that the Soviets could not take one step in the international arena without their human rights policies becoming an issue. As a result, real progress was made.

The massive flow of anti-Semitic propaganda from the Arab and Muslim worlds can no longer be ignored or tolerated. I believe that combating anti-Semitism ought to become a much more prominent issue in the bilateral relations between the United States and the Arab and Muslim worlds. Linkage should be used to marginalize the extremists and to encourage and support those who reject this virulent hatred.

Anti-Semitism is not a threat only to Jews. History has shown us that, left unchecked, the forces behind anti-Semitism will imperil all the values and freedoms that our civilization holds dear. We must not let this happen. We must do everything in our power to fight anti-Semitism. Armed with moral clarity, determination and a common purpose, I know that this is a fight that we can and will win.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SMITH. Minister Sharansky, thank you very much for your very eloquent testimony and for showing us that very disturbing and obnoxious video. I think it made clear that it is what the young are watching—not just the young, but all people or large numbers of people. It is any wonder why with that kind of propaganda and hate and disinformation, without a counterpoint to point out how false it is, why they are so easily led down the path of anti-Semitism.

You mentioned in your testimony that children's books, and now I think we would have to also say videos and TV broadcasts, in some Arab countries, including Egypt that has signed the peace treaty with Israel, regularly portrayed Jews as murderers and thieves.

Also, and I have actually done legislation on this, I have been very disturbed about what I have seen with UNRWA [United Nations Relief and Works Agency], that the United States has been the prime provider of fundings for some \$2 billion for UNRWA. It seems to me that the textbooks that are being used by young people with Hamas having such a dominant role in the boards of education for the Palestinian refugee camps ought to be absolutely cleansed of any anti-Semitic language or content, and yet it is not.

When we have raised these issues, folks from UNRWA make their way to my office to tell me how they are working on this, they are working on that. It seems to me that with the teaching of the young, there ought to be a zero tolerance for this kind of hate, and I wonder if you might want to comment on that.

If you would also comment on the recommendation made by, or the proposal, by the Spanish delegation to convene an anti-Semitism conference in Cordoba, Spain, next year. Is that the best venue? Might there be a more appropriate place that we might look at and work toward that? Do you feel a conference is necessary?

My own view is that we need accountability. We need more accountability and more accountability. We have not exhausted either the scrutiny that this issue deserves nor the efforts to eradicate it.

Then on the issue of linkage, one of the things that I, for 24 years as a member of Congress, have been very much in favor of is linkage—economic linkages, penalties. The carrots only go so far, moral suasion only goes so far. When you are talking to dictatorships or people who are filled with hate, they are not persuaded one iota by appeals to morality. There needs to be a penalty.

I would note that the trafficking law that I worked hard on and others—the linkage to foreign aid being stopped if they are what we call “tier three” has awakened many nations to the problem within their own borders, and they have taken, in many cases, corrective action. We did the same thing with the International Religious Freedom Act, and I could go on and on. Jackson-Vanik certainly was the quintessential example of trying to say there is a price to be paid when you disallow Jewish people to leave on their own accord from the Soviet Union.

So are you talking about some kind of linkage to foreign aid, to trade?

My sadness is, with the WTO and with its *modus operandi*, that it is extremely hard to penalize countries nowadays because of that, even for child-labor infractions. But having said that, this is U.S. foreign policy we are talking about or Israeli foreign policy. We can, if we so desire, can put holds on money or assistance.

What would be your thoughts on that?

Min. SHARANSKY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Great questions.

First, on the question of another conference on anti-Semitism of the Spanish Government and their proposal to have it in Cordoba—almost every place in Europe is good for having a conference on anti-Semitism because, unfortunately, practically every place has some tragic examples from the past. If it helps to overcome this past, of course it is welcome. I think it was very symbolic that this conference was in Berlin and that the determination that was reached that was demonstrated by the leaders of Germany to overcome the tragic past and to lead the battle against anti-Semitism.

Cordoba, of course, can be a very interesting place because that is a place of meeting of traditionalism, the meeting of Muslim and Jewish and Christian culture, of many battles in the past, of much persecution and but also many cooperations. If that can encourage this dialogue in the coming years, help us to bring the problem of the fight against Muslim anti-Semitism in Europe and everywhere, of course it can be helpful.

But let me tell you that I do not think that having more and more conferences is going to be an end by itself. We need now, after the Berlin Declaration was approved, we need a lot of professional work in this sphere of education about which you mentioned, to make sure that there will be zero tolerance to anti-Semitism in all education in every school in the world. We need to make a lot of efforts in legislation. There are some positive examples in some countries of Europe, and there are a lot of negative examples. We need to coordinate experience of fighting with police against anti-Semitism in different countries in Europe.

So I believe that now is the time for professionals to work. If you are talking about the next conference, I would like to see a conference of professionals who are united by experience in this field of this and can share their experience.

Accountability is definitely a very important issue. For accountability, we must have clear criteria. That is why I insist on the 3-D formula. Many other things have to be measured, that can be measured and should be accountable.

I think if all those legislative initiatives that we heard today—and, of course, we welcome all the efforts of the congressmen and senators to deal with the issue—even the result of which there will be a special decision that the State Department must prepare annual reports, as it did in the past about human rights after the Helsinki Process started, and this annual report of the situation in different countries that would comply with different criteria. The record of a specific country in fighting, or supporting, unfortunately, anti-Semitism can thus be measured. It can be extremely important, and it can be a new opportunity to be more successfully.

Mr. Chairman, I fully agree with you. As you know, I am a big supporter of the policy of linkage. I believe that it is absolutely an impossible situation when the same totalitarian regimes that are encouraging some of the most awful phenomena of hatred toward Jews or toward democratic countries, toward human rights, who are fighting against it, at the same time these regimes are surviving because of the support that comes from the free world. That was the case of linkage under the Soviet Union when the policy of detente, the one-sided concessions and support the Soviet Union in spite of their violations was stopped by the Jackson-Vanik amendment and later, of course, by Helsinki agreements. That is very important and should be introduced again today.

Yesterday we were discussing the question of introducing the Helsinki reports in the Middle East. I am sure that linkage with the question of state-supported anti-Semitism and relations between the free world and these countries that support anti-Semitism is an extremely important point or at least introducing Helsinki process to the Middle East.

Mr. SMITH. Thank you.

Mr. Cardin?

Mr. CARDIN. Well, once again, thank you for your appearance here before our Commission. It is certainly extremely helpful to us, and we are honored by your presence.

I do not understand why terrorists do what they do, and I do not understand why governments sponsor terrorism. Can you shed any light at all as to why a country, Syria, would want this type of direct anti-Semitism to be disseminated? Why do governments sponsor anti-Semitism?

Min. SHARANSKY. Well, let me share with you some of my experience in living in a totalitarian regime.

Totalitarian regime—what is the principle difference of the totalitarian regime from a democratic regime? First of all, you have to recognize that the leaders of dictatorships and the leaders of democracy want the same: They want to stay in power, to continue being the leaders. But for the democratic leaders to stay in power, they had to depend on their people and this means to improve the life of their people. Dictators do not depend on their people; people depend on the dictators. When dictators want to stay in power, it means to keep people under control.

Repeatedly, we can see in history that there is no better way for a dictator to keep people under control than to have to create the enemy, to constantly to mobilize your own people for the sacred struggle against the enemy. Stalin needed enemies; Hitler needed enemies; practically every dictator in history needed the enemy to control his own people. Anti-Semitism was one of the very powerful ways of keeping the eternal enemy the Jew.

In fact, the most anti-Semitic film in Nazi Germany that was shown in every school as a part of the curriculum was called *Eternal Jew*, and it was about the eternal hate of the Jews. This Syrian film, the two clips of which you saw, are episodes that, is exactly the same as this *Eternal Jew* from Nazi Germany. The only difference being that the old classic films is in black and white while the more recent is in color.

In the same quotes, in the same words, but much more powerful because TV is now in color and not black and white and TV can be sent all over the world. But the same eternal hatred for Jews helps the dictators to survive, helps the dictators to control their own people.

But that is the threat for us, not only for Jews, for all the free world. And that is why the linkage, the direct connection between our attitude toward these countries and their producing of the hatred is absolutely necessary.

Mr. CARDIN. Well, I think Chairman Smith is correct, I think you are correct, as far as linkage is concerned.

It is interesting, you know, it is been pointed out, probably our most successful linkage was Jackson-Vanik as it relates to the immigration of Soviet Jews, as it related basically to highlighting the gross human rights violations of the former Soviet Union. We were prepared to say that, look, even though trade may be helpful to us, to America, that there are principles that go beyond that.

We used the same message with South Africa to bring down the apartheid Government of South Africa. I remember very vividly the arguments being made; we need to engage and why are we setting up ways that we cannot engage a country for change, and yet the linkage brought about the change in South Africa.

We celebrated the life of Ronald Reagan last week, our 40th President, and the way that he went to Gorbachev, who was a reformer, against the advice of our own State Department and embarrassed Gorbachev in Berlin by saying, "Tear down the wall." I mean, it is these types of engagements.

So it is bilateral, it is regional, it is linkage, but a country that sponsors gross human rights violations, whether it is anti-Semitism or other types of activities, we need to continue the U.S. leadership in saying there will be linkage. If you want to have a bilateral relationship with the United States, you must clean up these activities. If you want to join these international organizations, you need to address these issues.

Mr. Lantos raised the point that I happen to agree with, as far as countries in which anti-Semitism occurs and violations of human rights occur but it is not government-sponsored. I would think we would acknowledge that in most of the states of the OSCE, the rise of anti-Semitism is not as a result of government-sponsored anti-Semitism. Maybe government indifference; it may not have the leadership that he mentions.

I look at some of the examples in the Middle East of anti-Semitism, and I would probably acknowledge that if these cartoons were in an American paper they would be constitutionally protected, that we could not prevent these types of announcements. However, we would hope that there would be political leadership to condemn this type of activity.

We saw in Germany political leadership. Foreign Minister Fischer is clearly a person committed to doing things in leadership. We have seen leadership in Bulgaria. We saw leadership in Turkey when the Jewish synagogue was bombed and Jews were killed, where the leaders of Turkey made it clear that Turkish citizens were killed by placing the Turkish flag on the coffin.

I guess my question to you—you have had a chance to visit these countries, or at least see what is going on in these countries. In the 55 countries that we are directly responsible for in the OSCE, how would you characterize the political leadership to really deal with these issues, to really make it a priority, to really say, look, we would not tolerate this type of discrimination in our country?

Is what happened in Germany or Bulgaria or Turkey an exception, or do we have hope that there is growing leadership within the OSCE states to really deal with this issue? Or do they just tolerate our conference and hope that we will forget about it?

Min. SHARANSKY. Thank you for the very important issues that you raised in your questions.

You mentioned two great leaders, Senator Jackson and President Reagan. When I am asked who brought down communism, I always mention three people: Andrei Sakharov, the leader of the dissidents in the Soviet Union; Senator Jackson; and President Reagan. I feel that these three people introduced moral clarity on this issue and helped to build the policy in accordance with this moral clarity.

Senator Jackson did not accept these technical explanations, why people cannot leave because of one or another technical situation, such as that their parents do not give permission, or they have secrets and so on. He said, if you know that there are hundreds of thousands who want to leave and people are not getting permission, it means that some-

thing is wrong with the country, and if there is no free movement of the people, then let us make sure that there will be no free movement of the goods.

That became an extremely powerful statement because it was a real pressure on the Soviet Union, and also because it made the situation absolutely clear.

When President Reagan made his historic speech, I was in the Soviet prison, and I found out about his speech through an article in *Pravda*. When you are not in a punishment cell, you have the luxury of reading the Soviet newspaper, *Pravda*. And it was there that I saw Reagan's speech condemned and that is how I found out that finally there was a leader in the West who called a spade a spade, who would not be deceived by all the talk about relativism of human rights that was so accepted in these days, namely that we in America have our problems with human rights, and you in Russia have your own problems, so let us just focus about how to live together. President Reagan stopped with all this nonsense. He called evil evil. From that day, we in the Soviet prison knew that the truth would prevail.

When 3 years later I was released from prison and had the honor of telling to President Reagan what a big day of trudging in prison, how we sent messages from one cell to the other by Morse code or talking through toilets, informing those prisoners who could not read *Pravda* what a great event happened. Listening to my story, President Reagan reacted with a boyish enthusiasm. He called everybody and said, "Listen to what this man says. Do you understand why it was so important for me to call it an evil empire?" Then I understood that many people in the West did not realize the power of that speech and the policy that he built in accordance with these principles of good and evil. The fact that he was speaking to Soviet leaders in very simple terms –

He once told me how he said to the Soviet leader, "You can keep saying that Natan Sharansky is an American spy, but my people trust that man, so you can do really nothing. Or you can release the dissidents and we will not be able to start a trusted relationship with you." So that was a simple way in which he explained some very basic truths, and that is why he was so successful.

So, when we come today to this awful issue of anti-Semitism, I believe this moral clarity, simple tools like those used by President Reagan are needed. There can be no way to build stable relations to conduct trade, to participate together in international conference and to talk to the leaders of these countries as equal partners as part of our family when they are financing and creating this type of anti-Semitic propaganda. It must be a very simple, but very strong and powerful message.

You just mentioned cartoons, that the Constitution could protect some of these cartoons that are so demonized if they published them in America. I will tell you the difference. The difference is that if these cartoons were published in America, I believe protecting voices would be raised immediately from here and from other people saying that this is anti-Semitism and to be aware of this. That can be debate about it.

But when it is state-sponsored anti-Semitism, when the only channel of information that people have is through these types of films and these types of cartoons, when people are brainwashed from day to day where they have no other picture of the world, that is what creates this anti-Semitism that kills. That is what prepares the atmosphere for the new

Holocaust because Holocaust can be possible only when hundreds of thousands or millions of people believe that Jews are less than other people, that Jews can and should be killed.

But of course there is also the other difference, and here is the question of leadership. Courageous leadership is extremely important. The fact that today in some countries of Europe such types of cartoons can be published, not only published, but can receive the prize for the best cartoon of the year—the best cartoon of the year in England was a cartoon in *Independence*, where Ariel Sharon is eating Palestinian kids. The best cartoon in Italy was when the baby from Beit Lehem is saying to an Israel soldier, “You came to crucify me for the second time.”

That brought a lot of support from public opinion and no condemnation from political leadership. That is a danger, and that is why it is so important that this OSCE is mobilized. That is why it is so important that ... [inaudible] ... the leaders in West European countries are taking this leadership. That is why it is so important to have clear criteria so we can distribute when we are talking about legitimate criticism, and free debate protected by the constitution or when there is open encouragement of anti-Semitism.

Mr. CARDIN. Thank you very much.

Mr. SMITH. Thank you.

Moving to our third panel, I just want to again thank you, Mr. Sharansky, for your lifetime commitment to human rights and justice.

I would just point out that the issue of linkage is a very difficult and heavy lift. I mentioned earlier the trafficking legislation that now everybody, I think, would agree is working, and it is another proof that wise sanctions, smart sanctions do work. That was opposed—because I was the prime sponsor of that—by the Clinton administration. They did not want to name names, which we do. They did not want to link it to foreign aid. Non-humanitarian foreign aid is exempted, but other kinds of foreign aid can be halted. There was a bipartisan effort thankfully here to get that passed, the same with Frank Wolf's International Religious Freedom Act. The previous administration opposed that, vigorously, on the record, in testimony, because it would set up a hierarchy of human rights and religious freedom that somehow trumped everything else, which was absolute unmitigated nonsense.

I pointed out during that debate that Jackson-Vanik and the fight against apartheid in South Africa only was value-added to any other human rights policy we had. It did not diminish one iota.

I would say that, going forward, and I am sure Mr. Cardin would agree, we will work hard on this linkage issue, but we have to build a very strong coalition, because there are a lot of people who say, if you just trade, make nice, somehow that will mitigate their behavior. Nothing could be further from the truth.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Chairman?

Mr. SMITH. Yes?

Mr. CARDIN. Just on that point, I agree with your point. We had a hearing yesterday as to the OSCE expansions in the Middle East. At that point, one of our witnesses pointed out the challenges that we have within our own governmental bureaucracy, and this time we are referring to the State Department, that tends to be cautious. We find that President Reagan went against the advice of the State Department in speaking out against Gorbachev, a reformer, in Berlin at the Berlin Wall.

I think what we find is that we have to guard against our own timidity in our own foreign policy bureaucracies that tend to be compartmentalized and, therefore, interested in opening up trade or opening up allies against communism or allies against drug trafficking or whatever it might be. They put human rights at a lower priority.

That is where we need leadership, whether it comes from the President or it comes from Congress, to say linkage to human rights issues should be a high priority of this nation and at times it must take priority over advancements in other areas. That is where I think we have had problems over the years with different administrations, where I think, unfortunately, the bureaucracy won over the political leadership.

I think we, this Commission, serves a very useful role in making sure that we place the highest priorities on the commitments within the OSCE.

Thank you.

Mr. SMITH. Thank you.

Thank you, Mr. Sharansky, and we appreciate your leadership.

I would like to now welcome our third panel, and I have the pleasure of introducing our distinguished witnesses. All these individuals were present in Berlin for the OSCE Conference on Anti-Semitism. After briefly introducing them, I would ask them to make their statements, and then we will go to questions.

First is Betty Ehrenberg, who is the director of the Institute for Public Affairs for the Orthodox Union of Jewish Congregations. The institute is a nonpartisan, public-policy research and advocacy center created to represent the nation's largest orthodox Jewish synagogue organization and works to bring its perspective to bear upon public-policy issues confronting America. Betty gave a very fine speech in Berlin. I congratulate her on that speech and for the good work she did over there and as well as here in the United States.

Paul Goldenberg is the national security consultant for the American Jewish Committee, a nationally-decorated and internationally-respected law enforcement executive with the unique mix of experience in criminal justice, human relations and regulatory matters. Mr. Goldenberg has played a key role in forging domestic and international policy concerning the legislation and investigation of hate crimes. We are now working with Mr. Goldenberg on a collaborative effort to train the trainers, and I am sure he will go into that in some detail, but I thank him for his leadership.

Then there is Jay Lefkowitz, a good friend and former domestic policy adviser to President Bush, who is also celebrating his wedding anniversary today.

Congratulations, Jay.

Mr. LEFKOWITZ. Thank you.

Mr. SMITH. Having served both George Bush 41 and George W. Bush, he is now a partner at Kirkland and Ellis, where he practices commercial litigation and strategic counseling. He is also the author of numerous essays about law, politics and religion. I know firsthand that, although he was domestic policy, he worked very effectively on a whole host of international human rights issues relative to the U.N. and elsewhere, as well as this issue. I am very grateful that he has joined us and was one of the public members at Berlin as well.

Lastly I am happy to introduce Fred Zeidman, Chairman of the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Council, appointed Chairman by President Bush in March 2002. The Council, which includes 55 presidential appointments and 10 Members of the U.S. Congress, is a governing board of the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum. The museum, as we all know, is America's national institution dedicated to remembering the Holocaust and teaching its lessons to future generations.

Betty, if you could begin?

**BETTY EHRENBERG, DIRECTOR,
INSTITUTE FOR PUBLIC AFFAIRS, ORTHODOX UNION OF
JEWISH CONGREGATIONS**

Ms. EHRENBERG. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

We are witnessing a new, virulent and globalizing anti-Semitism that has been developing for years and that has manifestations in many countries today. It is almost indistinguishable from classic anti-Semitism, yet there is a new aspect. As traditional anti-Semitism involved discrimination against Jews and the denial of their right to live as equal members of society, this new element involves the Middle East situation and it singles out Israel for discriminatory treatment in international bodies; it includes public calls for the destruction of Israel and the Jewish people, even for the killing of Jews as religious obligation.

The Conference on Anti-Semitism that took place in Berlin under the auspices of the OSCE last April was a breakthrough, and I was proud to serve as a public member with Mayor Koch, with Ambassadors Minikes and O'Donnell, with Congressman Smith and Congressman Cardin and my colleagues at the table. And the conference presented a challenge to all of us to see if we can shape our world in strengthening peace and justice.

Anti-Semitism, if allowed to continue to spread, will affect all the world's democracies. What represented a significant diplomatic victory was the fact that the governments expressed a willingness to acknowledge the severity of anti-Semitism in their countries and to take actions to combat it. For too long, the attacks on Jews and Jewish institutions that have been increasing in the past three and a half years have been either denied, ignored, rationalized or obfuscated, and the conference presented an opportunity for diagnosing and treating this terrible disease.

The Berlin Declaration was a groundbreaking example of countries willing to recommit themselves to the doctrine of the Universal Declaration on Human Rights. Fifty-five member States pledged to take concrete steps to fight the anti-Semitism in their midst, and they highlighted the global dangers that it presents in modern times.

Today, the increase of terrorism, the development of weapons of mass destruction by state sponsors of terrorism, plus the demonization of Jews and Israel, is a combination of very volatile elements. In this light, the Berlin Declaration, unequivocally condemning anti-Semitism, is even more timely and significant.

The acknowledgment by the international community that political developments, including those in Israel or elsewhere in the Middle East, never justify anti-Semitism render the demonization and delegitimization of Israel unacceptable. Singling out Israel for blame by the international community, while ignoring the most deplorable human rights records of others, is a double standard that cannot be allowed to exist.

The conference took place in an atmosphere of cooperation, working toward a common goal of eradicating discrimination. President Bush had set the tone by telling President Prodi of the European Union that he had to do something about the anti-Semitism in Europe. The presence of Secretary of State Colin Powell proved that the United States is really determined to take the lead to reverse this alarming trend, and his clear message that hate crimes must be prosecuted and that it is unacceptable to vilify Israel by using Nazi symbols and racist caricatures set the guidelines.

The achievements of the conference, to my mind, were unprecedented. Demonization of Israel was identified for what it is—anti-Semitism. For the first time, OSCE member States will commit to monitoring hate crimes, tracking bias crime statistics and issuing public reports.

I might add that really this is the most important thing. If there had not been the Helsinki monitoring group, and if there had not been the Helsinki Accords and then the Helsinki Commission and the OSCE, we would not have ever been able to demand the repatriation of Soviet Jews. It was because they were abusing human rights that we could call them on it. We could monitor and track. That was why we could monitor and call them on what they were doing.

Best practices to help prevent anti-Semitism and racism were shared. For once, the disease would be not only diagnosed, but treatments would be prescribed: namely, exhortations, arguments, examples, monitoring and oversight.

Ideas were exchanged, such as the formation of interfaith Commissions to cooperate on issues of common concern. Examples of public educational programs on teaching tolerance and preventing incitement were cited. Attention was focused on educating the young people; most important, since hatred and incitement have been taught to the young, as we saw on the video.

There should be an OSCE conference for educators, just like the current one ongoing for interfaith experts.

I serve as Director of International and Communal Affairs for the Orthodox Union. Our constituency of hundreds of synagogues all across the country has made the need for protection of Jewish institutions from anti-Semitic attacks a top priority. We respond very strongly to reports of attacks on Jews, and have met with representatives of homeland security and law enforcement agencies concerning the threats to the Jewish community. When Tom Lantos mentioned the black church burnings that took place several years ago, we joined the coalition of religious faith groups, including those who were the victims of those black church burnings, to work together against attacks on houses of worship.

We played a key role in helping Congress pass H.R. 393, which called on the U.S. Government to condemn anti-Semitism and to hold European leaders accountable for the safety of their respective Jewish communities. This resolution, introduced by Congressman Joe Crowley, was passed in December 2002, just as these anti-Semitic acts were on the upsurge.

We meet continually with both Jewish and non-Jewish leaders of countries who are experiencing this surge of anti-Semitism. Recent meetings were held with the Jewish and non-Jewish leaders of France, Turkey and Morocco to support those Jewish communities in the wake of attacks and to urge their leaders to bring the perpetrators to justice.

Our president, Harvey Blitz, attended the funerals of the victims of the bombings in Turkey several months ago in solidarity with that community.

The OU supports a Jewish school in Kharkov in Ukraine, and therefore, we closely monitor events in Eastern Europe. We recently contacted the representative of Belarus to protest the desecration of Jewish cemeteries in Grodno and waged a grass-roots campaign to stop the destruction of Jewish graves.

We have been in constant contact with Argentinian representatives since 1992 regarding the terrorist bombings of the Israeli Embassy and Jewish community center, and we mark each anniversary in the press.

As an NGO observer to the U.N., we strongly lobbied for the resolution condemning anti-Semitism proposed by the Irish delegation and for the inclusion of anti-Semitism in the resolution condemning racism. We work closely with the American U.N. mission to oppose anti-Israel resolutions and those, quote, unquote, "special sessions" that punish Israel alone, giving anti-Semitism the appearance of international sanction.

The OU takes part in interfaith dialogues with other religious groups to help increase mutual understanding and work on issues of common concern. We believe that these communities can form coalitions to avert crises and to further the interests of religious harmony and liberty.

Our current grass-roots initiative is an advocacy campaign for the passage of H.Con.Res. 425, the resolution introduced by Representatives Smith and Cardin, expressing the sense of the Congress in support of the ongoing work of the OSCE in combating anti-Semitism, and its parallel resolution in the Senate, S.Con.Res. 110, introduced by Senator Ben Nighthorse Campbell. These resolutions will strengthen the work of the OSCE and help ensure that the elements of the Berlin Declaration will indeed be carried out.

We recently applauded the passage of Senator George Voinovich's bill, S. 2292, and are looking forward to the passage of its related House bill introduced by Representative Smith.

Thank you very kindly for your attention.

Mr. SMITH. Thank you, Ms. Ehrenberg, for your testimony and your leadership.

Now Mr. Goldenberg?

**PAUL GOLDENBERG,
NATIONAL SECURITY CONSULTANT,
AMERICAN JEWISH COMMITTEE**

Mr. GOLDENBERG. Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. My name is Paul Goldenberg. I am the national security consultant for the American Jewish Committee.

The American Jewish Committee is the United States' premiere human relations organization, with more than 125,000 members and supporters and chapters in 33 cities throughout the United States. We also have active programs and offices in other parts of the world, including Europe, with offices in Berlin, Geneva and Brussels.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for the opportunity to testify today about the follow-up to the historic OSCE conference in Berlin. I applaud you and the Commission for today's discussion about concrete steps in the

aftermath of the Berlin meeting. However, unless the meeting is followed up with concrete initiatives, it will not have served its purpose: to define an action plan against growing anti-Semitism in Europe.

I am here today because I have more than 15 years' experience in helping governments in the United States and abroad focusing law enforcement institutions to the problem of hate crimes and ethnic terrorism, and how best to mobilize and combat them. My last law enforcement assignment was as the nation's first chief of a full-time hate-crimes unit with statewide jurisdiction under the attorney general's office of New Jersey.

Over the years I have been involved with directing more than 250 hate-crime arrests, and I am also a co-author of the Federal Law Enforcement Center's national hate crime training program. In addition, I have had the opportunity to establish hate-crime units in police forces throughout Canada and the United States, and have assisted the Japanese Government in similar initiatives, and have consulted with law enforcement agencies in the United Kingdom and Germany.

The reason I share that background with you is because today I speak to you, quite frankly, not as an academic but as a practitioner and a former law enforcement executive who has personally seen the impact of hate crimes on victims and on communities. I know the huge difference when such crimes are investigated in a framework that treats them seriously versus situations in which they are not.

I also, incidentally, speak to you as someone who recently relearned firsthand the meaning of anti-Semitism, when I had to respond to my own 11-year-old son, who had come home from school just several weeks ago baffled and upset after being called a kike. I had to look into the eyes of my own child, who looked at me and said, "Dad, what did the Jewish people ever do to anybody?"

I can just imagine the father in Paris recently who, rather than having to deal with a child victimized by a slur, like I had just done, had to console his 17-year-old son who had been repeatedly stabbed. What could he possibly say to him? Anti-Semitism is not academic; it is real.

Today's hearing is entitled Government Actions to Combat Anti-Semitism in the OSCE Region, but government cannot do it alone. Law enforcement can only effectively fight hate crimes if its strategies and procedures also involve the community. We need to enlist the aid of religious, community, business and educational groups, as well as NGOs, in an effort to moderate the impact of hate crimes and anti-Semitism, to reduce the potential for counterviolence, and promote good police community relations.

Prior to the enactment of either Federal or state anti-bias statutes, private organizations responded to anti-Semitism in the United States by monitoring hate crimes and tracking the activities of hate groups, drafting model legislation and implementing very successful anti-bias educational programs. Without the commitment of these NGOs, no data would have been available to us in the law enforcement community. Their work remains very much essential. However, through the efforts of these NGOs, most states now provide funding, training and collection of data. Many states have implemented, in the past, hate-crime laws. Therefore, the importance of standardized law enforcement reporting and documentation is essential, and has been at the core of the successful investigation and prosecution of these types of crimes.

Standardized reporting, data collection and documentation enables law enforcement professionals to analyze patterns and trends of hate crimes and anti-Semitism. It encourages reporting of these crimes by victims who might otherwise have been reluctant to do so. As I have seen—again, personally—it is demonstrated in the United States to the community that we, as law enforcement professionals, are sincerely committed to pursue vigorously the offenders of such heinous crimes. Most importantly, I have seen the sharpened community awareness and reduced fear.

During my travels to other jurisdictions and nations, I have personally seen seasoned and jaded law enforcement officers who were disdainful of the impact of hate-crime statutes, who, once well-trained, not only understood the damage of these crimes and what they did to the fabric and social order, but became energized to find effective ways to combat these crimes. They became motivated by a desire to protect and serve their citizenry and facilitate the administration of justice for their nations.

From years of experience in this venue, North American law enforcement officials now understand a simple lesson: One hate crime in a community may seem inconsequential compared to other crimes, but it opens the door to further incidents that can easily escalate into a larger-order maintenance problem.

Perhaps the best known example is that of Billings, Montana. Over a decade ago, the police chief there, Wayne Inman, had seen the deadly results of escalating hate crime in Portland, Oregon, and he understood the need to clamp down firmly after a brick was thrown through a window of a house displaying a menorah in his jurisdiction during Hanukkah. The Billings response, which was collaborative and involved not only law enforcement but religious, community and other groups, became a model for the rest of the nation and in many nations around the world.

We must remember that while hate-crime investigation and prosecution is primarily a governmental function through law enforcement, it works best when other parts of the community are fully engaged and fully involved. Data collection is important. It is essential. But its utility is not maximized when only law enforcement officials have access to that data. If it is publicized and presented in a way that allows for comparison in different jurisdictions, academics, journalists, practitioners and others can analyze, compare, contrast and identify not only trends but best practices as well.

Professionals in the fields of both law enforcement and victim assistance feel a growing desire to respond more effectively to the victims of anti-Semitic crimes and to work more effectively together. Until very recently, however, there have been few opportunities in Europe for professionals from these fields to share information, and almost no opportunity for interdisciplinary training.

I understand that the challenges in Europe are much more complex than those that we have here in the United States. Here we have a Federal system and 50 state governments. In Europe there are many nations and cultures with different traditions coming together, trying to find effective ways of dealing with this common problem, anti-Semitism.

The Berlin meeting tasked OSCE, and specifically ODIHR, with monitoring anti-Semitism and helping countries identify and adopt the best practices. Law enforcement agencies throughout the OSCE nation, as

well NGOs, such as EUMC, have a major role in this enterprise. But in order for the various governments to do what needs to be done, the respective law enforcement agencies need to work with those in their profession: other law enforcement agencies.

What I am here to discuss with you today is the prospect of identifying and bringing together a world-class group of law enforcement professionals from around the globe, each an expert in hate-crime investigation in their various countries, and having them, through OSCE, train their counterparts in Europe. In my experience, law enforcement officials learn best from other law enforcement officials. While academics, NGOs and others have a major and important role to play, law enforcement officials have a much more credibility amongst their peers, and they must be the centerpiece for any successful program to succeed.

I have spoken with law enforcement hate-crime experts in the United States, Canada and Europe who are more than eager to help make the promise of the language of the Berlin conference become a reality in the streets of Europe. They are willing to travel to Europe, hold pre-meetings with law enforcement officials of countries that will take part in this program to help identify local laws, customs, traditions and structures that might require adjustments in the lessons of best practices. Together they will then help create and execute a program to build a new cadre of trainers in each nation.

Of necessity, this training will include a clear and concise formal hate-crimes investigatory model. The mission of the training should be to heighten the effectiveness of OSCE's nations' law enforcement agencies in the identification, reporting and investigation and prosecution of hate crimes.

The curriculum should be developed to address the range of issues relevant to hate and anti-Semitic crimes, deterrence and prevention, the needs of the victim, the community, investigation, reporting and prosecution of these crimes within the criminal justice system.

The curriculum will also be developed in a modular format to enable specific European nations to adapt and customize their own training based on their own needs and time constraints. The modules of the curriculum should be developed sequentially, and occasionally one model will be a prerequisite for another.

I am aware that OSCE's task of monitoring anti-Semitism across the region is a more difficult challenge than any parallel task in the United States. Countries in Europe, much more so than the United States' 50 states, have different laws. Some data that can be collected in one country cannot be collected in another, for example. But by training law enforcement officials across the region, we can help maximize the possibility of obtaining uniform data so that meaningful comparisons and identification of trends and best practices will in fact become possible.

Data collection sounds like an academic enterprise, but used properly can be a gold mine for combating hatred. We need to view the data from these dastardly acts as the lemon from which to make lemonade.

But this data, however catalogued and used, is largely depended upon the information collected by the police responders—what we refer to in the business as the first responder of a hate crime.

By training the trainers in various countries, we hope to help the frontline responders do the best job possible, which is a precondition for letting others throughout society—human rights organizations, NGOs, journalists, media and others—do their jobs well too.

While I cannot underscore enough the need for professional law enforcement in the OSCE region to learn directly from other law enforcement, no training can work as well as it must without the active involvement, participation and support of the victim communities. They provide the context, the nuance, the urgency, support and in many cases the content.

I have spoken with many members of the Jewish communities from around Europe, most recently in Berlin, and as I heard Senator Clinton note, Montreal, I returned from Montreal late last night where I had the opportunity to speak personally yesterday with a rabbi and other members of the congregation who were involved in the firebombing of the school in Montreal.

I can tell you that they are eager to help such an initiative. Members of the community can often act as the eyes and ears of law enforcement if they know that law enforcement professionals will respond to hate-crime incidents quickly and effectively.

International projects such as this, involving law enforcement community and NGOs, can go a long way toward combating anti-Semitism. Projects of such a magnitude also display to the world community that all areas and levels of government are now working together to combat anti-Semitism.

Finally, projects that are undertaken by the law enforcement community show that policing is not just a reactive function, and that law enforcement agencies are willing and able to display the necessary leadership to combat societal problems that may ultimately become at the end of the day their problem.

In closing, let me thank this Commission for continuing to shine the light of the problem of growing anti-Semitism in Europe and helping to find concrete actions to counteract it.

On behalf of the American Jewish Committee, as well as many of the law enforcement officers around the globe, Jewish and non-Jewish alike, with whom I have had the opportunity to work and who are committed to using all appropriate tools of law enforcement to combat anti-Semitism, I look forward to working with you, Chairman, and the OSCE and others to help implement a realistic law enforcement program that will ultimately help European nations implement effective measures to combat anti-Semitism and hatred.

Thank you very much.

Mr. SMITH. Thank you very much for your recommendations and for your work, and we will follow up, as we have discussed previously, to this recommendation specifically.

Mr. GOLDENBERG. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. Lefkowitz?

**JAY LEFKOWITZ, PARTNER,
KIRKLAND & ELLIS, LLP**

Mr. LEFKOWITZ. Thank you, Mr. Chairman and members of the Commission.

It is a privilege to be invited to testify before the Helsinki Commission that for more than a quarter-century has served to monitor and to encourage compliance with the Helsinki Final Act.

It is also a great pleasure and privilege to join with Minister Natan Sharansky as one of your witnesses today. In the field of human rights, there have been many heroes from Raoul Wallenberg to Andrei Sakharov to Armando Valladares and many others. Of all the heroes in the battle to reaffirm the fundamental rights of all human beings, none looms larger in my life than Natan Sharansky.

As a young child, I wore a wristband with his name etched to it as a reminder of his imprisonment. Later on I attended countless demonstrations in front of Soviet missions and the Soviet embassy to protest his imprisonment. Then as a young adult in the mid-1980s, I traveled to the Soviet Union to meet with *refuseniks* who had been inspired by Natan Sharansky to seek their own refuge by leaving the Soviet Union and immigrating to Israel.

Only 10 days ago we celebrated the 60th anniversary of D-Day. On that day, U.S. soldiers landed on European soil to begin the final assault on Hitler and his poisonous ideology of hate. We also remember former President Reagan who stood up to the evil of communism with the same steadfastness that an earlier generation had stood up to Naziism. Both Naziism and communism were fundamentally expressions of nihilism, of a total rejection of religious belief or moral principles. Our country confronted both of these evils without moral equivocation. We knew it was our responsibility and our destiny to conquer this evil and we did. If we had not, no one else would have.

Today our country faces the threat of a new "ism", one that is equal to Naziism and communism in its toxic ambitions and destructive force. I speak of the evil of terrorism, and in particular the terrorism being perpetrated by al Qaeda and other radical Islamic fundamentalists. The challenge for our leaders today is to show the same determination to confront this evil as it took to confront and finally vanquish the evils of Naziism and communism. In the war against terror, we cannot equivocate.

The rise of Islamic fundamentalism is directly related to the upsurge in anti-Semitism throughout the OSCE countries. And anti-Semitism often masquerading as anti-Zionism has become one of the more potent weapons in the terrorist arsenal in the war against the United States.

Consider, for example, the scurrilous charge one hears all too often these days, that the United States is fighting a war in Iraq to protect Israeli security, or that President Bush is being led by a cabal of Jewish advisers. Not only are such statements blatant acts of anti-Semitism, but they are also plainly intended to undermine the moral authority of the United States in its war against terror.

I had the privilege recently of representing the United States at the International conference on anti-Semitism in Berlin, sponsored by the OSCE. The good news is that 55 nations agreed that anti-Semitism is a growing problem that needs to be tackled. The bad news is that the problem is growing more acute and many Jewish leaders from Europe reported to us that for the first time in more than half a century, Jews are afraid to wear symbols of their religion in public: yarmulkas, *mezuzahs*, the Star of David.

On the whole, the conference was a success.

First, there was great symbolic value to the fact that 55 of the leading nations of the world gathered in Berlin less than a mile from where Adolf Hitler planned the extermination of the Jewish people to discuss in earnest ways to combat anti-Semitism. The whole week we were in Berlin, I could not help imagining what the world would look like today if a similar conference had taken place in 1934.

Second, the conference produced a consensus Declaration recognizing that developments in the Middle East do not justify anti-Semitism. In an organization like the OSCE where many countries have large Muslim populations, and any member country, if it chooses, can block action by the entire body, the reference to Israel in the Declaration was a very significant and positive development.

But the conference's Declaration only scratched the surface of the problem we are facing. Moreover, if all of the countries represented in Berlin agreed that anti-Semitism is on the rise, there was lack of consensus as to why this is so and whether the disturbing trends of the past few years can be reversed.

What is critical about the new anti-Semitism today is that it does not stem predominantly from either religious bias or racial prejudice. Today's anti-Semitism is not rooted in the ancient and discredited charge of deicide, which was the basis of so much of the anti-Semitism of the last two millennia.

It is also not principally inspired by allegations of racial inferiority which served as the foundation for Naziism. Instead, the new anti-Semitism has its roots firmly planted in the growing resentment toward Israel that has been fostered by Arab rejectionists and is now ubiquitous in Europe.

Moreover, while this anti-Israel sentiment is surely related to the growing number of Muslims in Europe, the surging anti-Zionism around the world is also closely related to a growing anti-Americanism being promoted both by the perpetrators of terror and by those who for self-serving political reasons do not want the United States to confront that terror directly.

In order for the international community to agree upon concrete steps that must be taken to combat anti-Semitism, it is first necessary to have a clear definition of anti-Semitism. I propose the following very simple test: It is anti-Semitic to subject Jews or the State of Israel to a different standard of behavior than other countries.

I want to be very clear that individual Jews as well as the State of Israel are not and should not be exempt from criticism when it was warranted. But the line between legitimate criticism of Israeli policies and anti-Semitism is clearly crossed when the international community applies a double standard to Israel.

A glaring example of this double standard took place just 2 months ago in Geneva at the U.N. Human Rights Commission. Five resolutions were adopted condemning Israel for a variety of human rights abuses, including its killing of Sheikh Yassin who had personally instigated and authorized suicide bombings against Israeli civilians. But the Commission could not muster a single condemnation of human rights abuses in either China or Zimbabwe, and the United States' own proposal to condemn the grave violations of human rights in Sudan, where more than 30,000 people have died, was defeated.

Nor is it only in foreign countries where a double standard is applied to the supporters of Israel. Although the Bush administration has been exceptional in its promotion of human rights across the globe and has not wavered in its opposition to bigotry and anti-Semitism of any kind, there have been troubling displays of anti-Semitism on some of our own nation's campuses.

Last year there was a petition drive on several college campuses aimed at forcing universities to divest from investments in the State of Israel and Israeli companies. At some universities, there have been calls for ending financial support to Israeli researchers. And when Jewish and Israeli leaders, such as former Prime Minister Netanyahu and Minister Sharansky have been invited to give speeches on campuses and have been jeered so loudly that they have been unable to deliver their remarks, there is no word to describe such actions other than anti-Semitism.

In the last few years, anti-Semitism has reared its ugly head in a variety of settings. Perhaps the most egregious example of the toxic mixture of anti-Semitism and anti-Zionism is the recurring demonization of Jews, and in particular of the prime minister of Israel, Ariel Sharon. Those who equate him with Adolf Hitler and accuse the victims of the Holocaust of the same horrible Nazi deeds deliberately and cynically blur the differences between self-defense and murder. Those who equate the two not only seek to undermine the moral authority of the Jewish people but also insult our collective intelligence.

The OSCE's decision to combat anti-Semitism could not have come at a more important time I commend the Members of this Commission for their significant involvement in the Berlin Conference.

In my view as the OSCE continues its efforts in this area, it should focus its efforts in three specific areas.

First, all governments must be absolutely intolerant of the acts of violence against Jews and Jewish institutions and take prompt action to punish the perpetrators. While we may not be able to eliminate anti-Semitism, we can strive for a day when anti-Semitic acts never have the cover of government sanction.

Second, there needs to be a recognition that Israel's struggle against terrorism perpetrated by teenage suicide bombers has become a universal struggle, just as the U.S. war against the operatives of al Qaeda has become the world's struggle. For a society as ours dedicated to liberty and pluralism, there is no alternative but to succeed in this war.

Finally, the OSCE should consider passing a straightforward resolution to ensure that the human rights records of all countries are evaluated according to the same standards. In other words, Israel should be judged by the same standards as other nations. Such a resolution embracing the principle of evenhandedness would go a long way toward eliminating one of the most virulent forms of anti-Semitism today, the near universal and counterproductive condemnation of Israel on a regular basis by the international community.

I have had the great privilege of serving on the staff of President Bush for most of the last 3 years. I know firsthand his dedication to combating anti-Semitism. I also know from having served with members of the Helsinki Commission, and in particular Chairman Smith and Congressman Ben Cardin, of your personal dedication to human rights and toward eliminating bigotry, racism and anti-Semitism wherever it exists.

I commend you on your important work. I thank you for the opportunity to testify today.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. Lefkowitz, thank you very much for your eloquent testimony and your fine work.

We will get to questions momentarily, but I think you would underscore, especially at the end, the importance of recognizing the work that President Bush did. This conference in Berlin would not have happened had it not been for the administration pushing so hard for it.

Ambassador Minikes did a great job. So many of our people at the State Department did a great job. But at the very top, including Secretary of State Colin Powell and the President pushed hard for it as well, working with our friends and colleagues in the German Government.

I thank you for reminding us of that and for your testimony as well. Mr. Zeidman?

**FRED ZEIDMAN, CHAIRMAN,
U.S. HOLOCAUST MEMORIAL COUNCIL**

Mr. ZEIDMAN. Thank you.

Let me begin today by thanking the Chairman and members of the Commission for holding this hearing and for inviting me to testify.

As Chairman of the governing council of the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum, I pledge that we will continue to work side by side with the Commission to fight anti-Semitism and to warn of the dangers it presents.

It was my honor to be a part of the American delegation at the Berlin Conference. I have to admit that when I went to Berlin I questioned how much really could be accomplished. I left Berlin, however, encouraged and optimistic that the conference will lead to real action and real progress.

I want to take this opportunity to acknowledge the resolute leadership of Mayor Koch, and Secretary of State Colin Powell's critical role in the success of this conference cannot be overstated. His opening remarks set the tone for the entire meeting when he declared, "We must not permit anti-Semitic crimes to be shrugged off as inevitable side effects of inter-ethnic conflicts. There is no justification for anti-Semitism."

I am hopeful that the nations of the OSCE took Secretary Powell's words to heart and have finally begun to confront the reality of anti-Semitism. To be truly successful, this conference had to produce action. The Berlin Declaration is a positive first step because it not only roundly condemns anti-Semitism, but because it prescribes specific concrete actions for member nations to adopt in order to combat the sickness of anti-Semitism.

As the representative of an institution whose central mission is about the dangerous potential of hatred, I am particularly heartened by the increased emphasis on education that has come out of the conference.

Educating new generations about the evils of anti-Semitism is essential, but, and let me make it clear here, it will not be complete unless it includes a full, frank and accurate discussion of the Holocaust.

As you know, centuries of European anti-Semitism in various forms, eventually culminated in the mass murder of Europe's Jews during WWII. Nazism flourished in Germany and elsewhere in Europe for many reasons, but understanding the Holocaust—the motivations of the per-

petrators and the indifference of the bystanders—requires an understanding of anti-Semitism, how it evolved over time, and the significant role it has played throughout European history.

As the Helsinki Commission correctly points out, all OSCE member States, including the United States, have an obligation to ensure “full compliance with OSCE commitments,” in order to combat anti-Semitism.

Let me take a moment to talk about what we do at the Holocaust Museum, to teach about the Holocaust and the consequences of hatred and indifference.

We are already very involved in improving Holocaust education and remembrance in Europe through our leading role on the Task Force for International Cooperation on Holocaust Remembrance, Education and Research.

Just this past week in Rome, the task force met and addressed the pressing issue of how to follow up the Berlin Anti-Semitism Conference. The task force has clearly seized the urgency of encouraging and assisting its members and prospective member nations to develop practical education-related programs to combat rising threats of anti-Semitism, especially in Europe.

Eighteen countries now belong to this very effective voluntary organization. And to become a member, every prospect must commit its nations to adhere to the Stockholm Declaration. The Museum’s representatives, together with its partners, develop educational seminars and other approaches to place the Holocaust and its lessons in the mainstream of teacher training and curriculum development.

For example, we are assisting Croatia, Romania, Hungary, the Baltic States, Slovakia and others to look at their national histories honestly and train their educators about the true significance of the Holocaust and anti-Semitism. This summer, 28 teachers from eight countries in Eastern and Central Europe will participate in teacher-training seminars at Holocaust education centers throughout the United States. Following the week-long seminar, the teachers will visit the Holocaust Museum in Washington and meet with our educators who will then provide material for their classrooms, and also will guide them through the extensive educational materials available on the Museum’s web site.

Now in its fourth year, the teacher-training program has a definite multiplier effect in the education systems of the new democracies of Eastern and Central Europe. The Museum coordinates this project, with financial assistance from the U.S. embassies in the teachers’ home countries as well as from the Claims Conference, and the Association of Holocaust Organizations Holocaust Education Centers. This project has substantial impact and is obviously growing each year.

We all know, of course, that the work of learning from Holocaust history and confronting anti-Semitism is not only a European issue. That’s why the Museum’s work is so critical here in our own country, and why it will become even more so in the future. I believe no institution teaches about the dangers of unchecked anti-Semitism as powerfully as the Museum does.

We educate the general public about the Holocaust through traveling exhibitions, our web site which hosts more than 5 million visitors per year, as well as teacher training and regional programming.

We are ensuring that the field of Holocaust scholarship remains vibrant and healthy. We are intensifying our efforts to rescue the physical evidence of the Holocaust in this vanishing window of opportunity.

In addition, through a variety of innovative partnerships in Washington and around the country, we are expanding programs for law enforcement officers, clergy, the military, the Foreign Service and others who lead and protect our society. We believe we must provide special, in-depth learning opportunities for those in positions of civic leadership, for whom an understanding of the Holocaust can help shape our world.

And, through our Committee on Conscience, we are raising public awareness of contemporary acts or threats of genocide. In fact, our Committee on Conscience staff director has just returned from 2 weeks in Chad talking to Sudanese refugees who escaped the neighboring Darfur region of Sudan where increasing violence is threatening genocide.

The success of the museum is made possible by the full support of Congress and the current and former administrations, and perhaps most importantly, an American public that places great value on individual rights and freedoms. Marshaling similar support throughout Europe is essential if we are to prevail over ignorance and hatred.

In conclusion, let me identify three principles on which Holocaust education stands.

First, Holocaust education is about accurately understanding the history of this tragic period. The first step toward ensuring the dissemination of real, accurate and relevant information is making the historical record easily accessible.

The second principle is one of fairness in approaching the history. All groups struggle with appropriately understanding history, yet, we all know that no nation bears an unblemished past. Certainly, this is as true of our own country as it is of many others. We make that clear in the Museum's Permanent Exhibition. We are honest about what the United States did and did not do, during the Holocaust. In other words, each nation must face its own history honestly.

Finally, information must be relevant to the audience. Which elements of Holocaust history actually pertain to events we are addressing today? Our political leaders are committed to action, and this hearing and the introduction of House concurrent Resolution 425 are both concrete responses to that determination.

We may prefer to believe that the world is now enlightened that we have advanced too far, learned too many lessons, that humanity has matured too much. But I am reminded of what President Bush said after visiting the Museum: "When we remember the Holocaust and to whom it happened, we must also remember where it happened. It did not happen in some remote, unfamiliar place. It happened right in the middle of the Western World ... moral discernment, decency, tolerance—these can never be assumed in any time, or in any place. They must always be taught."

The Berlin Conference was a significant move in the right direction. But it must be followed by action, and for many nations this will be difficult.

I believe we are engaged in an act of *Tikkun Olam*, Hebrew for "repairing the world." This is in the best spirit of both the Jewish tradition and all of humanity's greatest aspirations.

We must focus our energies and actions at home and abroad to confront hatred before it damages people, property and civil society. We must redouble our efforts with our friends in Europe to stop any manifestations of anti-Semitism. It can be done. It must be done for the future of democratic society in Europe and elsewhere.

Along with our partners throughout the United States, we are doing our part at the Holocaust Museum. We are setting a standard that stops hatred before it gains a foothold in our communities. Our political leadership in Congress and the Administration and at the state and local levels support these efforts. That is why I am so incredibly proud to lead America's national memorial to the Holocaust—the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum—and likewise proud to have participated in the Berlin Conference.

Thank you.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. Zeidman, thank you very much. You are doing your part and then some. We are very grateful on this Commission for the work of the museum, your personal commitment, which is indeed making a difference.

So thank you so very much.

I just have a couple of questions because your testimonies were very complete, as we should have anticipated, and answered some of the questions before they were posed.

I just want to touch on, Mr. Lefkowitz, the issue of double standards. Mr. Sharansky made a very strong point of that as well in his testimony. Matter of fact, he, at the Berlin Conference you will recall, made a very powerful statement to the plenary and articulated, as he did here, the three D's of the separate legitimate criticism of Israel from anti-Semitism: demonization, double standard and delegitimization—the denial of the Jewish state, in other words.

On the double-standard issue, I, too, have been appalled by that. I attended and participated with Ambassador Williamson and Assistant Secretary Lorne Craner, and others from the State Department at the U.N. Commission on Human Rights in Geneva. I met with 23 delegations while I was there, most of which were led by an ambassador. I met with some of the DCMs. But I was appalled by the lack of interest in looking at what was going on in Darfur, especially as it relates to the newest killing fields in the Sudan.

The issue of China, the indifference about the ongoing human rights abuses there.

And yet when it came to Israel, everybody was full speed ahead, criticize Israel, the only democracy. Freedom House yesterday testified that in the Middle East, they are the only state in the region where freedom exists. There are some that are partly free, some that are not free, but Israel, a robust democracy that it is where you can disagree.

This double standard—it seems to me we have got to address that even more aggressively than we have in the past. Because it is appalling, as I think some of my colleagues said.

Durbin could have been a good conference. It turned out to be a disaster because of the double standard.

You might want to elaborate on that a little bit.

And, again, another point you made about the comparisons, equating Adolf Hitler with the nation of Israel. I went through this book—and I will look through even more so; I am sure we all will—but to see Ariel Sharon with swastikas on his tie and looking in the mirror and in the

mirror he sees Adolf Hitler as his reflection, words cannot describe how appalling that really is. I think we need to be much more aggressive in showcasing this despicable kind of depiction of the state of Israel.

Mr. Lefkowitz?

Mr. LEFKOWITZ. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I agree wholeheartedly with Mr. Sharansky that you can identify anti-Semitism by this effort to delegitimize Israel, the effort to dehumanize the Jewish people and the application of double standards.

The reason I would focus on the issue of double standards is that it is completely objective. It is a neutral principle.

The issue of delegitimization, the issue of demonization, I think I can see it. I think I can call it straight. But people can differ. I think they are wrong when they differ. I am not afraid to make moral judgments. But it is a completely neutral principle to say we are not going to have double standards.

Civil society, democratic societies depend on clear and predictable rules, ordered liberty. What we are trying to do now in shaping a new constitution in Iraq is to help bring freedom and liberty, ordered liberty, to Iraq with clear and predictable rules.

So the whole premise of the OSCE, in my estimation, is the premise of ordered liberty. And so to me, the effort by the international community to focus on the lack of double standards is resident with the U.N.'s overall mission.

You will all remember, in 1975 the United Nations adopted perhaps the darkest resolution in its history, the resolution equating Zionism as racism. It took until 1991 for the international community, with the leadership of the United States and with your leadership, to finally repudiate that. And even then there were some dissenters from that vote in 1991.

I think that if the international community, either at the OSCE or at the General Assembly, could try to adopt a resolution, and at least wage the battle to adopt a resolution, calling for neutral principles in the assessment of human rights records of all countries, it would go a very long way, not only symbolically but in reality to getting rid of this double standard.

Just very briefly, you raised this point about the equation of Sharon to Hitler. I will simply say this: There's a wonderful new book about the rise of the new anti-Semitism written by Gabriel Schoenfeld, who is the editor now at *Commentary* magazine. He makes the point in his book, and it is a chilling point, that part of what is going on throughout the Arab world and throughout the European world is this effort to blame the victims of the Holocaust, to demonize them so much in part to assuage the conscience of those who in fact perpetrated the Holocaust.

We cannot stand for that kind of moral equivalency. It is wrong. You have said it on many occasions.

Mr. Cardin, I have heard you speak to it, and I know the President has.

But as an international community, anytime there is that comparison made, it is incumbent upon all freedom-loving people to speak out forcefully against it.

Thank you.

Mr. SMITH. Let me just ask Mr. Goldenberg—and anyone else who might want to respond to any of these questions, please do.

But on the issue of training the trainers, I hope we can work together, our Commission and you and others, to put together a project that would bring in Justice Department, State and others so that a funded project—whether it would be the FBI academy in Budapest, which might be a venue that lends itself to this kind of training.

I am concerned that the OSCE and ODIHR, we are not even gathering the information. Notwithstanding the Vienna Conference, followed up by the conference in Berlin, the Maastricht Declaration, 19 states of the 55 states have actually provided information. And United Kingdom and France have not. Despite the fact that they have been real players in this whole issue, they have not provided data as to their acts of anti-Semitism in their own countries. Maybe it is in the mail.

But it just begs the question that people make nice statements, they come to conferences, and then the interest falls off as they are boarding their plane en route to their home country.

So I think your point about the importance of getting the police involved and to train the trainers—but also the laudatory effect it can have, the chilling effect, if you will, if the police know that this is going on in their community on additional acts of anti-Semitism—it was very well taken.

But if any of you would like to comment on anything further—before you leave, Mr. Cardin, double standard or anything.

Mr. CARDIN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Let me first point out in your last comment about those states who have not yet even complied with supplying the information to ODIHR that they committed to do, many of the states that did submit information submitted inadequate information. So the numbers are even worse than what we have here and we need to follow up on that.

Let me compliment each of you for your individual participation on this issue and your participation with our delegation in Berlin.

Your testimonies show the strength of our delegation, that we had a well-balanced delegation. And the fact that we were able to achieve a success in Berlin reflected the fact that the United States placed such a high priority on this conference to be able to get the quality participation of the individuals that are before us.

So I thank you for making this commitment.

I also want to acknowledge Ambassador O'Donnell. I know he has been in and out today. He, particularly here in Washington, coordinated our efforts so that we could provide a unified delegation in priority-setting for the Berlin Conference.

And of course Mayor Koch has been mentioned frequently as a person who not only added stature but added a great deal of background and leadership quality to our delegation.

So I thank you for your commitment.

We look at this as a continuing responsibility. So we at the Commission to intend to call on your individual expertise, whether it is in the law enforcement area or whether it is in the Holocaust education. Because we do need to continue to involve you as we carry out our commitment of follow-up.

Everybody talks about the fact that we have to make sure that we follow up on the commitments and what we believe was the good-faith efforts being made in Berlin.

Part of that is sharing best practices. And here we have a list of issues in the United States that we think make sense for other countries to look at. The way we collect data: We have been doing it for a long time. We think that you do not have to reinvent the wheel here, take a look at what we have done in this country and see whether you cannot use that practice in your country to comply with the data collections.

We, this past week, had the opportunity to visit with our academy members who will be visiting Auschwitz. Fred Schwartz has financed a wonderful program to sensitize military to the effects of intolerance. I think that is an area where the world can learn. On Holocaust education there is certainly lots being done that we can share.

My question basically to you is: We should be listening also as to what is happening throughout Europe. Are there things happening in Europe that could help us?

I am always concerned that we get so complacent in the United States that the—we know anti-Semitism is on the rise here also. Are the things that we can learn on Holocaust education—which is an area, by the way, that many communities in this country are rather weak in dealing with Holocaust education.

But are there things that we can learn from what is happening around the world, particularly in the OSCE region?

Ms. EHRENBERG. If I may?

Mr. Chairman, I just want to make one comment regarding the monitoring and countries not giving adequate statistics or adequate reporting.

We have been talking about, as you have, with the possibility of appointing a special OSCE envoy to oversee that the Berlin Declaration will be carried out. I think that is very important simply because when you are talking about oversight from the outside as opposed to governments monitoring themselves, you will have a big difference, and that does make a difference. You do not want distorted statistics. So that places another argument for the special envoy.

It also places more importance on outside NGOs in monitoring and in reporting these statistics.

So there is an increased role for the OSCE to play as well as for NGOs.

I can point to the school system in Israel, if I may.

For Holocaust Memorial Day, all the schools take the children to some kind of ceremony. In Jerusalem they take the children to Yad Vashem, and in many other schools they take them to Yad Vashem, to learn about what happened.

We could do something here in the United States. Some states do have Holocaust education in their public schools and some do not. And perhaps that might be an initiative of the NGOs, of the museum, of the Congress together to see what we can do to make sure that more public schools will indeed take this on.

This could be done via a conference of educators that return from Israel, from these Holocaust education training programs. You could have a hearing with those educators, and that would be a jumping off point, I think.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Zeidman?

Mr. ZEIDMAN. The thrust of our activity obviously worldwide but particularly in this country is Holocaust education. We work very closely in all of the countries in Western Europe, but very closely with Yad Vashem in trying to increase this educational activity.

A great deal of our focus over the next several years, again, with all of our teacher training programs is both to learn what is being done in other countries and what we can teach them.

We have accepted the responsibility of being the resource for Holocaust education, again, I think particularly through our web site and our constant traveling exhibits, internationally and domestically, as well as our teacher-training programs, bringing teachers here. Very extensive that we have, again, an office in Western Europe where we are trying to monitor everything that is going on there.

I think that this proliferation now of memorials and museums around the world is, again, starting this process of hopefully Holocaust education so that it would not be forgotten.

Western Europe, and as you are only too well aware, has been remiss in their remembrance, if you will, historically, I think. It has only been through your activities and the activities of our administration here that have continued to force these issues on countries that perhaps have not been as attentive to these issues as they might have been.

So our ear is to the ground. We are constantly monitoring the pulse of what is going on, both in anti-Semitism and Holocaust education. We are providing this resource on a worldwide basis, but particularly, again, with emphasis here in the United States to try and, again, work with all of the museums and memorials around the country to do teacher training around the country, both bringing teachers to the museum and sending our trainers out. I think we have been in 48 of the states, I believe. I could not tell you the ones we have not been in yet, but we are doing teacher training around the country as well.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Goldenberg?

Mr. GOLDENBERG. Congressman Cardin, as a testament to the museum, I had the opportunity to join 80 seasoned law enforcement officers, state police, officers, troopers from around the metropolitan area. We took a one-day field trip about 5 years ago to the museum in Washington. And needless to say, on the bus ride down, it was a very noisy, active bus ride down. After a day at the museum, on the bus ride back, it was one of the most silent rides I have ever taken with 80 to 90 grown-up, seasoned law enforcement officers in my career.

So undoubtedly it not only is effective with our young, but is effective with those of us out there who are responsible for maintaining order and responsible for the investigation of hate crimes.

Mr. CARDIN. I am glad to hear that.

I want to make it clear: The commitment is not to 54 states to energize their actions against anti-Semitism. It is 55 countries, including the United States. And we have taken on commitments that we are going to energize our activities and review what we are doing around our nation, and that we know we need to improve.

But the one of the areas that affects you, Mr. Goldenberg, I am always disappointed when I see acts of anti-Semitism or religious intolerance called "youth vandalism" by local police. Because they are not sensitive to the signs of hate crime in a community.

And you are absolutely correct, the only way that you can deal with this is energize a community—involve the community as well as sensitize law enforcement. And we know we can do a better job here in the United States in that regard.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is incumbent upon our Commission not only to try to share best practices with our friends in Europe, but also to listen and to listen to our NGOs here in this country, and our experts, and do what we can to energize our communities to fight religious intolerance and anti-Semitism wherever we may find it.

So thank you all very much.

Mr. SMITH. Thank you very much, Mr. Cardin.

Let me just ask Mr. Zeidman, if you do not mind: You mentioned 48 states. Would it be possible for you to give us a breakdown of which states are participating with you?

Mr. ZEIDMAN. Surely.

Mr. SMITH. It always seems to me that a partnership with you would be an indication of both sensitivity and commitment. And on the world scene, which countries are more actively involved with the museum.

Mr. ZEIDMAN. Be happy to get that back to you.

And I am glad Paul brought that up. I had referred to it in my speech. We initiated a program jointly with ADL initially in the Greater D.C. Metropolitan Area, where we now have sensitivity training for every law enforcement officer in this area. It has been incredibly successful, and we are now starting to take that on the road. I think it is being tried I want to say Houston, which happens to be my home, and I hope that is not just thinking parochially.

The first time we are taking that program on the road is going to be in Houston. But it has been tremendously successful, as well as programs we have at the military academies, at both West Point and the Naval Academy. Again, we have gone up there. We go up there—I had the honor of speaking to the incoming freshman class this past year. But in turn after we go there and do some training there, they then bring the entire freshman class down to the museum.

So we are reaching out in every way we can I will be happy to provide for you ...

Mr. SMITH. If you could also include in that the countries.

Mr. ZEIDMAN. Yes.

Mr. SMITH. Are any Middle Eastern countries, do they show any ...

Mr. ZEIDMAN. I am sorry?

Mr. SMITH. Do the Middle Eastern countries use the services of the museum?

Mr. ZEIDMAN. Historically they have not.

I will tell you that the first leader of a Middle Eastern country visited our museum just in the past several months—the first time that there has been a willingness on their behalf—at danger to themselves. Requested to come to the museum and tour the museum and had a tremendous experience, which he expressed at the end in writing in our book, which I think was—I said if our museum did nothing else over its first 10 years—and of course we have had 20 million visitors and it has been such an incredible experience for everyone. But to have a leader of one of the Middle Eastern countries come and talk about peace, I think was tremendous.

So we have an open invitation to anyone seeking to learn the lessons of the Holocaust.

Mr. SMITH. I think it would be helpful for many of us. We meet routinely with visiting heads of state and ambassadors from those countries, every country really, to recommend that they go to the Holocaust Museum.

We hope a year from now, when we host the Parliamentary Assembly, to encourage the 320-plus Members of Parliament, many of whom are heads of their foreign relations committee or the equivalent of, or speaker of their parliament, like the Duma in Russia, to go to the Holocaust Museum for that very purpose.

Mr. ZEIDMAN. And, again, not only on behalf of us at the museum, but have all of us who have an interest in human rights, I think it is just imperative. We obviously would welcome an opportunity to provide whatever type of tour we can to anyone that would have any interest.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. Lefkowitz, not to belabor the point, but you mentioned in your testimony about what is happening on campuses. I understand that Rutgers, Berkeley, University of Florida, University of Michigan, Columbia, Ohio State and others have all had some very damaging situations relative to anti-Semitism, rallies and so on and so forth, cartoons in their newspapers.

What can we do there? And secondly, is this also being replicated on their college campuses?

Mr. LEFKOWITZ. What was the last part?

Mr. SMITH. Are the college campuses in Europe also experiencing this anti-Semitism?

Mr. LEFKOWITZ. Yes, and I think you may be able to hear more about this from some of the NGOs who are going to be speaking later, because I know that this is something that the ADL, for example, is heavily involved in.

My understanding is that this is replicating itself on college campuses in Europe.

In terms of what we can do: I think it is something that our own leaders need to speak out about. Members of Congress need to go back to their districts and speak out about it. It is something that we need to engage with college presidents about.

Since I am always quick to level criticism where it is warranted, I also want to take this opportunity to applaud the work of one university president in particular, Lawrence Summers, who is the president of Harvard University, who has really spoken out very clearly, very loudly, used really the bully pulpit of the Harvard presidency to take on this issue of divestment, the rising anti-Semitism. I would hope that his colleagues in the university community follow his lead.

Mr. GOLDENBERG. I just want to add on.

I have visited about a dozen campuses last year at the request of the American Jewish Committee. I guess to put it simply, security issues, there are many students that I spoke to when things were very tumultuous that were intimidated and extremely concerned for their safety.

So when we think in terms of what can we do, we also have to think about the safety issues. Many of these campuses are in fact policed—their law enforcement are professional and are sworn, but many are not. They are security agencies that are not well-equipped. Not by their fault. They are just not well-equipped for this type of activity.

So we do need to take a close look at the interaction between the campus law enforcement agencies, which, as I say and on record, many are just superb. But there is a concern that for the good ones out there,

we have some that just are not equipped and we need to take a close look at how these agencies are being trained and how effective they are to protect these students during very serious and tumultuous incidents.

Mr. SMITH. On behalf of the Commission, a million thanks for your testimony, for your patience, during this long hearing, and most importantly for the great work you do. Appreciate it.

Mr. ZEIDMAN. Thank you.

Mr. SMITH. And now I would like to invite our fourth panel to the witness table, beginning with Stacy Burdett who is the Anti-Defamation League's Associate Director of Government and National Affairs and ADL's lobbyist on international issues. Ms. Burdett represents the League to Congress and the executive branch on issues related to the fight against global anti-Semitism, the Middle East peace process, international religious freedom, human rights and terrorism.

Next we will hear from Shai Franklin, the Director of Government Relations for the NCSJ. In this capacity he coordinates NCSJ's legislative agenda on Capitol Hill and acts as liaison to the executive branch and the diplomatic community. As a member of NCSJ's staff, he participated in planning and organizing the April 2002 Israel Solidarity Rally in Washington, D.C., and coordinated follow-up activities with the U.S. Congress.

Dan Mariaschin, who is the Executive Director of B'nai B'rith International. As the organization's top executive he directs and supervises B'nai B'rith's programs, activities and staff in 58 countries. He also serves as director of B'nai B'rith's Center for Human Rights and Public Policy.

Next we will hear from Rabbi Israel Singer who serves as Chairman of the World Jewish Congress. [Due to extenuating circumstances, Rabbi Singer was unable to participate in person and submitted his statement for the record.] Within the framework of the WJC activity during the last few years, Mr. Singer has traveled in excess of a million miles and has visited almost every Jewish community on all continents. He also serves as Chairman of the World Jewish Restitution Organization where he has maintained negotiations to benefit Holocaust survivors and heirs of Holocaust victims around the world. He has also been before this Commission before and has provided us expert testimony, for which we are deeply grateful.

Following Rabbi Singer is James Tisch, Chairman of the Conference of Presidents of Major American Jewish Organizations. Mr. Tisch is President and Chief Executive Officer of the Loew's Corporation. He is also the past Chairman of the Board of the United Jewish Communities and past President of UJA Federation of New York.

Lastly we will hear from Mark Weitzmann who directs the Wiesenthal Center Task Force against Hate. As a recognized expert in the field of extremism and cyberhate, he has lectured and worked with various groups ranging from the U.N. to the European Commission, European Union and U.S. Embassy in Berlin to the U.S. Army and the FBI.

I understand that Mr. Weitzmann has a pressing family engagement and would like to speak first.

**MARK WEITZMANN, DIRECTOR,
TASK FORCE AGAINST HATE, SIMON WIESENTHAL CENTER**

Mr. WEITZMANN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, members of the Commission. I appreciate it. I have a son who is graduating school tonight back in New York, and I promised I would get back in time for the graduation. So I appreciate the generosity in allowing me to go first.

Mr. Chairman, Members of the Commission,

Any discussion that attempts to shed light on anti-Semitism must do so in the shadows of the Holocaust, the most extreme manifestation of anti-Semitism in our, or any, time. This is not to say we must dwell in the past, but that the past does create our present.

Just last week I had the privilege of once again representing the Simon Wiesenthal Center and being a part of the U.S. delegation that was so ably headed by Ambassador Edward O'Donnell and his staff to the biannual meetings of the International Task Force for Holocaust Education, Remembrance and Research. This Task Force was originally set up in the wake of the conference convened in Stockholm, by Prime Minister Goran Persson of Sweden in 2000. It began with eight member countries who pledged to cooperate and encourage education about the Holocaust in Europe and elsewhere. In the words of the Declaration from that conference "We share a commitment to encourage the study of the Holocaust in all its dimensions... to plant the seeds of a better future amidst the soil of a bitter past."

The good news is that today membership in the Task Force has grown to almost 20 countries. The bad news, however, is that the current rise in anti-Semitism has created a climate in which even teaching about the Holocaust has become a matter of controversy and concern.

Some examples should suffice to illustrate this alarming trend. In Sweden, a major newspaper published an article that suggested that instead of taking students to Auschwitz, to see where Jews were murdered by Nazis, the students should now be sent to Bethlehem to see where Jews are currently murdering Arabs. In Holland, the home of Anne Frank, a ceremony commemorating the Second World War was disrupted by students who chanted " Hamas, Hamas, Jews to the gas" In France, the situation was so bad that last year the minister of education had to make a major statement that disrupting the teaching of the Holocaust, along with other forms of anti-Semitism would no longer be tolerated. And in Germany, where the Third Reich originated, some teachers report that they are now hesitant and fearful to introduce the Holocaust into their classrooms.

Throughout Europe, in countries that suffered the most under the Nazis, who should be the most invested in educating to prevent any resurgence of Nazism, we see that very education challenged on political grounds and itself becoming a flashpoint for anti-Semitism. This is no accident. Those who have a stake in spreading anti-Semitism know that a school is as important as a government ministry.

Today, there is much talk about the "new anti-Semitism." Anti-Semitism, however, reflects the values of its period. Medieval Christendom had a religiously-based anti-Semitism, while the scientific advances of the late 19 and early 20th centuries developed the concept of "racial science" that legitimized anti-Semitism and racism. Similarly, the economic boom and depression of the early 20th century helped create the space for the conspiracy theories of *The Protocols of the Elders of Zion*, with its alleged Jewish plot to take over the world.

After the Holocaust, all these versions of anti-Semitism were repudiated by Western democratic society, and were preserved only in the extremes, or in the Communist and Arab worlds. Today however, we can see all these manifestations of anti-Semitism in their newest version, folded under the cloak of anti-zionism, and defended as a form of legitimate political discourse.

Israel, and thus all Jews are the now the new Nazis, murdering the Christ-like figure of Yasser Arafat (as in some Italian political cartoons). In this mythology they have constructed concentration camps and even gas chambers, to use on the innocent Arabs. Jews have plotted and planned events ranging from September 11 to the war in Iraq to the introduction of AIDS and SARS. All this has been done to help create the climate in which that state of Israel, that tiny state the size of New Jersey could exist and through its surrogate, the United States, with its military and economic power, control the entire world.

Thus, the new language of anti-Semitism is political, because that is the prevalent discourse of our times. And, the more that a government abdicates the responsibility for clearly repudiating the anti-Semitism that is apparent on both the elite and mass levels, the more that government allows and legitimizes anti-Semitism. In that vein, the Simon Wiesenthal Center has asked the Governments of Greece and Ireland to publicly repudiate the anti-Semitic and neo-fascist LAOS party of Greece, after the election of its head to the European Parliament. Furthermore, we have asked the Government of Greece to publicly condemn the stream of anti-Semitic invective that has become a regular feature in the Greek media.

If anti-Semitism is not challenged, it becomes acceptable. That is why we published the first full length refutation of the *Protocols*, entitled *Dismantling the Big Lie*, because this forgery lives on in both the charter of Hamas and in some circles of the Orthodox Church in Russia. That is also why we produce and distribute our CD-ROM report, *Digital Hate and Terrorism 2004*, that draws on our database of more than 4,000 extremist web sites, in various languages and from all around the world. And, in our Museum of Tolerance in Los Angeles, and our newly opened New York Tolerance Center, our Tools for Tolerance Program works with professional such as educators and more than 100,000 law enforcement and criminal justice personnel, to train them in bringing fresh perspectives to redefine personal responsibility and social action.

NGOs, like ourselves and the others represented here today, can help to identify the problems and to suggest possible solutions. But, ultimately, it is governments who represent nations, and who set the tone for how their country will be perceived.

Far from being apathetic, governments can, and must, be active participants in the fight against anti-Semitism. They can, like France, work with NGOs like the Simon Wiesenthal Center and others in the fight against extremism on the internet. They must, in Germany, reject shortsighted legislation that could cut off funding to Holocaust memorial sites, such as concentration camps. They should not build memorials to the SS, in the name of a misguided nationalism, as Latvia did, but they should, like Latvia, France, Germany and all the other members of the International Task Force on Holocaust Education, Remembrance and Research, pledge themselves to use Holocaust education as a way of influencing the future. And, they must join initiatives,

as the 55 Member States of the OSCE did last April in Berlin, to commit themselves as active partners in the fight against anti-Semitism. As a member of ODIHR's Advisory Panel on Freedom of Religion and Belief, I look forward to assisting those efforts.

Furthermore, they must push the U.N. to not allow itself to continue to be a place where some countries use anti-Semitism as policy. Next Monday's U.N. Conference on Anti-Semitism represents a welcome first step in this direction. But the rejection of anti-Semitism by the U.N. must become a matter of practice and accountability, not just of isolated conferences and individual expressions of concern.

Years ago Simon Wiesenthal expressed the fear that we would "repeat the old mistakes under new conditions..., (that) we are afraid to mobilize right against wrong." If the Holocaust has any lesson, it is precisely that we cannot stand by while anti-Semitism and other forms of bigotry take root. And, as our representatives, it is the role and responsibility of government to take the lead in that regard. Their silence can condemn the world; their protests can save it.

Thank you.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. Weitzmann, thank you very much for your testimony. Congratulations to your son. Stay as long as you like, but I know you probably have to make that plane to get to the graduation.

Ms. Burdett?

**STACY BURDETT, ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR,
GOVERNMENT & NATIONAL AFFAIRS,
ANTI-DEFAMATION LEAGUE**

Ms. BURDETT. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We are grateful to the Commission for holding these hearings and for your yeoman's efforts to make the Berlin Conference a success.

On behalf of ADL and our national director, Abe Foxman, let me just offer special thanks to you, Chairman Smith, Ranking Member Cardin. Your commitment and determination to move beyond concern and speeches to action really inspires us to do our jobs better.

The Berlin effort and the broader campaign to mobilize awareness and action against anti-Semitism has begun to yield results. And there are some hopeful signs.

I attached to my statement a summary of a survey of attitudes about Jews in 10 European countries that ADL released in Berlin on the eve of the conference. The survey found some decrease in anti-Semitic attitudes compared to 2 years ago, and we attribute that to the beginnings of a drumbeat of statements and actions by some leaders.

Each of us has met with officials from OSCE states to talk about the need to monitor and to take greater action. And we hear time and again about their concern that public action against anti-Semitism would not have support of their electorate. So we put into the field two questions on this issue. We asked: "Do you agree that your government should monitor and publicly report on crimes committed against people because of their race, ethnicity or religion?" And the results, you can see from these long purple bars, most respondents, in the 70 and 60 percent range, supported the notion that their governments should monitor.

To take it a step further, we did a second question that explicitly mentioned anti-Semitism, a supposedly unpopular thing, and said, "Do you believe it is important for your government to take action to combat anti-Semitism in your country?" And you can even see from where you

are sitting, these are in the '80 and '90 and '70 percent range. This is overwhelming support. And it really showed us that if governments take the lead, they can count on the support of good people, the bystanders that Congressman Lantos talked about, they can be swayed one way or the other.

It is without question that a key factor that has enabled the growth of the problem is the fear and reticence to talk about it in honest terms, to touch that raw nerve. Our insistence that the Berlin Agenda and Declaration talk about anti-Semitism, as we see it today, was a repudiation of the notion that anti-Semitism is a Middle East issue or a conflict between two ethnic minorities that needs to be brokered or mitigated or massaged. It showed that leaders can acknowledge anti-Semitism without being punished for somehow disrespecting their Muslim constituency.

As with any disease, the denial is insidious, and the Berlin Conference and Declaration marked an end of that kind denial and the beginnings of an awareness of a line between disagreement with Israeli policy and demonization of Israel and Jews.

We definitely did not come to an agreement on where the line is, but there is a growing understanding that when you cross that line, you are veering into an area of anti-Semitism.

And if the conference signaled an end to government denial, on the nongovernmental side, for us, American NGOs, the conference eased the alienation that Jews have felt by the silence of the civil and human rights movement on the subject of the new anti-Semitism.

You both saw the delegation of organization heads who are members of the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights who stood with the Jewish community to demonstrate solidarity and proclaim that combating anti-Semitism is a human rights and civil rights imperative. In that spirit, ADL has engaged in all three OSCE meetings this year.

In addition to serving as public adviser to the Berlin delegation, ADL was honored to be appointed to serve on the U.S. delegation to the OSCE Conference on Cyberhate, that opened today in Paris, and we plan to lend our support and knowhow to the September Conference on Racism and Xenophobia in Brussels.

Now is the time to seize on the momentum provided by Berlin and to really breathe life into the program of action adopted by the participating States. I have attached to my statement a checklist of ADL's promising practices and would like to highlight just a few general recommendations.

Beginning with our own government, we know that any future progress will depend on strong U.S. leadership and diplomatic muscle. The United States must continue to address the nature and the source of the problem squarely whenever the opportunity arises. And we have to explore ways to build on Berlin to secure condemnation of the new anti-Semitism in other fora, like the U.N., the E.U., even the OAS.

In the area of monitoring, beyond the Jewish organizations that work on this issue, ask institutions like ECRI, the European Commission on Racism and Intolerance, ask international human rights monitors, like Human Rights First, and they will tell you there is a gross information deficit on this issue and that anti-Semitic crime, for all that we know about it, is vastly underreported. This is a challenge that we have to chip away at piece by piece.

The OSCE Human Dimension Implementation Meeting should include an agenda item devoted to this topic flowing from the Berlin and Brussels meetings and should serve as a vehicle for discussing ways to forge a common language and process for data collection.

Of course the United States has great experience to lend.

I have attached to my statement also a compendium of our own government's best practices which we have suggested the United States cite in its own response and submission to ODIHR.

With the paucity of data collection laws, it is vital that ODIHR take a much more proactive approach to follow up and encourage states to institute monitoring mechanisms.

ODIHR can do a number of creative things. One thing they could do is publish a booklet, like this one published by the International Association of Chiefs of Police. This is a publication for law enforcement funded by a Department of Justice grant. It acknowledges that legal definitions vary in different states in our country, but there are common guidelines that you can follow: This is how to respond, this is how to help victims, this is how to prevent hate crimes. ODIHR could do a pamphlet just like this one.

American reporting on anti-Semitism as a human rights issue is an indispensable tool for diplomacy. As with any reporting that originates in embassies, it varies from place to place. We welcome passage in the Senate and introduction in the House of legislation that would improve the quality and consistency of America's reporting.

In the area of education programs, the OSCE Parliamentary Assembly should continue to urge Parliaments to take concrete steps to use their own countries' schools as a staging ground for anti-bias education. ADL has identified a number of programs that have already demonstrated results and transferability into the European pedagogical model and context.

There are a wealth of tools to promote Holocaust remembrance that have been talked about here. ADL has a curriculum that uses video survivor testimony, and unfortunately, you could use that in any number of European countries because you can get testimony, unfortunately, in so many languages.

Congress should continue to support the work of the International Task Force on Holocaust Education in some of the ways that Fred Zeidman described.

The Holocaust is also a meaningful educational tool to help law enforcement. Mr. Zeidman talked about the museums program that they do in partnership with ADL.

In addition, the action program that you outlined in your letter of intent with the German Bundestag from a year and a half ago called for states to work with religious leaders to examine the Holocaust in the past. And just one model, and I know other organizations have models to share as well, is ADL's Bearing Witness program for religious educators. It helps Catholic-school teachers look at anti-Semitism and the Holocaust as a starting point for addressing issues of diversity, and it looks very honestly at the role of churches and religious institutions in the Holocaust.

Beyond the work of the OSCE Parliamentary Assembly, I think other parliaments should do what you have done: convene hearings, pass resolutions, set up caucuses, like the Helsinki Commission or the Congressional Task Force Against Anti-Semitism. And to share best practices,

OSCE and participating States should host showcases of best practices. These are great fora for experts and practitioners to look at working models and to assess how they can adapt them to their culture.

Some people have asked whether the months of lobbying and cajoling and drafting that went into the Berlin Conference were worth the effort. The legacy of Berlin is still a work in progress. It is being written in hearing rooms like this, in our follow-up in Warsaw, in Sophia. A conference is only speeches and a Declaration is only a piece of paper. But when I imagine what it would have been like in Durban if 55 governments, or even if five governments, had made a statement or said even one sentence to one reporter, recognizing that anti-Semitism is a rights violation, that “I am a victim of racism and not a perpetrator of apartheid or ethnic cleansing,” it would have, at the very least thrown a cold stone into a very boiling pot.

Abe Foxman, who, like Tom Lantos, was rescued from extermination in the Holocaust as a child frequently poses the question: What if? What if there were five Raoul Wallenbergs, 50, 500, 5,000? Now we can add to that question: What if 55 governments had come together to say no before WWII? With the answer to that question in mind, we have to follow up with rigor on the Berlin effort.

We hope that your work, your commitment, and the initiatives that all of us will be outlining here will command the day.

Thank you.

Mr. SMITH. Ms. Burdett, thank you very much for your testimony. If you just could convey to Abraham Foxman how grateful we are for not only your work but his work as well.

I remember when we were in Berlin for the OSCE Parliamentary Assembly, meeting with Members of Parliaments from various countries that came, he not only—he hit a grand slam home run. I mean, not only did he make the point and provide empirical proof of this rising tide of anti-Semitic activity in each of the countries that were looked at, he very persuasively convinced many of the members that you can be against a specific or a collective policy of the Government of Israel without crossing that line of demarcation of becoming an anti-Semite, and pointed out that the most robust and the most heated debates take place in the *Knesset* as well.

I thought it was a very good point. He repeated it. And you always know you are making a good point when you get the most questions, and he had the most questions.

So just convey to him how grateful we are for that work.

And that was I think a very important harbinger of what happened thereafter, especially Vienna and Berlin, because so many people then spoke to that and used that, including me, that disagree all you want with Israeli policies but do not hate.

I want to just make the point that Ambassador Ed O'Donnell has joined us, the Special Envoy for Holocaust Issues. The Commission really is very grateful for his work.

We are a group of workhorses; we are not showhorses. Ben and I are not out on the tube doing press conferences every day of the week. We work hard, and our staffs are identical. We have very smart people who work these issues.

As one of those from the executive branch who is very helpful to us on all of these issues and for the issue itself, so I want to just thank him and thank him for joining us on the panel.

I would like to ask Shai if he would ...

**SHAI FRANKLIN, DIRECTOR OF GOVERNMENT RELATIONS,
NCSJ: ADVOCATES ON BEHALF OF JEWS IN RUSSIA, UKRAINE,
THE BALTIC STATES AND EURASIA**

Mr. FRANKLIN. Mr. Chairman, thank you for this opportunity to appear before the Commission. I have submitted a prepared statement for the record.

I also wish to recognize Representative Cardin as the ranking member of the Commission, and your fellow Commissioners from the Senate and the House.

I will take this opportunity to recognize Ambassador O'Donnell. I would not go over the praise that you have heaped on him in his presence and in his absence.

Although this is my first time testifying personally before the Commission, NCSJ's relationship with this body goes back to before the Commission's founding.

I could easily spend my allotted time describing the important role that the Commission and each of you and your staff members have played. But fortunately, NCSJ has had many opportunities to do just that, and to report to you on our own efforts as well.

I will note that the Commission effectively launched the OSCE track on anti-Semitism through a similar hearing more than 2 years ago, just before the OSCE Parliamentary Assembly met in Berlin—as you mentioned, Mr. Chairman—and today I proudly wear the pin from that conference.

It was the leadership of the Commissioners that mobilized your colleagues from European Parliaments to adopt the OSCE's first stand-alone document on anti-Semitism.

Your earlier discussion of the Jackson-Vanik amendment is one more example of a congressional initiative changing and shaping the world we live in.

I must also recognize the leadership of the U.S. Government; Ambassadors Steve Minikes; as I mentioned, Ed O'Donnell; and Randy Bell; as well as Secretary Powell who leads from the top and delivered a very forceful message in Berlin.

Building on last year's Vienna conference, the first-ever such international forum on anti-Semitism, Berlin produced measurable commitments by 55 OSCE member States and demonstrated actionable programs for governments to support and implement.

Mr. Chairman, my focus today is on the steps we can take to achieve implementation of Maastricht and of Berlin, to move this process further beyond rhetoric and to ensure that governments and institutions fulfill those commitments.

I am also submitting for the record the proceedings of a roundtable I moderated during last October's OSCE Human Dimension Implementation Meeting in Warsaw that illustrates the types of contacts we have on an ongoing basis.

And we were very pleased to have you, Mr. Chairman and Congressman Cardin, with us at that event.

NCSJ works with many governments, particularly the Soviet-successor states, where anti-Semitism is manifested in different ways than in the West, and fortunately, the level of recent violence has not matched that in the West.

My prepared statement reviews several examples of U.S.-funded initiatives, homegrown campaigns, monitoring programs and government responses in three of those countries: Russia, Ukraine and Lithuania. I hope these examples may answer some of Congressman Cardin's earlier points.

However, to focus on the action that we can take from this end, I want to go straight to the region-wide capacity for coordinated action. Given NCSJ's close cooperation with this Commission and our involvement in the Helsinki Process, I will focus my recommendations on this avenue.

To follow up on the successful and high-profile Berlin Conference, OSCE member States can pursue a range of steps, including the following:

One, use the Parliamentary Assembly in July, the Human Dimension Implementation Meeting in October, and the Ministerial Council in December to oversee and encourage the progress of the ODIHR and member States. We must maintain the momentum for ODIHR to fulfill its mandate.

Two, reinforce the impact of Berlin by ensuring adequate funding for ODIHR to collect data.

Three, respond to ODIHR's request for data collection and sharing of best practices. The United States and other governments already engaged in these activities should offer to share expertise with those still developing such capabilities.

Four, respond to Spain's proposal to host a conference in 2005. If such a conference is to take place, an early announcement provides a target date for individual countries and the OSCE to implement their commitments and responsibilities from Maastricht and Berlin. A conference is only useful if the participants have something to report and something to hold to account.

Five, while the U.S. delegation to Berlin included an official from the Department of Justice, not enough countries followed suit. To succeed on the ground, we need to bring in the practitioners from ministries of interior and education, from universities and media, from politics and civil society. As Paul Goldenberg said a few minutes ago, law enforcement officials learn best from other law enforcement officials.

Six, use the September 2004 Brussels Conference on Xenophobia to promote greater support for data collection and to demonstrate that a new focus on anti-Semitism enhances rather than detracts from concerns of other minority groups.

Seven, devote part of the 2004 Sofia Ministerial to a public forum on anti-Semitism. While many ministers may not be able to attend a stand-alone conference, nearly all foreign ministers participate in the annual ministerial council. It also attracts the greatest media attention, given the variety of issues discussed.

Mr. Chairman, European governments should not misread efforts toward a special OSCE representative, or other initiatives, as a sanction to delay implementing the Maastricht and Berlin Declarations: fighting anti-Semitism at home, upgrading data-collection, and cooper-

ating with the emerging ODIHR mechanism. We must continue moving forward with what has been agreed, even as we consider new initiatives to reinforce this process.

In much the same way, here at home, NCSJ urges rapid passage in the House of S. 2292, that has already passed the Senate. Once S. 2292 is enacted, the State Department can begin preparing the first-ever country-by-country global assessment of anti-Semitism and government responses, for delivery to Congress this year.

While ODIHR and OSCE member-governments move unevenly toward implementing data collection, at least the U.S. Government can provide ODIHR and the world with an initial consistent assessment of incidents and response.

We look forward to working with Congress on additional measures to follow, and would also welcome broad-based discussion leading to comprehensive legislation that covers important new ideas on combating anti-Semitism internationally.

As we all reflect on President Reagan's legacy in this movement for human rights in Europe, it is also worth recalling what Thomas Jefferson wrote to John Adams in 1821, that "Even should the cloud of barbarism and despotism again obscure the science and liberties of Europe, this country remains to preserve and restore light and liberty to them."

Jefferson foreshadowed the singular importance of American leadership in fighting anti-Semitism, in building strong and pluralistic post-communist societies, and in transmitting our values to a new generation of Europeans, even as the identity and boundaries of Europe are undergoing a fundamental transformation.

Mr. Chairman, through the leadership of Congress and the Helsinki Commission, together with the U.S. Government, our country continues this tradition.

Thank you all for your commitment and your effectiveness. Thank you again for this opportunity to testify personally and to work alongside you in this sacred task.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. Franklin, thank you very much for your testimony, for the great work of NCSJ. I think I mentioned this earlier today, but my first trip to the Soviet Union was with your boss. It was an eye-opening trip if ever there was one, and it began me on my work, working with other members on behalf of refuseniks and generally on the issues.

So I do thank you, and your testimony was outstanding.

Mr. FRANKLIN. Mr. Chairman, if I could just add, in my written statement it is mentioned, but Mr. Levin is in New York today, which is why he could not be here with us. He is actually participating in a celebration marking 40 years of Soviet Jewry activism. So I appreciate your comments. I will convey them to him.

Mr. SMITH. I appreciate that.

Our next distinguished speaker is Dan Mariaschin, as I mentioned before director of B'nai B'rith's Center for Human Rights and Public Policy and also VP of B'nai B'rith International.

**DAN MARIASCHIN,
EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT,
B'NAI B'RITH INTERNATIONAL**

Mr. MARIASCHIN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and I would like to thank you for the privilege of addressing this hearing on behalf of B'nai B'rith International and its more than 110,000 members and supporters.

Mr. Chairman, if you would allow a personal note first: My father, who passed away 30 years ago this week, immigrated to this country from Russia in 1914. The Russia from which he came on the eve of World War I was rife with anti-Semitism and pogroms. The foresight of my grandparents in bringing my father and his siblings to these shores has been validated in so many ways over the years, but no more so than in the important hearings on anti-Semitism that the Commission is conducting and the work that all of you have done on this issue. We thank you for that.

As a member of the U.S. delegation to the OSCE's Vienna conference on anti-Semitism last year, and as a public adviser to the U.S. delegation in Berlin, I am encouraged by what I feel to be the many positive developments that have resulted from these OSCE-sponsored gatherings.

The Berlin Conference was long overdue. With the exception of the Vienna meeting in 2003 and a brief seminar on the subject hosted by the European Union earlier this year, both of which helped place anti-Semitism on the world radar screen, no collective body, no multilateral body since 1945 has met to discuss and act on hate crimes committed against Jews, particularly in Europe.

What we have seen in Europe over the past decade has been a series of meetings, the adoption of legislation, and the creation of commissions and committees on Holocaust-era restitution issues, but nothing so coordinated or prioritized regarding anti-Semitism has been attempted.

Compounding the problem has been the blinders-on view of many European leaders about the demonization of Israel and Zionism, which has become a pernicious and regularly accepted form of modern-day anti-Semitism.

Rather than characterize, for example, the comparison of Israel to Nazi Germany or violent acts against Jews and Jewish communal properties as outright anti-Semitism, the initial reaction of some leaders to these acts was dismissive, with many ascribing such incidents or portrayals as, quote, "legitimate criticism of Israel," or as the pranks of disaffected youth. This has been especially true when such acts were carried out by individuals from the growing Arab and Muslim communities in countries like France and Belgium.

It was therefore of particular note that the historic Berlin Declaration, which provided an initial blueprint for combating hate crimes against Jewish individuals and institutions, specifically addressed the growing problem of anti-Semitic attacks being committed by opponents of Israel's policies vis-a-vis the Palestinians.

The passage stating that, quote, "International developments or political issues, including those in Israel or elsewhere in the Middle East, never justify anti-Semitism" should be a wake-up call to those who try to justify hate crimes with politics.

But while the demonization of Israel has now been broached in an international forum, the parameters of the problem have not yet been defined. European leaders will need to summon the political will and the courage to acknowledge the dangers of anti-Israel hatred and to act forcefully against it. This means recognizing that anti-Israel sentiment is growing fastest among Arabs and Muslims in the Middle East and in Europe, a realization that until now European officials have not been swift to achieve.

Another major issue at the Berlin Conference was the matter of how best to monitor acts of anti-Semitism Europe-wide. While the Office of Democratic Institutions and Human Rights, ODIHR, serves as the OSCE's own monitoring arm, it has not carried out any kind of systematic process of gathering accurate data on anti-Semitic acts in the OSCE member States. For there to be any coordinated approach to combating the phenomenon, one needs to have factual information on what is happening and where.

So ODIHR's involvement in this effort is indispensable, and it must be provided with the necessary funding to begin this information- and data-gathering process.

And yet, even on this question, some member States initially balked, citing budgetary concerns or doubts as to whether national governments could demand such information from their own provinces or states.

To capitalize upon the progress made at the Berlin Conference, OSCE member States should immediately begin to implement their own recommendations. Some of these proposals include an informal exchange of best practices between nations, government support for anti-hate programs, assistance in facilitating the prosecution of anti-Semitic crimes, and the promotion of academic exchange and educational programs.

Furthermore, there must be follow-up in the areas of legislation, law enforcement, education, media, and general monitoring of anti-Semitic hate crimes. Progress in these spheres will require a continuation of the collaborative effort of friendly countries and NGOs in order for the promise of Berlin to be realized in a serious way.

Education ministers and justice ministers, interior ministers, for example, should regularly meet in multilateral forums to develop an ongoing form of cooperation on matters related to anti-Semitism and hate crimes.

And as OSCE member States create legislation, they should call on the experience of NGOs—many of whom met the day before the opening of the OSCE plenary and agreed on their own highly detailed proposal to combat anti-Semitism—to assist them in this effort.

U.S. lawmakers have provided important leadership in these areas and their ongoing efforts should be strongly encouraged.

Mr. Chairman, you in particular are to be applauded for introducing the Global Anti-Semitism Review Act of 2004 which would require the State Department to report on acts of anti-Semitism around the world. Senator Voinovich, much to his credit, has introduced the companion bill in the Senate.

We commend also Representatives Cardin and Hastings for their active involvement in the Berlin Conference and for their substantial contributions to the cause of combating global anti-Semitism through their participation in the OSCE process.

And let also join in the praise of both Ambassador O'Donnell and Ambassador Minikes for their tireless efforts, not only in Berlin but in other venues as well, such as the International Task Force, in bringing the issue of anti-Semitism into the public eye.

Another action the OSCE could take to elevate the problem of anti-Semitism on the organization's agenda would be to appoint a special representative to deal with the issue. This official, appointed by and working closely with the OSCE chair, should have the prestige, the profile and the resources to bring the OSCE's influence to bear in addressing the problem.

Finally, the OSCE should strongly consider a third special plenary on anti-Semitism next year. Some countries resisted the idea of a second meeting. But at least one country, Spain, has extended an offer to host a gathering in 2005. Such a session might well take the form of an experts conference, or might otherwise differ from the previous two gatherings in its objectives or focus. For example, such a meeting might address the importation of anti-Semitism to Europe from the Arab and Islamic world.

Mr. Chairman, as the OSCE prepared to convene the Berlin Conference, the French Government reported a steep rise in anti-Semitic incidents since the beginning of this year, nearly double the number in the first quarter of 2004 as in the last quarter of 2003. Just this month—and it was mentioned by Senator Clinton early on—a 17-year-old Talmud student was stabbed in a suburb of Paris by a man who screamed "God is great" in Arabic. And in recent weeks, rabbis in Marseille and Creteil were attacked, and a rabbi's son was severely beaten in Paris over the holiday of Shavuot just a few weeks ago.

Meanwhile, in Hungary 5 months ago, 5,000 right-wing demonstrators rallied outside a Budapest radio station, chanting, "Dirty Jews." And in Germany's *Berliner Zeitung* last month, an editorial cartoon derided Deputy Defense Secretary Paul Wolfowitz by comparing him to a controversial political science professor at the University of Munich. It is well known in German society that both men happen to be Jewish.

Mr. Chairman, such episodes are painful reminders of the urgency of the problem we continue to face. As we gauge our progress in the struggle against anti-Semitism, let us draw reassurance from the positive atmosphere of the Berlin Conference, but let us also commit ourselves to sustaining the forward momentum of that gathering.

Sixty years after the Holocaust, and nearly 4 years after the start of the current rise of anti-Semitism in Europe, let us embrace one of the central messages of the Berlin Conference: that complacency and passivity in the face of anti-Semitism can no longer be tolerated.

Thank you.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. Mariaschin, thank you very much for that very eloquent testimony.

For all of our witnesses, I just want to make this point: that we are going to be producing—when we produce the hearing record from today, we will produce more copies than we normally do. And the purpose of that will be to get that to every member of the OSCE Parliamentary Assembly, for one. That is about 320-plus Members of Parliament.

And taking up, Ms. Burdett, your statement about others should be holding such hearings, we do encourage that, but we want to be able to put in their hands another copy of something we have done and say, “Do as we have done and tell us what you are doing that we should be doing.”

This record will be very widely disseminated immediately by way of our web site and through other means, but also by way of saying, “This is a collection of very thoughtful analyses of anti-Semitism, what you would do, the status of the problem.” We will get that out far and wide, I can assure you.

So thank you for your testimonies.

Our final speaker—because I am not sure if Rabbi Singer is going to be here—but last but absolutely not least because this is all a matter of—it is difficult to work this right.

But, Mr. Tisch, we thank you for being here and for taking the time to come down here and present your testimony. Please proceed as you would like.

**JAMES S. TISCH, CHAIRMAN,
CONFERENCE OF PRESIDENTS OF
MAJOR AMERICAN JEWISH ORGANIZATIONS**

Mr. TISCH. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And thank you for the opportunity to appear before this Commission and to discuss my concerns about anti-Semitism.

My name is James Tisch and I am the Chairman of the Conference of Presidents of Major American Jewish Organizations, representing 52 national Jewish organizations from across the political and religious spectrum.

The Conference of Presidents was represented in Berlin by our Executive Vice-Chairman, Malcolm Hoenlein, who was a public adviser to this year’s delegation and a public member of last year’s delegation to the OSCE conference in Vienna. Anti-Semitism is a vital concern and priority for the Conference of Presidents, and I am pleased to make this statement on our behalf.

The OSCE conference produced the Berlin Declaration, which advocates combating anti-Semitism in all its forms. That document, however, could not have been named the Beirut Declaration, the Cairo Declaration or the Riyadh Declaration. While the countries of Europe to varying degrees are battling anti-Semitism, the Arab world is promoting it.

I do not blame the Arab man in the street for being fiercely anti-Semitic. He does not stand a chance of being anything but, considering the barrage of hatred and venom about Jews to which he is constantly exposed. This river of lies flows from his leaders, his newspapers and his television set. The Arab media and the governments that sponsor and tolerate this flood of poison are to blame. This is not about politics; it is about an ocean of hatred.

We know that there is an enormous difference between the official statements Arab leaders make to foreign media concerning Jews and anti-Semitism and what they then say in Arabic in the press, or what is then broadcast on the Arab television. Let me give you a few examples.

The demonization of Jews comes straight from the top in Saudi Arabia. Concerning the terror attack at Yanbu in which six foreigners were killed, Crown Prince Abdullah told his subjects on Saudi television, "Zionism is behind everything. This has been established. I am not saying by 100 percent, but 95 percent." He went on to claim that "Satan's helpers" had "seduced" young Saudis into committing the attack.

The Saudi interior minister, Prince Nayef, publicly blamed September 11 on the Jews. And although the Saudi ambassador here in Washington grudgingly admitted on *Meet the Press* that Prince Nayef was wrong when he claimed that September 11 was a Zionist plot, I am sure that clip did not air on Saudi TV.

And it is not just the Saudi leadership that promotes anti-Semitism. When Malaysia's Mahathir Mohammed said in a speech that "Jews rule the world by proxy and must be fought," he received a standing ovation from the leaders of 57 Islamic countries. Some of those leaders control the media in their countries and actively promote anti-Semitism.

Egyptian TV and other Arab channels ran *A Knight Without A Horse* during the Muslim holiday of Ramadan in 2002. This 41-part series was based on the famous anti-Semitic forgery, *The Protocols of the Elders of Zion*. The plot of the series concerns the hunt for a copy of *The Protocols of the Elders of Zion*, which is portrayed as a genuine Jewish plot to control the world. Jews are accused of infiltrating governments everywhere in order to instigate wars, racism and religious clashes. The Jews will then step into the bedlam and dominate the world through their control of the world's supply of gold.

Some governments, like Lebanon's, tolerate anti-Semitic incitement by private TV stations such as al-Manar, also known as Hezbollah TV. Indeed it was al-Manar that broadcast what is perhaps the most gruesome example of hatemongering that I want to share with you today, and that in fact you saw previously in Minister Sharansky's presentation. But I would like to describe it nonetheless, just because it is so extraordinary.

During Ramadan this past October and November, Arab audiences were treated to a 26-episode, Syrian-produced series called *Diaspora*. Nine days before American families gathered at Thanksgiving to celebrate, eat and watch football, Arab families gathered for Ramadan to celebrate, break the daily fast together and perhaps watch a little television. Let me describe to you what they saw on Hezbollah TV that day.

By Western standards, the production values were terrible, like a third-rate soap opera. The content, though, was genuinely outrageous.

In episode 20, a black-hatted, side-locked Jew instructs his teenage son to abduct Joseph, the child next door, because they need the blood of a Christian to make the Passover matzoh. A third conspirator brings Joseph to the house. The boy is about 8 years old. The Jews force the child into a windowless basement. At this point, the tone turns ominous, and what had seemed like a poorly produced soap opera now has the feel of a horror film.

In the middle of the basement floor is an empty basin. The boy Joseph is scared and asks to be taken home. The three Jews exchange a knowing look, and the slaughter begins. Two of the Jews grab the boy. He struggles and shouts for his mother as they position his neck over the basin. The camera pans in to show Joseph's face. The third Jew pulls

the boy's head back, puts the knife to his neck and then slits his throat. For the next 20 seconds, the camera focuses on a grotesque close-up of the boy's blood flowing into the basin.

In the next scene, the black-hatted, side-locked Jew offers matzoh to another Jew, telling him that it is "tastier and holier because it is kneaded with pure blood."

Ramadan happens to be the peak television season in the Arab world, but I can assure you that this poison is being spread year-round. So I repeat: How does the Arab man in the street have a chance not to hate Jews?

Why bring up examples specific to the Arab world at a hearing on the OSCE and anti-Semitism? Because al-Manar TV, Syrian TV, Saudi TV and other Arab stations are broadcast by satellite and via the World Wide Web to Europe, to North America and the rest of the world. Arab living rooms today are also in France and Florida.

This hatemongering has been documented and acknowledged. Recognizing the severity of the problem, the French Government is taking action through their FCC in response to the al-Manar broadcast of the blood libel program.

Mr. Chairman, I do not have a ready solution for the dire problem of Arab anti-Semitism. I do know that we must bring to bear the same high-level commitment against Arab anti-Semitism as the OSCE has done, not only because this hatred is wrong, but also because it makes achieving peace in the Middle East much more difficult.

Anti-Semitism, based on and promoted by lies, breeds generations who loathe Jews. Secretary Powell should put the battle against anti-Semitism on the diplomatic agenda with Arab states that promote or tolerate incitement against Jews, and the U.S. Government should hold Arab leaders responsible for the anti-Semitic poison that their state-controlled media airs. In the OSCE member States, the commitments of the Berlin Declaration must be implemented and enforced. Mechanisms must be strengthened for monitoring, accurate reporting and law enforcement. Within the OSCE secretariat, the Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights must have the resources to meet its reporting obligations. It is my hope that the Berlin Declaration will also be adopted without amendment by the U.N. General Assembly, which has been as yet unable to pass a resolution on anti-Semitism.

In 1840, the first political action of organized American Jewry was to ask President Van Buren to aid the Jews of Damascus who were being persecuted on account of the same blood libel story that Arabs watched on Hezbollah TV just last year. So today, nearly a century and a half later, American Jewry again urges the president and the Congress to take action against anti-Semitism coming from Damascus and other Arab capitals, for it is a poison that knows no borders.

Thank you.

Mr. SMITH. Thank you very much, Mr. Tisch.

Just a couple of questions to the entire panel. As you have mentioned and the idea of an experts conference, something you have suggested to us, my question is to all of you: Is that the way we should go, an experts panel? Should there be another conference? Is there a consensus that there ought to be a follow-up to Berlin?

And let me ask Mr. Tisch, because you did point out and describe again that excruciatingly cruel video that was shown by Mr. Sharansky. Is that commonplace, that kind of depiction of Jews in fiction and in their broadcasts?

Because I have never, frankly, in all candor—I have seen the printed word, I have seen the cartoons, I have read translated versions of the hate, but I have never seen it quite so stark as that on a video. And that was powerful. I mean, every member of Congress should see that and I think Colin Powell and other people in our executive branch ought to see that. Because that is a chilling reminder of, as you said, the man in the street does not have much of a chance but to be anti-Semitic when you are fed that kind of lie.

Mr. TISCH. The series that ran on Egyptian TV, *A Night Without A Horse*, was a 41-part series. And likewise, this series that ran on Syrian al-Manar TV was a 26-episode program. So, yes, there are plenty of programs of this sort.

I recommend that you go the MEMRI web site, <<http://memri.org>>, which has a whole series of videos that have aired on Arab television that are translated into English. The two that Minister Sharansky showed today came from that web site.

Mr. MARIASCHIN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to answer on the issue of a possibility of another meeting next year. But before I do, I would like to add just one word on this.

There's an assumption I think that in the Arab world the discussion about what we used to call the Arab-Israeli conflict was about borders and territory and such. For too long these countries—and I say for too long, it is really since 1948—for too long what has been shown here today by Minister Sharansky and what has been talked about by Mr. Tisch has passed off the radar screen.

The amount of hatred and the amount of anti-Semitism which is produced daily in these countries is horrendous.

Just like on other issues related to anti-Semitism, we have kind of suffered in silence over these years simply because the broader issue of the Arab-Israeli conflict was assumed to be something other than what we have seen.

Now we are beginning to shed some light on this. And it is an important subject.

Whatever venue there may be—and here I will segue into my comment on next year—whatever venue we might have next to explore this kind of anti-Semitism, we should take advantage of it.

With regard to another conference, as I mentioned, and I think as you know, we battled so hard for Vienna and then for Berlin that the assumption was that all we needed to get this effort off the ground was a major meeting, and then two meetings to really begin to lock this in.

We believe that the matter is of such importance and such gravity that there should be another meeting. But as I think all of us agree, and we have discussed this amongst ourselves, it does not necessarily have to take the form or the focus of what occurred in Vienna, which had its own purposes, and Berlin, which had its own purposes.

Any time there is an opportunity or an offer to hold another meeting—and we could call this “the accountability meeting,” we could call this “the review meeting” to take a look back and see, after the promise of Berlin to see that this was not just rhetoric but that the wheels are really beginning to turn, we should take that opportunity.

So we support such a meeting. But we would have to discuss, of course, the parameters and the focus of such a meeting.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. Franklin?

Mr. FRANKLIN. Mr. Chairman, I would only add one thing to what Mr. Mariaschin said about conferences: If there is a conference, Vienna, as Mr. Mariaschin said, served a purpose for putting anti-Semitism on the map, and Berlin went beyond that.

And we need to make sure that any conference that does take place is not just speeches. Vienna was just speeches because it had to be, because those were speeches that we were told could not be made.

But if a conference is only speeches, then we are giving various governments a free ride.

Because of the process that you and we together have instituted, other bodies, other international bodies, have tried to play catchup, and they have done so largely with speeches. They have done it because they feel pressure, because we are shining a spotlight. We cannot allow them to run away from that spotlight easily.

So whatever conference there is, we need to make sure that it fits the priorities and the strategies that we, not just the United States, all of us as members of the coalition of the willing are agreed to, and not just to have a conference so that officials can tell their populations, many of whom want an increased focus, that, "Well, we have now satisfied that, we have now gotten beyond the Holocaust, we have defeated anti-Semitism." It cannot be that easy.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. Franklin, I am glad you mentioned the coalition of willing. In this hearing room, when we had [Inaudible] in here and we drew up a list of agreed-upon principles, we only had a half-dozen member States in the OSCE that were part of the coalition of the willing. It was not for lack of asking the others. There was an indifference, if not hostility, but I would prefer to think it was indifference, in which you can hopefully bring them along.

So there was some drag throughout this.

Mr. Mariaschin, your comment about an experts conference—in our previous panel, one of the members made that comment as well.

I think the sooner we come to a consensus on what that ought to look like the sooner we can work with the administration and hopefully other governments, the German Government in particular, to make that come to pass so that if it is an accountability meeting, we would begin to tell everybody, "Hey, the bright light is going to be shown," whether it be in Cordoba or somewhere else, "get prepared and let us work together on this so we keep that focus."

Yes?

Mr. WEITZMANN. Mr. Chairman, if I may, at the recent task force meeting in Rome, one of the items that came up was related to this, and it was also spoken about an experts meeting, and perhaps the model of the task force, which brings together experts and government officials, and requires some accountability in that sense, may be one that may be applicable as well under these circumstances, along with reaching out to the groups that are working, such as the task force, ... [Inaudible] ... bringing them all together in different ways that are working on the same issue.

The other point that I would like to briefly refer back to, Syria, the anti-Semitism of this forum is not limited to the street. The defense minister of Syria, Mustafa Tlass, wrote a book called *The Matzoh of*

Zion, which is essentially about ritual murder. The book has been translated into a number of languages, including European languages, and is in, I think, its eighth or its thirteenth publication already.

So this goes all the way up the highest levels of government and to other forms of intellectual and political leadership.

Mr. SMITH. Before I yield to Mr. Cardin, I would just point out that video, we will take that to Edinburgh and try to get as many of our parliamentarian colleagues to look at it.

Mr. Cardin?

Mr. CARDIN. Thank you, again, Mr. Chairman.

Once again I thank all of our witnesses not only for their participation here but for the work that you do on these issues.

I would just make one observation in regards to a follow-up meeting on anti-Semitism within OSCE.

It seems to me that there are two other issues that we need to address and we have to make sure that the focus on a follow-up meeting does not interfere with. And one of those has been referred to in that there are two other conferences that will have taken place: one on the cyberspace hate, the other on racism and xenophobia. And we need to look at how we are coordinating the efforts on intolerance generally I think that we have to be careful that we do not focus on a follow-up meeting on anti-Semitism and it looks like we do not want to work with a coordinated strategy to deal with intolerance. I think that us one issue that we have to be concerned about.

The second is, there are commitments to build up a capacity within OSCE, that is, to strengthen ODIHR, and we hope to have some high-level position—whether it is a special representative or a special envoy—for the chair and office that will focus in on the follow-up work that us going to be necessary.

I would hope that capacity moves forward in both of these areas and that a follow-up meeting is not used as a way to defer those issues being resolved prior to such a meeting. That would be one of the concerns that I would have.

I agree that we do not want to turn away any offer of help, and that there is certainly a useful purpose for another meeting, particularly as it relates to the experts in the area from the different states getting together. But I would just caution.

The reason why Berlin was so successful is that we developed a game plan ahead of time. And we knew that we needed an action document. That decision was made by the U.S. delegation well in advance of the Berlin meeting.

And as I mentioned about Ambassador O'Donnell, the fact that he was able to get all the members of our delegation and the NGO community on the same page as to what we wanted to accomplish in Berlin, and then to work—the only thing that the Chairman has said that I think that he has exaggerated today is, I do not think there were six countries that were part of the coalition of the willing when we started. I did not even remember three within OSCE that were interested in—did you get six?

Mr. SMITH. Yes.

Mr. CARDIN. I stand corrected. I do not even remember three that helped us in an active way in trying to get this within the OSCE framework when we started.

This is an area where we have to make progress where we can.

I very much appreciate your specific recommendations that have come from the panel members. I agree with much of what you have said. I think we do have to use the opportunity in Edinburgh to try to advance this among parliamentarians, that gives us a chance.

There will be, as we understand it, parliamentary hearings in other countries. That is one of the strategies we have talked about among parliamentarians in Berlin. I will be disappointed ... [inaudible], following through on Edinburgh, that we expect that there will be other countries whose Parliaments will announce hearings to follow up on the Maastricht and Berlin commitments. We hope we will have that as early as July, when we get to Edinburgh, that those announcements will be made.

What we are doing here we hope will be used in other countries around the OSCE region.

Our next challenge is to develop priorities: How do we proceed from here? That is where I think this hearing has been particularly helpful. What should be the next step that we take in order to follow up on the commitments that have been made? What should our priorities be? What should the instructions be given to our ambassador as to where we want to see progress made within the OSCE?

I think this hearing has been very helpful in trying to help us focus in on that. And for that I say thank you to all of you for your continued participation.

Mr. SMITH. Thank you, Mr. Cardin.

Ambassador Ed O'Donnell, special envoy for Holocaust issues.

**HIS EXCELLENCY ED O'DONNELL,
SPECIAL ENVOY FOR HOLOCAUST ISSUES,
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF STATE**

Amb. O'DONNELL. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. First, let me say thank you very much for extending me the honor of sitting up here with you and being a part of the dais, and also to say what an honor it was to be with you, Mr. Chairman and Congressman Cardin, in working on the U.S. delegation in Berlin.

And you are absolutely right, you are workhorses, and it was a pleasure to be with you shoulder to shoulder and with our NGO representatives.

I think this issue of combating anti-Semitism is an example of where the Congress, the Helsinki Commission and the administration, and the NGOs are really working together in the same direction and with a unified voice. It is a tragedy we have to confront anti-Semitism today, but I think we are committed. And certainly we did achieve a lot in Berlin.

There are some excellent and very eloquent statements by the NGO representatives, on this panel and the previous panel, and I think some excellent ideas I think we all know the work ahead is still there for us in the next year and years ahead, unfortunately, I am sorry to say. But that there are some real specific ideas, especially in the area of education, law enforcement and legislation.

Mark Weitzmann and Fred Zeidman spoke very well and eloquently about the Task Force on Holocaust Education, particularly about the education part of it. Stacy Burdett and Dan Mariaschin and others—spoke about law enforcement and legislation.

I think there is a lot of food for thought I just want to commit for the administration—President Bush, Secretary Powell, my office, others in the State Department who work on these issues—we look forward to working with you, the Helsinki Commission.

Congressman Cardin, thank you very much for your comments about me personally.

Mr. Smith, thank you very much.

We look forward to working with all of you to plan the way ahead, implementing the Berlin Declaration.

Thank you.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. Ambassador, thank you very much. Certainly we are very grateful for your work personally and out of your office. Thank you for your leadership.

We do have our work cut out for us, but I think we are up to it. We have got a great partnership going here.

I look forward to working with our distinguished panelists as well

Do you have anything else further to add?

If not, the hearing is adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 2:06 p.m., the hearing was adjourned.]

APPENDICES

PREPARED STATEMENT OF HON. CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH, CHAIRMAN, COMMISSION ON SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE

Ladies and Gentlemen, I want to welcome you to this U.S. Helsinki Commission hearing on "Government Actions to Combat Anti-Semitism in the OSCE Region." I am very pleased to have many distinguished panelists present today and look forward to their testimony.

As we all know, roughly two years ago, a wave of anti-Semitic violence swept through much of the OSCE region. Unparalleled since the dark days of the Second World War, Jewish communities throughout Europe and North America faced repeated attacks against Jewish cultural sites, cemeteries and individuals. In the eastern portions of the OSCE region, anti-Semitic acts occurred in places long devoid of Jewish life, as hate-filled individuals tried to extinguish the last whispers of history testifying to a once vibrant Jewish community. Despite sincere government efforts, sporadic incidents continue to arise throughout the region, both east and west. It is an ugly reality that won't go away by ignoring or by wishing it away. It must be defeated.

This increase in violence is a chilling reminder that our societies still harbor a dangerous collection of bigots and racists who hate Jews. We are gathered here today to see what we can do—what actions we can take—to ensure that incidents of anti-Semitism become a thing of the past.

At the recent U.N. Human Rights Commission in Geneva, the representative of the Holy See said anti-Semitism is a "distinct form of intolerance with religious and racial characteristics" and is the "oldest and most continuous form of religious intolerance ever known."

George Washington's 1790 letter to Touro Synagogue stated clearly that America was to be place of tolerance for all, and said America "gives to bigotry no sanction, to persecution no assistance." One year later, France became the first European country to emancipate its Jewish population and offer equal citizenship.

More recently, during the horrors of World War II, Chairman-in-Office Passy's Bulgaria chose not to abandon its Jewish citizens. In the OSCE context, the 1990 Copenhagen Concluding document represented the first time an international body spoke specifically to the crime of anti-Semitism.

This hearing comes on the heels of the April OSCE Conference on Anti-Semitism. At that historic Berlin Conference, held in a city of unquestioned significance, 55 participating States gathered together in the fight against anti-Semitism. Mayor Ed Koch ably led the U.S. delegation, and we are sorry he was unable to join us for today's hearing. I also want to publicly thank Secretary Powell for making his personal attendance at the conference a priority.

In short, the conference was a success. U.S. Ambassador to the OSCE, Stephan Minikes, and his staff worked tirelessly to bring our Berlin achievements to fruition. A welcomed surprise was the Spanish offer to host a follow-up meeting on anti-Semitism next year in Cordoba. We certainly appreciate the offer and look forward to working with the Spanish.

Particularly significant was the Berlin Declaration given by the Bulgarian Chairman-in-Office Foreign Minister Solomon Passy. Despite serious objections from some European countries and Mediterranean Partner States, the Declaration stated, “international developments or political issues, including those in Israel or elsewhere in the Middle East, never justify anti-Semitism.” The declaration also highlighted increased commitments by all participating States to monitor anti-Semitic crimes and hate crimes.

The Berlin meeting was a highlight to our ongoing efforts to fight anti-Semitism, but it must not be our high-water mark. Our words must be repeated with frequency, passion and tenacity and matched—and even exceeded—by deeds.

If our fight is to succeed, we need government officials at all levels to denounce, without hesitation or delay, anti-Semitic acts wherever and whenever they occur. No exceptions. Law enforcement officials must vigorously investigate and prosecute acts of anti-Semitic hate. The purveyors of hate never take a holiday or grow weary, nor should we. Holocaust remembrance and tolerance education must dramatically expand, and we need to ensure that our respective laws punish those who hate and incite violence against Jews. To protect our children from the seductive evil of anti-Semitism, we must inoculate future generations from all its mutations and insidious forms through education systems that teach tolerance.

The 18th century British statesman and philosopher Edmund Burke said prophetically “the only thing necessary for evil to triumph is for good people to do nothing.”

When national leaders fail to denounce anti-Semitic violence and slurs, the void is not only demoralizing to the victims but silence actually enables the wrongdoing. Silence by elected officials in particular conveys approval—or at least acquiescence—and can contribute to a climate of fear and a sense of vulnerability.

Since May 2002, Members of Congress and I have spoken out repeatedly and forcefully, and last month Ben Cardin and I introduced a resolution furthering the successes of the Berlin Conference. One important element of H.Con.Res. 425 is our call for the “Bulgarian Chairman-in-Office, in consultation with the incoming Slovenian Chairman-in-Office, to consider appointing a high-level ‘personal envoy’ to ensure sustained attention with respect to fulfilling OSCE commitments on reporting of anti-Semitic crimes.” We do not want to create a new permanent bureaucracy, but rather have the CiO designate an individual of high political standing to work with OSCE States on fulfilling their commitments. Having a personal envoy of the CiO is the best way to complement ODIHR's objective in moving countries to respond and bolster the fight against anti-Semitism.

Paper promises must be followed with concrete actions, so there is no excuse for not putting in place an aggressive, sustainable monitoring program. Last year's Maastricht Ministerial Council decision and the Berlin Declaration committed all participating States to collect and keep records on reliable information and statistics on hate crimes, including anti-Semitism. According to a report on “Official Indifference” written by Human Rights First, of fourteen OSCE countries reviewed, nine had no systematic monitoring. A surgeon can't remove a cancer or prescribe a course of treatment without documenting the nature, scope, and extent of the disease. We must find out what's going on!

For its part, the United States has been collecting hate crime information for almost 15 years. Many of the 50 states in the United States have enacted their own laws addressing hate crimes. Congress passed the Federal Hate Crimes Statistics Act in 1990, which requires the Attorney General to collect data each year about crimes that “manifest evidence of prejudice.” The most recent report available, the 2002 Hate Crimes Statistics Report, documented that religious bias motivated 19.1 percent of all hate crime incidents in the United States. Of this total, a whopping 65.3 percent were anti-Semitic in nature.

One positive by-product of reporting is the impact it has on police. When solid reporting is coupled with police training fewer acts of anti-Semitic violence are likely to occur. The public sharing of this information at home and with the OSCE enhances accountability and allows interested communities and NGOs to craft and implement strategies. I therefore urge each of us to enhance our monitoring mechanisms and to promptly forward these findings to ODIHR.

A top to bottom review of laws, the enforcement of existing laws, and the enactment of new laws will help enormously. When France experienced a particularly high rate of anti-Semitic attacks in 2002, the French enacted a new statute. Mr. Pierre Lellouche was the champion behind these vital reforms. It is hoped that in each of our countries penalties that are commensurate with crimes motivated by anti-Semitic bias will have a chilling effect on those contemplating acts of hate, and surety of punishment for those who do.

Finally, if we are to protect our children from the dark evil of anti-Semitism, we must reeducate ourselves and systematically educate our children. While that starts in our homes, the classroom must be the incubator of tolerance. It seems to me that only the most hardened racist can remain unmoved by Holocaust education and remembrance. Only the most crass, evil, and prejudiced among us can study the horrors of the Holocaust and not cry out: Never again!

I urge all participating States to fulfill the requirements to become a member of the Task Force for International Cooperation on Holocaust Education, Remembrance, and Research. Of the current Task Force members, 16 are OSCE participating States. Open to all countries willing to meet certain criteria, applicant countries must commit to open all public and private archives establish some form of Holocaust remembrance, usually a national day of remembrance, and create or improve Holocaust education curricula.

In 1991, my home state of New Jersey established the Commission on Holocaust Education to promote Holocaust and genocide education standards throughout my state. The Commission is unique, and perhaps a model for others, as it regularly surveys the status of Holocaust education and the design of curricula to ensure that all schools are teaching about the Holocaust and genocide.

The New Jersey Commission has developed more than 2,000 pages of material to aid educators in teaching children about this painful, but important, topic. The New Jersey Commission is an innovative model for other OSCE participating States and local governments to emulate.

The Anti-Defamation League's “A World of Difference” Institute has delivered programs to more than 450,000 American teachers about the Holocaust and intolerance. The Federal Bureau of Investigation, the FBI, partners with the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum and the Anti-Defamation League teach new FBI trainees about law enforcement's

role in the 1930s and 40s in abetting the Holocaust. Conducted at the Holocaust Museum, these sessions leave an indelible impression and lead to greater sensitivity and understanding.

Abraham Lincoln once said concerning slavery: "To sin by silence when they should protest makes cowards of men." Silence my friends is not an option. Nor is inaction.

In closing, many said segregation in the United States would never end. Many laughed at the notion that the Soviet Union would simply crumble and vanish. Many similarly scoff at the idea that anti-Semitism will ever be eradicated. In fact, two years ago when we first raised concerns about anti-Semitic violence, no one would have believed the Berlin Conference would ever happen.

We must be resolute. If we are not working to erase anti-Semitism completely, what are we working for? No amount of anti-Semitism can be tolerated—not now, not ever.

**PREPARED STATEMENT OF
HON. BEN NIGHTHORSE CAMPBELL, CO-CHAIRMAN,
COMMISSION ON SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE**

I am very pleased that the U.S. Helsinki Commission, which I co-chair, is holding today's hearing focused on anti-Semitism in the OSCE region. Since the Spring of 2002, when we observed a spike in anti-Semitic violence in the region, Members of the Helsinki Commission have provided important leadership which has led to concrete action. In May of that year, the Helsinki Commission held a congressional hearing to highlight the alarming trend and to discuss strategies to combat the problem.

Following, in response to the depredations, last summer I introduced S.Con.Res. 7, a resolution highlighting the "expressions of anti-Semitism experienced throughout the [OSCE] region" that "included physical assaults, with some instances involving weapons or stones, arson of synagogues, and desecration of Jewish cultural sites, such as cemeteries and statues." It passed unanimously, sending a resounding message that the Congress will not stand silent in the face of violence against Jews and Jewish institutions.

Last month I introduced S.Con.Res 110, aimed at providing impetus for further action following up on the success of the Berlin OSCE Conference on Anti-Semitism held in April. The measure highlights the accomplishments of the Berlin Declaration, especially the statement that "international developments or political issues, including those in Israel or elsewhere in the Middle East, never justify anti-Semitism," while furthering the commitment of participating States to monitor anti-Semitic crimes and hate crimes.

The Berlin Conference was a success, in part because of the high level participation of many delegations. In this regard, I appreciate the personal participation of Secretary of State Colin L. Powell at the Berlin Conference. Many of the other accomplishments from the meeting are also a result of the good work of the State Department and Stephan M. Minikes, the U.S. Ambassador to the OSCE.

One proposal emerging from the Berlin Conference worth highlighting is the possible appointment by the Bulgarian OSCE Chair-in-Office, in consultation with the incoming Slovenian chairman, of a special high-level envoy to ensure that the commitments from the Maastricht OSCE Ministerial meeting and the Berlin Conference are implemented by the 55 participating States. There is much to be done, and having a personal envoy of the Chair-in-Office would help see these commitments are honored and fulfilled.

There is also a need to follow up on the offer of the Government of Spain to organize and hold the next OSCE Conference on Anti-Semitism in Cordoba, Spain, in the event the Sofia OSCE Ministerial Council decides to hold another conference on anti-Semitism. The Spanish offer would help ensure sustained attention to anti-Semitism in the OSCE region.

Meanwhile, the United States should urge OSCE participating States to support the Declaration of the Stockholm International Forum on the Holocaust of January 2000, and the work of the Task Force for International Cooperation on Holocaust Education, Remembrance and Research, in developing effective methodologies to teach the lessons of the Holocaust. If we are to turn the tide of growing anti-Semitism, education is essential. The Task Force and the ongoing work of the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum deserve our continued support.

We have accomplished much over the past two years to confront and combat anti-Semitism in the OSCE region. As Secretary Powell stressed in his address to the Berlin Conference, "We must send the clear message far and wide that anti-Semitism is always wrong and it is always dangerous. We must send the clear message that anti-Semitic hate crimes are exactly that: crimes, and that these crimes will be aggressively prosecuted." The Helsinki Commission will continue to build upon the work begun in Berlin with the aim of eradicating anti-Semitism and related violence at home and abroad.

**MATERIAL SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD
BY HON. CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH, CHAIRMAN,
COMMISSION ON SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE**

REFLECTIONS ON ANTI-SEMITISM AND THE CHURCH

CARDINAL WILLIAM H. KEELER

JUNE 6, 2004

Cardinal Keeler is the Archbishop of Baltimore and the Episcopal Moderator for Catholic-Jewish Relations of the U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops. This address was delivered at a Jewish–Catholic dialogue sponsored by the Brazilian Conference of Catholic Bishops in Salvador, Brazil.

THE CHURCH AND ANTI-SEMITISM

The first half of the 20th Century was arguably the most violent and tragic period in human history. Two World Wars devastated much of the globe. Advances in technology enabled totalitarian regimes to destroy entire populations. Indeed, a new vocabulary with words such as “genocide” and “Holocaust” had to be developed to describe the horrors visited on whole peoples in so many parts of the world.

The second half of the 20th Century saw new beginnings and renewed hopes as new nations arose and democratic principles began to spread to lands long suffering under oppression. Among Christians, the ecumenical movement articulated the deep longing for unity. Between Christians and people of other religions, dialogue began to replace disputation, a quest whose spirit was embodied in the gathering at Assisi in 1986 of the leaders of the world’s great religions to pray for reconciliation and peace. Similarly, the prayerful visit of Pope John Paul II to the Great Synagogue of Rome earlier in the same year vividly exemplified the Church’s attitude of respect for the Jewish People and for Judaism, as did his Liturgy of Repentance in St. Peter’s in Rome and his subsequent visit to Yad va Shem and the Western Wall (Kotel) in Jerusalem in 2000.

For Catholics, the impetus for involvement in these movements of the Spirit came chiefly from the Second Vatican Council in the 1960s, which condemned both anti-Semitism and Christian theological polemics, and called for “fraternal dialogues” with Jews.¹ The Holy See’s Commission for Religious Relations with the Jews was established after the Council to implement this vision, and has issued three major statements. Also, it has co-sponsored a series of international dialogues with representatives of the Jewish people.²

At the same time, episcopal conferences around the world have issued statements and guidelines to foster understanding of Jews and Judaism among Catholics. Central in all of these official Catholic reflections, including *Nostra Aetate*, as the 1985 Notes affirmed, has been the necessity to preserve “the memory of the persecution and massacre of Jews which took place in Europe just before and during the Second World War.”

Pope John Paul II has repeatedly called upon Catholics “to see where we stand” in our historic relationship with the Jewish People.³ In doing so, we must remember how much the balance (of these relations) over two thousand years has been negative.⁴ This very long period, “which we must not tire of reflecting upon in order to draw from it the appropriate lessons,”⁵ has been marked by many manifestations of anti-Semitism and, in the last century, by the terrible events of the Shoah.⁶ In meeting with Jewish leaders at the beginning of his September 1987 pastoral visit to the United States, the Pope referred to the Shoah and called for the development of “common educational programs” to “promote mutual respect and teach future generations about the Holocaust so that never again will such a horror be possible. Never again!”⁷

There is no future without memory.⁸ Memory and memories are crucial for understanding Jewish-Christian relationships in the past and for the future. They need to be approached with great sensitivity and care for the truth, which is often complex and ambiguous. How did European civilization, largely Christian for so many centuries, reach the point where there could emerge and prevail such a profoundly un-Christian and, indeed, anti-Christian idea as dividing the one human race, into groups perceived as subhuman? “Anti-Christian” I say, because of the Christian teaching that every man and woman is infinitely precious as made in “the image of God.” And then slate those groups for elimination as though they were less than human? Why the fanatical focus on the Jews? Why was the opposition of civil, intellectual and religious leaders so ineffectual? Why did the rest of the world look on and, with very few exceptions, refuse life-saving refuge? Why did the genocidal hatred against God’s People, the Jews, emerge in the 20th Century and not before in medieval times when the Church had more political power?

These and many other questions are raised by the history of the past centuries. They still concern us today. They concern the whole of humanity. They concern the Church. It is greatly encouraging to note, in this context, the development of so many centers and institutions of Christian-Jewish studies, many connected to Catholic universities, both in Europe and the United States. These have joined to form the Council of Centers of Jewish-Christian Relations, which will enable them to share research and respond to new developments.⁹

THE RELATIONSHIP OF CHRISTIAN TEACHING TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF MODERN RACIAL ANTI-SEMITISM

One of the reasons for the urgency of confronting the Shoah in Catholic thinking today lies in the question of whether there exists a relationship between the modern racial anti-Semitism propounded by National Socialism in the 1920’s and ‘30’s, and the negative images of Jews and Judaism that had encrusted themselves on Christian teaching itself over the centuries. And if there is a relationship, we ask, how ought it to be understood? And how do we inoculate future generations of Catholics against its reemergence?

The great French Jewish historian, Jules Isaac, was one of the first to study this issue in a systematic way, beginning his studies even as he hid from the Nazis during World War II.¹⁰ His work showed that very early in the history of the Church passages of the New Testament originally written in the context of what was then an internal Jewish

controversy between the Evangelists, who were Jewish, and other Jewish leaders, were taken out of that context by gentile Christians of subsequent generations, embroidered with already existing Greco-Roman anti-Jewish rhetoric, and then “read back” into the New Testament creating a systematic distortion that he aptly called “the teaching of contempt” against Jews and Judaism. Cardinal Joseph Ratzinger, in introducing the 2001 document of the Pontifical Biblical Commission, *The Jewish People and Their Sacred Scriptures in the Christian Bible* asks the question: “Did not the presentation of the Jews and of the Jewish people, in the New Testament itself, contribute to creating a hostility to this people which the ideology of those who wanted to suppress it has encouraged?” This document and that of the Holy See’s Commission for Religious Relations with the Jews (*We Remember*, 1998) candidly admit the historical link between the ancient and modern forms of anti-Semitism. The Biblical Commission states that many passages in the New Testament that are critical of the Jews “served as a pretext for anti-Jewish sentiment and, effectively, have been used for this purpose” (n. 87), while the latter acknowledges that “sentiments of anti-Judaism in some Christian quarters, and the gap which existed between the Church and the Jewish people, led to a generalized discrimination” towards the Jews over the centuries, in particular in Christian Europe.¹¹

Over the centuries the anti-Jewish teaching was refined, developed, and made ever more negative until, in the 20th century, the majority of Christians in Europe had such a negative (and false!) understanding of Judaism and such a negative attitude toward Jews that they became easy prey for the Nazi racial categorizations that rationalized genocide. Within Christianity, Pope John Paul II has noted, “erroneous and unjust interpretations of the New Testament relative to the Jewish people and their presumed guilt circulated for too long, engendering sentiments of hostility toward this people. That contributed to the lulling of many consciences, so that when Europe was swept by the wave of persecutions inspired by a pagan anti-Semitism that in its essence was equally anti-Christian, alongside those Christians who did everything to save those who were persecuted, even to the point of risking their own lives, the spiritual resistance of many was not what humanity expected from Christ’s disciples.”¹²

It needs to be noted that this framing of the issue, while acknowledging fully the historical link between Christian anti-Judaism and Nazi anti-Semitism, also acknowledges the distinctions between them. Distinctions are necessary for the historical record. Christian anti-Judaism was not racial in character. It adhered, for example, to the teaching of Genesis on the oneness of humanity in the divine image.¹³ It sought a vision of the Church itself in which the distinction between Jew and Gentile would be overcome by baptism.¹⁴ History, too, shows the difference. Historian Yosef Yerushalmi asked why, if genocide had been latent in the Christian teaching of contempt, no such attempt was made in the Middle Ages when the Church held sufficient political power within “Christendom” to implement such an idea: “There is no question but that Christian anti-Semitism through the ages helped create the climate and mentality in which genocide, once conceived, could be achieved with little or no opposition. But even if we grant that Christian teaching was a necessary cause leading to the Holocaust, it was surely not a sufficient one. The Holocaust was the work of a thoroughly

modern, neo-pagan (secularist) state. . .The slaughter of the Jews by the state was not part of the medieval Christian world order. It became possible with the breakdown of that order.”¹⁵

One of the great graces of my life was to attend the Second Vatican Council (1962-1965). It seems like yesterday to me that Cardinal Augustin Bea rose, on November 19, 1963, to introduce what evolved into *Nostra Aetate*, telling us that Pope John XXIII wished the Council to make clear that Christian Scriptures and teachings should not be twisted to anti-Semitic ends, much less used as an excuse for violence against the Jewish people.¹⁶

It does not diminish the failures and sins of Christians on all levels in Church and society over the centuries to acknowledge the multiplicity of causes that lead to the unthinkable becoming reality in the 20th century. Today we must, for the sake of future generations, confront all the causes that led to the Holocaust so that, in understanding them, we can effectively ensure nothing similar can ever occur again, whether to Jews or to other peoples. It is vital to continue the work of the Second Vatican Council to reject and to eliminate from Catholic teaching anything that might be used to present the Jews “as repudiated by God or accursed, as if this followed from Sacred Scripture.”¹⁷ As the Pope has said:

For Christians the heavy burden of guilt for the murder of the Jewish people must be an enduring call to repentance. Through it we can overcome every form of anti-Semitism and establish a new relationship with our kindred nation of the Old Covenant. The Church, mindful of her common patrimony with the Jews, and motivated by the Gospels’ spiritual love. . .deplores the hatred, persecutions, and displays of anti-Semitism directed against the Jews at any time and from any source (*Nostra Aetate* n. 4). Guilt should not oppress and lead to self-agonizing, but must always be the point of departure for conversion.¹⁸

The failure and guilt of that time have a church dimension. Despite the exemplary behavior of many Christian individuals and groups, most Christians kept on living their lives, in essence turning their back on the fate of their Jewish neighbors, looking fixedly at the threat to their own institutions, and remaining all too often silent. Though the Shoah was conceived and carried out by a thoroughly “modern” neo-pagan regime, the classical teaching of contempt was a central factor in “lulling the consciences” of Christians, enabling them to remain appallingly indifferent to Jewish suffering, and even in generating popular support among many for the Nazi crimes. Thus it happened that Jewish men, women and children were systematically put to death without the Christian community as a whole having raised a successful and effective opposition.

The fact that throughout history and during the Shoah many people in the Church, leaders as well as ordinary faithful, did speak up and act in defense of the Jews at the risk of their lives (for example, the convents and monasteries of Italy in which, in response to the personal leadership of Pope Pius XII, thousands of Jews were hidden during the

Nazi occupation)¹⁹, does not take away the guilt of those other Christians, leaders as well as ordinary faithful, who committed the sin of anti-Semitism by action or omission.²⁰ God will judge them.

THE “NEW” ANTI-SEMITISM

Already in 1988, the Holy See’s Commission for Justice and Peace, in its document, *The Church and Racism*, noted that “anti-Zionism—which is not of the same order (as anti-Semitism), since it questions the State of Israel and its policies—serves at times as a screen for anti-Semitism, feeding on it and leading to it.”²¹ Old conspiracy theories and world domination fantasies are being given new life and are exploiting the conflict between Israel and the Palestinians.

In January of 2004 the European Monitoring Centre on Racism and Xenophobia completed a study, begun in 2002, of “Manifestations of Anti-Semitism in the European Union,” which concluded that while the ‘familiar’ threat by ‘ordinary’ right-wing anti-Semitism is obvious, left-wing, anti-globalization, Muslim and pro-Palestinian groups are backbones of contemporary anti-Semitism as well.

At the same time, I do wish to note some cautions about the Middle East situation. One is the fact that Christians living there, living in Israel and under the Palestinian authority, feel themselves under constant pressure.

As Father Drew Christiansen has pointed out, there has been a lack of “effective police involvement in protecting Christians and their holy sites in Nazareth and other places. The lack of police action in Nazareth, whether in protecting Christians against attack or in preventing illegal construction, is a recurrent problem. When the militants rioted a few years ago, attacking Christians, the police held back for three days before intervening in the fray. Some time later the police commander for the northern region admitted he had been under orders not to get involved. With repeated court orders and top government decisions to end the construction in Nazareth, it is hard to comprehend how the authorities could have permitted the protest site to become half completed—under such conditions, you can understand why the Christians of Galilee live in fear.

The vulnerability of Israel’s indigenous Christians is made apparent in the vulnerability of the holy places. Just like the illegal construction in Nazareth, the occupation and siege. . . [some time ago] of the Church of the Nativity in Bethlehem revealed the pressures to which the Holy Land’s Christians are now exposed. In both cases they found themselves and the holy places at the mercy of the worst of their neighbors, along with outside agitators. Before the al-Aqsa Intifada, there were some 50,000 Christians on the West Bank. Today, as a result of emigration, there are fewer than 35,000. The ambiguities in police protection, whether by the Palestinian Authority or the Israeli police, including the border police, is a source of grave concern for the future of the Church in the Holy Land.

Also, there is the issue of the Latin Patriarch, Michel Sabbah. As Father Christiansen points out:

Patriarch Sabbah is a Palestinian National, but he is also a bishop with responsibilities after Vatican II—and I would add after World War II and the Holocaust—to speak out on issues of justice, peace and human rights.

When asked, he consults with police officials on some security matters. With the Anglican and Lutheran bishops, both Palestinians, he has gone to Gaza to meet with Sheikh Yassin, the spiritual head of Hamas, to ask him to end suicide bombings. He has met . . . with Israel's chief rabbis, in an unprecedented move for a Middle East Christian leader, and he engages in regular bible study with rabbis and priests of the Patriarchate. Because of this he is shunned, as I was alarmed to discover, by even moderate, secular academics of Muslim background. . . . When he called for political leaders who could not bring peace to step aside, he once again was criticized by the Palestinian side. But he is given no credit by Israel. Instead he is scorned by an [Israeli] official with an important role in interreligious relations as "the Islamic Patriarch." The issues of fairness and of honest respect deserve to be raised in this context. Anything that we can do to promote both fairness and honest respect among leaders will help to hasten the day of justice and peace in the land we call Holy."

There has indeed been a huge increase in anti-Semitic speech and incidents in Europe, the latter in the main attributed to young Arabs influenced by anti-Israel propaganda. European governments, to their credit, are now taking the rise over the last three years quite seriously, though they did not seem to initially. On April 28, 2004, over 500 representatives from the 55-nation Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe convened in Berlin to formulate an action plan to deal with the growing problem throughout Europe. Secretary of State Colin Powell represented the U.S., acknowledging candidly that "regrettably, my own country has its share of anti-Semites, skinheads and other assorted racists, bigots and extremists, who feed on fear and ignorance and prey on the vulnerable."

One very distressing feature of the new anti-Semitism is the use in Muslim countries of so much of the remnants of Christian anti-Semitism, such as the widespread distribution of translations of the thoroughly discredited classics, *The Protocols of the Elders of Zion* and *The Talmud Unmasked*. Similarly, in some parts of the Arab world, certain elements of the Gibson movie that derive from pre-Vatican II Passion Plays have been exploited for anti-Israel and anti-Semitic propaganda. I would hope that the United Nations, which will hold its first-ever seminar on anti-Semitism on June 21, 2004, will confront the phenomenon not only its "old" but also its "new" form as well.

The Catholic Church takes the rise in anti-Semitism very seriously. When, some three years ago, the situation appeared on the verge of getting out of hand in France, and the politicians were silent because it was an election year and they seemed unwilling to alienate French Muslim voters, the French Bishops Conference issued a terse, strongly worded statement condemning anti-Semitism that broke the logjam and allowed the politicians to find their own voices and actions. Last fall, Cardinal Walter Kasper, the President of the Pontifical Commission for Religious Relations with the Jews, felt it necessary to publish in the October 1 edition of *L'Osservatore Romano*, an article he had written entitled "Anti-Semitism: a Wound to Be Healed." Cardinal Kasper re-

minded his readers to be ever-alert for signs of anti-Semitism and to probe its history and causes even within our own Christian teaching, in order to root it out once and for all.

It is not only a question of the cultural, social, political or ideological, and in a more general way “secular”, dimensions of anti-Semitism which must also be a cause of concern to us, but of a specific aspect of it that was firmly condemned in 1928 by the Apostolic See when it defined anti-Semitism as “odium adversus populum olim a Deo electum” (AAS XX/1928, pp. 103-104). Today, 75 years later, the only modification we feel duty bound to make is the elimination of the word “olim” (“once”): this is no small thing, because in recognizing the perennial timeliness of the Covenant between God and his people, Israel, we in turn will be able to rediscover, with our Jewish brethren, the irrevocable universality of the vocation to serve humanity in peace and in justice, until the definitive coming of his kingdom. This is what the Pontiff also recommends to us in his Post-Synodal Apostolic Exhortation *Ecclesia in Europa* of last 28 June, recalling the ‘relationship which binds the Church to the Jewish people and of Israel’s unique role in salvation history’ (n. 56). Pope John Paul II continues, observing that ‘there is need for acknowledgment of the common roots linking Christianity and the Jewish people, who are called by God to a covenant which remains irrevocable (cf. Rom 11: 29) and has attained definitive fullness in Christ. Consequently, it is necessary to encourage dialogue with Judaism, knowing that it is fundamentally important for the self-knowledge of Christians and for the transcending of divisions between the Churches’ (*ibid.*). Dialogue and collaboration between Christians and Jews ‘also implies that ‘acknowledgment be given to any part which the children of the Church have had in the growth and spread of anti-Semitism in history; forgiveness must be sought for this from God, and every effort must be made to favor encounters of reconciliation and of friendship with the sons of Israel’ (*ibid.*). In this spirit of rediscovered brotherhood a new springtime for the Church and for the world can bloom once more, with the heart turned from Rome to Jerusalem and to the land of the Fathers, so that there too a just and lasting peace may quickly germinate for all and mature like a banner flying in the midst of the peoples.”

Finally, *Ecclesia in America*, the post-Synodal Apostolic Constitution promulgated by Pope John Paul II in Guadalupe, Mexico, in January 1999 says,

American society also includes Jewish communities, with which the Church has fostered increasing cooperation in recent years. The history of salvation makes clear our special relationship with the Jewish people. Jesus belongs to the Jewish people and he inaugurated his Church within the Jewish nation. A great part of the Holy Scriptures, which we Christians read as the word of God, constitute a spiritual patrimony which we share with Jews. Consequently any negative attitude in their regard must be avoided, since ‘in order to be a blessing for the world, Jews and Christians need first to be a blessing for each other. [*Ecclesia in America*, N. 50.]

NOTES

- ¹ “Declaration on the Relationship of the Church to Non-Christian Religions,” *Nostra Aetate*, no. 4 (28 October 1965). “Fraternal” or “brotherly” here is intentionally theological, to show the intimacy of the Church’s relationship with the Jewish people.
- ² Guidelines and Suggestions for Implementing the Conciliar Declaration, *Nostra Aetate* n. 4 (1 December 1974), *Notes on the Correct Way to Present the Jews and Judaism in Preaching and Catechesis in the Roman Catholic Church* (24 June 1985), *We Remember: A Reflection on the Shoah* (16 March 1998). Cf. International Catholic-Jewish Liaison Committee, *Fifteen Years of Catholic-Jewish Dialogue, 1970-1985* (Libreria Editrice Vaticana & Libreria Editrice Lateranense, 1988). Such dialogues provided the basis for the statements’ understanding of Jews and Judaism.
- ³ Cf. for instance his address to the Delegates of Episcopal Conferences and Other Experts in Catholic-Jewish Relations (6 March 1982).
- ⁴ *1985 Notes*, n. 25.
- ⁵ Pope John Paul II at the Great Synagogue of Rome (13 April 1986).
- ⁶ In 1995 the German, Polish, Dutch and U.S. Bishops, for example, issued statements on the 50th anniversary of the liberation of Auschwitz-Birkenau. On 30 September 1997 the French Bishops issued a remarkable “Statement of Repentance” on the occasion of the 57th anniversary of the enactment of anti-Semitic laws in wartime Vichy France. The French bishops argued there that the Catholic Church must confront the past with integrity since “conscience is formed in remembering.”
- ⁷ Pope John Paul II to Jewish Leaders in Miami (11 September 1986). It is heartening to note the many academic programs and institutes which have developed, especially within the past decade, to foster Jewish-Christian relations and Holocaust education.
- ⁸ Pope John Paul II, Prayer of the Angelus, 11 June 1995, cited in *We Remember: A Reflection on the Shoah, Holy See’s Commission for Religious Relations with the Jews*, March 1998, section I.
- ⁹ See www.bc.edu/research/cjl.
- ¹⁰ See Jules Isaac, *Jesus et Israel* (Paris, Fasquelle Editeurs, 1948; New York: Holt, Rinehart, Winston, 1971). The story of Professor Isaac’s meeting with Pope John XXIII on 13 June 1960 and its subsequent influence on the decision to include a schema on the Jews in the Second Vatican Council is well-known.
- ¹¹ Holy See Commission for Religious Relations with the Jews, *We Remember: A Reflection on the Shoah*, 16 March 1998; ORE, 18 March 1998, n. III, p. 6).
- ¹² Address to the Vatican Symposium on “The Roots of Anti-Judaism in the Christian Milieu,” 31 October 1997.
- ¹³ Genesis 1:27.
- ¹⁴ Galatians 3:28-29. The exception of the Spanish principle of *limpia de raza* or “purity of blood,” with its tragic consequences in the expulsion of the Jews from Spain in 1492 and the Spanish Inquisition over the succeeding centuries deserves special study.
- ¹⁵ In Eva Fleischner, editor, *Auschwitz: Beginning of a New Era?* (New York: KTAV, 1977) p. 105.
- ¹⁶ Council Daybook, Vatican II, Sessions 1 and 2, pp. 282-284.
- ¹⁷ *Nostra Aetate* no. 4.
- ¹⁸ John Paul II, “Address to the New Ambassador of the Federal Republic of Germany to the Holy See,” November 1980.

¹⁹ Yad Vashem in Israel preserves the memory of many more of these “righteous gentiles.”

²⁰ Pope John Paul II first characterized anti-Semitism as a sin in his address to Jewish representatives in Sydney, Australia on 26 November 1986:

“For the Jewish people themselves, Catholics should have not only respect but also great fraternal love for it is the teaching of both the Hebrew and Christian Scriptures that the Jews are beloved of God, who has called them with an irrevocable calling. No valid justification could ever be found for acts of discrimination or persecution against Jews. In fact, such acts must be held to be sinful.” *The General Directory for Catechesis*, issued by the Holy See’s Congregation for the Clergy in 1997, emphasizes that “In particular, an objective of catechesis should be to overcome every form of anti-Semitism” (no. 199).

²¹ *The Church and Racism*, no. 15. Text and commentary can be found in *Anti-Semitism is a Sin* by Eugene Fisher and Leon Klenicki (New York: Anti-Defamation League, 1990).

**PREPARED STATEMENT OF
HON. BENJAMIN L. CARDIN, RANKING MEMBER,
COMMISSION ON SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE**

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank you for holding this important hearing today, to discuss government efforts to combat anti-Semitism within the participating States of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe. The Helsinki Commission and its Members have been on the forefront of efforts to move governments and the international community to address anti-Semitic violence that spiked throughout the region in the Spring of 2002. While we have achieved much, I hope to learn today where we should direct our energies next, as the shadow of anti-Semitic hate still darkens many corners of our world.

Considering this reality, I want to highlight the Berlin OSCE Conference on Anti-Semitism that shined the light of truth into these dark corners. Chairman Smith and I and many others attended in April, and I honestly believe that our work through the OSCE Parliamentary Assembly created the momentum that moved the Organization to convene this historic and high-level conference. The conference culminated with the Berlin Declaration, given by the Bulgarian Foreign Minister and OSCE Chairman-in-Office, Solomon Passy. In addition to declaring international events will never justify anti-Semitic acts, the Declaration highlighted new commitments obligating all 55 participating States to monitor anti-Semitic crimes and hate crimes. This is a significant step forward, moving the OSCE in a new direction, as OSCE States agreed to track these crimes and forward the information to the ODIHR for compilation.

I want to acknowledge the good work of the U.S. Mission to the OSCE and our ambassador, Stephan Minikes, for his unflagging efforts to make this extraordinary meeting a success. In addition, our German hosts and the Bulgarian Chair were invaluable partners as we pushed for new commitments. Much credit also goes to the NGOs here today, as their tireless work with OSCE governments, including our own, helped build the necessary consensus for the Declaration.

However friends, the success of Berlin must not end with the production of this valuable Declaration, but rather continue through the fulfillment of the commitments highlighted therein.

While I hope Berlin will open a new chapter in the fight against anti-Semitism in North America and Europe, we must not forget that the primary responsibility to combat anti-Semitism rests first with governments and not the OSCE. ODIHR's role is to be a clearinghouse and focal point for information, so it is incumbent on participating States to provide protection and vigorous prosecution in matters relating to anti-Semitic violence. Therefore, we must continually work to ensure that the political will is present to denounce acts when they occur and to ensure a proper response by law enforcement.

Concerning ODIHR, we must make certain the Office is properly resourced to fulfill this new and expanded mandate. I understand this is a novel undertaking for ODIHR, so operationalizing these responsibilities will take some time. Yet time is something we cannot waste, as incidents of anti-Semitism must be confronted now.

I am submitting for the record a list that ODIHR circulated highlighting countries who have forwarded information to the Office for compilation. Sadly, less than half of the OSCE membership has so far complied, and some of our closet allies are noticeably absent. The next

benchmark of compliance will be the September Brussels Conference on Racism, Xenophobia and Discrimination. I therefore urge participating States to fulfill their commitments and to provide ODIHR the necessary information and funds, and I also urge ODIHR to expedite its work.

The lack of compliance by participating States raises the question of whether a special high profile position is needed to supplement the work of the ODIHR Director and ODIHR in collecting this information. I note that in our House resolution, Mr. Smith and I urge the Bulgarian Chairman-in-Office, in consultation with the incoming Slovenian Chair, to considering creating a "personal envoy" to interlock and liaise with countries that have not submitted the information or need assistance in creating the necessary mechanisms to track these crimes. Our intent is not to establish a new, permanent bureaucracy, nor is it to take any responsibility from ODIHR, but rather to jump-start these efforts to ensure the collection of accurate data.

In closing, before traveling to Berlin, I made a point visit Auschwitz for the first time. Seeing the remains of that factory of intolerance, hate and death, it reaffirmed how we must continually stress the importance of advancing tolerance throughout the OSCE region. We must assiduously work to prevent future acts of hatred and injustice if we are to one day live in a world free of the toxic waste of anti-Semitism. Consequently, Berlin must be the start of our efforts and not the finish.

Thank you Mr. Chairman.

**PREPARED STATEMENT OF
HON. MIKE MCINTYRE, COMMISSIONER,
COMMISSION ON SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE**

I am pleased that the U.S. Helsinki Commission recently held a hearing on anti-Semitism in the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) region. As a new member of the Commission and someone who is very concerned about anti-Semitism, I know firsthand how important it is to adequately address anti-Semitism in the OSCE region. I also know the importance of assessing the results of the April 2003 Berlin Conference on Anti-Semitism. By highlighting these issues during hearings and other events, we can truly consider ways to effectively combat anti-Semitism and related violence.

Recently, I cosponsored a resolution, H.Con.Res. 425, which expresses Congress' support of the OSCE in combating anti-Semitism, racism, xenophobia, discrimination, intolerance, and related violence. This resolution is aimed at maintaining momentum following the Berlin Conference to ensure that real action by OSCE participating States results from their stated commitments. It also urges the 55 OSCE countries to condemn anti-Semitic acts and create legal mechanisms for tracking anti-Semitic crimes. In addition, the resolution calls for the creation of a special OSCE envoy to ensure continuous attention to the issue.

Anti-Semitism is a hateful crime—one that knows no boundaries. In order for us to prevent it from spreading to other areas of the world, it is imperative that we address it now. Therefore, I look forward to working with my colleagues on the U.S. Helsinki Commission on these and other issues during the Edinburgh OSCE Parliamentary Assembly. I am confident that this conference will allow us to continue to build on the work that we have already begun.

**PREPARED STATEMENT OF
HON. GORDON H. SMITH, COMMISSIONER,
COMMISSION ON SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE**

Mr. Chairman, thank you for convening this hearing today to discuss the options for governmental response to anti-Semitic incidents within the Member States of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe. The Helsinki Commission has made great strides in working with OSCE since the dramatic increase in anti-Semitic activity was noted by the Commission in the spring of 2002.

In April, our efforts culminated as 55 countries drafted the Berlin Declaration. This pronouncement, tailored to address the growing concern over global anti-Semitism was a significant display of the willingness of the delegations to tackle even the most difficult topics. The Declaration states that "international developments or political issues, including those in Israel or elsewhere in the Middle East, never justify anti-Semitism." This admonition echoes Lawrence Summers, president of Harvard University, who said in 2001, that in many cases anti-Israel rhetoric is "anti-Semitic in effect, if not in intent."

In light of these positive developments, I would like to thank Chairman Chris Smith for his successful leadership of this Commission, and his sustained commitment to the implementation of the Helsinki Final Accords. Additionally, Representatives Cardin and Hastings, as well as Mayor Koch and Secretary Powell, played crucial roles in securing the achievements of the Berlin Conference.

I am also pleased to say that while the Berlin Conference was an important step in combating anti-Semitism, we are also in the process of applying the resolution to specific action in Congress. S. 2292, which I have co-sponsored, calls upon the State Department to include in its November report the Office of Democratic Institutions and Human Rights (ODIHR) study on anti-Semitic patterns in OSCE countries. Making this statistical public would lead to increased pressure on OSCE nations that have a poor track record of combating anti-Semitism.

S. 2292 has been approved by the Senate, and is now awaiting consideration in the House. I urge my colleagues to take this step swiftly toward eliminating anti-Semitism and implementing the Helsinki Final Accords, as charged to this Commission.

Additionally, I would mention that my 1997 amendment, which is still in effect today, that limits foreign aid to the Russian Federation for its restrictions on religious freedom, could serve as a model for pressuring OSCE countries to cooperate with the ODIHR report as well as with the Helsinki Accords in general.

The detrimental effects of anti-Semitism, and more generally any type of religious persecution and restriction on the freedom of conscience, lead to tyranny and societal decay. We must remain vigilant in the fight against these ills and work to protect basic human rights for the many that still suffer under the dark cloud of religious intolerance.

**PREPARED STATEMENT OF
 PROF. GERT WEISSKIRCHEN, MEMBER,
 GERMAN BUNDESTAG AND VICE-PRESIDENT,
 OSCE PARLIAMENTARY ASSEMBLY**

The Berlin Conference drew attention once again to the massive, growing problem of anti-Semitism in the OSCE space and produced a series of commitments and concepts to fight anti-Semitism—the Berlin Declaration. The Berlin goals, concentrating on the areas of monitoring systems, legal measures, and educational programs, must be effectively and immediately implemented—the seriousness of the problem calls for swift and systematic action, international efforts, and innovative solutions.

The government of each OSCE participating State carries the fundamental responsibility to keep its promises and commitments and actively fight anti-Semitism. These governments must have a specific OSCE partner on this issue, for support and accountability. Therefore, a OSCE Special Representative against Anti-Semitism (comparable to the issues of Human Trafficking and Freedom of Media, which also have OSCE SRs) is essential to provide the necessary conceptual help, political pressure and public awareness—in short, the driving force in promoting the implementation of the Berlin Declaration, in all of its aspects—monitoring, investigation, legal measures and educational programs. The Bulgarian Chairman-in-Office, in consultation with the incoming Slovenian Chairman-in-Office, is charged to appoint this high level Special Representative [SR], who will work closely with the governments of all OSCE states. Not only will the SR support government actions to combat anti-Semitism—it will also serve as a sort of watchdog, drawing attention to government inaction or areas where government action is weak. The SR will make specific suggestions for improvement and increase international pressure on negligent governments.

1. Monitoring

Most of the OSCE countries don't have national monitoring systems in place. So the first main focus of the SR's activities will be to promote the creation and implementation of a national monitoring system in each OSCE state. She/he will make sure that the collected information is forwarded regularly to ODIHR.

2. Legal Measures

The SR will also be a partner and promoter in the area of legal efforts. He/She will push for and assist in the creation of all necessary legal mechanisms at national levels to systematically and effectively combat and track acts of anti-Semitism and intolerance. The SR can play a special role here, in internationally evaluating and comparing legal measures against anti-Semitism in the OSCE space.

3. Education

Also in the area of education, the SR can galvanize government actions, by assisting in the development, implementation, evaluation, and international comparison of Holocaust education, public awareness campaigns, and general tolerance programs. The SR will also recommend and push for new programs and pressure for and promote Holocaust education in the countries where it is little or non-existent.

Task Force

The establishment of a small, professional Task Force to assist the SR should be considered.

This Task Force would have the capacity to systematically evaluate each government's actions in this area and develop recommendations and directives. The TF would assist in the development and implementation of educational programs and coordinate the exchange of educational campaigns, programs, and concepts among governments. The TF would also work together with ODIHR to analyze the data collected from each government, discerning trends and structural factors in anti-Semitism and developing specific methods and programs on the basis of the analysis.

VISION

In the long run, the Special Representative will make a massive, coordinating contribution to the fight against anti-Semitism, especially through his/her close collaboration with each national government. The SR will be the essential partner of the government of each OSCE participating state in generating and pursuing a long-term vision and an innovative agenda, as well as constantly calling public attention to, creating public pressure toward, and dynamically focusing efforts on the fight against anti-Semitism. The Special Representative will play a key role in strengthening the foundations of tolerance and democracy throughout the OSCE space.

The Berlin Conference, initiated by Congressman Christopher Smith, was a convincing starting point. As an officer of the OSCE PA, I am proud to have supported it from the very beginning. The Berlin Conference presented the unique chance to enhance the core values of the OSCE—the fight for humanity in our common space. The Conference opened up a new process: the beginning of the end of a new and old enemy of mankind and democracy—anti-Semitism.

**PREPARED STATEMENT OF
STACY BURDETT, ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR,
GOVERNMENT & NATIONAL AFFAIRS,
ANTI-DEFAMATION LEAGUE**

Good morning. My name is Stacy Burdett, I am the Associate Director of Government and National Affairs for the Anti-Defamation League—ADL. For over ninety years, since 1913, the ADL has worked to expose and counter anti-Semitism, as well as all forms of bigotry. We are grateful to the Commission for holding these hearings today and are honored that ADL has been part of this Commission's efforts against anti-Semitism in the OSCE region for many years—culminating with the success of the Berlin conference on anti-Semitism.

Let me offer special thanks on behalf of ADL and its National Director, Abraham Foxman, to Chairman Smith all the of Commissioners whose commitment to this issue and determination to move beyond concern and on to concrete action, inspires us all in ADL to do our jobs even better.

The Berlin conference and the many discussions and lobby meetings around it were part of a broad effort to mobilize awareness and action against anti-Semitism, particularly in Europe. This campaign has yielded some results and there have been some hopeful signs.

I have attached to my statement a summary of results of an opinion survey of attitudes about Jews in ten European countries which ADL released in Berlin on the eve of the conference [appendix I]. The survey found some decrease in anti-Semitic attitudes compared to our 2002 findings. We attribute this to the beginnings of a drumbeat of statements actions by some leaders to counter anti-Semitism, and a recognition that doing so makes a society stronger.

Since each of us have had conversations with officials who fear that public action against anti-Semitism won't be supported by their electorate, we put questions into the field to take the pulse of public attitudes about increased government monitoring and action. We were gratified that respondents in all ten countries overwhelmingly support increased action and monitoring by their governments.

But polls and conferences, even successful ones, do not prevent hate crimes. Appended to my statement you will find just a sampling of incidents of anti-Semitism that have continued to occur in the first few months of 2004. The Helsinki Commissioners are ever mindful that the numbers and statistics represent real people, many of them children. Even in France where the overall rate of incidents is not rising at the rate it once had been, the number of incidents aimed at children increased in 2003. Each child—each victim, has a name; has a mom or a dad; perhaps a kid brother or sister; possibly a grandparent; all of whom watch and feel the hurt and debasement of being singled out, attacked or harassed for who they are.

For those of us who have watched the problem closely, it is without question that a key factor that has enabled the growth of this problem is the fear, reticence, inability to talk about it in honest terms. Something about defining, talking about anti-Semitism today touches a raw nerve.

In this regard, addressing anti-Semitism in the OSCE region presents the same challenges as confronting any form of bigotry.

First, it is believed that, if you talk about the problem, you create it.

Second, without a common language and understanding about what the problem is, we cannot come together to combat it, monitor it, or implement counteraction measures. There is still no common language—no common definitions—no agreement as to what is indeed an act of anti-Semitism. Further, there exists no formal system through which to channel information—if you ask the man or woman on the street to whom they should report anti-Semitism, you will often hear conflicting answers.

Third, confronting and recognizing bigotry honestly often runs against a prevailing political climate. Just as openly confronting bigotry against African Americans in the American South was an irritant in the climate of the day, so today we are struggling to achieve recognition of the current manifestation of anti-Semitism that is causing the most problems today.

Addressing the new forms of anti-Semitism honestly is considered controversial. In the U.N. and even in the OSCE, language on anti-Semitism is not dealt with by the human rights departments—but in the Middle East section. Talking about anti-Semitism that is related to Jewish equal rights to have their nationalism, their self determination, their homeland—is a political hot-button issue.

If we are to mainstream anti-Semitism as a “rights” issue, we must first reject attempts to brand it a Middle East issue subject to efforts to be even handed. There is no even handedness when it comes to defending victims of racism and hate violence.

Anti-Semitism is not a conflict between two ethnic minorities that should be brokered, mitigated, massaged. We must reject the notion that a leader who acknowledges anti-Semitism must pay a price for somehow disrespecting their Muslim constituency. Surely we oppose all forms of bigotry including anti-Muslim hatred, but exposing anti-Semitism as it is found in our society should not be shunned as a denigration of any other religion or group.

We hear much about controversy surrounding the identification of the perpetrators and have seen examples of how naming sources of anti-Semitism is considered too provocative. Those who oppose identifying sources and perpetrators—think exposing anti-Semitism should be limited by a fear of insulting the communities to which perpetrators of hate violence belong.

As with any disease, the denial is insidious and makes it fester and grow. The Berlin Conference and its Declaration marked an end of that kind of denial and marked the beginnings of a collective awareness about the role that anti-Israel rhetoric and action plays in stoking the fire of anti-Semitism.

If the conference signaled an end to governmental denial—on the non-governmental side, at least in the American NGO community, the conference eased the alienation Jews have felt by the silence of the civil and human rights movement on the subject of the “new” anti-Semitism. An impressive delegation of organization head who are members of the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights stood with the Jewish community to demonstrate that combating anti-Semitism is a human rights and civil rights imperative. In a meeting with Secretary Powell and American NGOs, the Secretary reiterated America’s determination in the fight against anti-Semitism. We were deeply moved by a sense of unity as non-Jewish civil rights and human rights NGO leaders stood up to af-

firm their support and even to press the Secretary further on the details of greater United States follow-up. OSCE as a forum has always embodied a sense of unity in the fight against intolerance.

In that spirit, ADL is engaged in all three OSCE meetings this year devoted to different aspects of the fight against intolerance. In addition to serving as Public Advisor to the Berlin delegation, ADL was honored to be appointed to serve on the U.S. delegation to the OSCE conference on Cyberhate which opened today in Paris and we plan to lend our support and know how to the September conference on xenophobia in Brussels.

Now is the time to seize on the momentum provided by the Berlin conference and to breath life into the program of action adopted by the 55 participating states. The focus of my statement today is to offer some ideas for how governments can put in place programs which fall squarely within the Berlin action program and which can have a meaningful, sustained impact on the ground. I have attached a checklist of ADL programs that have been identified as “promising practices” by governments and NGOs in the fight against racism and xenophobia [appendix III]. These run the gambit of programs implemented in Germany in response to hate crimes against Turkish Muslim immigrants in the early 1990s to others that address interfaith issues and Holocaust education. The appendix also notes formal evaluation information where available.

Beginning with our own government, we know that further progress will continue to depend on strong U.S. leadership.

The United States must continue to address the nature and source of the problem squarely. There has been progress but the problem will grow until European leaders do more to speak out and to counter Middle Eastern sources of anti-Semitism flowing into Europe. U.S. diplomacy has been the vital tool for promoting and rewarding morally responsible action and for calling governments on their shortcomings. This continues to be an uphill battle and continued U.S. leadership is essential.

The United States must work to secure condemnation of the new anti-Semitism in fora like the U.N., and E.U. and even the OAS. Since explicit recognition and condemnation is still lacking, bucking this trend will continue to require U.S. diplomatic muscle.

I. MONITORING

Considering the challenge of building political will, it is no surprise that there is a lack of appropriate monitoring. Beyond the Jewish community organizations following this issue, institutions like ECRI [European Commission Against Racism and Intolerance] or organizations like Human Rights First and they will tell you there is a gross information deficit and that anti-Semitic crimes is estimated to be vastly under-reported.

It is critical that governments come together to create a common language and process for data collection, as well as appropriate training of those empowered to collect the data. Without this we cannot comprehensively describe the problem nor find mechanisms for correcting it. The OSCE Human Dimension Implementation Meeting should include an agenda item on this topic flowing from the Berlin and Brussels meetings.

The value of monitoring has many layers. The very process of data collection is a powerful mechanism to confront violent bigotry. Increased public awareness of data collection, promotes reporting. Studies have repeatedly shown that victims of hate crimes are more likely to report the crime if they know that a special reporting system is in place. Moreover, the more crimes reported, the better informed the public becomes of the extent of the problem and thus the more demand for a solution and/or a willingness to be part of the solution.

In this particular area, the United States has great expertise to lend. I have attached to my statement a compendium of U.S. Governmental best practices which we have suggested the United States cite in its submission to ODIHR [appendix IV]. The United States truly leads in hate crime data collection, as well as in the training of those responsible for it. Far more than mere statistics, the U.S. Hate Crime Statistics Act has increased public awareness of the problem and sparked meaningful improvements in the local response of the criminal justice system to hate violence. Police officials have come to appreciate the law enforcement and community benefits of tracking hate crime and responding to it in a priority fashion. Law enforcement officials can advance police-community relations by demonstrating a commitment to be both tough on hate crime perpetrators and sensitive to the special needs of hate crime victims. By compiling statistics and charting the geographic distribution of these crimes, police officials may be in a position to discern patterns and anticipate an increase in racial tensions in a given jurisdiction.

- Nations should adopt comprehensive hate crime data collection laws and provide training to appropriate law enforcement professionals in how to identify, report, and respond to hate crimes.
- Governments should fund national assessments of hate violence, its causes, the prevalence of the problem in state schools, the characteristics of the offenders and victims, and successful intervention and diversion strategies for juveniles. There is a direct connection between identifying the nature of the problem and identifying appropriate educational initiatives to address the problem.
- *OSCE Monitoring.* The OSCE Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights (ODIHR) has been tasked by OSCE ministers with serving as a “collection point” for data on anti-Semitic incidents and other hate crimes. Since so many OSCE participating states have no data collection laws or mechanisms, it is vital that OSCE take a much more proactive approach to encourage states to institute these mechanisms. Proactive follow up with states and find ways—perhaps through a publication—to put forward a common data collection model and guidelines for law enforcement.

- *Enhance U.S. Reporting.* The efforts of the United States to raise international awareness about this problem have been singular in their importance and effectiveness. U.S. reporting on anti-Semitism as a human rights and religious freedom issue is an indispensable tool in spotlighting the problem as well as a tool for diplomacy. As with any reporting which originates in embassies around the world, it varies from place to place. We welcome the introduction of legislation that would bolster the quality and consistency of America’s reporting on anti-Semitism.

II. PROMOTE AND INSTITUTIONALIZE EDUCATION PROGRAMS

- Participating States should be urged to institutionalize anti-bias education. This is an essential building block of combating hatred. History has shown that, when people of conscience are given tools and skills to recognize and combat bigotry, prejudice and discrimination, they will do so. We know that people are not born to hate—they learn to hate. And, if we learn it, so might we “un-learn it” or prevent the initial learning from taking place to begin with. Senators should urge parliaments to use schools as a staging ground for Anti-Bias Education. Governments must act now to provide ongoing Teacher Training in the use of Anti-Bias Education curricula and methodologies as well as providing opportunities to empower students through Peer Training programs. Research has shown that from the age of 3-5 years-old when children begin to recognize differences and form attitudes based on their perceptions of differences, to the college and university level where intergroup understanding is critical to fostering a successful learning environment, anti-bias education is necessary to equip students with the skills and confidence which enable them to confront prejudice, to become activists against bigotry and to serve as agents for change.

ADL has identified a number of programs that have demonstrated both results as well as transferability to the European pedagogical model and context. Validated by the University of Pennsylvania’s Graduate School of Education, the ADL A WORLD OF DIFFERENCE Institute has delivered programs to over 450,000 U.S. teachers, training them in how to confront their own biases as well as how to use specially designed curricular materials. Further, this program has been exported to eight European countries, as well as to Argentina, Japan, states of the Former Soviet Union and Israel. The Institute’s Peer Training program is currently in use across the United States as well as in Austria, Belgium (in French & in Flemish), France, Germany, Greece, Italy, Luxembourg, The Netherlands, Portugal, Spain and The United Kingdom.

III. PROMOTE HOLOCAUST REMEMBRANCE

As we have all repeatedly acknowledged, crimes against humanity such as the Holocaust, serve as grim reminders of where intolerance can lead if permitted to flourish and of the absolute necessity that it be stopped.

- Congress should continue to support the work of the International Task Force on Holocaust Education. Parliamentarians should seek to implement Holocaust curricula in public schools to draw upon the lessons of this tragic period to illuminate the importance of moral decision. There are a number of quality programs working well in Europe today and two relatively new programs would be useful models as well.
- There is a wealth of innovative educational tools like a new ADL Holocaust curriculum, developed together with the Shoah Foundation, which utilizes video survivor testimony as a teaching tool and could easily use testimony in different languages to resonate with students from different countries. As the survivor population ages, this kind of video adaptation will be critical to helping the memory of survivors endure.
- The Holocaust is a meaningful education tool for law enforcement. Working with the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum, ADL's Law Enforcement and Society: Lessons of the Holocaust program challenges law enforcement professionals to examine their partnership with the communities they serve. It uses the history of the Holocaust to explore issues of their role as protectors of individual rights, checks and balances, and personal responsibility of officers 60 years ago and today. Officers have said this examination of the Holocaust has helped them gain a deeper perspective on the critical role they play in society and a greater understanding of the values and code of ethics of their profession.
- Working with Religious Institutions. In the United States, ADL's Bearing Witness Program for Religious Educators helps teachers examine anti-Semitism and the Holocaust as a starting point for addressing issues of diversity in contemporary society. Its goal is to successfully implement Holocaust education in religious schools. In order to do this effectively, teachers work to confront and to acknowledge the history of the Holocaust including the role of Churches and other religious institutions. This program is a collaborative effort between ADL, the Archdiocese, and the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum. Initially offered only in Washington, DC, the program has now expanded and will be offered in five U.S. cities this summer.

IV. WORKING WITH THE PARLIAMENTARIANS

Replicate the CSCE Model in other Parliaments. So many important initiatives against anti-Semitism—including the Vienna and Berlin conferences—have originated in hearings like this and are advanced by Members of Congress moved by their convictions to take action. Beyond the important work of the OSCE Parliamentary Assembly, it would be important to replicate this activity abroad. Let other parliaments do as you have done, convene hearings like this one, pass resolutions against anti-Semitism, set up caucuses like the Helsinki Commission or the Congressional Task Force Against Anti-Semitism and develop national action plans to combat it.

V. DEVELOP EXCHANGES OF BEST PRACTICES

OSCE and Participating States should host a showcase of “promising practices.” As the populations of participating states become more diverse through immigration, the need to promote tolerance, respect

and understanding becomes greater, especially for young people. Beyond the tasking of ODIHR to collect and disseminate information on best practices, governments should host “Showcases of Best Practices.” These will allow for maximum exposure of working methods as well as for exploration of how states might adapt these to their specific country culture.

CONCLUSION

Even in Berlin there were those who asked whether all of the efforts to pull off the Berlin conference really worth the trouble. The concrete legacy of this effort is still a work in progress being crafted in hearings like this, in our follow up, in Warsaw, in Sofia and beyond.

Yes a conference is made up of speeches, and a declaration is only a piece of paper. But when I imagine what it would have been like in Durban if 55 governments—no if five governments—had made a statement or said even one sentence to one reporter recognizing that I was an equal victim of racism, and not a perpetrator of racism and apartheid and ethnic cleansing, it would have thrown at least a cold stone into a boiling pot.

Abe Foxman frequently poses the question “what if?” referring to pre-war Europe. What if there were five Raoul Wallenbergs, or five hundred or five thousand? What if 55 government leaders had banded together then to say no?

With that question in mind, we must follow up with rigor on the Berlin effort. We hope that your work, your commitment, and initiatives like those I’ve outlined will command the day.

**MATERIAL SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD
BY STACY BURDETT**

**GLOBAL ANTI-SEMITISM:
SELECTED INCIDENTS AROUND THE WORLD IN 2004**

AUSTRALIA

January 5, 2004—Hobart—Vandals used poison to create anti-Semitic slogans on the lawns of Tasmania's Parliament House. The words "Kill the Jews" and several swastikas were burned into the lawns

AUSTRIA

June 1, 2004—Villach—A memorial honoring Holocaust victims in southern Austria, consisting of 17 glass plates engraved with the names of 108 local Holocaust victims, was smashed. The memorial, which was created in 1999, was previously damaged by vandals in March 2003.

January 18, 2004—Hinterbruehl—A Holocaust memorial was desecrated, with the word "lie" spray painted over a historical plaque. The memorial near Vienna is at the site of a former concentration camp.

CANADA

June 2/3, 2004—Quebec City—Twenty gravestones were toppled by vandals in the historic Beth Israel cemetery. The cemetery is designated a national historic site by the Canadian Government.

April 14, 2004—Toronto—A Jewish cemetery was vandalized during Passover. Ten tombstones were overturned at The Pape Avenue Cemetery, the oldest Jewish cemetery in Ontario.

[April 4, 2004—Montreal—A Jewish school in the St. Laurent neighborhood of Montreal was set on fire by an arsonist. No one was hurt in the attack, but the blaze heavily damaged the library of the United Talmud Torah School. Police found a note with anti-Semitic comments on the exterior wall of the library. Canadian Prime Minister Paul Martin strongly condemned the attack declaring: "This is not my Canada.



This is not our Canada.” In May, three were arrested, including two 18-year-old youths who were charged with arson and conspiracy. One of the teen-agers’ mothers was charged as an accessory. The three are reportedly of Lebanese Christian origin.

March 19-21, 2004—Toronto—A weekend-long rash of anti-Semitic vandalism was perpetrated on a Jewish cemetery, a Jewish school and a number of area synagogues. Twenty-two gravestones were overturned in the cemetery and other structures, such as benches and plaques, were destroyed. Swastikas were painted on the walls and on outside signs of the synagogues, along with slogans calling for death to Jews, and a number of windows were broken. The previous weekend, swastikas and anti-Semitic messages were sprayed on doors, cars and garages of over a dozen homes in a predominantly Jewish neighborhood not far from the cemetery and synagogues.

FRANCE

June 11, 2004—Rivesaltes—A Holocaust-era mural painted by Jewish children in a transit camp who were being held before being sent to Nazi death camps, was discovered vandalized in southwestern France. A historian visiting the site, where 4,500 Jews and Gypsies were held, found that the mural had been chiseled off the wall. According to *The Independent*, in 1942, a Swiss nurse at the camp asked the children to paint a Swiss landscape on the infirmary wall. The painting was discovered in 1999 and was to become the central exhibition of a Holocaust museum at the Rivesaltes transit camp. Half of the inmates of the transit camp, including 400 children, were later killed in Auschwitz. French Government officials condemned the incident, and the Interior Minister promised that the mural would be restored.

June 4, 2004—Epinay-sur-Seine—A 17-year-old Jewish student was stabbed with by a man with a knife shouting “Allahu Aqbar” (G-d is great in Arabic). The student was leaving a Jewish school in the northern Parisian suburbs. The attacker tried to hurt two other students with a screwdriver. The student was in serious, but not critical condition. President Jacques Chirac condemned the attack and the French Interior Minister, Dominique de Villepin, visited the scene.

May 30, 2004—Boulogne-Billancourt—A 17-year-old Jewish youth was attacked outside his home in a Paris suburb by a group of young men yelling anti-Semitic slogans. The youth is the son of a local rabbi. President Jacques Chirac condemned the attack.

May 7, 2004—Villier-le-Bel—A small explosive device was discovered outside a synagogue north of Paris. According to media reports, the bomb was in a bag with the writing “Boom anti-Jews” and a swastika. On May 14, an 18-year-old man was found guilty of putting the fake bombs on the grounds of the synagogue and was sentenced to two months in prison.

May 6/7, 2004—Verdun—A memorial to Jewish soldiers who died in the Battle of Verdun was vandalized. Nazi slogans and symbols were scrawled on the memorial. The Battle of Verdun was fought between French and German armies near the northern French city in 1916.

April 29/30, 2004—Colmar—A Jewish cemetery in the Alsace region in eastern France was vandalized. At least 127 headstones were spray painted with swastikas and anti-Semitic statements. The cemetery dates back to the 18th century. The attack was condemned by numerous French officials, including President Jacques Chirac.

April 4, 2004—Valenciennes—A synagogue in northern France was defaced with neo-Nazi slogans, including swastikas, and “One people, one empire, one leader, 59 years, sieg heil.” The 59 is believed to be a reference to the 59 years since the death of Nazi dictator Adolf Hitler.

March 23, 2004—Toulon—A Jewish synagogue and community center was set on fire. According to media reports, the arsonist broke a window and threw a Molotov cocktail into the building. There was minor damage and no injuries.

January 23, 2004—Villiers-au-Bois—Two gravestones marked with Stars of David were damaged in the World War I cemetery of Villiers-au-Bois near the English Channel coast.

January 20, 2004—Strasbourg—A parked minibus used to transport children to a Jewish school in the eastern French city of Strasbourg was burned. Police are investigating the attack as an arson.

January 20, 2004—Strasbourg—Police reported that a group of assailants hurled stones at the door of a Strasbourg synagogue.

January 20, 2004—Paris—A Jewish teenager was injured in an attack by Muslim youths at an ice-skating rink. The youths shouted anti-Semitic insults at the 15-year old boy before kicking him in the head and jaw with ice skates.

RUSSIA

April 15/16, 2004—Pyatigorsk—Fourteen tombstones were vandalized in a Jewish cemetery. The cemetery had been previously attacked in June 2003.

March 29, 2004—St. Petersburg—The city’s only kosher restaurant had its windows broken by vandals.

February 15, 2004—St. Petersburg—Vandals desecrated about 50 graves in a Jewish cemetery, painting swastikas and anti-Semitic graffiti on headstones. Police are investigating.

January 27, 2004—Derbent—An explosion shattered several windows in a synagogue in Derbent in the southern region of Dagestan.

(FORMER SOVIET REPUBLICS)

MOLDOVA/TRANSNISTRIAN REPUBLIC

May 5, 2004—Tiraspol—Vandals threw Molotov cocktails at the synagogue in Tiraspol.



UKRAINE

May 23, 2004—Kiev—More than 50 gravestones were vandalized in a Jewish cemetery. According to the chief rabbi of Kiev, headstones were broken and heavy old stones were thrown about. Ukrainian Interior Ministry spokesman Viktor Korchinsky denied any acts of vandalism, saying the graves were destroyed “all by themselves, because they were too old.”

March 23/24—Odessa—Vandals broke several windows of the Osipova Street Synagogue. No one was injured.

**MATERIAL SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD
BY STACY BURDETT**

**U.S. HATE CRIME MONITORING MODELS
AND BEST PRACTICES**

About the Anti-Defamation League

Since 1913, the mission of ADL has been to “stop the defamation of the Jewish people and to secure justice and fair treatment to all citizens alike.” Dedicated to combating anti-Semitism, prejudice, and bigotry of all kinds, defending democratic ideals and promoting civil rights, ADL is proud of its leadership role in the development of innovative materials, programs, and services that build bridges of communication, understanding, and respect among diverse racial, religious, and ethnic groups.

Over the past decade, the League has been recognized as a leading resource on effective responses to violent bigotry, conducting an annual Audit of Anti-Semitic Incidents, drafting model hate crime statutes for state legislatures, and serving as a principal resource for the FBI in developing training and outreach materials for the Hate Crime Statistics Act (HCSA), which requires the Justice Department to collect statistics on hate violence from law enforcement officials across the country.

While education and exposure are the cornerstones of a long-term solution to prejudice, discrimination, bigotry, and anti-Semitism, effective response to hate violence by public officials and law enforcement authorities can play an essential role in deterring and preventing these crimes.

Americans and Europeans share a common commitment to an effective response to violent bigotry. These crimes demand priority attention because of their special impact. Bias crimes are designed to intimidate the victim and members of the victim's community, leaving them feeling isolated, vulnerable, and unprotected by the law. Failure to address this unique type of crime could cause an isolated incident to explode into widespread community tension. The damage done by hate crimes, therefore, cannot be measured solely in terms of physical injury or dollars and cents. By making members of minority communities fearful, angry, and suspicious of other groups—and of the power structure that is supposed to protect them—these incidents can damage the fabric of our society and fragment communities.

THE AMERICAN CONTEXT

1) Hate Crime Statutes: A Message to Victims and Perpetrators

While bigotry cannot be outlawed, hate crime penalty enhancement statutes in the United States have demonstrated an important commitment to confront criminal activity motivated by prejudice. At present, forty-six states and the District of Columbia have enacted hate crime penalty-enhancement laws, many based on an ADL model statute drafted in 1981. In *Wisconsin v. Mitchell*, 508 U.S. 476 (1993), the U.S. Supreme Court unanimously upheld the constitutionality of the Wisconsin penalty-enhancement statute—effectively removing any doubt that state

legislatures may properly increase the penalties for criminal activity in which the victim is intentionally targeted because of his/her race, religion, sexual orientation, gender, or ethnicity.

The League's most comprehensive rationale for hate crime statutes is available online here:

<<http://www.adl.org/99hatecrime/intro.asp>>

A copy of the ADL Model Hate Crime Statute is available online here:

<http://www.adl.org/99hatecrime/text_legis.asp>

The Wisconsin hate crime law unanimously upheld by the Supreme Court is available online here:

<<http://www.adl.org/99hatecrime/wisconsin.asp>>

2) The Hate Crime Statistics Act (HCSA): Progress and Significant Promise

Enacted in 1990, the HCSA requires the Justice Department to acquire data on crimes which “manifest prejudice based on race, religion, sexual orientation, or ethnicity” from law enforcement agencies across the country and to publish an annual summary of the findings. In the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994, Congress expanded coverage of the HCSA to require FBI reporting on crimes based on “disability.” Though a number of private groups and state law enforcement agencies also track incidents of hate violence, the HCSA now provides the best national picture of the magnitude of the hate violence problem in America—though still clearly incomplete.

On November 12, 2003 the FBI released its annual report, “Hate Crime Statistics 2002,” collected under the HCSA. The full Hate Crime Report for 2002 is available at:

<<http://www.fbi.gov/ucr/hatecrime2002.pdf>>

Highlights from the 2002 hate crime data:

- While the overall number of crimes reported to the FBI in 2002 increased by less than one-tenth of one percent, reported hate crimes decreased from 9,726 in 2001 to 7,462 in 2002 (a 23.3 percent decrease).
- The 7,462 hate crime incidents reported to the FBI involved 8,832 separate offenses, 9,222 victims, and 7,314 known offenders.
- Racial bias again represented the largest percentage of bias-motivated incidents (48.8 percent), followed by Religion Bias (19.1 percent), Sexual Orientation Bias (16.7 percent), and Ethnicity Bias (14.8 percent).
- Of the 7,462 incidents, 5,960 were crimes against persons, 2,823 were crimes against property, and the remaining 0.6 percent were crimes against society.
- 931 anti-Semitic crimes were reported, a slight decrease from 1,043 in 2001. Overall, crimes against Jews and Jewish institutions comprised 12.5 percent of all the bias-motivated crimes—and 65 percent of the religious-based crime incidents.
- Anti-black bias was the most prevalent racial motivation, with 2,486 incidents (33.3 percent of all hate crimes); anti-male homosexual bias was the most common sexual orientation motivation, with 825 incidents (11.1 percent of all hate crimes).

- The number of reported anti-Islamic crimes decreased from 481 in 2001 to 155 in 2002, a decrease of 67.8 percent. In addition, the number of hate crimes directed at individuals on the basis of their national origin/ethnicity also decreased significantly—from 2,098 in 2001 to 1,102 in 2002. This significant reduction is likely the result of a decrease in the backlash crimes that characterized the period following September 11th and led to record Hate Crimes in 2001.
- The number of national law enforcement agencies reporting to the FBI in 2002 increased slightly from 11,987 to 12,073—the second highest total of participating agencies in the twelve year history of the data collection effort. However, of the 12,073 that participated, only 1,868 agencies (15.5 percent) reported even a single hate crime, a slight increase from the 17.6 percent that reported incidents in 2001. Thus, for 2002, 10,205 agencies (84.5 percent) reported zero hate crimes.
- Of the 7,314 identified hate crime offenders, the majority were white (4,517, or 61.8 percent); 21.8 percent were black, 10.0 percent were of unknown race, and the remainder were of other races or multiple races.
- The five states with the highest numbers of hate crime were: California (1,648 incidents, 22.1 percent of total reported incidents), New York (693, 9.3 percent), New Jersey (570, 7.6 percent), Massachusetts (430, 5.8 percent), and Michigan (416, 5.6 percent). These five states comprise 44.7 percent of all incidents reported in the United States.

Despite an incomplete reporting record over the first twelve years of the Act, the HCSA has proved to be a powerful mechanism to confront violent bigotry against individuals on the basis of their race, religion, sexual orientation, or ethnicity. Far more than mere statistics, the HCSA has also increased public awareness of the problem and sparked improvements in the local response of the criminal justice system to hate violence.

3) Hate Crime Policies and Procedures for Law Enforcement Agencies

In part inspired by the enactment of the HCSA, over the past 15 years, dozens of law enforcement agencies across the country have promulgated new policies and procedures for addressing hate violence. Building on model policies, drafted by, among others, the International Association of Chiefs of Police and the National Organization of Black Law Enforcement Executives, departments have complemented their participation in the HCSA data collection mandate with the development of protocols for their officers on how to identify, report, and respond to hate violence. Studies have demonstrated that victims are more likely to report a hate crime if they know a special reporting system is in place.

Police officials have come to appreciate the law enforcement and community benefits of tracking hate crime and responding to it in a priority fashion. Law enforcement officials can advance police-community relations by demonstrating a commitment to be both tough on hate crime perpetrators and sensitive to the special needs of hate crime vic-

tims. By compiling statistics and charting the geographic distribution of these crimes, police officials may be in a position to discern patterns and anticipate an increase in racial tensions in a given jurisdiction.

Here are some examples of simple pamphlets ODIHR or Participating States could be urged to produce on how to report a hate crime and how to respond to a hate crime. The International Association of Chiefs of Police (IACP) have prepared very useful and accessible resources to help improve law enforcement preparation and response to hate violence.

IACP held a Summit on hate crimes in June, 1999. The Summit report is available online here:

<http://www.theiacp.org/documents/index.cfm?fuseaction=document&document_id=160>

In addition, funded by a grant from the Justice Department, the IACP prepared a guide to hate crimes for first responding police officers in the field. This guidebook is online here:

<http://www.theiacp.org/documents/index.cfm?fuseaction=document&document_id=141>

Here are two additional interesting examples: one from Sikh Media Watch, the second, in English and Spanish from the Los Angeles County District Attorney's Office.

<http://www.sikhmediawatch.org/pubs/Know_What_To_Do.PDF>

<<http://da.co.la.ca.us/pdf/hatecrimes.pdf>>

4) Federal Hate Crime Awareness and Training Initiatives

There is growing awareness in the United States of the need to complement tough laws and more vigorous enforcement—which can deter and redress violence motivated by bigotry—with education and training initiatives designed to reduce prejudice. The U.S. Government has played a central role in funding program development in this area and promoting awareness of initiatives that work.

A. The Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI)

In part to complement the implementation of the HCSA, the FBI developed and has circulated widely training materials on how to identify, report, and respond to hate crime. These resources are available online here:

<<http://www.fbi.gov/ucr/traingd99.pdf>>

and here:

<<http://www.fbi.gov/ucr/hatecrime.pdf>>

B. The Justice Department's Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP)

In 1992, Congress approved several new hate crime and prejudice reduction initiatives as part of the four year Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act reauthorization. The Act included a requirement that each state's juvenile delinquency prevention plan include a component designed to combat hate crimes and a requirement that the Justice Department's Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Preven-

tion (OJJDP) conduct a national assessment of youths who commit hate crimes, their motives, their victims, and the penalties received for the crimes.

In association with the Department of Education, Safe and Drug-Free Schools Program, OJJDP has provided funding for the development of Partners Against Hate, an ambitious program of outreach, public education, and training to help address the cycle of bias, hatred, distrust, and violence by:

- (1) increasing public awareness—especially among youth and juvenile justice professionals—about promising practices to reduce and prevent youth-initiated hate violence;
- (2) providing effective hate crime prevention and intervention strategies and training and technical assistance for law enforcement agencies, educators, religious and community leaders, parents, and youth; and;
- (3) helping individuals working with youth embrace the potential of advanced communications technologies—particularly the Internet—to break down barriers, address biases, and provide communities with the services and support they need.

The Partners Against Hate initiative draws on the experience, networks, and resources of its three cooperating national organizations—the Anti-Defamation League (ADL), the Leadership Conference Education Fund (LCEF), and the Center for the Prevention of Hate Violence (Center). The Partners Web site,

<www.partnersagainsthate.org>

serves as a comprehensive clearinghouse of hate crime-related information, including resources developed through the grant, as well as other promising programs from across the country. In addition, the Web site includes access to the finest database of hate crime laws that form the basis of criminal enforcement in the states, and counteraction tools.

C. The Department of Education

In 1992, for the first time, Congress acted to incorporate anti prejudice initiatives into the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), the principal Federal funding mechanism for the public schools. Title IV of the Act, Safe and Drug Free Schools and Communities, also included a specific hate crimes prevention initiative—promoting curriculum development and training and development for teachers and administrators on the cause, effects, and resolutions of hate crimes or hate based conflicts. The enactment of these Federal initiatives represented an important advance in efforts to institutionalize prejudice reduction as a component of violence prevention programming.

In addition to the important support provided by the Department of Education to Partners Against Hate, the Department's Office of Civil Rights, in association with the National Association of Attorneys General, has provided excellent counsel and programming for schools in a publication entitled, "Protecting Students from Harassment and Hate Crimes: A Guide for Schools." That publication is available online here:

<<http://www.ed.gov/offices/OCR/archives/Harassment/index.html>>

**PREPARED STATEMENT OF
SHAI FRANKLIN, DIRECTOR,
GOVERNMENT RELATIONS, NCSJ**

Mr. Chairman, thank you for this opportunity to appear before the Commission. I also wish to recognize Representative Cardin as the Ranking Member, and your fellow Commissioners from the Senate and House. Although this is my first time testifying personally, NCSJ's relationship with the Commission goes back to before the Commission's founding. Mark Levin, NCSJ's Executive Director, wanted to be here today, but is at this moment participating in a celebration in New York marking 40 years of activity on behalf of Soviet Jewry. Just as the Soviet Jewry movement—yourselves included—changed the nature of U.S. foreign policy and European diplomacy, and motivated the establishment of the OSCE, it also profoundly affected the American Jewish community. Our latest challenge has been to marshal European leaders and institutions to defeat the monster of anti-Semitism on the European continent—the first serious effort in history, 60 years after World War II.

The Commission's leadership has been instrumental in pulling together the multi-disciplinary U.S. team. I could easily spend my allotted time describing the important role that the Commission and each of you, and your staff members have played, but fortunately NCSJ has had many opportunities to do just that. However, I will note that the Commission effectively launched the OSCE track on anti-Semitism through a similar hearing over two years ago, just before the OSCE Parliamentary Assembly met in Berlin. It was the leadership of the Commissioners that mobilized your colleagues from European parliaments to adopt the OSCE's first stand-alone document on anti-Semitism, which was used as a model for the 2003 Maastricht Ministerial Declaration and—ultimately—for the April 2004 Berlin Declaration. At every step, and in every consultation and strategy meeting, your role has been pivotal.

My colleagues and I, together with you and other Members of Congress and a broad American delegation, were privileged to be in Berlin for the action-oriented conference sponsored by the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) and hosted by the German Government. I should mention two new Web pages in addition to the official OSCE Web site: the NCSJ-sponsored <<http://Berlin2004.org>> and the American Jewish Committee's <<http://ngoforumberlin.org>> provide background, links and updates.

I must also recognize the leadership of the United States Government. Career diplomats and Administration officials have been instrumental in achieving what we were told was impossible. In particular, I would like to express appreciation to Ambassadors Stephan Minikes, Edward O'Donnell and Randolph Bell, as well as to Secretary Powell, who leads from the top and delivered a forceful message in Berlin.

Our goals for the Berlin conference were ambitious because the situation is critical. To be sure, anti-Semitism remains a significant, endemic problem throughout the successor states and across Europe. Much of the support for advancing this process has come from formerly communist nations, including successor states, who see fighting anti-Semitism as indispensable to their transition from the Soviet shadow. Building on last year's Vienna conference, the first-ever such international

forum on anti-Semitism, Berlin produced measurable commitments by the 55 OSCE member states and demonstrated actionable programs for governments to support and implement.

Thirty years ago, when NCSJ and our partner agencies worked with Members of Congress to push for a new kind of multilateral organization, we could only dream of the dramatic changes that would occur in conjunction with the Helsinki Process. Yet we also did not foresee the resurgence of Old Anti-Semitism and the rise of a New Anti-Semitism. During the past two years, working together, we have taken the OSCE and again forged a new mechanism—this time one devoted to coordinating the international fight against anti-Semitism.

Mr. Chairman, my focus today is on the steps we can take to achieve implementation of Maastricht and Berlin, to move this process further beyond rhetoric, and to ensure that governments and institutions fulfill their commitments.

I am submitting for the record the proceedings of a roundtable I moderated during last October's OSCE Human Dimension Implementation Meeting in Warsaw, which illustrates the types of contacts we have on an ongoing basis. With participation by you, Mr. Chairman, and Representatives Cardin and Pitts, as you recall, we heard from officials of several successor states on their approaches and responses to anti-Semitism. The substance and the nature of their reports were challenging and encouraging.

NCSJ works with many governments, particularly the Soviet successor states, where anti-Semitism is manifested in different ways than in the West and—fortunately—the level of recent violence has not matched that in the West. I want to report on a few examples of the responses to anti-Semitism in three countries—Russia, Ukraine, and Lithuania. In many cases, these success stories are not the product of government initiative, but of an emerging civil society. Such programs promote the kind of societal interactions and openness that we take for granted in the United States, and which are integral to building a society in which anti-Semitism has no place.

RUSSIA

In Russia, U.S.-based programs are presenting models for other initiatives on the ground. "Project KOLOT: Women's Voices" was organized by NCSJ in partnership with Jewish Women International, Project Keshet, and the Russian Jewish Congress. Initiated with a grant from the U.S. State Department, this 18-month project engaged ethnic and religious communities in addressing the issue of domestic violence in Russia, in Tula and Voronezh, and created an advocacy model for training religious communities to participate in civil society. This collaboration generated a new working relationship between the ethnic and religious communities and the police and other city officials, opened police protocols to public oversight, and produced informational leaflets, bilingual training manuals, and a first-ever one-day conference with officials and activists. The "Climate of Trust" program, an ambitious "citizen-level" program of the Bay Area Council for Jewish Rescue and Renewal, promotes ethnic and religious tolerance through U.S.-Russian exchanges among law enforcement and local officials, community leaders, activists, and educators. Regional Tolerance Centers have been established in three of Russia's seven Federal Districts, as well as media seminars Internal Affairs officials. UCSJ: Union of Councils for Jews

in the Former Soviet Union has launched a project to train monitors and collect data on discriminatory practices, establish hotlines and legal clinics, and institute curricula for the justice system and schools.

From within Russia, the Russian Jewish Congress and Euro-Asian Jewish Congress maintain monitoring networks and are developing new programs to combat anti-Semitism. Ongoing outreach to religious and political movements is helping to build bridges. Earlier this year, according to the Federation of Jewish Communities of Russia (FEOR), the Tambov Regional Administration held a roundtable discussion on extremism and tolerance, with the Governor, and numerous other regional and local officials as well as representatives of ethnic communities and the mass media.

In February 2004, U.S. Ambassador Alexander Vershbow joined the Chief Rabbi of Bryansk and the head of the Bryansk Regional Administration for a Jewish community-sponsored conference on xenophobia that included local representatives of the Armenian community and human rights activists.

Just last month, the American Jewish Committee honored Tatiana Sapunova, the extraordinary Russian heroine who was injured in May 2002 when she tried to remove a booby-trapped anti-Semitic sign outside Moscow. Although the perpetrators have not been found, Russian leaders did speak out strongly at the time, and President Vladimir Putin awarded Ms. Sapunova a medal for her bravery.

Of course, responding to anti-Semitism and hate crimes requires more than medals and speeches. This is why, when NCSJ leadership visited Russia's new Foreign Minister, Sergey Lavrov, in Moscow two days before the Berlin Conference, they were pleased to confirm Russia's vital support for the Berlin Declaration and for continuing the OSCE anti-Semitism track.

UKRAINE

In Ukraine, the government has been actively enforcing a law against incitement of inter-ethnic hatred. Recent legal action against a prominent newspaper publishing virulently anti-Semitic articles has already led other likeminded publications to significantly scale back their appeals to anti-Semitism and extreme nationalism. Major political parties have signed agreements of cooperation and support with three different umbrella organizations for national minorities. The President's Council of National Minorities also serves as an official conduit for input from religious and ethnic minorities.

The Institute for Jewish Studies, in Kyiv, promotes a range of programs as well as monitoring and reporting on anti-Semitism in the media and society. The Kyiv office of the Euro-Asian Jewish Congress recently issued its second annual report on "The Basic Tendencies of Anti-Semitism in the CIS States," including substantive submissions from Belarus, Central Asia, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Russia, and Ukraine. Whether or not governments are able to produce such reports on their own, such publications by independent non-governmental bodies play a vital role in promoting awareness and providing a diversity of views.

The new and independent Association of Churches and Religious Organizations of Ukraine incorporates 18 faiths, including Judaism, Islam, Catholicism, and the Orthodox Church. His Beatitude Lubomyr Huzar, Patriarch of the Ukrainian Greek Catholic Church visited Washington last December, and he sought our advice and assistance in fight-

ing anti-Semitism, promoting better awareness of Jewish concerns, and using education to promote tolerance among Ukrainian Greek Catholics and others. “We have to live as real neighbors,” he stressed. “This is so important for the Church,” he said, because Soviet strategy sought to alienate groups from each other, by planting lies and reinforcing stereotypes. He sees anti-Semitism as part of the same Soviet approach that repressed his own church for so many decades.

In Dnepropetrovsk, Chief Rabbi Shmuel Kaminezki has spearheaded TKUMA, the National Center for Holocaust History Studies, together with the American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee and other partners. TKUMA has organized a series of teacher-training seminars, curriculum development, and a new Holocaust museum and regional network are in development. This new institution already cooperates closely with the Ukrainian Ministry of Education, research centers around the world, and the Task Force for International Cooperation on Holocaust Education, Remembrance, and Research. It is having a measurable impact on what students are learning about the legacies of the Holocaust and the costs of intolerance.

LITHUANIA

In Lithuania earlier this year, when one of Lithuania’s mainstream newspapers, *Respublika*, published a three-part series of anti-Semitic articles written by the editor, the Prime Minister condemned the articles and asked the Prosecutor General to investigate whether the newspaper had violated Lithuania’s law against inciting ethnic hatred. Lithuania’s Foreign Minister summoned the ambassadors from European Union candidates and member states and aspirants to report on Lithuania’s response and reaffirm his government’s commitment to zero tolerance of anti-Semitism. The Speaker of the Parliament expressed similar sentiments. We continue to follow this situation, but with confidence that Lithuania has the capacity and channels to confront anti-Semitism as lessons learned. I hope Lithuania’s response in this case can be replicated in other countries.

The Task Force for International Cooperation on Holocaust Education, Remembrance and Research is involved in a variety of projects in Lithuania and other countries, which I am sure other witnesses are describing to you today. European nations must recognize and comprehend the difficult legacies of the Holocaust if they are to truly combat anti-Semitism, and accepting accountability for the past can in no way relieve Europeans from their contemporary obligations.

Even as the OSCE process continues to evolve and show results, other multilateral efforts are underway in the Europe/Eurasia region that merit mention. A series of two international conferences in Kazakhstan during the past year have attracted heads of state and other officials, and religious and ethnic leaders from across Europe, Asia, and the Middle East—prominent and credible representatives of Judaism and diverse streams of Christianity and Islam. With the involvement of the Euro-Asian Jewish Congress, these public events have generated publicity as well as joint declarations against terrorism and religious extremism, and in support of tolerance and inter-ethnic understanding and cooperation.

The First Interparliamentary Conference on Human Rights and Religious Freedom, organized in Brussels last September by the Institute on Religion and Public Policy, brought delegates from over two dozen

countries, including Belarus, Estonia, Kazakhstan, Russia, Tajikistan, Ukraine, and Uzbekistan. One session was titled “Anti-Semitism as a National and International Religious Freedom and Legislative Issue.” While anti-Semitism is not exclusively a religious freedom issue, the multiple manifestations of anti-Semitism can only be adequately addressed across a spectrum of disciplines and constituencies. I look forward to attending the second meeting of the Interparliamentary Conference in August 2004.

OSCE

Mr. Chairman, now I turn to the region-wide capacity for coordinated action. Given NCSJ’s close cooperation with this Commission and involvement in the Helsinki Process, I will focus my recommendations on this avenue.

To follow up on the successful and high-profile Berlin Conference, OSCE member states can pursue a range of steps, including the following:

- Use general OSCE meetings—the Parliamentary Assembly in July, the Human Dimension Implementation Meeting in October, and the Ministerial Council in December—to oversee and encourage the progress of ODIHR and member states. On an ongoing basis, governments and the OSCE must maintain the momentum for ODIHR to fulfill its mandate.
- Reinforce the impact of Berlin by ensuring adequate funding for ODIHR to collect data, whether through the OSCE budget or individual state contributions, and possibly by seconding experts from key governments. Organize consultations toward common standards for reporting and classifying hate crimes, and work toward a universal definition of anti-Semitism.
- Respond to ODIHR’s request for data collection and sharing of best practices. The United States and other governments already engaged in such activities should offer to share expertise with those still developing such capabilities.
- Respond to Spain’s proposal, introduced at the Berlin Conference, to host a conference in 2005. Establish as early as possible what purpose such a meeting could serve, and what level and format would best advance the process at this next stage. If such a conference is to take place, an early announcement provides a target date for individual countries and the OSCE to implement their commitments and responsibilities from Maastricht and Berlin.
- Whether in Spain or elsewhere, expert-level events can help move the process beyond the realm of diplomacy and speeches. While the U.S. delegation to Berlin included an official from the Department of Justice, not enough countries followed suit. To succeed on the ground, we need to bring in the practitioners from ministries of interior and education, from universities and media, from politics and civil society.
- Use the September 2004 Brussels Conference on xenophobia to promote greater support for data collection, and to demonstrate that a new focus on anti-Semitism enhances, rather than detracts from, concerns of other minority groups.

- Devote part of the 2004 Sofia Ministerial to a public forum on anti-Semitism. While many ministers may not be able to attend a stand-alone conference, nearly all foreign ministers participate in the annual Ministerial Council. It also attracts the greatest media attention, given the variety of issues.

Mr. Chairman, we are faced with a daunting task and an urgent mission, but also with a tremendous opportunity. Obviously due to the upsurge in anti-Semitism, but also due to U.S. leadership, we have a window of opportunity—we have Europe’s attention. We cannot afford to squander time or political resources.

We are redoubling efforts to promote follow-up by OSCE member governments and ODIHR, to expedite cooperation in data-collection and best practices. European governments should not misread efforts toward a special OSCE representative as a sanction to delay implementing the Maastricht and Berlin Declarations—fighting anti-Semitism at home, upgrading data-collection, and cooperating with the emerging ODIHR mechanism. We must continue moving forward with what has been agreed, even as we consider new initiatives to reinforce this process.

In much the same way, here at home, NCSJ urges rapid passage in the House of S. 2292, which has already passed the Senate. Once S. 2292 is enacted, the State Department can begin preparing the first-ever country-by-country global assessment of anti-Semitism and government responses, for delivery to Congress. While ODIHR and OSCE member governments move unevenly toward implementing data collection, at least the U.S. Government can provide ODIHR and the world with an initial consistent assessment of incidents and response. We look forward to working with Congress on additional measures to follow, and would also welcome broad-based discussion leading to comprehensive legislation that covers important new ideas on combating anti-Semitism internationally.

As the European Union cements its expansion eastward, it is worth noting that anti-Semitism is now being addressed at this founding moment of the new Europe. Through the OSCE, we are sending the message that not just speeches, but actions will be necessary if Europe is to become a true community of all. Unlike our friends to the East, many Western European governments and societies have not had to address their anti-Semitic past. Those that have done so have generally avoided noticing their anti-Semitic present. They are beginning to realize that their future stability cannot be guaranteed without confronting anti-Semitism and, yes, Islamophobia.

In his 1992 book, *Summer Meditations*, Vaclav Havel writes: “The sovereignty of the community, the region, the nation, the state—any higher sovereignty, in fact—makes sense only if it is derived from the one genuine sovereignty—that is, from the sovereignty of the human being, which finds its political expression in civil sovereignty.” There can be no junior members in a mature society, and there can be no excuses.

As we reflect on President Reagan’s legacy in this movement for human rights in Europe, it is also worth recalling what Thomas Jefferson wrote to John Adams in 1821, that “even should the cloud of barbarism and despotism again obscure the science and liberties of Europe, this country remains to preserve and restore light and liberty to them.”

Jefferson foreshadowed the singular importance of American leadership in fighting anti-Semitism, in building strong and pluralistic post-communist societies, and in transmitting our values to a new generation of Europeans—even as the identity and boundaries of “Europe” are undergoing a fundamental transformation. While other governments are also sponsoring educational, training and awareness programs, history continuously confirms that U.S.-funded programs show the way and set the tone for other international efforts and local initiatives, be it creating citizens’ groups, running seminars and exchanges, providing a safety net for unfiltered broadcasting, or crystallizing the region-wide consensus to fight anti-Semitism. This is the formula that has allowed our country to lead the world toward effective enforcement of human rights standards and respect for religious freedom.

Mr. Chairman, through the leadership of Congress and the Helsinki Commission, together with the United States Government, our country continues this tradition. Thank you for your commitment and your effectiveness.

**MATERIALS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD
BY SHAI FRANKLIN, DIRECTOR,
GOVERNMENT RELATIONS, NCSJ**

**PROCEEDINGS OF NCSJ SIDE EVENT, "POST-SOVIET STATES
RESPOND TO ANTI-SEMITISM," HELD IN CONJUNCTION WITH
2003 HUMAN DIMENSION IMPLEMENTATION MEETING, ORGA-
NIZATION FOR SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE
(OSCE), WARSAW, POLAND, OCTOBER 14, 2003**

**MODERATED BY SHAI FRANKLIN
NCSJ DIRECTOR OF GOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS**

Mr. FRANKLIN. I would like to welcome everyone to this side-event organized by NCSJ, formerly known as the National Conference on Soviet Jewry. Due to a fortunate series of events about 15 years ago, we were compelled to change our name. The 'National' refers to the United States: we are an American organization. We represent an umbrella of 50 American Jewish organizations and 300 communities across the United States. Some of those organizations are with us here today, and we have not only the U.S. Government as a partner, but fortunately many governments as partners, and they are represented here as well.

Our intention today for the next hour, hour-and-a-half, is to allow a more focused conversation on issues relating to anti-Semitism in the former Soviet Union and post-Communist Europe, and what the lessons are from those experiences of combating anti-Semitism that we can apply to the OSCE framework in the next formal session of the [HDIM] meeting next door.

We know that anti-Semitism continues to exist in most of Europe, including in the former Soviet Union, but we have seen that there are steps being taken in many of these countries—in most of these countries—to address anti-Semitism. I hope that some of the lessons shared here today can be applied to other countries, whether it is to the United States or to Western Europe. Some have observed, even, a flow of anti-Semitism from the West to the East during the past several years, so that might be something to address as well.

Let me just convey, in advance, the apologies of our American delegation who are arriving from another meeting and will be joining us shortly. But since we are fortunate enough already to have such a good representation here of interested parties and governments, I would like to begin and turn the microphone over to those who wish to relate their insights as to the nature of anti-Semitism, the importance and success of combating it on the governmental and societal levels, and recommendations for where the OSCE can play a useful role.

I would ask only that you identify yourself and your organization or delegation, and try to keep your initial presentation brief so we can hear from as many people as possible in this short time. We are recording this session so that there will be some record, although this will not become an official record of the OSCE, of course. So, I invite whoever would like to make some observations first: I know we have a delegate from the Russian Federation, several delegates from Ukraine, Azerbaijan, Armenia, the Czech Republic, and the Slovak Republic—and

you don't have to be from the former Soviet Union in order to participate in these discussions. You can speak in English or in Russian, as you see we have very qualified translation.

**DR. VERA GRACHEVA, SENIOR COUNSELOR
PERMANENT MISSION OF THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION
TO THE OSCE**

Dr. GRACHEVA. Thank you very much. My name is Vera Gracheva and I am not alone here in representing the delegation of the Russian Federation—as you can see, there are many of us. First of all, I would like to respond to the commentary made by our chairperson that the organization was required to change its name due to the fortunate events in the beginning of the 1990s. Probably this comment is not very much relevant to the subject matter of this meeting, however, I feel that it would be a simplification to call this event as 'fortunate'. All of the events which led to the collapse of the USSR were accompanied by a great multitude of other negative phenomena. All those conflicts that took place in the territory of the former Soviet Union would have been unthinkable in the days of the USSR. The collapse of the USSR has been accompanied by very severe social and economic earthquakes, and a very significant reduction in the standards of living of all the people inhabiting the territories of the former Soviet Union. Thus, unfortunately, the social and economic problems and the objective difficulties that we face have led to the exploitation of these difficulties by the political circles who use them to promote their political purposes and to suggest the population seek an external enemy, which is the most primitive, the simplest form of justifying the events.

I am not in the position to talk on behalf of other countries of the former Soviet Union, but I may say that as far as Russia is concerned, the issue of anti-Semitism is a very deeply, historically rooted issue that was already present in the days of tsarist Russia. But in Russia it is not a matter of ethnic or religious issues, it is rather an issue exploited for political purposes. By saying this, I also would like to underline that it has nothing in common with the official policy of the government or the state. By 'political' I mean that the anti-Semitic issues are exploited by the nationalistic parties and movements who use anti-Semitism to promote their ideas. Therefore, anti-Semitism in Russia should be regarded in the context of intolerance, of xenophobia, so these are all other accompanying phenomena that usually go hand in hand with social and economic problems.

We believe that the upbringing of the youth is of utmost importance—that is, to bring the youth up in such a manner that they grow resistant to such phenomena as anti-Semitism, xenophobia, and other extreme reactions. Therefore, I do believe that the OSCE as an organization can have a major contribution in the upbringing, including the ODIHR. Thank you very much, and I'm afraid I've taken up quite a lot of time from the other participants.

**RUSTEM ABLYATIFOV,
HEAD OF INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS DIVISION,
STATE COMMITTEE OF UKRAINE FOR
NATIONALITIES AND MIGRATION**

Mr. ABLYATIFOV. Good afternoon, my name is Rustem Ablyatifov. I am the representative of the Ukrainian Government. I would like to underline that Ukrainian legislation bans any discrimination on the grounds of race, color of skin, confession and other features, and obviously this also relates to the ban of discrimination against the Jewish population.

The Ukrainian Jewish community is a community of great influence, and it is also a very constructive community that has contributed much to the development of the independent, democratic Ukrainian state. I am proud to mention in this group that, through all these years of the independent Ukraine, we have not noted any anti-Semitic incident or disrespect toward the Jewish population on the part of the Ukrainian Government. Whatever anti-Semitic incidents we have had, those were incidents on the lower level of the general population. The last sad incident that took place in Kyiv was a group of young football fans who threw stones at the principal synagogue in Kyiv, and this incident was promptly dealt with by law enforcement.

The positive actions taken by the Ukrainian Government have been acknowledged by the representatives of the Ukrainian Jewish community, and they have noted that, yes indeed due to the government's activities, there is no place, there is no room whatsoever for anti-Semitism in Ukrainian society.

We believe that the root of all anti-Semitism is ignorance, and the primary tool to deal with anti-Semitism is education. We have to start proper education at the grammar-school level. Together with the association of social and cultural groups, we have conducted a series of lessons on tolerance in Ukrainian schools and we intend to organize such lessons on tolerance in the future as well. Thank you very much for your attention.

Mr. FRANKLIN. Thank you very much. I want to recognize the head of the U.S. delegation, Ambassador Pamela Hyde Smith, who has joined us, and I neglected to mention that we have at least one delegate from Lithuania as well. We just heard from the Russian delegate about the importance of education and from the Ukrainian delegate about the success of law enforcement. I would like to turn briefly to another aspect of combating anti-Semitism, which is the legislative framework. We are honored to have with us two members of the U.S.-Helsinki Commission. They just arrived from the Parliamentary Assembly of the OSCE in Rome, and I would ask Congressman Ben Cardin of Maryland and Congressman Joseph Pitts of Pennsylvania to share some of their reflections on where various countries in the OSCE are succeeding and where the OSCE can play a more useful role.

**REP. BENJAMIN CARDIN (D—MARYLAND),
U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES**

Mr. CARDIN. Thank you. First, let me thank NCSJ for their convening of this forum, this opportunity for us to talk with each other, and for their longstanding leadership in combating anti-Semitism. We came to Warsaw with four members of the United States Congress because we thought it was very important for us to be here to underscore the

work of the OSCE in fighting anti-Semitism. We thank Ambassador Smith, the leader of our delegation, for her incredible service on human rights issues. She gives us great credibility in our chair in the commitment of our country to the human rights dimension.

It was through the leadership of the chairman of our [Congressional] delegation, [Congressman] Chris Smith, who is here, that we were able to move forward within the OSCE Parliamentary Assembly resolutions to single out anti-Semitism for special meetings. We pursued that agenda because of the rise of anti-Semitism in each of our OSCE states, and we thought it was very important to have a conference solely focused on what we can do to fight the rise of anti-Semitism. We believe that we are on the verge of accomplishing that through the [2004] Berlin Conference, which we hope will be sanctioned at the [December 2003 OSCE] ministerial meeting, and I want to thank many people in this room who made that possible, including the leadership at NCSJ.

As a parliamentarian, I believe I have a responsibility to show leadership and speak out when people in my country do things that can provoke anti-Semitism. We have seen, in recent weeks, high-level public officials making comments that are irresponsible at best, anti-Semitic at worst. In too many of those cases, their fellow government officials are silent. One of the matters that I hope will come out of our conference is a commitment by leadership to speak out to—make sure that, if there are problems within our own community, we speak out against it. And for your record, we will submit the letters that our commission has sent—signed by Chairman Smith and myself, and by Congressman Pitts—to officials in other countries who we believe must be held accountable for their lack of leadership. And, now, with Mr. Pitts' agreement, I think I've talked long enough, so you can hear directly from the Chairman of our delegation, Chris Smith, who as I said was one of the leading—the leading—person in moving forward the anti-Semitism agenda for special attention.

**REP. CHRIS SMITH (R—NEW JERSEY),
U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
CHAIRMAN, U.S. HELSINKI COMMISSION**

Mr. SMITH. First of all, I apologize for being late: our press conference went over. It is a distinct honor and a privilege to join you at this side meeting to discuss the ongoing problem of anti-Semitism. It's good to see you all again. We are old and good friends. And also you should know that Mark Levin (who is the Executive Director of NCSJ) and I made our first trip—it was my first trip—to what was then the Soviet Union, to Moscow and Leningrad, in January of 1982. So I truly believe I have been mentored by the NCSJ on the issue of persecution, anti-Semitism, and—in the case of the Soviet Union—how to effectively advocate for the release of individual *refuseniks* and political prisoners.

I am a Republican, Ben is a Democrat. We are united in our concerns for Jews around the world, but right now in particular, this rising tide of anti-Semitism that we see occurring. The Parliamentary Assembly of the OSCE has already held three summits, and your organization played an important role in those summits on anti-Semitism: one each in Washington, Vienna, and Berlin. Many of us believe that the [2004] Berlin summit by the OSCE itself—not only the Parliamentary Assembly, but the [broader] organization—can be a watershed event.

The months leading up to the event ought to be fully utilized to chronicle individual and collective instances of anti-Semitism in each of the [OSCE member] countries. Then the conference itself can become a catalyst for accountability, but also for forward action after the conference. And the effort has to be comprehensive, from education—textbooks, how our school systems are dealing with intolerance, and especially Holocaust remembrance—to what political figures are doing when they express anti-Semitic views: are they chastised for it? Do their colleagues—does their government—speak out against it? And, of course, a complete review of hate-crimes legislation, to ensure there is a criminalization of this hate, this incitement of violence.

I do believe that this conference can also have a laudable—perhaps indirect, but laudable—impact on the Middle East itself. It has been my view that, far too often, European powers enable the PNA [Palestinian National Authority] and others, including Yasser Arafat, to engage in acts of terrorism by not holding them to account. And, again, just to conclude, many of us have brought up talking about education, the ongoing problems with UNRWA—the U.N. Relief and Works Agency—to which the United States has contributed \$2.5 billion. Yet, a review of the textbooks and much—but not all—of the leadership shows at least a tolerance, if not an embrace, of suicide bombings. Thank you for your vigilance, and let's use this window of opportunity to hold these countries to account, including the United States, so there will be no anti-Semitism.

Mr. FRANKLIN. Thank you very much for your leadership, Congressman Smith, and for the leadership of all the Helsinki Commissioners over the past 20-25 years. A lot of the delegations that are here today are here because of work that the U.S. Helsinki Commission did with many organizations and many Western countries. I'm very pleased to call on Congressman Pitts to share his comments.

**REP. JOSEPH PITTS (R—PENNSYLVANIA),
U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES**

Thank you. One thing about going last is that it's all been said. Let me first thank NCSJ for convening this important side event with Members of Congress and delegations from former Soviet republics, along with NGOs. Thank you very much for allowing us to be here. One of the questions at the press conference that the American delegation just had was from a reporter who asked if we did not feel that the OSCE had become an outdated institution. In response, our chairman said indeed it was not. The agenda and the items we are discussing are very relevant, and this is one of the few forums where NGOs can meet with government officials, as in sessions like this one.

As we discussed the upcoming meeting in Berlin on anti-Semitism, one of the reporters asked if this was just going to be a place for making speeches—a debating society—or if there would be a plan of action. Our chairman responded, one of the things we hope develops as we plan the conference is, indeed, for a creative plan of action with various follow-up activities after the conference. These would include many practical steps that could be taken, but chief among them would be education—our education of the young. Children do not naturally hate other people. They're taught to hate. The education of our young and the type of

curriculum that they have in their schools is extremely important—whether it's a madrasa in Pakistan or whether it's schools in all of our countries.

Back in the 1980s, I used to visit the Soviet Union and its republics and meet with Jewish *refuseniks* and other people who were being persecuted, and advocated on their behalf with the officials of the government. As my colleague Congressman Cardin said, I think those of us in government who are considered government leaders have an obligation to speak out against injustice. Silence is consent.

And as we travel in many of these countries [today], the human rights picture is quite varied, but one thing that is needed is engagement by all of us, with one another, so that misunderstanding, misrepresentation, can be nipped in the bud and we can, through engagement, encourage our colleagues—whether they be parliamentarians, government officials, NGOs, or citizens—to do what you're doing, and that is to speak out strongly against the scourge of anti-Semitism.

Mr. CARDIN. Let me just introduce my wife, Myrna, who has joined us. I do that because in 1987 she traveled to Vienna on behalf of Soviet Jews to meet with Soviet officials. And, yes, we've made a lot of progress since 1987, but we still have a long way to go. Thank you.

Mr. FRANKLIN. We actually have a team with us today, because the Cardins both have been active in legislative leadership and community leadership on issues that we work with for a number of years. In fact, one Cardin used to chair NCSJ—but that's from the other side of the family. I want to call on the Belarus representative of the Union of Councils for Soviet Jews who wanted to speak, and then the delegate from Azerbaijan also wants to speak. Please let me know if you want to speak as well, and we'll try to get everybody a chance.

**ARTUR LIVSHYTS,
BELARUS REPRESENTATIVE
UNION OF COUNCILS OF SOVIET JEWS**

Thank you very much. And first of all, I want to thank NCSJ for making this meeting happen, and I think it's very important. I represent an organization called Union of Councils for Soviet Jews. This organization was founded in the 1970s as a coalition of local grassroots action councils, supporting freedom for Jews of the Soviet Union. And as the Soviet Jewry movement grew, gathered steam in the 1970s, more individuals, more councils became involved and the Union of Councils for Soviet Jews grew into the large organization that has eight member councils in North America, and eight bureaus on the territory of the former Soviet Union.

In the Republic of Belarus, the Union of Councils for Soviet Jews does the monitoring of xenophobia and anti-Semitism. Also, we try to work with Jewish organizations and government by preventing acts of vandalism, acts of anti-Semitism.

Once, Albert Einstein said that anti-Semitism is a shadow of the Jewish people, and it is really true. And it's true that anti-Semitism, as a specific form of xenophobia, has been, is and will be everywhere that Jews are, and even where there are no Jews. So, the problem is not where anti-Semitism is, the problem is how strong and aggressive it is. And I think the problem is in the *quantity* of anti-Semitism.

Speaking of Belarus, Belarus is a multi-national, multi-confessional country and throughout the ages, and in the present time, relations between confessions—talking about countries of the former Soviet Union—are probably the most tolerant. So I agree with the Russian delegate talking about anti-Semitism in Belarus. It is not a common process in society. It's a result of activity of groups, of individuals.

Now I can say that the Belarus Government ... is ready to fight anti-Semitism [generally], but is not ready to fight individual acts of anti-Semitism. State anti-Semitism stopped to be one of the elements of social force, but we still have some acts by state officials.

And we're talking about education here, and I think that the OSCE should concentrate on the education of state officials in the countries. And I'm talking about the cultural level, education of individual state officials, and that's the work that should be done, because I have many examples of the lack of this education: We see the destruction of former synagogues—not only in Belarus, [throughout] the former Soviet Union—and the reconstruction of stadiums that are built on the former Jewish cemeteries, and without consulting the Jewish community.

MR. FRANKLIN. Thank you. We're now going to hear from the delegate from Azerbaijan. I see that we have been joined by diplomats from Israel, and Latvia, and the Netherlands and there may be others that I'm not aware of, so I apologize if I've overlooked any other delegations.

**SEYMUR MARDALIYEV, ATTACHÉ,
DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN RIGHTS, DEMOCRATIZATION
AND HUMANITARIAN PROBLEMS, MINISTRY OF
FOREIGN AFFAIRS, AZERBAIJAN**

Mr. MARDALIYEV. Good afternoon. My name is Seymur Mardaliyev, and I am the representative of the Azerbaijani delegation and the Ministry of Ethnic Relations. In my brief speech, I would like to talk about the experience of Azerbaijan, where historically for centuries Jews and Jewish communities have lived and cooperated with society without any manifestations of anti-Semitism.

For centuries, Azerbaijan has been one of a few countries in the world with several dozen ethnic minority groups and confessional groups that spread all over around the world. The high level of tolerance among the Azeri people has brought about the development of ethnic minorities in Azerbaijan, including Jewish communities, who have been able to maintain and develop their culture and religious traditions for centuries.

And I would like to give you the specific example of an activity conducted by our government. Namely, we have created a separate institute—this is the forum of three confessions. These are the principal confessions of Judaism, Islam and Christianity, and this forum has been created following the initiative of the leaders of the Muslim communities in the Caucasus. Therefore, no one should be surprised by the fact that the representatives of the Jewish people have lived in the territory of Azerbaijan for the past 2,600 years.

Today, five different Jewish communities live in Azerbaijan, and they maintain wonderful relations with other Jewish communities in the United States, Israel, and Europe.

Apart from that, in Azerbaijan function 20 miscellaneous non-governmental organizations, cultural organizations and Jewish charity organizations—and apart from them, such international organizations as

Sochnut [Jewish Agency for Israel], Vaad HaHatzolah and “Joint” [the American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee] also function in our country.

In the previous presentations, we have heard the participants talking about the destructions of synagogues in their countries. As far as Azerbaijan, we have not faced destruction, but on the contrary, the construction, the erection of new synagogues. So by March 2003, there were five synagogues functioning in Azerbaijan and since March, another synagogue has been erected, which is the largest synagogue in the Caucasus region.

I would like to emphasize that the construction of the new synagogue was possible not only due to the financial contribution of Jewish communities living in Azerbaijan, but also due to the financial contribution by the leaders of Muslim communities and by the Bishopric of the Orthodox Christian Church in Baku.

I obviously could give many more examples of tolerance in Azerbaijan, but currently I would like to focus on the perspective of Azerbaijan in this respect. My government highly assesses and cherishes the results of the Vienna conference on anti-Semitism, which took place in June 2003. This conference, that was...effective and timely, was an opportunity to exchange many opinions and views in the area of anti-Semitism. It was also an opportunity to talk about the events' efforts by governmental bodies, non-governmental institutions, civil society groups and OSCE member states, as well as recommendations [that] have been developed in the field dealing with anti-Semitism.

And we believe that only effective, practical implementations of the resolutions developed during such conferences would be able to facilitate the lives of those people who unfortunately are still being persecuted today.

And finally, I would like to put forward a specific suggestion on Azerbaijan's part, that following the Vienna conference, we would be very much blessed—glad—to become hosts of yet another meeting/conference, of whatever scale, in Baku, Azerbaijan. Thank you very much for your attention.

Mr. FRANKLIN. Thank you, and I look forward to returning to Baku for a future conference, as you suggested. The delegate from Belarus has asked to speak to us. Please.

DELEGATE FROM BELARUS. Thank you very much. Please, I would like to introduce myself. I am a representative of the Committee on Religious and Ethnic Groups, and I am a member of the Belarusian delegation.

First of all, I would like to talk about the role of the organization that has the current name of [NCSJ] Advocates on behalf of Jews in Russia, Ukraine, the Baltic States & Eurasia. And, there is no mention of Belarus in the name of the organization; perhaps this is an indication of the current status. In June this year, the leaders of your organization visited our countries, and met with leaders of our institutions, including the head of my institution. Unfortunately, [NCSJ Executive Director] Mr. Mark Levin, who took part in that meeting, is not present here today.

At this point, I would not delve into the details describing the life of the Jewish community, but additional material shall be distributed tomorrow, which will be another opportunity to learn about the life of the Jewish community.

In brief, I would like to say that for more than seven centuries, Belarus has been the center of European Jewry, if I may use this term. And one of the examples of the inter-ethnic relations is the fact that there were no pogroms against the Jewish population, also in the days of the Russian empire. The only exception could be the so-called “nationalization” of certain towns.

As far as the incidents of xenophobia and anti-Semitism are concerned, we strongly believe that any such incident should be looked into, prosecuted, and punished. As far as the incidents are concerned—the incidents that take place in Belarus—there are the incidents of libels and offensive attacks against cemeteries and buildings, and we have several dozen such incidents annually. However, if we compare it to the situation in other countries, such incidents in other countries may be measured in the thousands. Nevertheless, I do emphasize that each act of xenophobic behavior should be seriously dealt with, prosecuted, and punished. But still, I would like to draw your attention to the fact, to the much lower rate of such incidents in our country.

We welcome the contribution that has been made by the organization represented in this room by Mr. Livshyts. Our Azerbaijani colleague has mentioned the number of synagogues in Azerbaijan; I would like to mention that we have 47 Jewish organizations that are all incorporated in the Union of Jewish Associations and Communities. Moreover, we have three different Jewish religious communities that live in Belarus. Also, I just would like to state that Mr. Livshyts has spoken on behalf of his organization.

And finally, I would like to state one fact and make one statement. First, how can we talk about anti-Semitism in a country where only a minor percent of the population suffers from the incidents based on a hostile attitude toward the people of Jewish origin. And the second statement is just as my colleague has mentioned, that the principal problem with anti-Semitism is how to deal with it regarding varying manifestations of its intensity, and how to deal with anti-Semitism even where there are no Jews.

I would like to disagree with the above-mentioned statement, but I think that the real factor, the real factor that shows the current state of affairs is that Belarus enjoys the most comfortable situation among the countries of the former Soviet Union with regard to anti-Semitic behavior. And finally, I would like to say that we will be most grateful for cooperation with all those who struggle against anti-Semitism in any of its forms.

Mr. FRANKLIN. Thank you very much, and thanks to all of you for joining us. We’re going to break now in order to allow people to reassemble for the formal OSCE session on anti-Semitism. Though the first session this morning did not end on time, that does not mean that the afternoon session will not *begin* on time. And, I would like to thank our diplomatic delegates and our non-governmental participants. I find myself agreeing more with my colleague from the Union of Councils than with the representative of the Belarus Government, but the important thing should be not what the situation on the ground is, but what governments are doing to *respond* to it. And that’s why it is so important that everybody—whether it’s Belarus or Azerbaijan—everybody is here in this room and next door to address these issues.

Thank you very much.

**PREPARED STATEMENT OF
ISRAEL SINGER, CHAIRMAN,
WORLD JEWISH CONGRESS**

Congressman Smith, I want to thank you. Not for inviting me back here again, but for your leadership, your interest and your courage. You see the OSCE, but more importantly, the Helsinki process not for what many outside of the United States would have it be, but what you know it can be and we wish it would be. For that, we and people of good will the world over owe you our gratitude.

The limited success we had in Berlin was due mostly to the tremendous efforts of a few individuals. The German Foreign Minister's leadership in seizing the moment and forcibly putting together April's conference on anti-Semitism against the will of many showed once again that he is not only a true leader, but indeed a partner and a friend. His mission to expose a plague that has resurfaced and again threatens the safety of Europe's peoples and the integrity of its leaders succeeded and it succeeded because of his leadership and the dedication of the people in this room.

When I went to see Secretary of State Powell in March, I told him that his presence in Berlin was critical to the success of the conference, if not for the only reason that it would raise the level to one unseen at the OSCE in many years. He gave me his word and he kept it. There are those in the United States and around the world who would have preferred that Mr. Powell stay home, but he came. He came and he spoke out. He came and he spoke the truth.

From the labors of this commission, the Secretary, the Ambassadors and the members of the U.S. delegation led by Mayor Koch—and I see several of the delegates here today—we achieved for the first time in our history a resolution, language adopted by 55 nations condemning anti-Semitism.

Language that says its not okay to beat Jews in the street. Language that says it is not okay to firebomb synagogues. Language that says its not okay to torment Jewish children on their way to school. Language that says its not okay to destroy a synagogue, deface a holy site or desecrate a grave. Anti-Semites hate Jews so much they are willing to even beat on those who Jews who are dead. An anti-Semite hates a Jew before he is born and long after he is dead.

For the first time in our history we have governments aggressively combating anti-Semitism. When I last sat here, I challenged this commission and Mr. Weisskeirchen specifically to take this issue to Parliament. I challenged you to take this issue of anti-Semitism and the need to condemn it, legislate against it and punish those who perpetrate its despicable acts, to positively act to put it to an end. I sit here today to say that we have met with mixed results. Many of your colleagues in parliaments around the world have answered this call. Shamefully many have not. I do not understand why. A body that cannot adopt a resolution condemning anti-Semitism is itself anti-Semitic. These are not my words, Edgar Bronfman wrote this in the *Financial Times*.

He wrote this in a call to arms against anti-Semitism. History has brought us to a day where the nations of the world will have to stand up and be counted. This September, before the United Nations General Assembly, there will be a resolution. This resolution is unlike any other ever proposed. It is a standalone resolution that condemns anti-Semitism. It does nothing else. It does not take sides in the Middle East con-

flict. It does not discuss the war on terror. It does not make reference to treaty violations or boarder disputes. It simply and clearly states that anti-Semitism is wrong.

If the nations of the world cannot stand up and be counted in opposition to anti-Semitism, then they are complicit in its spread and will have abandoned the tradition of human rights upon which the United Nations was founded and for which it professes to act. They will testify that the atmosphere in the United Nations is so corrupt and so poisoned with hatred that it cannot bring itself to condemn the world oldest and most persistent for of racism.

To this I must thank Congressman Smith, Congressman Lantos and others for introducing legislation in the House that would call on this government to support and act on behalf of such a resolution. Your efforts to establish an office in the State Department to deal with the subject of anti-Semitism, catalogue occurrences and combat manifestations of it is surely to be lauded. Congressman Lantos, we have known each other for a very long time and you know better than anyone else who ever served in this chamber the horrible evils spawned by anti-Semitism. You saw its destruction first hand and you deserve to see the day when all the nations of the world vow to combat and destroy it.

Not long ago, I visited Senator Clinton and asked her to craft legislation in the Senate that deal with the subject of anti-Semitism. Since then, her office and mine have been in constant contact and I believe we are not far away from seeing that bill in the Senate. The most productive portion of our conversation was not the specific issues of how to legislate against anti-Semitism and encourage others to do the same, but rather the notion there is even more we can do to ensure that never again will Jews fear walking in the street.

So, with Senator Clinton as an inspiration and a partner, I come before you today to say that we can do more and we must do more. Legislating against hate crimes and anti-Semitism in particular serves to define the crime and punish offenders. But we must act today to make such laws unnecessary.

Who would have thought that after witnessing the horrors of the holocaust, this generation would again be looking down the dark corridor of ethnic hatred and violence. We must embark on an aggressive campaign to educate the public and educate our youth. We must teach them the dangers of hate and the consequences of conflict. We must teach them to resolve their differences with words, not molotov cocktails, knives, guns and bombs. We must avoid conflict by teaching mutual respect and tolerance.

Today, every child in this country if asked could clearly identify enemies of the United States but I dare say few would be able to point to a map and find an ally. This is not because we do not have any, but because combating foes has taken precedent over finding friends.

We do not need to approach this subject with glib naivety. The realities and perils of this world are not lost on anyone in this chamber. We all remember that horrible day in September. We all had family or friends who were there. We all read the newspapers, see the TV screens.

But those who believe that the only way to speak with the Muslim world is with the sword will find that to be the case, for they will be responsible for creating that reality. A generation ago, no one could have imagined that the Catholic Church and the Jewish people would not only find common ground, but work together in areas of social wel-

fare, politics and morality. In just two weeks, I am chairing a meeting of the Jewish people and the Catholic Church. Cardinals, Chief Rabbis and clergy from around the world will gather in Buenos Aires to discuss the shared ideals of charity and justice.

We are meeting in Argentina because it was there, when most of the world had forgotten, when most of the world had turned its back, when even people in this country neglected and forgot its neighbor to the south, it was in Argentina that the Jewish people and the Catholic Church joined forces to feed the hungry, treat the sick and care for the poor, during that nations crippling and debilitating economic crisis. Thankfully the sea has changed for that country and people are once again slowly finding jobs, but the lessons learned are many and great. For the first time in a two thousand year history Jewish and Christians worked together to carry out a universal moral message: caring for the stranger, the widow and the orphan.

I mention this to call attention to a great example of what mutual respect, understanding and dialogue can achieve. I mention this because it cost far less than war and its effects were far more fruitful. I mention this because those who would believe that the only way to speak with Muslims or other groups we do not understand is with the sword are wrong and have proved to be wrong.

We are repeating this model of dialogue and education throughout the world with many religions, ethnicities and groups. Edgar Bronfman, the World Jewish Congress, our colleagues in Jewish communities in nearly 100 countries, and yes, even the great State of Israel have begun talks with leading members of the Muslim community to try to find the common language of peace and respect that we can stamp out the darkness and truly shine a light on this troubled world. We have made progress with other Christian groups and we continue to build bridges between nations and ethnic rivals.

We will succeed whether this body or parliaments around the world assist us or not. We will succeed because we have to succeed. We will succeed because Armageddon is not an ends for which we are to yearn and help facilitate. Assured mutual destruction is not a policy that builds hope, heals wounds and avoids conflict. It is a tinderbox waiting to be set aflame. We can do more and we must do more. The current generation and our children deserve our best efforts. They shall inherit the Earth and we consider with care what we are leaving them.

Thank you.

**PREPARED STATEMENT OF
JACK ROSEN, PRESIDENT,
AMERICAN JEWISH CONGRESS**

I want to thank the Commission for giving me this opportunity to testify about the dangerous and mounting phenomenon of anti-Semitism. In April, I was privileged to be among those asked by President Bush and Secretary Powell to represent the United States at the Berlin Conference on Anti-Semitism of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe, the OSCE. I am pleased to report that the Berlin Declaration commits the 55 member nations of the OSCE to monitor and report on anti-Semitic incidents in their respective countries. Significantly, the Berlin Declaration concluded that European nations "Declare unambiguously that international developments or political issues, including those in Israel or elsewhere in the Middle East, never justify anti-Semitism."

Such a conclusion is far from self-evident. In the Sunday, June 13 European Union parliamentary elections, one list of candidates in France, Euro-Palestine, ran on a platform announcing that "there cannot be a future for the people of the European Union nor peaceful coexistence between the citizens of [different] origins and cultures which make it up, without respect of the right and justice in the world, beginning with the Middle East."

While subject to different interpretations, I read this as a threat: Jews are fair game in France (and throughout Europe) until there is "justice" for Palestinians. As for what type of "justice" this group has in mind, their leader has compared the Israelis to Nazis--a comparison that suggests that justice for the Palestinians requires the cessation of Israel's existence as a separate state.

The Euro-Palestine candidate list did not garner enough votes to send any deputies to Strasbourg, but the thinking that manifested itself in that list runs through far too many of Europe's politicians. I should say that in speaking of Europe, I am referring to Western Europe, or in Secretary Rumsfeld's felicitous phrase, Old Europe. In contrast, New Europe, ten nations of which joined the E.U. in May and elected representatives to the E.U. Parliament on Sunday, has a different political configuration. The Westernizers in those nations are instinctively pro-American, pro-Israel, and on guard against anti-Semitism, which they identify with their nativist, fascist and Soviet pasts. This is not to say that there is no problem of anti-Semitism in the New Europe: parties and institutions hostile to the European Union and fearful of their prospective loss of national sovereignty (a sovereignty only recently restored following the withdrawal and then collapse of the Soviet Union), and cultural reactionaries committed to resurrecting a national past are less immunized against Jew-hatred, which was an unfortunate part of their respective national legacies. These developments oblige us to extend our scrutiny to the wider Europe that has recently come into existence.

As the OSCE Berlin and Vienna Conferences demonstrate, international institutions have removed their heads from the sand to acknowledge that anti-Semitism is a real problem. Much of this is due to the proactive policy of the United States, which implored OSCE nations to take up the matter and which has, through its diplomacy at the United

Nations and elsewhere, born witness to the proposition that standing up for Jewish rights and opposing threats against the Jews is a hallmark of decency.

The European Union has also held a conference on the subject, but only after being embarrassed by its suppression of a survey, which pointed to the connection between Moslem immigrants and anti-Semitic violence, as well as by the results of a survey, which found that almost 60 percent of western Europeans view Israel as the greatest threat to world peace.

And some European governments, notably France, have begun to address the problem with the gravity it deserves.

Nevertheless, in Paris, attacks against Jews have increased sharply to 67 from the 34 reported in the last quarter of 2003. These attacks include attempted murder, which cannot be dismissed as pranks. The conventional wisdom is that these attacks are fueled by violence in the Israel-Palestine theater, and indeed the number of incidents in 2002 was 1,669. This figure declined by almost 600 to 1,051 in 2003. But why then a surge in 2004?

Orthodox Jewish men in France now wear baseball caps to conceal their yarmulkes—the chief rabbi publicly advised them to do so. Jewish institutions must receive police protection. Jewish life in Europe today requires extraordinary protective measures.

The Europeans suffer from an additional problem. They cannot figure out how to address the implications of the massive immigration from North Africa and elsewhere in the Moslem world. They have no successful absorption policy to ease the immigrants' transformation into full citizens. They find it difficult to openly and honestly debate the issues, surrendering space to the anti-immigration radical right.

Moreover, they are dumbfounded by the mixture of extreme criticism of Israel with anti-Jewish motifs. The European Left, which is particularly hostile to Jewish national aspirations, routinely refers to Israel as a Nazi or pariah state. Not content to criticize Israel's security fence as a bad idea, they attack it as an "apartheid wall." There is also the apparently widespread notion that Israeli assertion of Jewish rights is dragging the West into a conflict with the Islamic world, a view that places the burden of the entire current global clash on Israel's shoulders. This view is manifest in that 60 percent who see Israel as the greatest danger to world peace.

American and Congressional leadership in this struggle is key. Next Monday, June 21, the U.N. is holding a conference on anti-Semitism. This will be followed up by a new attempt, hopefully successful this time, to obtain General Assembly approval for a stand alone declaration against anti-Jew hatred that, at least, approximates the language of the OSCE Berlin Declaration to which 55 U.N. member nations have already subscribed. Congress should support these efforts.

Thank you once again for the opportunity to share my thoughts with you.

**THE BERLIN DECLARATION
OF THE OSCE PARLIAMENTARY ASSEMBLY
ON ANTI-SEMITIC VIOLENCE
IN THE OSCE REGION, ADOPTED
AT THE ELEVENTH ANNUAL SESSION**

1. PREAMBLE

We, Parliamentarians of the OSCE participating States, have met in annual session in Berlin on 6-10 July 2002 as the Parliamentary dimension of the OSCE to assess developments and challenges relating to security and cooperation in Europe, in particular confronting terrorism, and we offer the following views to the OSCE Ministers.

We wish every success to the next OSCE Ministerial Council Meeting in Estoril in December and bring to its attention the following declaration and recommendations.

**RESOLUTION ON
ANTI-SEMITIC VIOLENCE IN THE OSCE REGION**

1. Recalling that the OSCE was among those organizations which publicly achieved international condemnation of anti-Semitism through the crafting of the 1990 Copenhagen Concluding Document;
2. Noting that all participating States, as stated in the Copenhagen Concluding Document, commit to “unequivocally condemn” anti-Semitism and take effective measures to protect individuals from anti-Semitic violence;
3. Remembering the 1996 Lisbon Concluding Document, which highlights the OSCE’s “comprehensive approach” to security, calls for “improvement in the implementation of all commitments in the human dimension, in particular with respect to human rights and fundamental freedoms,” and urges participating States to address “acute problems,” such as anti-Semitism;
4. Reaffirming the 1999 Charter for European Security, committing participating States to “counter such threats to security as violations of human rights and fundamental freedoms, including the freedom of thought, conscience, religion or belief and manifestations of intolerance, aggressive nationalism, racism, chauvinism, xenophobia and anti-Semitism”;
5. Recognizing that the scourge of anti-Semitism is not unique to any one country, and calls for steadfast perseverance by all participating States;

The OSCE Parliamentary Assembly:

6. Unequivocally condemns the alarming escalation of anti-Semitic violence throughout the OSCE region;
7. Voices deep concern over the recent escalation in anti-Semitic violence, as individuals of the Judaic faith and Jewish cultural properties have suffered attacks in many OSCE participating States;

8. Urges those States which undertake to return confiscated properties to rightful owners, or to provide alternative compensation to such owners, to ensure that their property restitution and compensation programmes are implemented in a nondiscriminatory manner and according to the rule of law;
9. Recognizes the commendable efforts of many post-communist States to redress injustices inflicted by previous regimes based on religious heritage, considering that the interests of justice dictate that more work remains to be done in this regard, particularly with regard to individual and community property restitution compensation;
10. Recognizes the danger of anti-Semitic violence to European security, especially in light of the trend of increasing violence and attacks region wide;
11. Declares that violence against Jews and other manifestations of intolerance will never be justified by international developments or political issues, and that it obstructs democracy, pluralism, and peace;
12. Urges all States to make public statements recognizing violence against Jews and Jewish cultural properties as anti-Semitic, as well as to issue strong, public declarations condemning the depredations;
13. Calls upon participating States to ensure aggressive law enforcement by local and national authorities, including thorough investigation of anti-Semitic criminal acts, apprehension of perpetrators, initiation of appropriate criminal prosecutions and judicial proceedings;
14. Urges participating States to bolster the importance of combating anti-Semitism by holding a follow-up seminar or human dimension meeting that explores effective measures to prevent anti-Semitism, and to ensure that their laws, regulations, practices and policies conform with relevant OSCE commitments on anti-Semitism; and
15. Encourages all delegates to the Parliamentary Assembly to vocally and unconditionally condemn manifestations of anti-Semitic violence in their respective countries and at all regional and international forums.

**THE ROTTERDAM DECLARATION
OF THE OSCE PARLIAMENTARY ASSEMBLY
ON ANTI-SEMITIC VIOLENCE
IN THE OSCE REGION, ADOPTED AT
THE TWELFTH ANNUAL SESSION**

1. PREAMBLE

We, Parliamentarians of the OSCE participating States, have met in annual session in Rotterdam on 5-9 July 2003 as the Parliamentary dimension of the OSCE to assess developments and challenges relating to security and co-operation in Europe, in particular the role of the OSCE in the new architecture of Europe, and we offer the following views to the OSCE Ministers.

We wish every success to the next OSCE Ministerial Conference in Maastricht in December and bring to its attention the following declaration and recommendations.

**RESOLUTION ON
COMBATING ANTI-SEMITISM IN THE 21ST CENTURY**

1. Recalling the Resolution on Anti-Semitic Violence in the OSCE Region unanimously adopted at the Assembly's 2002 Annual Session in Berlin, which encouraged parliamentarians to "vocally and unconditionally condemn manifestations of anti-Semitic violence in their respective countries and at all regional and international forums,"
2. Reaffirming the 2002 Porto Ministerial Decision condemning "anti-Semitic incidents in the OSCE area, recognizing the role that the existence of anti-Semitism has played throughout history as a major threat to freedom,"
3. Recalling the 2002 Porto decision No. 6 recognizing the responsibility of participating States for promoting tolerance and non-discrimination,
4. Noting ongoing efforts to create a parliamentary Coalition of the Willing, initiated by the German and American delegations to the Assembly, to gather like-minded parliamentarians willing to denounce anti-Semitism and related violence, be it on the domestic or international level,
5. Recalling the leadership shown by the OSCE in addressing the issue of anti-Semitism, and the fact that it was the first international organization to publicly condemn anti-Semitism through provisions of the 1990 Copenhagen Concluding Document,
6. Acknowledging that incidents of anti-Semitism occur throughout the 55-nation OSCE region and are not unique to any one country, which necessitates unwavering steadfastness by all participating States to erase this black mark on human history,

The OSCE Parliamentary Assembly:

7. Recognizes the danger of anti-Semitism to the societies of all OSCE States, as unchecked growth of this phenomenon and related vio-

lence will jeopardize peace, pluralism, human rights and democracy;

8. Condemns unequivocally anti-Semitism (including violence against Jews and Jewish cultural sites), racial and ethnic hatred, xenophobia, and discrimination, as well as persecution on religious grounds whenever it occurs;
9. Recommends that parliamentarians of OSCE participating States strongly and publicly condemn anti-Semitic acts when they occur;
10. Supports the promotion of special efforts to train law enforcement officers and military personnel to deal with diverse communities and respond to racism and hate crimes;
11. Urges all OSCE participating States to ensure effective law enforcement by local and national authorities against criminal acts stemming from anti-Semitism, xenophobia, or racial or ethnic hatred, whether directed at individuals, communities, or property, including thorough investigation and prosecution of such acts;
12. Encourages educational efforts throughout the OSCE region to counter anti-Semitic stereotypes and attitudes among younger people, to increase Holocaust awareness programs, and to identify necessary resources to accomplish these goals;
13. Calls on participating States to identify concrete action that may be possible within the OSCE to counter proliferation of neo-Nazi and other racist material over the Internet, while protecting and preserving the rights of freedom of expression;
14. Emphasizes the need to commence and complete the proper and just restitution or compensation of seized properties to the rightful owners, noting that many claimants are elderly survivors of the Holocaust;
15. Calls upon parliamentarians in OSCE participating States to play a leading role in combating anti-Semitism, thereby ensuring concrete actions are implemented at the national level;
16. Urges those participating States that have not already done so to join the Task Force for International Co-operation on Holocaust Education, Remembrance and Research, and to implement the provisions of the Declaration of the Stockholm International Forum on the Holocaust.

This is a U.S. Government publication
produced by the
**Commission on Security and
Cooperation in Europe (CSCE).**

This publication is intended to inform
interested individuals and organizations
about developments within and among the
participating States of the Organization for
Security and Cooperation in Europe
(OSCE).

All CSCE publications may be freely
reproduced, with appropriate credit, in any
form. The CSCE encourages the widest
possible dissemination of its publications.

Visit our site on the World Wide Web at
<http://www.csce.gov>

The Commission's Web site provides
instant access to the agency's latest press
releases and reports on recent hearings and
briefings in addition to an electronic
subscription service. Using the
Commission's subscription page, readers
with e-mail may choose to receive
press releases, notices, reports, and other
documents on issues in which they are most
interested.

Please subscribe today.