S. HRG. 108–370

ANTI-SEMITISM IN EUROPE

HEARING

BEFORE THE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON EUROPEAN AFFAIRS

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS
UNITED STATES SENATE

ONE HUNDRED EIGHTH CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

OCTOBER 22, 2003

Printed for the use of the Committee on Foreign Relations

Available via the World Wide Web: http://www.access.gpo.gov/congress/senate

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

92–370 PDF WASHINGTON : 2004

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office
Internet: bookstore.gpo.gov Phone: toll free (866) 512–1800; DC area (202) 512–1800
Fax: (202) 512–2250 Mail: Stop SSOP, Washington, DC 20402–0001

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

RICHARD G. LUGAR, Indiana, *Chairman*

CHUCK HAGEL, Nebraska	JOSEPH R. BIDEN, JR., Delaware
LINCOLN CHAFEE, Rhode Island	PAUL S. SARBANES, Maryland
GEORGE ALLEN, Virginia	CHRISTOPHER J. DODD, Connecticut
SAM BROWNBACK, Kansas	JOHN F. KERRY, Massachusetts
MICHAEL B. ENZI, Wyoming	RUSSELL D. FEINGOLD, Wisconsin
GEORGE V. VOINOVICH, Ohio	BARBARA BOXER, California
LAMAR ALEXANDER, Tennessee	BILL NELSON, Florida
NORM COLEMAN, Minnesota	JOHN D. ROCKEFELLER IV, West Virginia
JOHN E. SUNUNU, New Hampshire	JON S. CORZINE, New Jersey

KENNETH A. MYERS, JR., *Staff Director*
ANTONY J. BLINKEN, *Democratic Staff Director*

SUBCOMMITTEE ON EUROPEAN AFFAIRS

GEORGE ALLEN, Virginia, *Chairman*

GEORGE V. VOINOVICH, Ohio	JOSEPH R. BIDEN, JR., Delaware
CHUCK HAGEL, Nebraska	PAUL S. SARBANES, Maryland
JOHN E. SUNUNU, New Hampshire	CHRISTOPHER J. DODD, Connecticut
LINCOLN CHAFEE, Rhode Island	JOHN F. KERRY, Massachusetts

CONTENTS

ANTI-SEMITISM IN EUROPE

WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 22, 2003

U.S. SENATE,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON EUROPEAN AFFAIRS,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS,
Washington, DC.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to notice, at 2:35 p.m. in room SD–419, Dirksen Senate Office Building, Hon. George Allen (chairman of the subcommittee), presiding.

Present: Senators Allen, Voinovich, Coleman, Biden, Sarbanes, and Corzine.

Senator ALLEN. Good afternoon. I'd like to call this hearing of the Foreign Relations Committee, Subcommittee on European Affairs to order. I'd like to thank all our witnesses for appearing before the subcommittee this afternoon.

The purpose of our hearing today is to examine anti-Semitism in Europe and the best practices that have been implemented to address the current problem and prevent any future acts.

During the last 3 years, there have been documented increases in anti-Semitic incidents taking place throughout Europe. The desecration of Jewish cemeteries and monuments, vandalism of Jewish homes, schools, community centers, fire-bombing of synagogues, violence against Jewish individuals are all troubling signs that many of the countries of Europe are not doing enough, possibly, to protect the rights of Jewish citizens and also, importantly, educate their populace of the importance of religious tolerance and individual rights.

In 2003, we've seen a number of such incidents throughout Europe Specifically in a suburb of Paris, a synagogue was desecrated and vandalized with anti-Semitic graffiti. Books were scattered on the floors, and torah scrolls were in disarray.

Over 50 graves were vandalized in Kassel, Germany, in August of this year. Grave stones in the historic Jewish cemetery were overturned, and headstones were toppled.

In Greece, two swastikas were spray-painted on a Holocaust Memorial in February of this year. The desecrated memorial honors the tens of thousands of Salonican Jews killed by the Nazis.

In May of 2003, a rabbi in Vienna, Austria, was assaulted by two youths while walking home from prayer. The assailants shouted anti-Semitic slurs, kicked the rabbi, and struck his head with a beer bottle. Thankfully, the two suspects were apprehended.

More recently, in Russia, an object resembling a bomb with anti-Semitic slogans attached to it was found in a synagogue. Fortu-

nately, the bomb was found to be hoax or a fake, but the message was obvious.

Such examples show that anti-Semitism in Europe is not confined to one country or region. Instead, it is a widespread problem that leaves many in the Jewish community throughout Europe understandably worried and fearful of attack.

Many point, in all of this, to the ongoing violence in the Middle East, particularly the conflict between Israelis and Palestinians, as reasons for the growing anti-Semitic violence in Europe. Those type of motives are not an excuse for anti-Semitism, because, in my view, anti-Semitism is wrong. These attacks are based on the victims' ethnicity and/or their religious beliefs. When a person is attacked, threatened or assaulted because of their race, their ethnicity, or their religious beliefs, it is my view that government and community leaders must immediately and forcefully deplore these actions as unacceptable. All forms of hatred must be immediately condemned, both vigorously and publicly, to leave absolutely no doubt in the minds of the citizens that such actions are wrong and will not be tolerated. Failure to act quickly and to make these condemnations could be construed by some as condoning such behavior, and may lead to additional violent incidents.

Law enforcement obviously is key in all of this. It's not just the statements, but it's the follow up. Following the clues, following evidence, finding those who are involved, and prosecuting them to the full extent of the law for anti-Semitic violence is also absolutely essential. If this is not the message, then these hate crimes will, unfortunately, go unpunished, and victims will be denied due justice. More importantly, the wrong message is sent from the norms of civilized society.

Now, as we explore this issue, I think it's important to acknowledge that some efforts have been made in parts of Europe to stem the growing number of these incidents. Earlier this year, France began an effort through its Education Ministry to eliminate anti-Semitism and other types of discrimination in its schools. Such initiatives should be applauded, as schools are an optimum place to enlighten children and prevent bigoted views from carrying forward until adulthood.

To prosecute those committing anti-Semitic acts, France has developed a new unit to investigate these crimes, and has enacted legislation to toughen penalties for racist and anti-Semitic crimes, and encourage local law-enforcement agencies to aggressively prosecute these attacks.

For its part, the EU has begun to develop a Union position condemning anti-Semitism and racism, and has enacted measures to fight discrimination and religious intolerance. These efforts, as well as strong participation at the recent Anti-Semitism Conference of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe, OSCE, these are positive steps that ought to be commended and applauded.

Now, through this hearing, I'm hopeful that we'll be able to uncover some of the best practices that have been implemented by both Europe and the United States to combat anti-Semitism in this country, as well as in Europe. It is important to realize that the United States is not exempt from this problem and we must con-

tinue to be vigilant in educating our law-enforcement officials and prosecuting those who commit anti-Semitic acts in our own States.

Through collaboration with our European allies and sharing effective programs and initiatives, I believe we can stem the growing tide of anti-Semitism and better educate people on the importance of religious and ethnic tolerance.

With that, I'll conclude my remarks, and I know others will want to make some opening remarks. I know Chairman Lugar will submit a statement for the record.

[The opening statement of Senator Lugar follows:]

OPENING STATEMENT OF SENATOR RICHARD G. LUGAR

I am pleased that the Subcommittee on European Affairs is holding a hearing on "Anti-Semitism in Europe." I want to congratulate Senator Allen, the chairman of the European Affairs Subcommittee, for his diligence in constructing this hearing and his commitment to the topic, and Senator Voinovich for his contributions to the hearing and his ongoing work to promote international religious tolerance.

It is important that the United States oppose anti-Semitism wherever it is found and work in cooperation with good friends to overcome this problem. Evidence of anti-Semitism in Europe has increased alarmingly in recent years. According to Tel Aviv University's 2002-2003 annual report on anti-Semitism worldwide, more than 50 percent of violent anti-Semitic incidents reported in 2002 occurred in Western Europe. France, the United Kingdom, and Belgium had the highest number of reported incidents.

I am hopeful that European governments are beginning to grapple more seriously with the problem of anti-Semitism. I was pleased last February when the French education ministry launched a campaign to combat anti-Semitism and other types of racism in schools. The UK, Germany and Sweden reportedly also have initiated efforts to combat racism and anti-Semitism.

Last June, former New York City Mayor Rudolph W. Giuliani led the American delegation to the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe's first transatlantic conference on anti-Semitism. The conference was an important sign that the U.S. and Europe recognize that a serious and coordinated response to anti-Semitism is required. Among other proposals made at the conference, the U.S. delegation recommended establishing a more uniform reporting system of anti-Semitic events worldwide. I support the adoption of this idea.

This hearing will provide Members of Congress with insight into the administration's policy on this issue. It also brings together a distinguished panel of witnesses from the private sector that will expand our insights into how we can address anti-Semitism. I thank each of our witnesses for being with us today, and I look forward to their testimony.

[The opening statement of Senator Biden follows:]

OPENING STATEMENT OF SENATOR JOSEPH R. BIDEN, JR.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thank you for holding this important hearing.

I wish we didn't have to hold this hearing. But I'm not naive. Anti-Semitism has been a disgusting aspect of European—and world—history for nearly two millennia.

This committee has held many hearings on this distasteful topic. In the summer of 1994, for example, when I was Chairman of the Subcommittee on European Affairs, we held a series of three hearings on right-wing movements in Europe—which differed from each other in many respects, but had as a common thread the old, virulent anti-Semitism.

It goes without saying that one can oppose certain policies of the State of Israel without being anti-Semitic. On the other hand, anti-Semites regularly try to conflate the two issues and, moreover, often distort Israeli actions in the process.

In April 2002 we got a vivid picture of this tactic. In response to the first wave of suicide attacks against civilians in late March and early April of that year, the Israeli army went after terrorists in the refugee camp in Jenin.

The European news media, with very few exceptions, bought the line of the Palestinian terror lobby hook, line, and sinker. Massacres of seven or eight hundred civilians were proclaimed as fact.

In response to a petition by Arab Members of the Knesset, the Israeli Government allowed international observers into the camp. They found that a total of fifty-two people had died, thirty-three of them armed terrorists.

Of course the anti-Semites in Europe didn't want to be bothered by the facts. A really sick stream of vituperation spewed forth all over the continent—with over-the-top language that went far beyond criticism of Israeli actions, which themselves, as I said, had been described completely incorrectly. These statements were blatantly, unashamedly anti-Semitic, and many of them were made by prominent Europeans.

I cited a few of them in a floor statement I gave in June 2002 in support of a resolution that I co-sponsored, condemning the growing intolerance and acts of persecution against Jews in many European countries.

The French Ambassador to the U.K. made a demeaning, scatological reference to the State of Israel, and the only "scandal" that resulted was criticism of the supposed "indiscretion" of other guests for having leaked the story to the press!

Then there was the wife of the President of the European Central Bank who after flying the PLO flag from her house in Amsterdam complained that "Israel is being kept going by those rich Jews in America."

A similar example of objectivity came from Oslo where a member of the Norwegian Nobel Committee declared that she would like to rescind Shimon Peres's Nobel Peace Prize. Needless to say, she didn't choose to mention, let alone criticize, Yasser Arafat or the suicide bombers whom he aids and abets.

Even Germany's Free Democrats, a party with a proud history of liberalism and tolerance, was shamed by one of its top officials who explained that the Deputy Director of the Central Council of Jews in Germany had brought on anti-Semitism himself by his supposedly aggressive behavior as a television talk-show host!

One must add, sadly, that this troubled individual later committed suicide, and certainly he was not typical in any way of the Free Democratic Party.

And, of course, none of the other three statements reflected the policies of the French, Dutch, or Norwegian governments. But such utterances by prominent individuals do matter greatly in setting the tone of public discussion.

Well, Mr. Chairman, in the year since the United States Senate passed the resolution in question, anti-Semitic acts—both rhetorical ones and physically violent ones—have continued.

Students in a Jewish Day School in Paris were assaulted by a gang of North African teenagers. In another incident, a rabbi, who is the leader of a liberal Jewish movement was knifed on a Paris street and his car set afire.

A Vienna rabbi was assaulted on his way home from prayer.

A Berlin man wearing a Star of David was attacked on a bus by a group of teenagers who kicked him in the face, spat on him, and shouted anti-Semitic slurs.

Jewish cemeteries have been desecrated in London, Rome, and other European cities.

Just last week a new Jewish monument in Belarus was defaced.

Yes, several European governments have responded with declarations against anti-Semitism, and a few, like France, have stiffened laws against anti-Semitic and other such violence.

EU member-states are considering a proposal to harmonize their laws against racism.

But many observers have finally dared to discuss what has long been a "dirty, little secret"—namely that the threat of violence from millions of impoverished, often unemployed Muslim men in Western Europe has, at the very least, induced governments to temper their reactions to anti-Semitism. In truth, Europe's relations with the Muslim world increasingly affect its public diplomacy.

How else can one explain the absolutely scandalous behavior of the European Union last Friday in Brussels at the meeting of the European Council, the heads of EU governments?

On the previous day at a summit meeting of the Organization of the Islamic Conference the Prime Minister of Malaysia, Mahathir Mohamad, had treated the world to one of his periodic ravings, this time about Jews.

Mahathir's comment on the most heinous crime in history, the Holocaust, was the following: "The Europeans killed six million Jews out of twelve million, but today the Jews rule the world by proxy."

He went on to enlighten the Conference about Western intellectual history, explaining that the Jews "invented socialism, communism, human rights and democracy so that persecuting them would appear to be wrong, so that they can enjoy equal rights with others."

The United States immediately and publicly condemned Mr. Mahathir's ignorant bigotry. We would expect no less from our government.

The European Union reportedly was asked to include a similar condemnation of Mahathir's speech in the lengthy "Presidency Conclusions" ending its own summit meeting last Friday. It chose not to.

The "Presidency Conclusions" offered a perfect opportunity for a condemnation, since it devoted an entire section to "External Relations."

This section included declarations on the following international topics:

- the WTO,
- a so-called "New Neighborhood Initiative,"
- the Euro-Mediterranean Partnership,
- the "Northern Dimension,"
- Moldova,
- Iraq,
- Iran,
- Kosovo,
- Bolivia,
- Guatemala,
- the Great Lakes Region of Africa, and even sections on
- the Middle East, and
- relations with the Arab world.

Mr. Chairman, it is incomprehensible to me that the EU would publicly comment on these topics but not on the vile, anti-Semitic speech in Malaysia.

French President Chirac reportedly said that it was not the EU's place to issue a condemnation. There's real moral leadership!

Mr. Chirac apparently wrote a private letter to the Malaysian Prime Minister criticizing his remarks. I doubt that many of the one billion Muslims in the world had access to this letter.

Once again, the EU had a chance to show its true moral colors, and it failed the test miserably. How could it not forthrightly speak out against such repulsive nonsense, especially given the weighty historical burden of European anti-Semitism?

Mr. Chairman, I'm not sure, but I think it exemplifies the same lack of a moral compass that the EU showed when it voted for Libya to chair the UN's Commission on Human Rights, on the pathetic grounds that the chairmanship is rotational by geographic area.

Heaven forbid that Brussels should offend the Africa Group by rejecting its candidate!

Heaven forbid that the EU should offend the Organization of the Islamic Conference by publicly repudiating Mahathir's hateful garbage!

This reluctance to speak out is not only morally indefensible; it is also self-defeating.

Anti-Semitism is to democracy as the dead canary in the cage is to coal miners: a warning of impending doom. Miners can't compromise with lethal coal gas, and democracies can't compromise with purveyors of anti-Semitism.

Mr. Chairman, I am eager to hear the testimony of our expert witnesses today.

I know Mr. Harris, Mr. Foxman, and Mr. Levin personally—and I have the highest regard for their objectivity. I met Mr. O'Donnell briefly when he was our Consul General in Frankfurt and I was enroute to the Balkans on one of my frequent trips there.

I hope these gentlemen can disabuse me of my continuing impression of European half-heartedness when it comes to battling anti-Semitism.

Thank you again, Mr. Chairman.

Senator ALLEN. The practice of this committee usually is that the Chair and the ranking member give statements. In this case, though, there are Senators who are so interested in this subject that they want to make statements. I will put into the record the statements from Senator Ben Nighthorse Campbell and Congressman Christopher Smith.

[The prepared statement of Senator Campbell follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF SENATOR BEN NIGHTHORSE CAMPBELL, CO-CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMISSION ON SECURITY AND COOPERATION

THE FIGHT AGAINST ANTI-SEMITISM CONTINUES

Mr. Chairman, as Co-Chairman of the Commission on Security and Cooperation, and the sponsor of Senate Concurrent Resolution 7, I welcome this opportunity to address anti-Semitism in the OSCE region.

Kristallnacht occurred on the night of November 9, 1938, during which Nazis systematically looted stores owned by Jews and set fire to synagogues across Germany. More than 90 Jews were killed and many thousands more arrested. This "Night of Broken Glass" was intended to be a signal to German and Austrian Jews to leave as soon as possible. It was a prelude to the horrors to come during World War II, resulting in the Holocaust.

With the anniversary of Kristallnacht approaching, today's hearing on anti-Semitism in Europe is timely, as there is still much to do in the fight against anti-Semitism. While government sponsored anti-Semitism is almost unheard of within the participating States of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE), inaction and silence by officials and elected leaders can give the impression of tacit government approval. For example, anti-Semitic incidents have been on the increase in Belarus; just recently, one of only two synagogues in the Belarusian capital was set afire for the fifth time over the past two years. It is also telling that textbooks in Belarus include no references to the significant Jewish population from that country that perished during the course of World War II. The Government of Belarus should do more to ensure protection of the Jewish community and its institutions.

Anti-Semitic graffiti is also visible in Greece, such as on the Corinth-Tripoli highway, and for the third time in 18 months, the Holocaust memorial in the Jewish cemetery in Ioannina was desecrated with slogans including "Out with the Jews" and "Death to Jews." I urge the Government of Greece to take measures to address manifestations on anti-Semitism and speak out publicly when such incidents occur and pursue those responsible for such acts.

Mr. Chairman, even when governments are proactive, reports of uncoordinated incidents continue to arise across the OSCE region, from Russia, France, Germany, to the United States. For example, vandals recently desecrated a Jewish cemetery and a memorial to concentration camp victims in two separate incidents in Germany. In one recent incident, 42 headstones in a Jewish cemetery in central Germany were spray painted with graffiti including "Heil Hitler," "Sieg Heil" and "Hass," the German word for hate. Germany has some of the toughest laws against anti-Semitic incidents in the world, yet these deeds still occurred. Our fight against anti-Semitism is obviously far from over.

On May 22, the United States Senate unanimously passed Senate Concurrent Resolution 7, a bipartisan effort to raise our collective voices in the face of growing anti-Semitism and related violence. While the tide of anti-Semitic violence may be receding, manifestations of anti-Semitism require continued action. Mr. Chairman, together with Helsinki Commission Chairman Rep. Christopher Smith, I have worked and will continue to work to monitor related developments in the OSCE region and to urge political leaders to address the anti-Semitism at home and abroad. As part of that effort, I urge the State Department to work to ensure that the upcoming OSCE Ministerial Meeting endorses the German offer to host an OSCE follow-up conference in anti-Semitism, in Berlin next April. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the full text of Senate Concurrent Resolution 7 be included in the hearing record.

Calendar No. 105

108TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

S. CON. RES. 7

Expressing the sense of Congress that the sharp escalation of anti-Semitic violence within many participating States of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) is of profound concern and efforts should be undertaken to prevent future occurrences.

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

FEBRUARY 13, 2003

Mr. CAMPBELL (for himself, Mr. SMITH, Mrs. CLINTON, Mrs. MURRAY, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. TALENT, Mr. DEWINE, Mr. VOINOVICH, Mr. BUNNING, Mr. STEVENS, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mr. BIDEN, Mr. COLEMAN, Mr. MILLER, Mr. CHAFEE, Mr. BOND, Mr. SPECTER, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mr. BROWNBACK, Mr. NICKLES, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. FEINGOLD, Mr. FITZGERALD, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mr. DORGAN, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. NELSON of Nebraska, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. ALLARD, Mr. ENSIGN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mrs. HUTCHISON, Mr. DODD, Mr. KOHL, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. KERRY, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. REED, Mr. BAYH, Mr. GRAHAM of Florida, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. NELSON of Florida, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. SANTORUM, Mr. SHELBY, and Mrs. BOXER) submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations

MAY 21, 2003

Reported by Mr. LUGAR, without amendment

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

Expressing the sense of Congress that the sharp escalation of anti-Semitic violence within many participating States of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Eu-

rope (OSCE) is of profound concern and efforts should be undertaken to prevent future occurrences.

Whereas the expressions of anti-Semitism experienced throughout the region encompassing the participating States of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) have included physical assaults, with some instances involving weapons or stones, arson of synagogues, and desecration of Jewish cultural sites, such as cemeteries and statues;

Whereas vicious propaganda and violence in many OSCE States against Jews, foreigners, and others portrayed as alien have reached alarming levels, in part due to the dangerous promotion of aggressive nationalism by political figures and others;

Whereas violence and other manifestations of xenophobia and discrimination can never be justified by political issues or international developments;

Whereas the Copenhagen Concluding Document adopted by the OSCE in 1990 was the first international agreement to condemn anti-Semitic acts, and the OSCE participating States pledged to "clearly and unequivocally condemn totalitarianism, racial and ethnic hatred, anti-Semitism, xenophobia, and discrimination against anyone as well as persecution on religious and ideological grounds";

Whereas the OSCE Parliamentary Assembly at its meeting in Berlin in July 2002, unanimously adopted a resolution that, among other things, called 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;

Whereas Decision No. 6 adopted by the OSCE Ministerial Council at its Tenth Meeting held in Porto, Portugal in December 2002 (the "Porto Ministerial Declaration") condemned "the recent increase in 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";

Whereas the Porto Ministerial Declaration also urged "the convening of separately designated human dimension events on issues addressed in this decision, including on the topics of anti-Semitism, discrimination and racism, and xenophobia"; and

Whereas on December 10, 2002, at the Washington Parliamentary Forum on Confronting and Combating anti-Semitism in the OSCE Region, representatives of the United States Congress and the German Parliament agreed to denounce all forms of anti-Semitism and agreed that "anti-Semitic bigotry must have no place in our democratic societies": Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is the sense of Congress that—

(1) officials of the executive branch and Members of Congress should raise the issue of anti-Semitism in their bilateral contacts with other countries and at multilateral fora, including meetings of the Permanent Council of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) and the Twelfth

Annual Session of the OSCE Parliamentary Assembly to be convened in July 2003;

(2) participating States of the OSCE should unequivocally condemn 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;

(3) participating States of the OSCE should ensure effective law enforcement by local and national authorities to prevent and counter criminal acts stemming from anti-Semitism, xenophobia, or racial or ethnic hatred, whether directed at individuals, communities, or property, including maintaining mechanisms for the thorough investigation and prosecution of such acts;

(4) participating States of the OSCE should promote the creation of educational efforts throughout the region encompassing the participating States of the OSCE to counter anti-Semitic stereotypes and attitudes among younger people, increase Holocaust awareness programs, and help identify the necessary resources to accomplish this goal;

(5) legislators in all OSCE participating States should play a leading role in combating anti-Semi-

tism and ensure that the resolution adopted at the 2002 meeting of the OSCE Parliamentary Assembly in Berlin is followed up by a series of concrete actions at the national level; and

(6) the OSCE should organize a separately designated human dimension event on anti-Semitism as early as possible in 2003, consistent with the Porto Ministerial Declaration adopted by the OSCE at the Tenth Meeting of the OSCE Ministerial Council in December 2002.

[The prepared statement of Representative Smith follows:]

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

Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased that the Senate Foreign Relations Committee has convened this hearing to address this reoccurring problem of anti-Semitism in Europe. This issue is of longstanding concern to both Houses of Congress, most recently demonstrated by a concurrent resolution condemning anti-Semitic violence, introduced respectively by Commission Co-Chairman Senator Ben Nighthorse Campbell and myself, which passed the House and Senate this past summer.

Unfortunately, anti-Semitic incidents continue to occur in both Europe and the United States. While there is a dearth of government statistics, according to the good research of the Anti-Defamation League, anti-Semitic incidents in the United States increased by 8 percent in 2002 over the previous year and incidents of anti-Semitism on U.S. campuses rose 24 percent. The ADL also conducted a survey which showed that in five European countries, 21 percent of the people surveyed had strongly anti-Semitic perspectives or views. The survey found that 17 percent of Americans held strong anti-Semitic views, up five percent from just five years ago.

Against this backdrop, we must redouble our efforts, both at home and abroad, to confront and combat anti-Semitic hate. At the international level, I just returned from leading a congressional delegation to Warsaw for the annual human rights meeting of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE). Serving as Vice Chairman of the U.S. Delegation and delivering the U.S. statement on the Prevention of Anti-Semitism, I made a series of recommendations on how OSCE States can fight this reoccurring phenomenon.

For example, considering that not all governments specifically track anti-Semitic acts or have specific legislation to equip law enforcement officials, all participating States were encouraged to inform OSCE's Office of Democratic Institutions and Human Rights (ODIHR) of what legislation they have in place to penalize and punish the perpetrators of anti-Semitic violence. Where statistics are available, participating States should also share that information with ODIHR and other States, and should commit to strengthening their hate-crime statutes. The U.S. Delegation also recommended that all governments ensure their education systems accurately teach about the Holocaust and work to counter anti-Semitic stereotypes and attitudes. Lastly, participating States were urged to join, if they have not already done so, 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. I hope these recommendations will be adopted at the OSCE Ministerial meeting in December.

The United States has specifically endorsed a German offer to host an OSCE conference on anti-Semitism in spring 2004. In the Germans, we have found good partners in the fight against this scourge. As was eloquently and passionately declared in Warsaw by Prof. Gert Weisskirchen, a distinguished member of the German Bundestag and a Vice-President of the OSCE Parliamentary Assembly, Germany has experienced first hand the evil of anti-Semitism, and it must not be ignored. The German offer originated at the OSCE Conference on anti-Semitism held this past June in Vienna. Along with Mayor Rudy Giuliani, I co-led the U.S. delegation to the Vienna conference. It is essential that we maintain and build upon the international momentum created by that conference. Through such tireless efforts, other OSCE participating States have stated their support for the Berlin Conference, or at least removed their stated objections to it being convened.

I should also highlight the good work of my colleagues who serve with me on the Helsinki Commission—Co-Chairman Senator Ben Nighthorse Campbell and Ranking Member Rep. Ben Cardin, in particular—in voicing concern about anti-Semitism and other human rights violations and working for real change. Our efforts to address the violent acts of anti-Semitism began in earnest in May 2002, when the Commission held a hearing to raise specific attention to the growing problem of anti-Semitic violence in the OSCE region. From that hearing a number of initiatives emerged, the details of which can be found on the Commission's Web site at www.csce.gov.

At the OSCE Parliamentary Assembly Annual Session in Berlin in July 2002, I introduced and successfully secured unanimous approval of a resolution denouncing anti-Semitism and calling for all OSCE States to do more. ADL's Abe Foxman joined us in Berlin and made a passionate presentation at a special forum co-hosted by the U.S. and German parliamentary delegations. Building upon these initiatives at

the OSCE PA, I introduced a second resolution on anti-Semitism at the Assembly's 2003 meeting in Rotterdam, which was unanimously adopted.

However, much more needs to be done if we are to realize a future free of anti-Semitic hate and acts. While some may say this endeavor can never be accomplished, many also said the Soviet Union would never fall. Together, if we stay faithful to the course, we will hopefully see an end to this age-old plague.

Mr. Chairman, for my part, I remain committed to building an international coalition of parliamentary partners committed to confronting and combating anti-Semitism in Europe.

Senator ALLEN. And with that, we will proceed in the order in which folks appeared, unless Senator Biden shows up. I'd like to have Senator Voinovich and Senator Corzine—Senator Biden has arrived——

Senator BIDEN. I would yield to whomever has been waiting.

Senator ALLEN. I'm going to go to Senator Voinovich, then you or your designee, however you want to do that.

At any rate, I want to, again, thank all our witnesses, all the interest here in this hearing, which is a very important one for individual and human rights. And one person who, for many, many years has been a strong advocate of individual rights, making sure that people, regardless of their religion or ethnicity, have equal opportunities to succeed is Senator Voinovich, first as Governor, and now as a U.S. Senator. Senator Voinovich, if you have an opening statement, we'd like to hear it.

Senator VOINOVICH. Thank you very much.

I'd like to thank Senator Lugar and Senator Allen for agreeing to convene this hearing today to examine the alarming rise of anti-Semitism in Europe and, quite frankly, the world. The issue continues to be of great concern to me, and I believe it is not only appropriate, but absolutely essential that we do all that we can to highlight this serious problem.

Though some of my colleagues may not be aware, I've had the opportunity to visit the State of Israel seven times as Mayor of Cleveland, Governor of Ohio, and as a Member of the U.S. Senate. I will always remember visiting Yad Vashem, in Jerusalem, in 1980, and again on several other visits, and the Diaspora Museum in Tel Aviv, in 1982. That experience truly brought home to me the horrors of the holocaust and the role that anti-Semitism played in leading to the holocaust.

Frankly, I never thought I would see it again in my lifetime. Unfortunately, anti-Semitism's deadly, ugly head is rising again, and we're determined to do everything that we can to stop it.

We are reminded of the urgency and timeliness of this discussion following the unsettling remarks made last Thursday by the outgoing Prime Minister of Malaysia, Mohamad Mahathir. In a speech to the organization of the Islamic Conference, the outgoing Prime Minister said, quote, "1.3 billion Muslims cannot be defeated by a few million Jews. There must be a way." Further, he said, "The Jews rule this world by proxy," end of quote.

Such statements do nothing to promote the virtues of tolerance and understanding as we look to achieve a lasting peace in the Middle East, but only serve to further hatred and mistrust. The United States and our allies in Europe and other parts of the world must strongly condemn such remarks.

As our witnesses will testify today, these remarks were not made in a vacuum. There is a very real and growing problem, and it is imperative that we take action to stop this disturbing trend.

As many of my colleagues are aware, we have seen growing reports of anti-Semitic incidents in countries that have traditionally been among Europe's strong democracies, including France and Germany. These reports—and Senator Allen has done a pretty good job of characterizing what's going on—are very troubling to me, and it's imperative that we do all that we can to take action to combat this problem, both at home and overseas.

In June, former New York City Mayor Giuliani led the U.S. delegation to the first conference of the Organization of Security and Cooperation in Europe, the OSCE, dedicated solely to the issue of anti-Semitism. The conference took place in Vienna, Austria, during the period of June 19 and 20, bringing together parliamentarians, officials, and private citizens from all 55 OSCE participating states.

As a member of the Helsinki Commission during the 107th Congress, I strongly encouraged the State Department to make this conference a priority of the U.S. Government. Last October, many of my colleagues joined me in a letter to Secretary of State Colin Powell, urging him to call on the OSCE to schedule this meeting. With the support of Secretary Powell, Under Secretary of State Marc Grossman, and our Ambassador to the OSCE, Stephan Minikes, I was very pleased that the current chair in office of the OSCE did, in fact, agree to put this meeting on the calendar. It is an important step, I believe, in the right direction.

Efforts to highlight this alarming trend began in earnest last year. In May of 2002, the Helsinki Commission conducted a hearing to examine reports of increased anti-Semitism. During that hearing, I called on the OSCE to conduct a separate session on anti-Semitism during the annual meeting of the OSCE parliamentary assembly in Berlin, in July of 2002. I was pleased that they did this—in fact, it did take place. Delegates to the meeting also unanimously passed a resolution calling attention to the danger of anti-Semitism. The conference held last June in Vienna was a product of much work done during the past year.

As we discuss this issue, I could not agree more with the statement made by Mayor Giuliani just before he left for the Vienna Conference, in which he remarked, "The conference represents a critical step for Europeans who have too frequently dismissed anti-Semitic violence as routine assaults and vandalism. Anti-Semitism is anything but routine. When people attack Jews, vandalize their graves, characterize them in inhuman ways, and make salacious statements in parliaments or to the press, they are attacking the defining values of our societies and our international institutions."

While we are headed down the right path, I think it's critical that we take action to followup on that successful beginning found at the conference in Vienna. OSCE participating states began to discuss recommendations for action at the Human Dimension implementation meetings in Warsaw, Poland, last week. Additionally, a followup conference dedicated to the subject of anti-Semitism has been proposed to take place in Berlin in April.

I believe that we should not only encourage this meeting, but rather we must insist upon it. I'm hopeful that the United States will work with the OSCE to set a date for this important meeting now. Too often there is lots of talk, but no action. We must establish a commitment to action that can be monitored.

As Governor, I used to say that if you can't measure it, then it's not worth a darn, and I am hopeful that we will be able to really see sound progress in this area.

In July, I wrote to those individuals who joined Mayor Giuliani as members of the U.S. delegation to the Vienna Conference, including Abe Foxman and Mark Levin, who are with us today, asking them for recommendations for action, things that can be done to encourage tangible steps rather than just dialog. I am hopeful that they will share some of their thoughts with us today. Specifically, I'm interested in their ideas in how action by OSCE participating states can be monitored and assessed and how we might recognize those countries that have made progress, and call on others to redouble their efforts in this regard. I understand that this is going to take careful planning and coordination. It will also involve adequate resources in order to get the job done.

In order to further encourage U.S. attention to this issue, during the Senate consideration of the State Department Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004, I introduced an amendment that would require the State Department to include in its annual report on international religious freedom a section devoted to the subject of anti-Semitism. I was pleased the Senate agreed to this measure on the 10th of July. This amendment aims to ensure that the U.S. Government pays close attention to the issue of anti-Semitism internationally, with the hope it will encourage our friends, allies, and partners abroad to do the same thing.

As we continue to examine action that the United States can take in order to combat anti-Semitism abroad, I would like to join Senator Allen in welcoming our distinguished panel of witnesses today.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for this opportunity to make this opening statement, and the remainder of my remarks I'd like to have entered into the record.

Senator ALLEN. They will be, and thank you for your very strong statement and leadership.

[The prepared statement of Senator Voinovich follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF SENATOR GEORGE V. VOINOVICH

I would like to thank Senator Lugar and Senator Allen for agreeing to convene this hearing today to examine the alarming rise of anti-Semitism in Europe and, quite frankly, the world. This issue continues to be of great concern to me, and I believe it is not only appropriate but absolutely essential that we do all that we can to highlight this serious problem.

Though some of my colleagues might not be aware, I have had the opportunity to visit the State of Israel seven times, as Mayor of Cleveland, Governor of Ohio, and a member of the Senate. I will always remember visiting Yad Vashem in Jerusalem in 1980, and again on several other visits, and the Diaspora Museum in Tel Aviv in 1982. That experience truly brought home to me the horrors of the Holocaust, and the role that anti-Semitism played in leading to the Holocaust. I never thought that I could see it again in my lifetime. I vowed that I would do everything in my power to make sure that it would never happen again. Unfortunately, anti-Semitism's deadly, ugly head is rising again, and I am determined to do everything that I can to stop it.

We are reminded of the urgency and timeliness of this discussion following the unsettling remarks made last Thursday by the outgoing Prime Minister of Malaysia [Mohamad Mahathir]. In a speech to the Organization of the Islamic Conference, the outgoing prime minister said that, "1.3 billion Muslims cannot be defeated by a few million Jews. There must be a way." Further, he said, "the Jews rule this world by proxy."

Such statements do nothing to promote the virtues of tolerance and understanding as we look to achieve a lasting peace in the Middle East, but only serve to further hatred and mistrust. The United States and our allies in Europe and other parts of the world must strongly condemn such remarks.

As our witnesses will testify today, these remarks were not made in a vacuum. There is a very real and growing problem, and it is imperative that we take action to stop this disturbing trend dead in its tracks.

As many of my colleagues are aware, we have seen growing reports of anti-Semitic incidents in countries that have traditionally been among Europe's strongest democracies, including France and Germany. These reports are very troubling to me, and it is imperative that we do all that we can to take action to combat this problem, both at home and overseas.

In June, former New York City Mayor Rudy Giuliani led the U.S. delegation to the first conference of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) dedicated solely to the issue of anti-Semitism. The conference took place in Vienna, Austria during the period of June 19-20, 2003, bringing together parliamentarians, officials and private citizens from all 55 OSCE participating states.

As a member of the Helsinki Commission during the 107th Congress, I strongly encouraged the State Department to make this conference a priority of the U.S. Government. Last October, a number of my colleagues joined me in a letter to Secretary of State Colin Powell urging him to call on the OSCE to schedule this meeting. With the support of Secretary Powell, Under Secretary of State Marc Grossman and our Ambassador to the OSCE, Stephan Minikes, I was very pleased that the chair-in-office of the OSCE did in fact agree to put this meeting on the calendar. It is an important step in the right direction.

Efforts to highlight this alarming trend began in earnest last year. In May 2002, the Helsinki Commission conducted a hearing to examine reports of increased anti-Semitism. During that hearing, I called on the OSCE to conduct a separate session on anti-Semitism during the annual meeting of the OSCE Parliamentary Assembly in Berlin in July 2002. I was pleased that this did, in fact, take place. Delegates to the meeting also unanimously passed a resolution calling attention to the danger of anti-Semitism, which I cosponsored. The conference held last June in Vienna was a product of much of the work done during the past year.

As we discuss this issue, I could not agree more with a statement made by Mayor Giuliani just before he left for the Vienna Conference, in which he remarked, "The conference represents a critical first step for Europeans, who have too frequently dismissed anti-Semitic violence as routine assaults and vandalism. Anti-Semitism is anything but routine. When people attack Jews, vandalize their graves, characterize them in inhumane ways, and make salacious statements in parliaments or to the press, they are attacking the defining values of our societies and our international institutions."

While we are headed down the right path, it is critical that we take action to follow up on the successful beginning found at the conference in Vienna. OSCE participating states began to discuss recommendations for action at the Human Dimension Implementation Meetings in Warsaw, Poland last week. Additionally, a follow-up conference dedicated to the subject of anti-Semitism has been proposed to take place in Berlin next April. I believe that we should not only encourage this meeting; rather, we must insist upon it. I am hopeful that the United States will work with the OSCE to set a date for this important meeting now. Too often, there is lots of talk, but no action. We must establish a commitment to action that can be monitored. As Governor, I used to say that if it cannot be measured, then it's not worth a darn, and I am hopeful that we will be able to really see some progress in this area.

In July, I wrote to those individuals who joined Mayor Giuliani as members of the U.S. delegation to the Vienna Conference, including Abe Foxman and Mark Levin, who are with us this afternoon, asking them for recommendations for action—things that can be done to encourage tangible steps, rather than just dialog. I am hopeful that they will share some of their thoughts with us today. Specifically, I am interested in their ideas on how action by OSCE participating states can be monitored and assessed, and how we might recognize those countries that have made progress and call on others to redouble their efforts in this regard. I understand that this will take careful planning and coordination. It will also involve adequate resources in order to get the job done.

In order to further encourage U.S. attention to this issue, during Senate consideration of the State Department Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004, I introduced an amendment that would require the State Department to include in its annual report on International Religious Freedom a section devoted to the subject of anti-Semitism. I was pleased that the Senate agreed to this measure on July 10, 2003.

This amendment aims to ensure that the United States government pays close attention to the issue of anti-Semitism internationally, with the hope that it will encourage our friends, allies and partners abroad to do the same.

As we continue to examine action that the United States can take in order to combat anti-Semitism abroad, I would like to join Senator Allen in welcoming two distinguished panels of witnesses who will testify this afternoon: First, Ed O'Donnell, who succeeds Ambassador Randy Bell as Special Envoy for Holocaust Issues at the U.S. Department of State.

I look forward to his testimony regarding the efforts of the United States Government to combat anti-Semitism abroad. As I have said before, I believe that we need a strategic plan with regard to our efforts to tackle this problem, and I am hopeful that he will provide some insight with regard to the State Department's agenda on this critical issue.

Our second panel includes three distinguished witnesses who are actively engaged in efforts to combat anti-Semitism:

- *Abraham Foxman,* who serves as National Director of the Anti-Defamation League (ADL). Abe has been a leader in efforts to promote tolerance and awareness of the perils of anti-Semitism. He testified at an OSCE meeting in Berlin in July 2002, with regard to this issue, and joined Mayor Giuliani at the Vienna Conference this June. This month, he has released a book on the subject [entitled, "Never Again?: The Threat of the New Anti-Semitism"];
- *David Harris,* who is Executive Director of the American Jewish Committee. The American Jewish Committee has also been actively engaged on this issue, and I am glad that David is able to join us; and
- *Mark Levin,* who serves as Executive Director of the National Conference on Soviet Jewry (NCSJ). I have had the opportunity to work with Mark on this issue extensively during the last year. Mark testified before the Helsinki Commission on this subject in May 2002, and he also served as a member of the U.S. delegation to the Vienna Conference in June.

I sincerely appreciate your time and willingness to be here today, and I look forward to your testimony.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Senator ALLEN. Before I turn it over, I should have said, the other testimony that will be put in the record is that of Congressman Christopher Smith, will be included in the record.

With that, I'd now like to turn it over—he is deferring to you, the Senator from New Jersey, Senator Corzine.

Senator CORZINE. Thank you, Senator Allen. And thank you, Ranking Member Biden. It's hard to be deferred to by the senior Senator from Delaware. He is such an important voice for reason and responsibility in our foreign affairs. I feel like stepping aside.

I have a formal presentation I will put in the record, but I would like to make some comments that are suggestive of what I have put in a formal context.

I appreciate very much your holding this hearing. This is an issue that should be near to each of us, and it is a requirement that the United States exercise extraordinary leadership, I think, in pushing back against the anti-Semitism we see in Europe and around the globe. I think it is our most moral responsibility to do so. And I actually think that the tone that we set as a nation is one that, as the sole superpower, really does set the tone globally, and this sense of intolerance that's reflected in the litany of circumstances that you, Mr. Chairman, identified happening in Europe, intolerable, and the rise of anti-Semitic incidence is truly a

tragedy, particularly in light of the horrific experiences of the last century that we've all dealt with. And I think the historical lessons should be obvious, and it is only right that we both speak out, but, as Senator Voinovich says, we need to look for real practical actions, as opposed to just talk.

In that vein, I think the recent comments by the Prime Minister of Malaysia, departing Prime Minister, bespeak of the seriousness and the breadth with which anti-Semitic views are held in this world, and it is absolutely imperative that we speak to these issues, both quickly and forcefully. Frankly, I'm not clear why one would even meet with Prime Minister Mahathir after such ugly and, I think, horrific reminders of what anti-Semitism can be in this world.

I'm proud, along with a bipartisan group of Senators, to have introduced—last Friday, actually—actually, Thursday night—Friday night, excuse me—Senate Resolution 247 introduced by my senior colleague from New Jersey, Frank Lautenberg, condemning Mr. Mahathir's statement. Without direct and, I think, forceful responses, I think we are not pushing back from the kind of hatred and intolerance that is reflected here. And it's certainly what we are trying to address in a European context in today's hearing, but this is a global problem. This is not just a European problem. It is one that deserves the utmost focus and attention, and I appreciate your holding this hearing. I hope that we do more than hear facts, that we move forward. And I thank all of the witnesses for being here today.

Thank you.

[The prepared statement of Senator Corzine follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF SENATOR JON S. CORZINE

Thank you Mr. Chairman for having called this meeting of your subcommittee on the vital topic of anti-Semitism in Europe, and for your courtesy in affording me this opportunity.

There is no international issue on which decisive and sustained U.S. leadership is more necessary than that of anti-Semitism, in Europe and throughout the world. Your work on keeping this very fundamental moral and policy concern before the eyes of the world community has never been more appreciated or more important than it is now, and I want to thank you for your leadership in this regard.

The tone and example the United States sets in responding to anti-Semitism is vital. In responding to anti-Semitism and to every other form of ethnic, racial, religious or national hatred or intolerance, the U.S. must setting for itself a high standard of tolerance, mutual respect and civil discourse. The world community's aspiring to such a standard, of civilized discourse, will go far in enabling the world community to resolve its disputes and disagreements though discourse rather than through force or intimidation.

With respect to anti-Semitism in Europe, it is widely recognized that this very old and ugly phenomenon is once again on the rise, in the very seat of western civilization. One would have thought that the horrendous collective experiences of Europe in the mid-20th century would have branded indelibly on the collective minds of all Europeans, and of the entire world, the horrible cost and of anti-Semitism.

But apparently that is not the case.

Instead, Mr. Chairman, we see a pattern since 2000 of accelerating hatred and violence. Something over half of all anti-Semitic incidents recorded since 2000 occur in Europe—acts of violence against people and property, acts of desecration against cemeteries and community landmarks—as with the Holocaust itself, we are able to document in great detail the legacy of continuing hatred and intolerance, but still the hatred continues.

There are historical lessons all of us should have learned long ago—that virulent and deliberate propagation of racial and ethnic hatred, of which anti-Semitism is

an especially prominent and repugnant example—is incompatible with responsible political discourse or leadership.

I therefore want to register my very serious concern that our President chose not to speak out more forcefully and more quickly on the matter than he did in response to the Malaysian Prime Minister's repugnant and virulently anti-Semitic remarks last Thursday at the Islamic Conference in Putrajaya, Malaysia. Mr. Mahathir's statement reflected much of what is most reprehensible and poisonous in Muslim-Jewish relations today.

For the record I have co-sponsored together with many many other members of this body a bipartisan resolution (S.Res. 247) condemning Mr. Mahathir's statement.

I am very pleased that President Bush eventually did call Prime Minister Mahathir out on this; when they met in Bangkok on Monday, Mr. Bush said Mr. Mahathir's words had been "wrong and divisive" and that the speech stood against everything in which Mr. Bush believes. But, Mr. Chairman, it should not have taken four days—four days of U.S. silence while other western leaders were lining up to speak out forcefully against Mr. Mahathir's hateful words.

My fear is that this delay may have been read by Mr. Mahathir and some of those leaders who stood and applauded his words as a kind of permission—a deliberate softening of the U.S. response—it may have been seen as a signal that world leaders, when they are cooperative with us in other policy areas, when they win the labels "moderate" or "practical" that they are free in other spheres to indulge and to nurture reactionary and hateful forces within their own countries or within the Islamic world when that suits them.

Mr. Mahathir's reaction was to say that he had been taken out of context—he then pointed to the world's outraged reaction as somehow justifying his original anti-Semitic charges.

Mr. Chairman, responsible world leadership does not take hateful speech, and incitement to religious and ethnic strife lightly—responsible leadership reacts, condemns and corrects swiftly and in the strongest terms.

Thank you very much Mr. Chairman.

Senator ALLEN. Thank you for your statement, Senator Corzine.

And this is more than in Europe, although I'm only Chairman of the European Affairs Subcommittee, and it does get into Russia as part of Europe, and it does shed light on it internationally. We do have good relations with European countries, who should share and certainly are most familiar with the deplorable atrocities of the genocide based on religious intolerance and anti-Semitism. So that's why the European Affairs Subcommittee focuses on Europe. But clearly it's anti-Semitism not just focused on Europe. It also examines what we can do in our country, as well. And thank you for your good statement.

Senator Coleman, do you have any remarks that want to share with us?

Senator COLEMAN. Very briefly, Mr. Chairman.

I want to thank you, again, thank you for holding this hearing. It is important. I want to associate myself with the comments of all my colleagues here, on both sides of the aisle.

This is a worldwide problem. It is one that is certainly, I think, being fueled by what is taught in many of the religious schools in the Arab world that has to be addressed. It is a problem that's rearing its ugly head in American campuses, American universities, and we have to address that at some point in time. I'm certainly pleased that you've taken the lead today here in this setting to address this problem. It's a part of a larger overall picture that has to be dealt with, but I want to thank you again for your leadership in helping us deal with it today.

Senator ALLEN. Thank you, Senator Coleman.

Senator Biden, my colleague, ranking member.

Senator BIDEN. Thank you very much.

I was very interested to hear the statements of my colleagues, and I want to thank you for holding this hearing. Some suggested to me, you know, why are we holding this hearing? How are we going to legislate values in Europe? Well, we're not. Justice Holmes once said that sunlight is the best disinfectant, but one of the problems throughout modern European history has been that we have not shed sunlight on this as often as we should. So I don't think this is an exercise, merely allowing us to vent our frustrations.

I also want to thank Senator Corzine for his deep and unabiding commitment to fighting bigotry wherever he finds it. I've had a chance to work with Governor Voinovich in the Balkans, and I've found that even when it has not been in his immediate political interest—because we all have constituencies, my State included—Serb, Croat, et cetera—I've watched this man unabashedly speak out, whenever there was a disregard for human rights or basic decency.

When they used to talk about Frank Sinatra they would say, "this is a great young singer," and he'd say, "Tell me where he is 30 years from now." Well, this is a guy who has been absolutely consistent and unrelenting on these issues, and I want to pay public acknowledgment to that. We've been in meetings where it has not been easy to expose the prejudice that exists in some parts of the Balkans, but he did it. I just want to acknowledge that.

Mr. Chairman, I wish, as we all do, we didn't have to hold this hearing, but I'm not naive. Anti-Semitism has been a disgusting aspect of European and world history for nearly two millennia now. And this committee has held many hearings on this distasteful topic, as far back as the summer of 1994, for example, in the good old days when I was chairman of this committee—and I'm pleased to serve under my friend here. We held a series of hearings on right-wing movements in Europe, which differed from each other in many respects, but had one common thread to them, and that was that old virulent anti-Semitism. And it goes without saying that one can oppose certain policies of the State of Israel, and I do that as well, occasionally, without being anti-Semitic. On the other hand, anti-Semites regularly try to conflate the two issues, and, moreover, often distort Israel's actions in the process.

In April 2000, we got a very vivid picture—this is by way of reminder—a very vivid picture of this tactic. In response to the first wave of suicide bombings against civilians in late March 2002 and early April of that same year, the Israeli army went after terrorists in a refugee camp in Jenin. The European news media and a lot of the American news media, but the European news media, in particular with very few exceptions, bought the line, without any proof, hook, line, and sinker, that the Palestinians had put forward, which was that there was a massacre of between seven- and eight-hundred women, men, and children in this camp, by the Israelis. And I sat in this dais and said I did not believe it, and got absolutely blistered for saying there was no proof yet of that being the case.

Then in response to a petition by Arab members of the Knesset, in Israel, the Israeli Government allowed international observers into the camp. I argued they should have allowed them in immediately, but it was only at this point that they finally allowed them

in. And these international observers found that 52 people had died, and that 33 of them were armed and terrorists. Of course, the anti-Semites of the world, particularly in Europe, didn't want to be bothered by these facts. And a really sick stream of vituperative expression came spewing forth all over the continent, with over-the-top language that went far beyond criticism of Israel's actions, which as I said, had been completely misrepresented by the international press. These statements were blatantly and unabashedly anti-Semitic, and many of them were made by prominent Europeans.

I cited a few of them in a floor statement I gave in June 2002 in support of a resolution that we voted for condemning the growing intolerance and acts of persecution against Jews in many European countries. The French Ambassador to the U.K. made a demeaning scatological reference to the State of Israel, and the only scandal that resulted was criticism of a supposed indiscretion on the part of other guests who were there when he made those scatological references, for having leaked the story to the press. The people who leaked the story were criticized, not the comments criticized.

And then there was the wife of the president of the European Central Bank, who, after flying the PLO flag from her house in Amsterdam, complained, and I quote, "Israel is being kept going by those rich Jews in America," end of quote.

A similar example of objectivity came from Oslo, where a member of the Norwegian Nobel Committee declared that she would like to rescind Shimon Peres's Nobel prize. Needless to say, she didn't choose to mention, let alone, criticize Yasser Arafat or the suicide bombers, whom he aids and abets.

Even Germany's Free Democrats, a party with a proud history of liberalism and tolerance, was shamed by one of its top officials when that official exclaimed that the deputy director of the Central Council of Jews in Germany had brought on anti-Semitism himself by his supposedly aggressive behavior as a television talk-show host—blame the victim. One must add, sadly, that that troubled individual later committed suicide and certainly he was not typical of the Free Democratic Party.

And, of course none of these three I mentioned reflect the policies either of the French, German, Dutch, or Norwegian Governments. But such utterances by prominent individuals, no matter who they are, are greatly unsettling, and don't do much for intelligent public dialog at a time when there's a lot of disagreement over substantive issues relating to the Middle East.

Well, Mr. Chairman, in the year since the U.S. Senate passed the resolution in question, the anti-Semitic acts, both rhetorical ones and physical violent ones have continued. Students in a Jewish day school in Paris were assaulted by a gang of North African teenagers. In another incident, a rabbi, who was a leader of a liberal Jewish movement, was knifed in a Paris street, and his car set afire. A Vienna rabbi was assaulted on his way home from prayer. A Berlin man wearing a Star of David was attacked on a bus by a group of teenagers, who kicked him in the face, spat upon him, and shouted anti-Semitic slurs. Jewish cemeteries have been dese-

crated in London, Rome, and other European cities. And just last week, the new Jewish monument in Belarus was defaced.

Yes, several European governments have responded with declarations against anti-Semitism, and a few, like France, have stiffened laws against anti-Semitic behavior and such violence. And I don't mean to say that we don't have similar individual acts that occur here. But I dare say there's never been one that's occurred where there hasn't been immediate, instant condemnation by all stripes of all parties and all government officials.

U.N. member states are considering a proposal to harmonize their laws against racism. But many observers have finally dared to discuss what has long been a "dirty little secret," namely that the threat of violence for millions of impoverished, ill-treated, in many cases, and often unemployed Muslim men in Western Europe has, at the very least, induced governments to temper their reactions to anti-Semitism. In truth, Europe's relations with the Muslim world increasingly affect its public diplomacy. How else can one explain the absolutely scandalous behavior of the European Union last Friday in Brussels at a meeting of the European Council, the heads of the EU governments? On the previous day, at a summit meeting of the Organization of the Islamic Conference, as has been mentioned by two of my colleagues and I will not repeat, the Malaysian Prime Minister had treated the world to one of his periodic ravings, this time about Jews. And I will not repeat what he said, but he went on to say—beyond what was quoted here, in order to enlighten the conferees about Western intellectual history "that Jews invented socialism, communism, human rights, and democracy so that persecuting them would appear to be wrong, so that they can enjoy equal rights with others."

The United States immediately and publicly condemned the Prime Minister's ignorant bigotry. We would expect no less from our government. The European Union reportedly was asked to include a similar condemnation of the Prime Minister's speech in the lengthy Presidency Conclusions, ending its own summit meeting last Friday. It chose not to. The Presidency Conclusions—and I will conclude myself in a moment—offered a perfect opportunity for a condemnation, since it devoted an entire section to "External Relations." That section included 13 specific references, which I will not go through, from the WTO to Moldova to Iran, Iraq, Kosovo, et cetera. But there was no room for the condemnation of Mahathir's statement. Mr. Chairman, it's incomprehensible to me that the EU would publicly comment on these topics, but not on the vile anti-Semitic speech in Malaysia.

French President Chirac reportedly said—and I emphasize "reportedly," I don't know for a fact—that it was not the EU's place to issue condemnation. Now, there's real moral leadership. Mr. Chirac apparently wrote a private letter to the Prime Minister criticizing the remarks. But I doubt that many of the one billion Muslims in the world had access to that letter.

Once again, the EU had a its chance to show its true moral colors, and I think it's failed the test miserably. How could it not forthrightly speak out against such repulsive nonsense, especially given the weighty historical burden of European anti-Semitism?

This reluctance to speak out is not only morally indefensible, I think it's also self-defeating. Anti-Semitism is to democracy as a dead canary in a cage is to a coal miner, a warning, a warning of impending doom. Miners can't compromise with lethal coal gases, and democracies cannot compromise with purveyors of anti-Semitism.

We have a very distinguished panel here, Mr. Chairman, all of whom I know. And I hope these gentlemen can disabuse me of my continuing impression of European half-heartedness when it comes to battling anti-Semitism.

And, again, I thank you for holding the hearing, and apologize for the length of my statement and for my cold.

I yield the floor.

Senator ALLEN. Thank you, Senator Biden, for your always interesting and cogent remarks and your experience and strong stand. We very much appreciate you coming—we hardly recognize your cold.

At any rate, now we're going to go forward with our panel. Our first panel is one individual, Ed O'Donnell. He's the Ambassador-Designate and Special Envoy for the Office of Holocaust Issues at the Department of State. Prior to his present post, Mr. O'Donnell was the Director of the Department of State Liaison Office to the U.S. House of Representatives. He previously served as principal officer or Counsel General at the U.S. Consulate in Frankfurt, Germany.

We hope to hear the administration position on anti-Semitism in Europe and any policies or programs in place to combat this program.

Mr. O'Donnell, if you're ready, we'd be pleased to hear from you.

STATEMENT OF EDWARD B. O'DONNELL, JR., AMBASSADOR-DESIGNATE, SPECIAL ENVOY FOR HOLOCAUST ISSUES, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF STATE, WASHINGTON, DC

Mr. O'DONNELL. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee. I appreciate the invitation to speak to you today on anti-Semitism in Europe.

As the new Special Envoy for Holocaust Issues with less than 1 month on the job, I would like to express, in my first public statement, my appreciation to President Bush and Secretary Powell for selecting me for this position. Like my predecessors, I'm honored to be able to assist in bringing a measure of help and justice to Holocaust victims and their families. Professionally and personally, I also commit to doing my part to contribute to fighting anti-Semitism in Europe.

This hearing is an important part of our joint efforts between Congress and the administration to call attention to the problem of anti-Semitism and to seek practical solutions, working together with Europeans who also are deeply troubled by incidents of anti-Semitism throughout Europe.

My objective today is to state the U.S. administration policy, describe what we're doing with our neighbors across the Atlantic, and outline some practical steps to combat anti-Semitism.

We have made progress in the past year, and we can be pleased that it appears there has been some decrease in anti-Semitic vio-

lence that surged in parts of Europe in 2002. This does not mean that we can relax and direct our energies elsewhere. We need to redouble our efforts, we need to develop creative approaches to promoting respect for all persons and religions and to promote understanding toward Jewish communities in Europe.

The U.S. Government firmly believes that anti-Semitism is an insidious and continuing phenomenon that undermines basic values of democracy, tolerance, mutual understanding, and individual rights and freedoms. President Bush, on May 31 of this year, in Auschwitz, said, "This site is a sobering reminder that when we find anti-Semitism, whether it be in Europe or anywhere else, mankind must come together to fight such dark impulses."

I'd also like to quote Representative Christopher Smith last week in Warsaw. He said, "The United States also calls for ministerial language urging all elected leaders and government authorities to denounce acts of anti-Semitism when they occur, as well as seek vigorous investigations and prosecutions. While strong law enforcement is needed, education of youth is equally important."

What we are doing with our European allies is through the OSCE, and the U.S. has played a very strong leadership role in urging the OSCE to focus on the threat of anti-Semitism and to develop practical measures.

Mayor Giuliani, in Vienna, last June, and our delegation, presented ideas such as: compile and regularly evaluate hate-crime statistics in a uniform fashion; encourage all participating states to pass hate-related criminal legislation; set up educational programs in participating states about anti-Semitism; and remember the Holocaust accurately; and resist Holocaust revisionists.

The June meeting showed that OSCE could mobilize for what will be a long-term sustained effort to combat anti-Semitism. The U.S. administration undertook a major successful political push to build consensus for this meeting. As a result, the first time anti-Semitism was recognized as a human rights issue, and awareness was significantly raised.

Since June, the U.S. administration has remained active. On October 14, last week, in Warsaw, at the OSCE Human Dimension implementation meeting—this is Europe's largest human rights and democratization meeting—the U.S. delegation continued to push for concrete strategies dealing with anti-Semitism.

What did we achieve? With the European Union, we won support to hold a follow-on Berlin Conference on Anti-Semitism, to be held in Berlin at the end of April 2004. We need to build OSCE-wide consensus for the formal decision of the Foreign Ministers, but we're confident that that agreement will come and we will be able to proceed to the Berlin meeting.

By the Berlin meeting, we hope that the OSCE will have moved from holding meetings on the subject of combating anti-Semitism to have fully integrated it into the work of the OSCE. For example, we see the Office of Democratic Institutions and Human Rights, ODIHR, as a central part of collecting and analyzing hate-crime statistics by OSCE participating states.

We have seen positive developments in European organizations. The Council of Europe, for example, has established cooperation on Holocaust education, including creation of an official annual Holo-

caust Remembrance Day. The NATO organization now encourages aspirant countries to deal with anti-Semitism, racism, and xenophobia in their membership action plans. The NATO Parliamentary Assembly, in its own survey about aspirant countries, included information about the fight against anti-Semitism and related issues.

I also, Mr. Chairman, want to note the work of the U.S. Embassies and Consulates in Europe, which have been very active bilaterally. Ambassadors speak out against anti-Semitism and encourage prompt law-enforcement action by host nations against criminal conduct. Our diplomatic officials know local Jewish community leaders. They know local officials and law-enforcement authorities. We monitor incidents and we express our concerns very directly.

We also provide information that goes into the annual report on international religious freedom and annual country reports on human rights practices. Moreover, our public-affairs sections in Europe have important programs to foster religious respect, which counter anti-Semitism.

We believe the bedrock of efforts to fight anti-Semitism is education. The administration's efforts to prevent future anti-Semitism in Europe centers on our programs to educate the next generation of Europeans about the truth of the Holocaust and the lessons from history.

Secretary Powell, in April, in the Capitol rotunda, said, "Teaching new generations about the Holocaust . . . is an affirmation of our common humanity." The primary vehicle for education we use is the Task Force for International Cooperation on Holocaust Education Remembrance and Research. This was formed at the initiative of Sweden. The U.S., the U.K., and Sweden were the initial founding members. This, today, is a 15-member country, and we have important NGOs and also the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum in Washington and Yad Vashem in Israel as a part of our work. There are eight countries that have developed liaison projects with us. The members of this task force pledge to promote education, remembrance, and research, to open archives, and encourage an annual Holocaust Remembrance Day. Currently, the United States is in the chair. We plan a plenary for December 1st through 3rd. This follows on the meeting in May, and we will review applications and also new members.

This task force has projects that are small, but the impact is large. The priority is teacher training for engaging the intellectual curiosity of teachers and students. The average project is $13,500 and includes projects such as visits to concentration and extermination camps, funds for historical commissions to document the Holocaust, and translation of scholarly books and articles.

I have one, Mr. Chairman, today, a book that is titled, "Tell Ye Your Children," which is being distributed through our programs, and we will be translating this into languages in Eastern Europe. It's by a scholar, Paul Levine, and it's been very effective, we feel.

I'd also like to quote a letter we received from a Romanian teacher. She said, "The visit to the concentration camp of Auschwitz was the most emotive experience of my life. When I returned to my school in Romania, I told the students of the visit and the Holocaust. The students were completely silent, breathless. One girl

asked, 'How could this happen in the 20th century?' In fact, a few days later, a parent asked me for information to read about the Holocaust." This is the kind of effect we're looking for.

I also want to mention the work that we are able to do through the German Foundation, the German Foundation for Responsibility, Remembrance, and the Future, which was established as a means of justice to former slave and forced laborers, and has one aspect of it, the Future Fund, that is forward-looking. Of the approximately $5 billion by the Foundation, $350 million is allocated for specific projects about the Holocaust, education, tolerance, and social justice. Just to mention a few of the projects that are being funded under this Future Fund is a face-to-face meeting between survivors and young people. In some cases, in another project, this includes young people assisting elderly survivors with shopping and daily activities, and, by doing so, learning of their experiences during the Holocaust.

The U.S. Government also funds Holocaust Awareness Grants through our SEED Democracy Commission. We have about $100,000 in the Baltics that's been targeted; and also, in Russia, we have projects, one of which is 20 seminars for teachers and young people, and also the production of two brochures about the dangers of spreading neo-Nazi and racist views.

For the future, our strategy in Europe, Mr. Chairman, is to work intensively, both bilaterally and through multilateral institutions, such as the OSCE, to develop effective, practical ways of combating anti-Semitism, particularly anti-Semitic violence. Our work is not done. The first goal is to make sure the Berlin Conference is approved at Maastricht and is a success in April, resulting in concrete measures such as the creation of a centralized data base within the OSCE to monitor anti-Semitic incidents.

We also will continue our address of efforts at Holocaust education through the task force and the German fund and bilateral programs through our embassies. We will cooperate closely with Congress, the U.S. Helsinki Commission, and non-governmental institutions. We all have important roles to play.

Mr. Chairman, let me thank you again for the invitation to speak to you today, and I look forward to your questions.

[The prepared statement of Mr. O'Donnell follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF EDWARD B. O'DONNELL, JR., SPECIAL ENVOY FOR HOLOCAUST ISSUES, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF STATE

INTRODUCTION

Mr. Chairman, Members of the Committee, Senators, ladies and gentlemen, thank you for the invitation to address the European Affairs Subcommittee on "Anti-Semitism in Europe." As the new Special Envoy for Holocaust Issues, with less than one month on the job, I would like to express in this, my first public statement, my sincere appreciation to President Bush and Secretary Powell for having selected me for this position. I have been involved in various capacities with Holocaust issues during my career as a Foreign Service Officer. Like my predecessors in this position, I am honored to be able to assist in bringing a measure of justice to Holocaust victims and their families. Professionally and personally, I also commit to doing my utmost to contribute to fighting anti-Semitism in Europe and elsewhere.

This hearing is an important part of the joint effort between Congress and the Administration to call attention to the problem of anti-Semitism and to seek practical solutions, working together with the Europeans who also are deeply troubled by incidents of anti-Semitism throughout Europe. The United States is involved because of our enduring commitment to respect for all religions; and we also care

deeply because we are not immune in our own country from hate crimes and intolerance.

My objective in this testimony is to state U.S. Administration policy, describe what we are doing with our neighbors across the Atlantic, and outline several areas where we are working on practical steps to combat anti-Semitism. We have made progress in the past year, and we can be pleased that it appears there has been some decrease in anti-Semitic acts that surged in parts of Europe in 2002. However, this does not mean that we can relax and direct our energies elsewhere. Every incident of hate-related crime is tragic and should be denounced, be it graffiti on a cemetery headstone, an arson attack on a synagogue or a physical attack against an individual. There is still much work to be done. We need to develop creative approaches to enhancing respect for all persons and religions, to promoting understanding towards Jewish communities in Europe, and, also, in a broader sense, to supporting our goal in the War on Terrorism, of countering the religious extremism and intolerance which lead to hatred and violence.

U.S. POLICY

During President Bush's visit to Auschwitz on May 31 this year he said: "This site is a sobering reminder that when we find anti-Semitism, whether it be in Europe or anywhere else, mankind must come together to fight such dark impulses." The U.S. Government firmly believes that anti-Semitism is an insidious and continuing phenomenon that undermines basic values of democracy—tolerance, mutual understanding and individual rights and freedoms.

The Administration fully supports the October 14, 2003 statement to the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe's (OSCE) Human Dimension Implementation Meeting in Warsaw by Representative Christopher H. Smith. He said, "The United States also calls for Ministerial language urging all elected leaders and government authorities to denounce acts of anti-Semitism when they occur, as well as seek vigorous investigations and prosecutions. While strong law enforcement is needed, education of youth is equally important."

COOPERATION WITH EUROPEAN ALLIES

The U.S. has played a strong leadership role in urging the OSCE to focus on the threat anti-Semitism presents and to develop practical measures to combat it. Political momentum and a renewed awareness regarding anti-Semitism have been created. Former New York Mayor Rudolph Giuliani led the U.S. Delegation to the June 2003 OSCE Anti-Semitism Conference in Vienna. The delegation included representatives from the Administration, Congress and NGOs. Mayor Giuliani and others in the delegation presented concrete U.S. suggestions including:

- Compile and regularly evaluate hate crime statistics in a uniform fashion.
- Encourage all participating states to pass hate-related criminal legislation.
- Set up educational programs in participating states about anti-Semitism.
- Remember the Holocaust accurately and resist Holocaust revisionists.

The June meeting demonstrated that the OSCE could mobilize for what will be a long-term, sustained effort to combat anti-Semitism. The U.S. Administration undertook a major, successful, political push to build consensus for this meeting. The Vienna meeting recognized anti-Semitism as a human rights issue for the first time and significantly raised awareness of this continuing serious problem.

Since June, the U.S. has remained active. On October 14, 2003, in Warsaw at the OSCE Human Dimension Implementation meeting, which is Europe's largest meeting on human rights and democratization, the U.S. delegation pushed hard for the OSCE to turn the U.S. June recommendations into concrete strategies for dealing with anti-Semitism. What did we achieve? Importantly, with the European Union, we won support to hold a follow-on conference on anti-Semitism, in Berlin at the end of April 2004. We now need to build OSCE-wide consensus for a formal decision by the OSCE Foreign Ministers when they meet in Maastricht in December. At the Berlin meeting, our goal will be for the OSCE to adopt concrete measures for combating anti-Semitism as a fully integrated part of its work, including through the Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights. We will also seek further concrete progress toward the collection and analysis of hate crime statistics by OSCE countries to ensure that their education systems accurately teach about the Holocaust.

In other European organizations, there has been progress as well. The Council of Europe agreed in October 2002 on several steps concerning the Holocaust, including in the area of Holocaust education, and member- countries agreed to observe an an-

nual Holocaust Remembrance Day during which education about the Holocaust plays an increasingly important role. In 2003, the European Union extended its European Racism and Xenophobia Network to include the ten EU candidate countries.

U.S. Embassies and Consulates in Europe have been very active bilaterally. Ambassadors speak out publicly against anti-Semitism and encourage prompt law enforcement action by host nations against criminal conduct. Our diplomatic officials know local Jewish community leaders, and work through the local governments to monitor incidents and express our concern. These diplomatic activities are detailed for the Congress in the 2002 Annual Report on International Religious Freedom, and in annual Country Reports on Human Rights Practices. Moreover, public affairs sections in U.S. Embassies in Europe implement important programs to foster religious respect and to counter anti-Semitism.

EDUCATION

The Administration's efforts to prevent future anti-Semitism in Europe centers on programs to educate the next generation of Europeans about the truth of the Holocaust and the lessons from history of the importance of religious tolerance and respect. Secretary Powell, in April 30, 2003 remarks in the Capitol Rotunda, said "teaching new generations about the Holocaust . . . is an affirmation of our common humanity."

The Task Force for International Cooperation on Holocaust Education, Remembrance and Research was formed at the initiative of Sweden, with two other founding members, the United Kingdom and the United States. The Task Force's mission is to further Holocaust education, remembrance and research. Today, this important Holocaust forum includes 15 member-countries with participation by important NGOs such as the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum and Yad Vashem. In addition, there are eight liaison countries, and the Task Force is expanding to include new countries. Task Force members commit to the Principles of the Stockholm Declaration to which include: assuming responsibility for understanding causes of the Holocaust; pledging to promote education, remembrance and research; opening archives; and observing an annual Holocaust remembrance day. Currently, the U.S. is in the chair of the Task Force and will hold a plenary meeting in Washington at the beginning of December that delegations from more than 18 countries and 120 persons will attend. This will follows a similar meeting we hosted at the State Department last May.

While projects the Task Force finances are small in cost their impact is large, with a priority on teacher training to engage the intellectual curiosity of students. So far this year 27 projects for 11 countries, averaging about 13,500 dollars each, have been approved, from a budget of less than 300 thousand dollars. Since 2000, 60 percent of the budget for the Task Force's four working groups has gone to Holocaust education, or a total of about 400 thousand dollars within the last three years. In addition to teacher training, types of projects included: visits to concentration/extermination camps; funds for historical commissions to document the Holocaust; documentary film projects about the Holocaust; and translations of scholarly books and articles.

To give you a picture of the impact of the work of the Task Force, I would like to quote a recent letter from a Romanian teacher: "The visit to the concentration camp of Auschwitz was the most emotive experience of my life. When I returned to my school in Romania, I told the students of the visit and the Holocaust. The students were completely silent. One girl asked: 'How could this happen in the 20th Century?' In fact, a few days later, a parent asked me for information to read about the Holocaust."

Also important for the younger generation in Europe is the "Future Fund" of the German Foundation "Responsibility, Remembrance and the Future." The Foundation was established primarily to provide some measure of justice to former slave and forced laborers, but one element of it, the Future Fund, has a more forward looking goal. Of approximately five billion dollars administered by the Foundation, 350 million dollars is allocated for specific projects. Some of these are expected to include Holocaust education, tolerance, social justice and international cooperation in humanitarian endeavors. Currently funded projects include: textbook writing; video; video interviews with eyewitnesses; and scholarly projects. One particularly important activity supports face-to-face meetings between survivors and young people, and in some cases young people even assist elderly survivors with their shopping and other daily activities.

The U.S. Government also funds Holocaust Awareness Grants through the SEED Democracy Commission. Eleven grants to the Baltic countries totaling over 100,000 dollars support the development of textbooks and other materials for teachers, and

provide other resources on the Holocaust. Three grants to Russia totaling 43,000 dollars finance 20 seminars for teachers and young people; the production and distribution of brochures about the dangers of spreading neo-Nazi and racist views; and a manual for history teachers.

THE FUTURE

Our strategy for the future in Europe is to work intensively, both bilaterally and through multilateral institutions such as the OSCE, to develop effective, practical ways to combat anti-Semitism, and in particular anti-Semitic violence. Our work is not done. The first goal to make sure the planned Berlin anti-Semitism conference is approved at the OSCE Maastricht ministerial in December, and is a success in April resulting in the adoption of concrete measures such as a centralized OSCE data base to monitor anti-Semitic incidents. Through our embassies and in other fora we will seek to keep anti-Semitism at the forefront of attention of governments and the people of Europe. We also will continue our vigorous efforts to promote Holocaust education through the work of the Task Force for International Cooperation on Holocaust Education, Remembrance and Research, the Future Fund of the German Foundation, and bilateral U.S. programs. We will continue to cooperate closely with Congress, the U.S. Helsinki Commission and non-governmental organizations, all of which play important roles in focusing public attention on anti-Semitism in Europe, and in developing creative, effective and forceful approaches to prevent it.

Let me again thank you for the invitation to review the Administration's activities in combating anti-Semitism, and what we have achieved and what we plan for the future. I look forward to your questions.

Senator ALLEN. Thank you, Mr. O'Donnell, for your cogent remarks. We very much appreciate them.

You covered many of the questions that I had. Let me followup, though, on a few things. First, you mentioned—what's the title of this book?

Mr. O'DONNELL. "Tell Ye Your Children." It's a book by Paul Levine, a scholar on the Holocaust who chairs one of the working groups in the International Task Force on Holocaust Education, Remembrance and Research.

Senator ALLEN. All right. Here's my experiences, and I'll followup with questions, and maybe you can see how this is being utilized. When I was Governor, we created the Virginia/Israel Partnership so that you'd get the cultural, educational, business ties being enhanced between Virginia and Israel.

We also, in education, formulated what are called Standards of Learning in Virginia. And in those standards of learning were—in the history, mostly in the social studies and history, were ancient civilizations, the Middle East, and the Holocaust. And, therefore, teachers in every public school are teaching about ancient civilizations, and kids are learning about Ionic and Doric and Corinthian columns and Mesopotamia and so forth, and Middle East and the Holocaust. And many teachers in Virginia were funded to go over to Israel, and they have a good education program there, where you learn all that, as well as the Holocaust.

And, of course, here we have, in Washington, DC, the Holocaust Museum, which is the most compelling, emotional museum I've ever been in, because everyone has their own sense of going at their own pace, interested in all that information, and wondering how can human beings be so vicious and so hateful in killing not just adults, but killing children and volunteering to do so. It has just profoundly had an impact on me. And when we had church burnings in Virginia and other Southern States, I thought—that's why leaders have to—these are racial, against African-American churches—why it's absolutely important that leaders stand up, de-

plore it, make sure that no one thinks that can be countenanced or allowed, and obviously prosecute those who are involved.

Now, to get these books, this book, into schools in public schools in Europe, I don't know if any of them have in their standards of learning or if they have any curriculum that requires studying of the Holocaust. If you have something like that, I think it makes it much more effective than saying, yeah, our kids ought to learn about the Holocaust and, you know, maybe we'll have a field trip. Going to Auschwitz has an impact on people—Auschwitz or any of the other death camps.

How many of them, of these countries, have something like standards or curriculum development or Standards of Learning—that do include the holocaust? And how many schools have taken this book, "Tell Ye Your Children," and have it being taught to them, as opposed to putting it into the library, where it might be read. But it's not quite the same having a book in the library as opposed to required learning and teaching and testing for the accountability. What gets measured, gets better, is the way I'd say it. George says it doesn't matter if it doesn't get measured. Same point, is if it's part of the standards and curriculum and they're tested upon it, it's much more likely that that will be imparted, that knowledge, to the students.

So could you share with us how—if that book or others similar to it are part of a curriculum in European schools?

Mr. O'DONNELL. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

And I certainly agree with your views on the Holocaust Museum, which we work very closely with in this task force. They are very important to our work and everything we do, and we consult very closely with them.

I'd make a distinction between countries like Germany and France, where Holocaust as an issue has been in the curriculum for some time, and the countries we're working with, and the task force, which are really smaller and less resourced, and also new democracies. For example, in Eastern Europe. I show you this book as an example of a work in progress. We're considering translating this into Hungarian, as well.

These are small projects, and maybe to give you, if I may, a little more context of the task force, it's by consensus, our decisions, and it operates like the OSCE. Each member country contributes $25,000 a year, and that's our budget. So it's a small amount of money, but it is very effective, and it seems we are working in smaller ways—maybe better, in this instance. We're moving forward, and we're expanding the net, and we would like to invite new countries to join. A part of their joining would be to do things such as this, undertake the responsibility to make sure that the Holocaust is a part of the curriculum. Many countries, I think, do not have Holocaust as an important part of their required curriculum, in the smaller countries in Eastern Europe, but that's certainly our goal and priority, to expand the net and get more books like this into the hands of students.

This would also be with teacher training, and we're designing these projects, as well, to really teach the teachers and, by extension, the students. But that would be our goals.

The goals that I'm speaking of are from the Stockholm International Forum on the Holocaust, and what we do when we ask a country—when a country joins, we ask them to commit to these goals, such as encouraging the study of the Holocaust in all its dimension, and to commemorate the victims, and to start—to create a annual day of Holocaust remembrance.

This is work in progress. I wanted to give you a sense of the type of things that we're doing and our goals for the future.

Thank you.

Senator ALLEN. Well, thank you.

We'll talk in the—the accountability on the various types of crimes that are committed and so forth are important. I think one thing that would be useful is to determine which countries—and this would be an objective checklist—which countries have, as part of their educational curriculum, teaching the holocaust? You mentioned that France does, Germany does. Does, for example, The Netherlands, or Denmark, Austria, Italy, as far as the Central European countries? Poland? It would seem to me Poland certainly would want to have it, as well as the Czech Republic, Slovak, Hungary, and all the other aspirant countries, including the Balkans.

And we're doing these on 7-minute rounds, but if you could get us—or maybe our second panelists can get us—which countries do and don't have that in education, because every one of the people—all of the Senators spoken—have talked in various ways, all recognizing that young people need to understand the implications of anti-Semitic remarks, swastikas, and what the implications of that are, as opposed to just some artistic design.

Mr. O'DONNELL. If I may, I'd like to take that question and respond to you in writing, because I think we can give you a full picture of where we are on the question of which have the Holocaust as a part of their curriculum.

[The following information was subsequently supplied.]

PRESENT STATE OF HOLOCAUST EDUCATION IN EUROPEAN SCHOOLS

During the October 22, 2003 testimony of Special Envoy for Holocaust Issues Edward O'Donnell on anti-Semitism in Europe, Senator Allen as Chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations European Affairs Subcommittee requested additional information on the present state of Holocaust education in European schools. To obtain the most current information available, the State Department's Office of Holocaust Issues (EUR/OHI) tasked U.S. embassies in the 55 member states of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) to make appropriate inquiries of their host governments. EUR/OHI also checked with the Council of Europe (COE) and consulted other sources.

To provide for a standard presentation of the information we have gathered, the OSCE member countries are listed alphabetically on the attached matrix with their responses to four central questions (plus ancillary remarks) related to Holocaust education. The information submitted is current as of mid-January 2004.

The responsibility for education in the OSCE countries varies widely. Most educational systems are centralized, but some are not and decisions on educational curricula are taken at the state/provincial or local level. It is clear from our overall research that most European countries are now placing greater emphasis on Holocaust education in their school systems, and especially at the high school level in connection with courses related to the Second World War.

The Office of Holocaust Issues will continue to closely monitor this important issue, which is directly relevant to combating anti-Semitism in Europe. We will use the attached matrix to establish a baseline and will update this analysis periodically for our own purposes and also for the work of the Task Force on International Cooperation for Holocaust Education, Remembrance and Research.

January 15, 2004

	Country	National requirement for teaching the Holocaust	State or municipal requirements or guidelines for teaching the Holocaust	What curricula have been developed for Holocaust education?	How are the text materials on the Holocaust being used in schools?	Remarks
1.	Albania	No	Not applicable	No specific text. Holocaust taught in the framework of the teaching on the WWII.		Instructors use Western texts translated into Albanian.
2.	Armenia					
3.	Austria *	Yes	Yes	Specific curricula and school textbooks on the Holocaust		- 5 May Holocaust Remembrance Day - Cultural agreement with Israel for textbooks
4.	Azerbaijan					
5.	Belarus	No	Not applicable	No specific text.		Teachers seminars organized by Jewish NGOs with the approval of the Ministry of Education

* Member countries of the Task Force for International Cooperation on Holocaust Education, Remembrance and Research
** Task Force liaison project countries

6.	Belgium	No	Definition of curricula is of the responsibility of the linguistic communities of Belgium (German, Flemish and French)	Holocaust taught in the framework of the teaching on the WWII.		8 May 1945 Holocaust Remembrance Day
7.	Bosnia					
8.	Bulgaria					10 March Holocaust Remembrance Day
9.	Croatia**	Yes	Not applicable	Use of Council of Europe materials	N/a	January 27th Holocaust Remembrance Day
10.	Cyprus					
11.	Czech Republic*	Yes	Not applicable	Holocaust taught in the framework of the teaching on the WWII. Official program "Holocaust Phenomenon"		January 27th Holocaust Remembrance Day.
12.	Denmark	No formal requirement	Not applicable	Holocaust taught in the framework of the teaching on the WWII.	No specific text materials on the Holocaust	January 27th Holocaust Remembrance Day

13.	Estonia	No	No	Holocaust taught in the framework of the teaching on the WWII.	Swedish book ("tell ye your Children") distributed to every school	January 27th Holocaust Remembrance Day
14.	Finland	No	No	Textbooks mention the Holocaust	Holocaust teaching teacher dependent - Swedish book ("tell ye your Children") distributed to every high school	- New themes ("Victims of Persecution") starting in 2005 - January 27th Holocaust Remembrance Day
15.	France*	Yes	Not applicable	Holocaust taught in the framework of the teaching on "the twentieth century and the actual world".		- January 27th Holocaust Remembrance Day - Media report cases of hostility of students (from immigrant's communities) re. teaching of the Holocaust. New policy implem-ented in response.
16.	Georgia					

17.	Germany*	Yes	Yes. Coordination through a standing conference of state ministers of education and cultural affairs	Curricula differs from state to state but "National- Socialism and WWII including the Holocaust" program is mandatory	Recommendation of the joint German-Israeli commission implemented. Assistance of educational experts from foreign countries (including US)	January 27th Holocaust Remembrance Day
18.	Greece	No	No	Holocaust taught in the framework of the teaching on the WWII.		January 27th Holocaust Remembrance Day
19.	Hungary*	Yes	No	Holocaust taught in the framework of the teaching on the WWII.		16 April Holocaust Remembrance Day
20.	Iceland	No	No	Holocaust taught in the framework of the teaching on the WWII.	Holocaust teaching teacher dependent	
21.	Ireland	Yes	Not applicable	Holocaust taught in the framework of the teaching on the WWII.		

22.	Italy*	No	No	Holocaust taught in the framework of the teaching on the WWII.	Holocaust teaching teacher dependent	January 27th Holocaust Remembrance Day
23.	Kazakhstan	No	No	No specific text.		
24.	Kyrgyzstan					
25.	Latvia**					
26.	Lithuania*	Yes	No	Specific curricula developed	Specific text materials on the Holocaust ("the Jewish neighbors of my Grandparents and Great Grandparents")	September 23 Holocaust Remembrance Day
27.	Luxembourg*	Yes	Not applicable	Holocaust taught in the framework of the teaching on the WWII.		October 10 Holocaust Remembrance Day
28.	Malta	No	No	No specific text. Holocaust taught in the framework of the teaching on the WWII.		
29.	Moldova	No	No	No specific text	Inclusion of Holocaust in history curriculum considered for 2004	- Teachers seminars organized by the Min. Educ and Jewish NGOs

30.	Netherlands*	Yes	No	Extensive Holocaust education materials produced by the Anne Frank Foundation	Holocaust teaching teacher dependent	- May 4 Holocaust Remembrance Day - Media report cases of hostility of students (from immigrant's communities) regarding teaching of the Holocaust
31.	Norway*	Yes	Not applicable	Holocaust taught in the framework of the teaching on the WWII.		- January 27th Holocaust Remembrance Day - National Award given every year to a school for a project to fight against Racism and Intolerance
32.	Poland*	Yes	Not applicable	2 nationally approved curricula (including "the Holocaust: understanding why?")	Recommenda-tions of the joint Polish-Israeli commission being implemented	Teachers seminars organized by the Ministry of Education
33.	Portugal	No	Not applicable			

34.	Romania**	Yes	No	National curriculum for an elective high school course specifically on the Holocaust currently in development.		
35.	Russia					
36.	Serbia-Montenegro					
37.	Slovakia**			Holocaust taught in the context of history of the WWII.		September 9 Holocaust Remembrance Day
38.	Slovenia					May 9 Holocaust Remembrance Day
39.	Spain	No	No but Spanish Constitution divides educational powers between central govt. and states.	No specific text. Holocaust taught in the context of history of the religions and in the framework of the teaching on the WWII.		
40.	Sweden*	Yes	Not applicable			January 27th Holocaust Remembrance Day

41.	Switzerland	No	Yes			January 27th Holocaust Remembrance Day
42.	Tajikistan					
43.	Turkey	No		Holocaust taught in the framework of the teaching on the WWII.		The "History Foundation" is responsible for the content of textbooks regarding awareness and education on the Holocaust.
44.	Turkmenistan	No	No	No specific text		
45.	Ukraine**					Ukraine has approved Council of Europe's recommendation regarding inclusion of the Holocaust in contemporary History courses.
46.	United Kingdom*	Yes	Not applicable	Guidance provided for teaching and for the Holocaust Memorial Day.		January 27th Holocaust Remembrance Day
47.	Uzbekistan					

[From the New York Magazine, December 15, 2003]

THE RETURN OF ANTI-SEMITISM

(By Craig Horowitz)

Israel has become the flash point—and the excuse—for a global explosion of an age-old syndrome. Why has hating the Jews become politically correct in many places? And what can be done about it?

On the second floor of the plaza hotel, in a gaudy meeting room with lots of gold-painted wall filigree and *faux*-Baroque details, about 400 representatives of the Anti-Defamation League from around the country gathered one recent morning for the group's 90th-anniversary conference.

As they settled in for a sober two-day program reflecting the grim situation Jews find themselves in (speakers included John Ashcroft, Thomas Friedman, and Israel's ambassador to the U.N.), ADL national director Abraham Foxman rose to give the opening address.

Foxman, a professional noodge who has been sounding the alarm for more than three decades whenever he senses the slightest whiff of anti-Semitism—his new book is *Never Again? The Threat of the New Anti-Semitism*—began slowly, talking in an almost melancholy tone about his grandchildren and the uncertain future they face as Jews. But Foxman, who was sheltered during the Holocaust by his Christian nanny, quickly gained momentum and urgency, cataloguing stark examples of what he called "the world's growing crescendo of irrationality."

He invoked the shattered glass of Kristallnacht and mentioned Hitler several times, allusions that surely found their target with the mostly middle-aged-and-older crowd. As he has been doing for more than a year now, he described the threat to the safety and security of the Jewish people as being "as great, if not greater, than what we faced in the thirties."

It was Foxman at his best: passionate, indignant, and connecting naturally with other Jews. His fears are their fears. His hopes for the future are their hopes. The speech clearly resonated with the audience.

But there was one small problem. The centerpiece of the speech, its theme, was misleading. There's no question these are troubled times. But the notion that Jews in 2003 ought to use the Holocaust as a kind of lens to help them see their current predicament more dearly is, to say the least, problematic. The analogy no longer holds.

"Comparing what's going on today to the thirties is both wrong and dangerous," says Alan Dershowitz, who also has a new book, *The Case for Israel,* which is practically a point-by-point guide for responding to the Jewish state's critics. "The old labels don't apply, and the old diagnoses don't address the problem. They substitute emotion for reason, and we can't win this war with emotion. We need to look forward. We need to start thinking about the 2030s, not the 1930s."

The war to which Dershowitz is referring is the global explosion of hate and hostility directed at Israel and at Jews themselves. For the past eighteen months or so, members of the Jewish community—intellectuals, activists, heads of various organizations, and laypeople—have been struggling desperately to find an effective strategy to address the new reality.

It's been slow going. "The organized Jewish community has just not reacted strongly enough," says Morton Klein, head of the Zionist Organization of America.

Part of the reason for this is that they are facing a new problem, an enemy they haven't seen before. The stunning result of the burgeoning anti-Israel, anti-Zionist emotion is a kind of politically correct anti-Semitism. Foxman's analogy to the thirties is right in this respect: It is once again acceptable in polite society, particularly among people with left-of-center political views, to freely express anti-Jewish feelings. What only two or three years ago would have been considered hateful, naked bigotry is now a legitimate political position.

The new p.c. anti-Semitism mixes traditional blame-the-Jews boilerplate with a fevered opposition to Israel. In this worldview, the "Zionist entity" has no legitimacy and as a result no right to do what other nations do, like protect itself and its citizens. It is true that immediately labeling someone anti-Semitic because he criticizes Israel is a long-standing, often bogus tactic that has been used by Jews to stymie debate. The new anti-Semitism, however, is in some sense the inverse problem, with criticism of Israel being a kind of Trojan horse in which age-old anti-Semitic feelings are concealed.

"Israel has become the Jew among nations," says Mort Zuckerman, who in addition to his media holdings is the former chairman of the Council of Presidents of Major American Jewish Organizations. "It is both the surrogate—the respectable way of expressing anti-Semitism—and the collective Jew."

The irony here is that Israel, which was supposed to be the solution to centuries of anti-Semitism, is providing a flash point and a kind of cover for p.c. anti-Semitism. Recently, *The Forward,* the savvy weekly newspaper that focuses on Jewish life here and abroad, published its annual list of the 50 most influential American Jews. In its introduction, in a dramatic public expression of the thing that's on every Jew's mind, the paper explained that this year's list is dominated by people shaping the debate over the most critical question of the day: "Why has the world turned against us, and what is to be done about it?"

For most Jews, certainly those tied to the common-sense-based, moderate political middle, the momentum change is disorienting. How could this have happened when they believed so strongly in all the right things, like ending the occupation and dismantling the settlements? Fair-minded and compassionate, they regularly expressed concern for Palestinian suffering, and they cheered when Ehud Barak made an offer that appeared to finally clinch a peaceful two-state solution.

But when Yasser Arafat walked away from the peace talks and triggered the incomprehensible wave of suicide bombings, events took a very strange turn. First, the violence guaranteed the election of Ariel Sharon. I was in Jerusalem during election week in 2001, and the city was covered with bumper stickers and signs that read ONLY SHARON WILL KEEP US SAFE. The *intifada* also decimated Israel's left. Jews everywhere wanted something done. Enough was enough. They wanted a show of force, and they got it.

American Jews felt adrift at first, then angry, as if they'd been betrayed. If their hearts were in the right place, why hadn't the results been better?

But after a little more than three years, it's clear the use of force hasn't worked either. Palestinian violence hasn't stopped. And the Sharon government's hard line has generated runaway sympathy for the Palestinians and at least an equal amount of hostility toward the Israelis. Suddenly, Jews find themselves less and less able to claim the moral high ground as they are now cast as the villains in the conflict. No matter what Israel does—negotiate, fight, put up a fence—it only seems to make things worse.

"I feel sick to my stomach," says writer and activist Leonard Fein. "I go to meetings where despondence is thick on the table. I also feel scared because Israel is rudderless."

Senator ALLEN. And they may not—you know, some of the countries, such as Germany, as a federation, and each state may—Bavaria—I assume all the states, whether it's Bavaria or Baden-Wurttemberg, regardless, all of the states have it. And I'm not saying that—I'm saying that the Federal Government should be running those if they have a more localized approach, such as in a country like Switzerland. Nonetheless, it would be a good benchmark for us to see what youngsters are learning.

Thank you.

Now, I'd turn it over to Senator Biden for any questions you may have.

Senator BIDEN. Thank you, Senator. I just have two questions, then I'll yield, and I have another committee hearing.

By the way, staff points out to me that Lithuania has a unit on the Holocaust in its basic training manual for the army conscripts. So there's some movement. The whole picture isn't bleak in Europe. There's some positive things that are happening, and I—but, in the shortness of time, it's important that we dwell on the portions that need to be corrected, in my view.

I'd like to ask you one question, quite frankly. And, by the way, Mr. O'Donnell, it's nice to see you here, rather than greeting me on the tarmac. I appreciate it very much, and I wasn't nearly as hospitable to you as you were to me when you greeted me last year, and I thank you for that.

Can you give us your sense—and you may not have an opinion, or may not want to venture one—but how would you explain the refusal, if you would, of the European Union to include in its Brus-

sels Presidency Conclusions the condemnation of the Malaysian Prime Minister's anti-Semitic remarks? How do you read it?

Mr. O'DONNELL. I really don't think I can comment on the European Union. What I can say is that we spoke out, our administration, President Bush and other senior administration officials, and we spoke out very quickly and very forcefully with statements such as that Mahathir's comments were wrong and divisive, hateful and outrageous, offensive and inflammatory. And we also expect other countries to speak out very forcefully and directly, and that's part of our pursuit of speaking out against anti-Semitic statements.

Senator BIDEN. Well, you and the administration, the President, are personally to be complimented, because in these cases, words matter. Words matter.

Well, let me ask one last question, then. There has been discussion in Europe, as well as here, about the notion that there's a new strain of anti-Semitism emerging in the European media and among some European political elites who are critical of Israel.

Now, we have been very careful, even those who are very critical of Israel, in this country, to make a distinction, which is totally permissible, between the conduct of a government and the religion and ethnicity of a people. And so even in the United States, those who feel very strongly that Israel is not on the right path, have made this distinction.

My impression is that anti-Semitism and the old canards are being used increasingly even by elites to bolster and undergird their criticism of Israeli policy, almost as an ad hominem argument, as opposed to a direct and legitimate, and appropriate for democracy to do, attack or criticism of the policy of another government.

So my question is, not whether you personally believe—I don't want to put you in that spot—but is it your impression that some European political elites and the European media outlets are using anti-Semitism as a way of being critical or underpinning their criticism of Israeli conduct? I know that puts you in a spot. Not what do you think.

Let me phrase it another way so I don't compromise you. And I warn the next panel, I will try to compromise you. Have you heard discussion in your formal capacity, when in Europe, of this subject? Is it being debated, not just by European Jews, but is it being debated at all, discussed among elites in Europe as to whether or not this is seeping into the criticism of Israel, which is fairly universal in Europe, crossing political parties and lines? Is that something that's up for discussion at cocktail parties and among, you know, elites, who you, necessarily, should be and are exposed to? I think that's the way to ask it. I can't think of another way.

Mr. O'DONNELL. Thank you, Senator Biden, I appreciate that.

I would like to make two comments, if I may. In Germany, certainly this is a concern and something we watch from the embassy and the consulates, and Ambassador Coates certainly is very active in this area, and is talking to groups. I think this is a part of what we should be doing and are doing in embassies to explain our policy and also to explain our concern about anti-Semitism in Europe.

And it is an issue. I was with a group of young German politicians and also journalists this morning, and this type of discussion

did come up. And I think that we are all looking at this issue. And certainly in Germany they're very active in examining the roots of anti-Semitism. And that's why—one of the reasons, I think, that demonstrates the importance the Berlin April meeting of the OSCE. The Germans are very active. Yes, it is being discussed.

Senator BIDEN. I thank you very much.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'll be back.

Senator ALLEN. All right. Thank you, Senator Biden.

Senator Voinovich.

Senator VOINOVICH. Mr. O'Donnell, I have to say I'm very, very impressed with the followup you did from Vienna and your meeting in Warsaw. I said I'm very, very happy with the progress that you've been making, because that's exactly what I had hoped would happen as we're following up on that.

Has there been a date established for the meeting in April, or is that still tentative?

Mr. O'DONNELL. Thank you, Senator Voinovich. And I would like to give the credit to Ambassador Pamela Hyde Smith and Ambassador Minikes, who were at the meeting last week in our delegation in the U.S. Helsinki Commission. We have dates of the 28th and 29th of April, and they are set, but it's, of course, contingent upon formal approval by the Foreign Ministers in Maastricht in that meeting.

But in talking to Ambassador Pamela Hyde Smith and others on the delegation, that's certainly our goal, that that will be approved, and she's confident we do have consensus and that we'll be moving forward to prepare for that meeting.

Senator VOINOVICH. And the goal would be then to—at the meeting, to institutionalize this effort in the Office for Democratic Institution and Human Rights. So it would become part of the ordinary work of the OSCE ministerial group.

Mr. O'DONNELL. We would be using ODIHR, which is in Warsaw, as the central institution that would collect statistics on hate crimes, and that would include a number of other activities, such as helping participating member states and develop their own national statistics and trying to make sure they're uniform, as Mayor Giuliani pointed out. So there are a lot of issues there. But that's certainly our goal, to use ODIHR as the centerpiece of the reporting on hate crimes and anti-Semitic incidents, yes, sir.

Senator VOINOVICH. Well, I really think it's important that as you move down the road you have some real specific things that you're committed to and that you're going to be promoting with the other members of the OSCE. And I know Ambassador Minikes is a good one to have there.

Mr. O'DONNELL. Yes, sir.

Senator VOINOVICH. He's very dedicated. I had a chance to spend some time with him in Berlin last year.

The other issue—and, again, I am impressed with this Task Force for International Cooperation on Holocaust Education—how is that funded?

Mr. O'DONNELL. It's funded by each participating country, the 15 member countries. It's a contribution of $25,000 a year. So our total budget that we work with is not large, but we do have—beyond the monetary resources, we do have participation, which is

quite valuable, from the countries, the member countries, and that includes government officials, such as myself and my office, but also people from, for example, NGOs and scholars and the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum and, in other countries, for example, Poland's coming to the meeting in December. They're bringing the Education Ministry, they're bringing an NGO representative. So we have a network of people who have been working on these Task Force Working Groups, and that's also a contribution of resources.

Senator VOINOVICH. Well, one of the things that we talked about that would come out of this meeting is this whole issue of education. One of the things that drives me crazy with some of the European groups, is that they've got so many groups that you can hardly keep track of what they're doing. What would be interesting is if some linkage could be had between the Task Force for International Cooperation and the Holocaust, use that maybe as a benchmark for the meeting at the OSCE and say this is something that people have been doing, it's working, it's been effective, and then see if you can't get some more people that would participate in it, rather than having them come up with some brand-new way of getting things done.

Mr. O'DONNELL. Yes, sir.

I just might mention there are two countries that have applied for membership, Norway—and this will be for our December meeting here in Washington—and also Romania. Romania we've been working with, and there are some positive things that have happened. For example, Romania has decided to form a Holocaust Commission that will be chaired by Eli Weisel. So there are some things like that where we can work with countries, and we're engaging them to do the things that we would like, in terms of Holocaust education and memorials and remembrance days.

Senator VOINOVICH. Well, that's good to hear, from Romania, because they've had some problems, as you well know.

Mr. O'DONNELL. Yes, sir.

Senator VOINOVICH. I think you mentioned, too, the new nations that we are contemplating bringing into NATO. Our country has made it very clear that dealing with anti-Semitism is part of the dues to be a member of NATO, and I was very, very encouraged that many of the Jewish organizations in this country and around the world were encouraging these new countries to come into NATO. That's a wonderful way to followup on it.

Mr. O'DONNELL. Yes, sir. Thank you.

Senator VOINOVICH. Thank you.

Senator ALLEN. Thank you, Senator Voinovich.

Senator Sarbanes, do you have any questions of this first panel witness?

Senator SARBANES. Well, Mr. Chairman, I know you're anxious to go to the next panel, and I was unable to get here earlier, so I'll pass on this witness.

Senator ALLEN. Well, thank you, Senator Sarbanes.

Mr. O'Donnell, thank you for your comments and answering questions. I look forward to getting that checklist of which countries have Holocaust education in their curriculum. And I'm hopeful that this committee will soon have you as Ambassador, not Ambassador-Designate, as your formal title. This is probably—we're

going to try to get you before this committee—before recess, we'll get this hopefully accomplished. And, again, thank you for coming.

I also want to thank people in this committee, Senators in this committee, for allowing you to come forward without the usual procedures and so forth.

Look forward to working with you for years to come. Thank you very much.

Now, our second panel is—if the gentlemen can come forward, our second panel—and I'll introduce you as you all get situated there—our second panel includes the following three gentlemen: Abraham Foxman, the national director of the Anti-Defamation League, David Harris, executive director of The American Jewish Committee, and the executive director of NCSJ, Mark Levin.

Mr. Foxman has worked for the Anti-Defamation League since 1965. He was named the national director in 1987. Prior to that, he worked in the League's International Affairs and Civil Rights Divisions. In addition to his position at the Anti-Defamation League, Mr. Foxman has recently authored a book titled, "Never Again?" with a question mark, "The Threat of New Anti-Semitism," which was released yesterday. Is that correct?

Mr. FOXMAN. Correct.

Senator ALLEN. And Mr. Harris, Mr. David Harris, has been the executive director of The American Jewish Committee since 1990. Prior to assuming his current position, Mr. Harris served as the director of the AJC's Washington-based office of Government and International Affairs. He is the author of three books, "The Jewish World," "Entering a New Culture," and co-author of "The Jokes of Oppression."

Mr. Levin is the executive director of NCSJ, which is the National Conference on Soviet Jewry, and was recently appointed to this position—well, not recently—was appointed to it in October 1992, has been a member of the professional staff of that organization since 1980. From 1987 to 1989, Mr. Levin served as director of the National Conference of Soviet Jewry's Washington office. Prior to coming to NCSJ, he worked for the American Israel Public Affairs Committee.

We'll hear from all three of these witnesses in the order in which you're listed on the agenda and also the list of the order in which I introduced and gave a brief biographical sketch for everyone of your wonderful achievements and knowledge.

And so we'll hear first from Mr. Foxman.

STATEMENT OF ABRAHAM H. FOXMAN, NATIONAL DIRECTOR, ANTI-DEFAMATION LEAGUE, NEW YORK, NY

Mr. FOXMAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I'm very pleased to have the opportunity to address this subcommittee. Mr. Chairman, the convening of this hearing is just one more example of the kind of ongoing leadership commitment and focus by members of the committee to spotlight and combat anti-Semitism, for which we are grateful. It is at moments such as these that, as a Holocaust survivor, I feel so privileged to have an opportunity to raise my concerns, our concerns, with you. So proud. So proud that this country cares, worries, acts, speaks. And haunted by the thought that if only in the 1930s, forget about Europe, but

in this country, had there been such deliberations, had there been such discussions, had the voice been as clear as it is today, then maybe, maybe, the situation would have been different.

And as we look through Europe, I don't know if we can find one country where its congressional or senatorial legislative bodies have spent as much time as we have here grappling, struggling with this issue.

The hearing is so timely, because, unfortunately, as we've heard from some of the Senators, we have had a fresh opportunity to examine a monumental manifestation of anti-Semitism. But, more important—not what he said, not what he said, that's not new—where he said it, how he said it is a little bit new, but the reaction of the international community, and the reaction in Europe, in particular. Prime Minister of Malaysia has a record of anti-Semitism. What's significant is that he decided in his swan song of a lifelong career, in front of a group of nations, determined not by culture, not by geography, not by philosophy, but by religion. What brought those 57 countries together was their faith. And he believed that the door was open for him, that it would be acceptable to give a speech which we have not heard, since the days of the 1930s, by a head of state and for—in fact, called for a victory by 1.3 billion Muslims against the Jewish people.

And the lessons we need to learn is, No.1, that heads of state still believe that this can be said with impunity; No. 2, he was received with a standing ovation, and our so-called friends and allies, to whom I have written last week, the President of Egypt, the Crown Prince of Saudi Arabia, the leadership of Turkey, Jordan, stood and applauded. No one walked out. No one criticized. And in the week since then, we see words of praise, applause in the Arab world, for what he said. Maybe that shouldn't come as a surprise.

But then we look at Europe. Europe, which has been in a paroxysm of anti-Semitic violence in the last 3 or 4 years; Europe, struggling with a population to which this message of hate, of religious hate, reaches out; Europe, which has struggled with desecrations, torchings of synagogues. Only in the last month, Jews were killed in Moscow, in Istanbul, and in Casablanca because they were Jews.

And so one would have hoped, Mr. Chairman, that this would have been a magnificent example of Europe to stand up together to condemn. I've submitted, in my testimony, the written testimony, and I won't go in it in detail—suffice it to say that when history is written of this week, it will report that there was an angry, loud debate in the Council of Europe, that at the meeting Thursday night with the Foreign Ministers there was argument as to whether the word "anti-Semitism" should be used. And there was a victory. The good people said, "This is anti-Semitism." And so a statement was agreed upon with the word "anti-Semitism," and it was read as a statement Thursday night. And I challenge you to find that statement, that reference, from the EU with the word "anti-Semitism" describing Mr. Mahathir's comments. I challenge you to find it on any Web site of the EU. Because within hours, it was watered down, within hours, by the intervention and interception—and even though I will tell you I had a particularly harsh exchange with the President of France, Mr. Chirac, and I still stand by the

information that we have—by the intervention of France, by the intervention of Greece, it was watered down. And you would have difficulty finding on the Web site that condemnation. You need to be an expert.

And, yes, I think, Senator Biden asked, "Is it true that they hid behind process?" Yes, they did. They said, "This is the way we normally act." Well, this was not a normal event. This was an extraordinary hateful anti-Semitic event. And one needs to compliment, commend, the Governments of Italy, of Spain, and of Germany, and Netherlands, for they fought a valiant effort, but you'd never find out, you'd never read about it, because it doesn't exist anymore.

And then I'm told, by the President of France, about his letters that he wrote and the condemnations. And, again, I do not want to take the time. I have submitted the writings and the letters, and you tell me how strong a condemnation that is. In fact, I wrote to the President of France today, and I said to him if his letter to the Prime Minister of Malaysia would have been as angry as his letter to me, we'd have stood up and applauded his position. "Why?" one of the Senators asked. It's a lot more of the political expediency, and that's why we could understand why the Prime Minister of Malaysia, in fact, in fact, praised France for its reasonable national response. Whereas, he used the rest of the world's response—first and foremost, America—as proof of his anti-Semitic tirade that Jews control; otherwise, there wouldn't have been this response out there in the world.

And so the lesson to us is that we need to continue to press our European friends and allies, somewhere's down the line, our moderate Arab friends. But certainly this is a continent that has almost been destroyed by hate, by bigotry, by prejudice, by anti-Semitism. And if they don't understand it now, and if they don't raise their voice to their Arab friends, who will?

And so it's very poignant, poignant that this country—you, the Members of the Senate—so quickly condemned it—this country, through the State Department, to the Office of the President, to the President himself.

And I had a conversation with a French diplomat today who tried to compare what Chirac said to what President Bush said, and I said, "You know, we do have a gap in culture and language, but the gap isn't that large. Read what President Chirac said, and read what the President"—well, and then he said, "Mahathir said today that the President of the United States didn't say it to him." And I said, "And now you're talking the word of Mahathir against the words of the President of the United States?"

Well, our lesson is that we need to be there, because we are the only leader of the free world who understands whether it's on terrorism, whether it's on freedom or democracy, and certainly on anti-Semitism.

Senator Voinovich, I will never forget 2 years ago, when you led an effort—I was privileged, in Berlin then, to address a group of parliamentarians, and when history is written, it was that meeting, it was a rump meeting, it was outside the procedural foundations of what they were doing, but the United States, and your delegation, you felt there was a need to address it. That was the beginning of OSCE meeting on anti-Semitism. And if the United States

and the parliamentarians did not hear from you, from the American Senate and Congress, there would be no session next April in Berlin, because they're looking for excuses.

I have submitted in writing, to be responsive to your request, some recommendations. The recommendations, they're not that unique. They're very simple things to do. First and foremost, is to focus attention. The Ambassador referred to some of them. We worked with Senator Giuliani—not Senator—maybe—with Mayor Giuliani—we worked with him on it, we worked with the American Jewish Committee, we worked with the Conference on Society Jewry, to develop best practices, to develop that which has worked here, which hopefully will work there, but it will need our leadership.

In conclusion, let me say that despite the troubling assessment that we've heard and I bring to this committee, I come to you as an optimist, as a believer that we can go forward from this hearing, from this House, from this House of Congress, from this country, to make a difference.

As I said to you earlier, I am a survivor of the Holocaust, and I emerged from that horrific period because of the courage and compassion of my Catholic nanny and her priest, who hid my true identity and saved me while a million and a half Jewish children were not as fortunate. My story is a living reminder that individuals can make a difference, one life at a time.

Think of an impact you can have from the halls of Congress and through the bully pulpit of the U.S. Government, and as the President has done in Asia this week, to confront this pernicious hatred. Anti-Semitism has a particular place in the history of Europe, in the history of xenophobia. Focusing on it and combating it now can only advance the cause of eradicating all forms of hatred, of bigotry, of prejudice, and racism.

And we, assembled here, know that this is not the work of a day, but a long-term strategy to build an alliance of values one country at a time, one minister at a time, one parliamentarian at a time, to sensitize our allies so that years from now the Mahathirs of that generation will face wall-to-wall international condemnation.

Mr. Chairman, gentlemen, there is no greater challenge, and there is no greater good. And I am humbled by the opportunity to sit here and to meet with you.

Thank you very, very much.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Foxman follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF ABRAHAM H. FOXMAN, NATIONAL DIRECTOR OF THE ANTI-DEFAMATION LEAGUE, NEW YORK, NY

My name is Abraham Foxman. I am the National Director of the Anti-Defamation League, an organization currently celebrating its 90th anniversary year of working to expose and counter anti-Semitism and all forms of bigotry. I am pleased to have the opportunity to address the subcommittee, not just to offer an assessment of the problem, but to highlight concrete steps that Members of the Senate and the US government can take to address it.

As nations of the world, including our own, have turned their focus to the fight against terrorism, we are acutely aware that fighting anti-Semitism and other forms of hatred is critical, not just on humanitarian grounds, but as a matter of the national security of all freedom loving nations.

Mr. Chairman, the convening of this hearing is just one more example of the kind of ongoing leadership, commitment and focus by members of the Committee to spotlight and combat anti-Semitism for which we are grateful.

This hearing is so timely because unfortunately we have had a fresh opportunity to examine a monumental manifestation of anti-Semitism and the reaction of the international community and Europe in particular. I am referring to the poisonous, hate-filled, anti-Semitic speech by Malaysian Prime Minister Mahathir Mohamad just last week.

Let me begin by applauding the Senate for swiftly passing a Resolution condemning the Mahathir statement. Your action stands in stark contrast to that of other leaders who responded either with silence or bitter deliberations over whether it was appropriate to call anti-Semitism by its name and to criticize it publicly.

At last week's meeting of the Organization of the Islamic Conference (OIC), Prime Minister Mahathir took the already incendiary issue of global anti-Semitism to new and dangerous heights in his call to leaders of the 57 nations assembled for a final victory against the Jews who "rule the world by proxy." I have attached excerpts of Mahathir's remarks to my written testimony which you have in front of you.

The audience at this gathering was made up of the leaders of nations, most of which have witnessed an upsurge of anti-Semitic hate over the last three years. Surveys indicate that a significant part of the populations in these countries believe the big lie that Jews were responsible for carrying out the attacks of September 11th. Many opinion leaders and intellectuals in those states claim that the Holocaust did not happen or was greatly exaggerated by world Jewry in order to win support for Israel. There has been a proliferation of anti-Semitic stereotypes—Jews as Nazis, Jews drinking the blood of Muslims, Jews controlling America—in state-controlled media. And Muslim residents of European countries, inspired by this outburst of hate from Islamic media and the Internet, have committed hundreds of acts of anti-Semitic violence against Jews and Jewish institutions.

But the significance of Mahathir's speech being delivered to this particular forum lies not merely in the prevalence of anti-Semitism in those countries but in the fact that this was a meeting of Islamic nations. This was not a United Nations committee meeting, or the organization of French-speaking countries, or the Davos Economic Summit. The OIC member nations are not bound by geography, or politics or culture—but by religion.

This was a rallying cry to an entire faith, a call to holy war against the Jewish religion and people by 1.3 billion Muslims. It is grotesque anti-Semitism with the intent to incite a religious war on an international scale.

The potential effect of the hatred spewed by Mahathir is particularly lethal because of the ability of his message to reverberate across the Muslim world where there are those who are more than willing to take them at face value, to translate them into international terrorism and suicide bombs.

It is far from a surprise that Mahathir personally holds these views. He has a history of which we are aware. In 1997 he blamed Jewish billionaire George Soros for the currency crisis in his country. In 1984 Malaysia banned a performance of the New York Philharmonic Orchestra of a work based on Hebrew melodies by Jewish composer Ernst Bloch.

It is shocking, nevertheless, that 60 years after Europe was decimated by the worst kind of horror that can result when anti-Semitism is unleashed and unchecked, after we had come to believe the world had learned the lessons of the Holocaust, that a head of state would make a call for holy war against Jews the "swan song" of his decades-long political career.

But what alarms us most is Mahathir's presumption that, in making this incendiary speech, he was walking through an open door. And indeed, his confidence was born out by the standing ovation he received after his remarks.

We were truly dismayed and saddened that among the leaders of 57 countries, including US allies like King Abdullah II of Jordan, Prince Abdullah Abdul Aziz of Saudi Arabia, and Morocco's King Mohamed VI, no one stood up, no one walked out, and no one challenged him. Where were the good people at this summit who should have stood up to proclaim that Mahathir's words were evil and unacceptable?

INTERNATIONAL REACTIONS

Beyond the speech itself, it is instructive to look at how the world beyond the OIC reacted, even under the microscope of intense media scrutiny. And what should engage and concern this subcommittee is the fact that this incident is emblematic of one of the most difficult aspects of the new anti-Semitism in Europe which reverberates from the Middle East and—absent clear condemnation and prevention—has too often translated into acts of violence, and even murder of Jews in Europe and elsewhere.

Let us first look at just a sampling of the response from some leaders of Muslim nations:

Egyptian Foreign Minister Ahmed Maher said: "This was a pep talk to the Muslim countries for them to work hard and look to the future, but as soon as you have any criticism of Israel, then there are people who are very eager to rush to condemnation, even without comprehending what it's all about."

Somalian President Abdiqasim Salad Hassan defended Mahathir, saying: "The prime minister was not inciting war. He was just saying that we should be united to face threats from many quarters, including Israel."

Yemen's Foreign Minister Abubakar al-Qirbi said it bluntly. "I don't think they were anti-Semitic at all. I think he was basically stating the fact to the Muslim world."

Days after the controversy roared, Mahathir himself was unrepentant and defended his comments in a press conference saying: "My speech was very clear. I said that the Jews have all the world behind them and that's why they can defy the United Nations."

In Europe, the response of those who should be the most sensitive, because of their history, and their own experience with a leader rallying nations around this kind of invective, was mixed.

A two-day summit of the European Union Council in Brussels last week provided the perfect forum to publicly issue a forceful joint declaration. Italy, which holds the current EU presidency, issued a strong statement as did Spain, Germany and others.

However we were stunned that representatives to an EU summit in Brussels had to debate in closed session whether to condemn this anti-Semitism as part of their concluding declaration. In the end, they did not see fit to make it a part of the official record of the summit. A French government spokesperson defended the position saying that it is not customary policy to deal with such issues in summit declarations. Beyond the fact that this incident should have compelled them to break with "customary policy", numerous reports indicated that leaders of France and Greece actually blocked a condemnation that some EU members asked for. We are not alone in our assessment of the French reaction. Malaysian newspapers report that Mahathir had expressed his gratitude to President Chirac for his "understanding" of the speech.

I'll read to you the French response so you can see first hand the kind of reticence we are talking about. Even after an international outcry, they could only say: "We have respect for the Organization of the Islamic Conference. We have respect for the vast community of Moslems whom this Organization represents. We expect those who speak on behalf of the OIC to show the same respect towards other faiths, in accordance with the spirit of tolerance which is also Islam's." President Chirac later issued what he must have believed was a stronger statement saying to Mahathir: "Your remarks on the role of Jews provoked strong disapproval in France and around the world." The President of France could not bring himself to use the word anti-Semitism.

There certainly have been good people of conscience who prevailed in their own way and were able to mobilize an outcry. But we sorely regret that, while Mahathir's remarks are proudly posted on the OIC Web site, visit the official EU Web site and you will find their criticism makes no mention of the word anti-Semitism and is buried deep in its document archive. While the hater unabashedly trumpets his message, the condemnation is muted by dissent within the EU. Let me quote the simple message that was so difficult for some to accept, hotly debated behind closed doors:

"The EU deeply deplores the comments made earlier today by Dr. Mahathir in his speech at the opening of the 10th session of the Islamic Summit conference in Putrajaya, Malaysia . . . Such words hinder all our efforts to further inter-ethnic and religious harmony, and have absolutely no place in a tolerant world."

We commend those in the international community who took a strong stand against the incendiary anti-Jewish scapegoating of Mahathir's speech. In particular, we recognize Italy, Spain and Germany for their important comments and efforts to rightly denounce and condemn this speech as anti-Semitic, dangerous and morally repugnant. We salute those who worked behind closed doors in the EU to push for a rejection of Mahathir's speech and message.

We are appalled by those who acquiesced, with their silence or even with public support. We are especially outraged by the actions of French President Jacques Chirac and Greek Prime Minister Costas Simitis to block the EU Summit official condemnation. By their disgraceful behavior, these countries are willingly complicit in spreading these words of hate.

ADL wrote the leaders of Australia, Germany, Italy, and Spain to express appreciation for their strong condemnations of Mahathir's speech, and, on the other side,

to France, Greece, Jordan, Turkey, Morocco, Russia, and others, calling their behavior a "disgrace to their countries."

LESSONS GOING FORWARD

This chapter illustrates yet again that one cannot talk about anti-Semitism in Europe without confronting the role of the Arab world in propagating the kind of anti-Jewish myths which flourished in Europe centuries ago. These canards are being revived and cloaked in theology and religion. Islamist campaigns within the Muslim world and Europe have moved the anti-Jewish beliefs within Islam from the fringes, where they historically resided, closer to the center. This demonization of Jews and Judaism emanates from houses of worship and from clerics. It pervades educational systems and government-sponsored media, and it permeates popular culture well beyond the Middle East.

The ensuing radicalization of youth in Muslim countries and in Europe has played a large role in the attacks against individual Jews and Jewish institutions. I have appended to my written testimony just a sample of recent anti-Semitic incidents in Europe. This is in no way a quantitative representation but merely to demonstrate that, while the frequency may vary, the violence continues and presents a real danger to the security of Jews living in Europe.

Mr. Chairman, even the brief overview I have provided of world reaction to this one incident leads us to one paramount conclusion—that the US is unique in its resolve to be a voice of conscience when it comes to calling anti-Semitism by its name.

Even as the President traveled to Asia to meet world leaders to bolster US ties with nations on issues of vital US interest, he faced this issue head on. While others were afraid to mention the words anti-Semitism, our President spoke boldly and clearly in a face to face encounter with Prime Minister Mahathir himself. In making his outrage known on both a personal and public level, the President has left no doubt that the Prime Minister's anti-Semitism and his continuing defense of his speech is unacceptable and morally repugnant in the eyes of the United States.

With similar moral clarity, the Senate swiftly passed a resolution of condemnation—not at the urging of any organization or religious community—but instinctively as a matter of clear policy and principle.

It is abundantly clear that the vital task of getting leaders around the world to denounce the ideology of anti-Semitism that has gripped the Islamic and Arab world will depend on the steadfastness of US leadership.

While the last century witnessed the most heinous results of bigotry unchecked, fortunately, we also have witnessed in our lifetime powerful examples of how strong US leadership has brought about dramatic change.

Members of Congress and of this committee are uniquely positioned to exert such leadership and to build among our allies in Europe a coalition of those willing to stand up. You are in a position to use your good offices to recognize constructive and courageous leadership as well as to criticize those nations and leaders who fail to step up to the plate.

Parliamentarians in the US and Germany have taken a lead in getting the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) to address anti-Semitism for the first time in a separate meeting in Vienna. Germany has offered to host an important follow up meeting next April in Berlin. We urge Senators to look at other relevant international, regional and inter-parliamentary institutions that might address the issue.

I mentioned countries like Spain and Italy that have shown courage in speaking out. Your membership in this Committee, your meetings, your travel, your bilateral contacts with heads of state, foreign ministers and parliamentarians provide an opportunity to broaden the alliance of those who are courageous enough to stand up even where it is unpopular to do so.

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 condemning anti-Semitism is in no way a denigration of any other religion or group.

On the contrary, combating anti-Semitism, especially in Europe, advances the protection of all minorities. It was anti-Semitism which infected Europe and dismantled its democratic institutions and ultimately the freedom of all its inhabitants. Jews have been referred to as the canary in the coal mine—because concerted attacks against Jews will not stop there but will endanger the civilized world and democratic institutions wherever they exist.

I would like to highlight some concrete steps which we hope the Committee will be able to take. We look forward to continuing to cooperate and share ideas about

how to carry on this fight—armed with the clear knowledge that we can make a difference.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. European nations must take seriously the ideology of anti-Semitism coming out of the Arab and Islamic world.

- Political, intellectual, and religious leaders must insist in a variety of forums that, the Big Lie—blaming the Jews for September 11th, growing Holocaust denial, the spread of the infamous forgery the Protocols of the Elders of Zion and other manifestations of anti-Semitism in the Arab and Islamic world—are unacceptable, and call on Arab leaders to do something about it. The silence of nations in the face of this dangerous incitement against Jews must end.
- Nations of Europe have it well within their power today to play a very different role in international organizations where anti-Israel bias has been reflected even in the revival of the infamous "Zionism is racism" ideology. This bias has shown itself to be easily transformed into outright anti-Semitism, as we witnessed at the U.N. World Conference Against Racism in Durban, South Africa in 2001.
- Nations must confront the connection between the bias against Israel internationally and the surge of anti-Semitism on the streets. While the state of Israel is not beyond legitimate criticism, states must reject the self-satisfying rationalization that this bias and violence are manifestations of disagreement with Israel. Leaders must recognize that the singling out of Israel creates an environment in which anti-Semitism flourishes. We cannot let anti-Semitism and efforts to brand Israel a pariah state seep into the public debate disguised as political commentary. The ultimate question is not whether one can criticize Israel without being an anti-Semite, but whether that criticism reflects a double standard and an unfair bias against Jewish national self-expression and self-determination.

2. Recognize anti-Semitism as a human rights violation—de-linked from Middle East issues. While anti-Semitism has been acknowledged as a form of racism, there is a reticence to address its re-emergence squarely within multilateral frameworks for fear of raising the ire of Arab communities or states, or of running against a political climate which is increasingly hostile toward Israel. US diplomats and NGOs repeatedly encounter discomfort with any kind of special focus on the issue. In the United Nations, language on anti-Semitism or Holocaust commemoration is dealt with as part of negotiations of language on the Arab—Israeli conflict and not as a separate human rights or religious freedom issue. Addressing anti-Semitism head-on should not be viewed as a Middle East issue or taking a particular side in any regional political conflict.

Anti-Semitism is xenophobia that infects the community where it occurs—it should not be treated as a political hot-button issue related to the Middle East. Even, and especially when support for Israel may be unpopular, defense of Jewish rights must not be allowed to fall out of favor.

3. Hate Crime Data Collection and Monitoring.

- National and local authorities must call attacks on Jews and Jewish institutions what they are—anti-Semitism. The first step is to ensure that incidents are taken seriously and appropriately categorized as hate crimes. We have witnessed in some countries incidents rationalized as hooliganism or as expressions of political disagreement with Israel. They are a violation of national law in many states and of international norms and treaties against incitement, religious intolerance, and hate violence.
- Enhance worldwide monitoring efforts by governments and non-governmental bodies alike. Nations should promote the adoption of comprehensive hate crime data collection laws and provide training in how to identify, report, and respond to hate crimes for appropriate law enforcement officials. It is impossible to properly assess the scope and nature of the problem without data collection and public reporting on anti-Semitic incidents.
- Nations should allocate funds for 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.

4. Using the Bully Pulpit.

- Urge political and civic leaders to utilize opportunities they have every day to speak out against bigotry. Their statements and actions to promote tolerance resonate nationally and internationally. It is hard to overstate the importance of outspoken leadership in opposition to all forms of bigotry. These leaders set the tone for national discourse and have an essential role in shaping attitudes. Further, politicians and civic leaders should never engage in divisive appeals based on race, ethnicity, sexual orientation, or religion.
- Urge parliamentarians abroad to take action. The challenge is how to replicate these kinds of hearings and resolutions in parliaments of other nations. Building on the efforts of the US Congress, it is vital to broaden the alliance of those parliaments willing to speak the truth about this issue and take action. Let other parliaments do as Congress has done, pass resolutions against anti-Semitism and develop national action plans to combat it.
- Urge support for the OSCE Berlin Follow-Up Conference. The landmark June OSCE conference on anti-Semitism brought together leaders from 55 states to recognize the problem and forge a common commitment to follow up on a program of action. The Berlin follow up meeting will be critical in seeing this process through to meaningful implementation.

5. Implement Anti-Bias Education. Anti-Bias Education is an essential building block of combating hatred. History has shown that, when people of conscience are given tools and skills to stand up against bigotry, they will do so. The ADL has many programs, some of which have been highlighted by European governments as "best practices" in the fight against racism. One of our earliest successes, which is used as a model worldwide, was implemented in Germany in response to hate crimes against Turkish Muslim immigrants in the early 1990s. I have included a checklist of additional programs we have found to be successful internationally.

- Parliaments should press education ministries to use schools as a staging ground for anti-bias education. Governments must act now to provide appropriate teacher training on anti-bias education curricula and empower students through peer training programs. From the ages of 3-5 years-old, where children begin to recognize differences and form attitudes based on those perceptions, to the college and university level, where inter-group understanding is critical to fostering a successful learning environment, anti-bias education is necessary to equip students with skills and confidence which enable them to confront prejudice, to become activists against bigotry and agents for change.
- Resources should be allocated to institute and replicate best practices and promising programs on prejudice awareness, conflict resolution, and multicultural education through public-private partnerships, as part of education exchange and public diplomacy programs.

6. Holocaust Education. The Holocaust serves as a grim reminder of where intolerance can lead if permitted to flourish and of the absolute necessity that it be stopped. Following up on the January 2000 Declaration of the Stockholm International Forum on the Holocaust, parliamentarians should seek to implement Holocaust curricula to draw upon the lessons of this tragic period to illuminate the importance of moral decision.

- ADL developed a comprehensive, interactive secondary level Holocaust curriculum enhanced with state of the art audiovisual supplements for use in American high schools. This kind of curriculum could be easily adapted for use in classrooms abroad.
- One useful model is the ADL's Bearing Witness Program for Religious Educators. This program 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 is a collaborative effort between ADL, the Archdiocese, and the US Holocaust Memorial Museum.

7. Law Enforcement Training. In talking about grappling with bigotry with leaders, we often hear about the challenge of changing demographics. Beyond training in hate crimes response, anti-bias education for law enforcement professionals helps develop cross-cultural skills and communication in order to enhance officer effectiveness and safety by building cooperation and trust with diverse communities.

- A new proposed EU Law Enforcement Training Center would provide an ideal venue for such training.
- Respond to racism and hate crimes in the armed forces. Ministries of Defense should provide anti-bias and prejudice awareness training for all recruits and military personnel, improve procedures for screening out racist recruits, and clarify and publicize existing prohibitions against active duty participation in hate group activity. In Austria, ADL training has been implemented already for 8% of all law enforcement professionals throughout Austria. In Russia, ADL has provided training as part of the "Climate of Trust" hate crime training program for law enforcement.

8. Mobilize religious leaders to speak out. The religious context in which so much anti-Semitism festers—as we see in the Mahathir incident—compels a response from leaders of all faiths, including Muslims. At home and abroad, we maintain our vigilance and unequivocal opposition to intolerance against Muslims. But we respect the faith of Islam and its leaders enough to hold them accountable for their broad failure to speak out against anti-Jewish hatred being fed to youth and other believers as God's truth, as a tenet of faith.

CONCLUSION

Despite the troubling assessment I bring to this committee today I come to you as an optimist, as a believer that we can go forward from this hearing, from this House of Congress, from this country, to make a difference. I am a survivor of the Holocaust. I emerged from that horrific period only because of the courage and compassion of my Catholic nanny and her priest who hid my true identity and saved me. But 1½ million other Jewish children were not fortunate enough to meet with those rare individuals of conscience. My story is a living reminder that individuals can make a difference, one life at a time. Imagine the impact you can continue to make from the Halls of Congress and through the bully pulpit of the US government to confront this pernicious hatred.

We must raise our collective voices against any expression of hate and to challenge those whose "violence of silence" aids and abets its growth. Anti-Semitism has a particular place in the history of Europe and in the history of xenophobia. Focusing on it and combating it now can only advance the cause of eradicating all forms of hatred.

We assembled here know that this is not the work of a day, but a long term strategy to build an alliance of values—one country at a time, one minister at a time, one parliamentarian at a time, to sensitize our allies so that, years from now, the Mahathirs of that generation will face wall-to-wall international condemnation.

There is no greater challenge. There is no greater good.

APPENDIX I

SPEECH BY PRIME MINISTER MAHATHIR MOHAMAD OF MALAYSIA TO THE TENTH ISLAMIC SUMMIT CONFERENCE*

[Source: OIC Web site]

Prime Minister Mahathir:

Alhamdulillah, All Praise be to Allah, by whose Grace and Blessings we, the leaders of the Organization of Islamic Conference countries are gathered here today to confer and hopefully to plot a course for the future of Islam and the Muslim ummah worldwide . . .

The whole world is looking at us. Certainly 1.3 billion Muslims, one-sixth of the world's population are placing their hopes in us, in this meeting, even though they may be cynical about our will and capacity to even decide to restore the honor of Islam and the Muslims, much less to free their brothers and sisters from the oppression and humiliation from which they suffer today.

I will not enumerate the instances of our humiliation and oppression, nor will I once again condemn our detractors and oppressors. It would be an exercise in futility because they are not going to change their attitudes just because we condemn them. If we are to recover our dignity and that of Islam, our religion, it is we who must decide, it is we who must act.

To begin with, the Governments of all the Muslim countries can close ranks and have a common stand if not on all issues, at least on some major ones, such as on Palestine. We are all Muslims. We are all oppressed. We are all being humiliated. But we who have been raised by Allah above our fellow Muslims to rule our coun-

tries have never really tried to act in concert in order to exhibit at our level the brotherhood and unity that Islam enjoins upon us. . . .

From being a single ummah we have allowed ourselves to be divided into numerous sects, mazhabs and tarikats, each more concerned with claiming to be the true Islam than our oneness as the Islamic ummah. We fail to notice that our detractors and enemies do not care whether we are true Muslims or not. To them we are all Muslims, followers of a religion and a Prophet whom they declare promotes terrorism, and we are all their sworn enemies. They will attack and kill us, invade our lands, bring down our Governments whether we are Sunnis or Syiahs, Alawait or Druze or whatever. And we aid and abet them by attacking and weakening each other, and sometimes by doing their bidding, acting as their proxies to attack fellow Muslims. We try to bring down our Governments through violence, succeeding to weaken and impoverish our countries. . . .

With all these developments over the centuries the ummah and the Muslim civilization became so weak that at one time there was not a single Muslim country which was not colonized or hegemonised by the Europeans. But regaining independence did not help to strengthen the Muslims. Their states were weak and badly administered, constantly in a state of turmoil. The Europeans could do what they liked with Muslim territories. It is not surprising that they should excise Muslim land to create the state of Israel to solve their Jewish problem. Divided, the Muslims could do nothing effective to stop the Balfour and Zionist transgression.

Some would have us believe that, despite all these, our life is better than that of our detractors. Some believe that poverty is Islamic; sufferings and being oppressed are Islamic. This world is not for us. Ours are the joys of heaven in the afterlife. All that we have to do is to perform certain rituals, wear certain garments and put up a certain appearance. Our weakness, our backwardness and our inability to help our brothers and sisters who are being oppressed are part of the Will of Allah, the sufferings that we must endure before enjoying heaven in the hereafter. We must accept this fate that befalls us. We need not do anything. We can do nothing against the Will of Allah.

But is it true that it is the Will of Allah and that we can and should do nothing? Allah has said in Surah Ar-Ra'd verse 11 that He will not change the fate of a community until the community has tried to change its fate itself.

The early Muslims were as oppressed as we are presently. But after their sincere and determined efforts to help themselves in accordance with the teachings of Islam, Allah had helped them to defeat their enemies and to create a great and powerful Muslim civilization. But what effort have we made especially with the resources that He has endowed us with.

We are now 1.3 billion strong. We have the biggest oil reserve in the world. We have great wealth. We are not as ignorant as the Jahilliah who embraced Islam. We are familiar with the workings of the world's economy and finances. We control 57 out of the 180 countries in the world. Our votes can make or break international organizations. Yet we seem more helpless than the small number of Jahilliah converts who accepted the Prophet as their leader. Why? Is it because of Allah's will or is it because we have interpreted our religion wrongly, or failed to abide by the correct teachings of our religion, or done the wrong things? . . .

Today we, the whole Muslim ummah are treated with contempt and dishonor. Our religion is denigrated. Our holy places desecrated. Our countries are occupied. Our people starved and killed.

None of our countries are truly independent. We are under pressure to conform to our oppressors' wishes about how we should behave, how we should govern our lands, how we should think even.

Today if they want to raid our country, kill our people, destroy our villages and towns, there is nothing substantial that we can do. Is it Islam which has caused all these? Or is it that we have failed to do our duty according to our religion?

Our only reaction is to become more and more angry. Angry people cannot think properly. And so we find some of our people reacting irrationally. They launch their own attacks, killing just about anybody including fellow Muslims to vent their anger and frustration. Their Governments can do nothing to stop them. The enemy retaliates and puts more pressure on the Governments. And the Governments have no choice but to give in, to accept the directions of the enemy, literally to give up their independence of action.

With this their people and the ummah become angrier and turn against their own Governments. Every attempt at a peaceful solution is sabotaged by more indiscriminate attacks calculated to anger the enemy and prevent any peaceful settlement. But the attacks solve nothing. The Muslims simply get more oppressed.

There is a feeling of hopelessness among the Muslim countries and their people. They feel that they can do nothing right. They believe that things can only get

worse. The Muslims will forever be oppressed and dominated by the Europeans and the Jews. They will forever be poor, backward and weak. Some believe, as I have said, this is the Will of Allah, that the proper state of the Muslims is to be poor and oppressed in this world.

But is it true that we should do and can do nothing for ourselves? Is it true that 1.3 billion people can exert no power to save themselves from the humiliation and oppression inflicted upon them by a much smaller enemy? Can they only lash back blindly in anger? Is there no other way than to ask our young people to blow themselves up and kill people and invite the massacre of more of our own people?

It cannot be that there is no other way. 1.3 billion Muslims cannot be defeated by a few million Jews. There must be a way. And we can only find a way if we stop to think, to assess our weaknesses and our strength, to plan, to strategize and then to counter attack. As Muslims we must seek guidance from the Al-Quran and the Sunnah of the Prophet. Surely the 23 years' struggle of the Prophet can provide us with some guidance as to what we can and should do.

We know he and his early followers were oppressed by the Qhuraish. Did he launch retaliatory strikes? No. He was prepared to make strategic retreats. He sent his early followers to a Christian country and he himself later migrated to Madinah. There he gathered followers, built up his defense capability and ensured the security of his people. At Hudaibiyah he was prepared to accept an unfair treaty, against the wishes of his companions and followers. During the peace that followed he consolidated his strength and eventually he was able to enter Mecca and claim it for Islam. Even then he did not seek revenge. And the peoples of Mecca accepted Islam and many became his most powerful supporters, defending the Muslims against all their enemies.

That briefly is the story of the struggle of the Prophet. We talk so much about following the sunnah of the Prophet. We quote the instances and the traditions profusely. But we actually ignore all of them.

If we use the faculty to think that Allah has given us then we should know that we are acting irrationally. We fight without any objective, without any goal other than to hurt the enemy because they hurt us. Naively we expect them to surrender. We sacrifice lives unnecessarily, achieving nothing other than to attract more massive retaliation and humiliation.

It is surely time that we pause to think. But will this be wasting time? For well over half a century we have fought over Palestine. What have we achieved? Nothing. We are worse off than before. If we had paused to think then we could have devised a plan, a strategy that can win us final victory. Pausing and thinking calmly is not a waste of time. We have a need to make a strategic retreat and to calmly assess our situation.

We are actually very strong. 1.3 billion people cannot be simply wiped out. The Europeans killed 6 million Jews out of 12 million. But today the Jews rule this world by proxy. They get others to fight and die for them.

We may not be able to do that. We may not be able to unite all the 1.3 billion Muslims. We may not be able to get all the Muslim Governments to act in concert. But even if we can get a third of the ummah and a third of the Muslim states to act together, we can already do something. Remember that the Prophet did not have many followers when he went to Madinah. But he united the Ansars and the Muhajirins and eventually he became strong enough to defend Islam.

Apart from the partial unity that we need, we must take stock of our assets. I have already mentioned our numbers and our oil wealth. In today's world we wield a lot of political, economic and financial clout, enough to make up for our weakness in military terms.

We also know that not all non-Muslims are against us. Some are well-disposed towards us. Some even see our enemies as their enemies. Even among the Jews there are many who do not approve of what the Israelis are doing.

We must not antagonize everyone. We must win their hearts and minds. We must win them to our side not by begging for help from them but by the honorable way that we struggle to help ourselves. We must not strengthen the enemy by pushing everyone into their camps through irresponsible and unIslamic acts. Remember Salah El Din and the way he fought against the so called Crusaders, King Richard of England in particular. Remember the considerateness of the Prophet to the enemies of Islam. We must do the same. It is winning the struggle that is important, not angry retaliation, not revenge.

We must build up our strength in every field, not just in armed might. Our countries must be stable and well administered, must be economically and financially strong, industrially competent and technologically advanced. This will take time, but it can be done and it will be time well spent. We are enjoined by our religion to be patient. Innallahamaasabirin. Obviously there is virtue in being patient.

But the defense of the ummah, the counter attack need not start only after we have put our houses in order. Even today we have sufficient assets to deploy against our detractors. It remains for us to identify them and to work out how to make use of them to stop the carnage caused by the enemy. This is entirely possible if we stop to think, to plan, to strategize and to take the first few critical steps. Even these few steps can yield positive results. . . .

The enemy will probably welcome these proposals and we will conclude that the promoters are working for the enemy. But think. We are up against a people who think. They survived 2000 years of pogroms not by hitting back, but by thinking. They invented and successfully promoted Socialism, Communism, human rights and democracy so that persecuting them would appear to be wrong, so they may enjoy equal rights with others. With these they have now gained control of the most powerful countries and they, this tiny community, have become a world power. We cannot fight them through brawn alone. We must use our brains also.

Of late because of their power and their apparent success they have become arrogant. And arrogant people, like angry people will make mistakes, will forget to think.

They are already beginning to make mistakes. And they will make more mistakes. There may be windows of opportunity for us now and in the future. We must seize these opportunities.

But to do so we must get our acts right. Rhetoric is good. It helps us to expose the wrongs perpetrated against us, perhaps win us some sympathy and support. It may strengthen our spirit, our will and resolve, to face the enemy. . . .

There are many things that we can do. There are many resources that we have at our disposal. What is needed is merely the will to do it, As Muslims, we must be grateful for the guidance of our religion, we must do what needs to be done, willingly and with determination. Allah has not raised us, the leaders, above the others so we may enjoy power for ourselves only. The power we wield is for our people, for the ummah, for Islam. We must have the will to make use of this power judiciously, prudently, concertedly. Insyaallah we will triumph in the end.

I pray to Allah that this 10th Conference of the OIC in Putrajaya, Malaysia will give a new and positive direction to us, will be blessed with success by Him, Almighty Allah, Arahman, Arahirn.

Prime Minister's Office
Putrajaya

APPENDIX II

SELECTED INCIDENTS ACROSS EUROPE/EURASIA IN 2003 [1]

Austria

May 10, 2003—Vienna—A rabbi was physically assaulted by two youths as he was walking home from prayer in eastern Vienna. After shouting anti-Semitic slurs, the youths kicked the victim and struck his head with a beer bottle. According to the Austrian Anti-Terrorism Bureau for Protection of the Constitution, the suspects were in custody with charges pending.

Belarus

August 27, 2003—Minsk—A synagogue in the Belarusian capital was set on fire by unidentified assailants who doused the building's main entrance with kerosene. Firefighters managed to save the edifice, but its facade was damaged, according to Yuri Dorn, President of the Jewish Religious Union of Belarus. The attack was the fifth attempt to burn the synagogue over the last two years.

May 26, 2003—Minsk—Vandals desecrated a memorial to the thousands of Jews slain in Minsk during the Holocaust. The vandals scrawled swastikas, Nazi slogans and anti-Jewish threats on plaques at the Yama memorial, which marks the site of the ghetto where more than 100,000 Jews were exterminated by Nazi troops during World War II.

Belgium

June 13, 2003—Charleroi—A 32-year-old man of Moroccan descent attempted to explode a vehicle loaded with gas canisters in front of a synagogue. He was arrested by police shortly after the incident. The man reportedly set his own car on fire, but it did not explode. Belgian Prime Minister Guy Verhofstadt condemned the at-

[1] This listing is in no way meant to be comprehensive or to be a quantitative representative of the number of incidents in specific countries but merely to provide examples.

tempted attack but said he saw no need to raise security around Jewish buildings and institutions. In April 2002, the same synagogue, situated on the edge of the city, was hit by gunfire from unknown assailants .France

Paris

July 25, 2003—Paris—A synagogue in the Paris suburb of Saint-Denis was ransacked and desecrated with anti-Semitic graffiti. Prayer books were scattered on the floor, the Torah scrolls opened and money was stolen. "Juif=mort" (Jew = death) was scrawled on an outside wall.

July 20, 2003—Venissieux—Two plaques at a Holocaust memorial were defaced and broken. The plaques mark the site of a transit camp where hundreds of Jews from the Lyon region were rounded up before being sent to Nazi death camps in August 1942.

March 22, 2003—Paris—A number of Jews, including teenagers, were chased and attacked by anti-war protesters outside the headquarters of a Jewish youth organization. The protesters were described by witnesses as "wearing kaffiyahs." One teenage boy was hospitalized for injuries he sustained while being beaten by demonstrators.

Germany

August 15, 2003—Kassel—More than 50 graves were vandalized at a historic Jewish cemetery in the central German city of Kassel. Some gravestones were overturned, while others had headstones weighing up to 2,000 pounds toppled on them. Police were investigating.

July 28, 2003—Saxony-Anhalt—Vandals defaced a memorial to Nazi victims of a Buchenwald subcamp, plastering the buildings with anti-Semitic newspapers. Visitors to the Langenstein-Zwieberge memorial reported the damage to the police, who said that the perpetrators had used copies of anti-Jewish newspapers from 1933 to 1945, the years the Nazis ruled Germany.

July 8, 2003—Berlin—A Jewish memorial in Berlin was vandalized. The vandals apparently threw small paving stones, gouging the surface of a memorial dedicated to the former Levetzowstrasse synagogue, which was used by the Nazis as detention center to deport Jews. According to the police, the incident took place in broad daylight, but the perpetrators escaped before they could be arrested.

June 27, 2003—Berlin—A 14-year-old girl wearing a Star of David necklace was attacked by a group of teenage girls on a bus in the German capital. According to reports, the group first insulted the girl because of her religion and her Ukrainian nationality and subsequently hit and kicked her, injuring her slightly. Police were investigating.

Greece

August 4, 2003—Ioannina—Vandals sprayed swastikas and Greek nationalistic slogans on the outer walls of a synagogue. The town's Jewish community condemned the attack and urged the police to investigate.

February 1, 2003—Thessaloniki (Salonica)—Two swastikas were spray painted on a Holocaust memorial. The memorial honoring the tens of thousands of Salonican Jews killed by the Nazis has been vandalized before.

Italy

March 9, 2003—Milan—Anti-Semitic graffiti appeared on the office of the RAI, the Italian state-owned radio and television network, after a journalist of Jewish origin was named director. The graffiti read "RAI for Italians, no to Jews." The messages were condemned by political and popular figures.

Russia

October 10, 2003—An anti-Semitic sign with a fake bomb attached to it was placed on a roadside south of Moscow in the latest in a series of copycat crimes that began last year in Russia, the ITAR-Tass news agency reported on October 10. The sign, with an unspecified anti-Semitic slogan, was found by a motorist Thursday on a main highway about 60 kilometers south of the capital, ITAR-Tass reported, citing Moscow region police.

September 2, 2003—Novgorod—An object resembling a bomb with an anti-Semitic slogan attached was found at a local synagogue in Novgorod, 400 miles northwest from Moscow. The "bomb" was determined to be a fake when no explosives were found.

June 28, 2003—Pyatigorsk—On the last weekend in June, a Jewish cemetery in the town of Pyatigorsk, in the North Caucasus, was desecrated. Vandals smashed 10 tombstones, including those of Russian World War II soldiers. It is the only Jewish cemetery in the multi-ethnic Stavropol Region.

June 22, 2003—Yaroslavl—Windows were shattered and anti-Semitic graffiti painted on a synagogue in Yaroslavl, a town 300 miles northeast of Moscow. No one was injured in the incident. The police were investigating.

Slovakia

January 21, 2003—Banovce nad Bedravou—A 19th-century Jewish cemetery was desecrated in the western Slovak town of Banovce nad Bedravou, about 100 kilometers northeast of the capital, Bratislava. Thirty-five tombstones were toppled and vandals drew a swastika in the snow by the gate to the cemetery.

Sweden

April 27, 2003—Malmö—Unknown assailants attempted to set fire to the purification room in the Jewish cemetery in Malmö. The attackers threw firebombs into the building, but the structure was still standing. It was the eighth time the purification room at the cemetery has come under attack.

United Kingdom

August 5, 2003—Manchester—Vandals smashed and toppled 20 headstones in an attack at a Jewish cemetery in Prestwich, in Greater Manchester. Police are treating the incident at Rainsough Hebrew Burial Ground as racially motivated. The cemetery has been targeted in the past.

July 8, 2003—Southampton—Eleven tombstones in the Jewish section of the Hollybrook cemetery were desecrated with Nazi slogans and swastikas. Six others were toppled. A spokesman for the Community Security Trust, which provides security and defense advice for the Jewish community across Britain, said it was the second attack on Jewish graves in Southampton in seven months. Police were investigating.

May 15, 2003—London—Police discovered the desecration of 386 Jewish graves at the Plashet Cemetery in East Ham. The gravestones had been pushed over. Police are treating the incident as a racially motivated attack. In addition to three youths, all under 17 and who were subsequently released on bail, four more youths have been arrested and were being held in custody.

APPENDIX III

INTERNATIONAL ANTI-PREJUDICE PROGRAMS OF THE ANTI-DEFAMATION LEAGUE

Germany

- A CLASSROOM OF DIFFERENCE® Program integrated into Teacher Training Institutes of eleven German Laender.
- Eine Welt der Vielfalt in Berlin implements ADL A WORKPLACE OF DIFFERENCE® programs.
- Participate in the Bertelsmann International Network on Education for Democracy, Human Rights, and Tolerance. This network identifies best practice models from programs that foster education, democracy, human rights and tolerance around the world.
- Peer Training supported by Eine Welt der Viefalt, the Deutsche Kinder und Jugendstiftung and EPTO (European Peer Training Organization).

Belgium

- In conjunction with Centre Europeen Juif d'Information (CEJI), the ADL Teacher and Peer Training programs are implemented in French and Flemish Belgium schools.
- Foundation support—Evens and Bernheim Foundations.

Italy

- In conjunction with CEJI, the ADL Teacher and Peer Training programs are implemented in the region of Milan.
- Foundation support-Compagnia San Paolo.

France

- In conjunction with CEJI and the French Catholic School Network (UNAPEC), the ADL Teacher and Peer Training programs are implemented in France.
- Foundation support-Charles Leopold Mayer Foundation.

Netherlands

- In conjunction with CEJI, the ADL Teacher and Peer Training programs will be implemented this year.
- Funding support-Dutch Insurers Association.

Spain

• In conjunction with CEJI, Peer Training programs exist and the ADL Teacher Training programs will begin this year in the region of Altea.

Greece

• In conjunction with CEJI Peer Training programs exist.

Luxembourg

• In conjunction with CEJI Peer Training programs exist.

Portugal

• In conjunction with CEJI Peer Training programs exist.

The United Kingdom

• In conjunction with CEJI Peer Training programs exist.

Austria

• The A WORLD OF DIFFERENCE® Institute office is responsible for implementing anti-bias education programs for all Law Enforcement professionals throughout Austria. To date 8% have participated in program. Funded by the Ministry of Interior.
• In conjunction with CEJI Peer Training programs are being implemented.
• Austrian ADL trainers deliver WORKPLACE programs.

Japan

• In conjunction with the Diversity Education Network ADL Teacher Training programs are implemented in the region of Osaka.

Argentina

• In conjunction with the Fundacion Banco De La Provincia Buenos Aires the ADL WORKPLACE program is being implemented in the areas of public administration, in the province of Buenos Aires.

Israel

• Teacher and Peer Training programs exist in the schools and in after school programs. Materials are in Hebrew and Arabic.
• Children of the Dream program exists initiating a cultural exchange between Ethiopian-Israeli teens and their native Israeli counterparts.

Russia

• In conjunction with the Bay Area Council for Jewish Rescue and Renewal, the San Francisco Police Department and San Francisco District Attorney, ADL participates in the Climate of Trust Russian Hate Crime Training for Law Enforcement professionals.

In conjunction with CEJI, Peer Training programs will begin in Hungary, Poland, Ireland and the Czech Republic this year.

In every country materials are translated and culturally adapted.

Senator ALLEN. Thank you, Mr. Foxman. Your entire statement and recommendations will be entered into the record. Thank you for your testimony.

Now, I'd like to hear from Mr. Harris.

STATEMENT OF DAVID A. HARRIS, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, THE AMERICAN JEWISH COMMITTEE, NEW YORK, NY

Mr. HARRIS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I, too, am honored to appear before this subcommittee today, and thank you for the opportunity.

I have the privilege of speaking on behalf of the American Jewish Committee, the nation's oldest human relations organization. With offices in 33 cities in the United States and 14 overseas posts, including seven in Europe, we have an eye on the world.

For nearly a century, Mr. Chairman, we have struggled against the scourge of anti-Semitism and its associated pathologies by seeking to advance the principles of democracy, the rule of law, and

pluralism; by strengthening ties across ethnic, racial, and religious lines among people of good will; and by shining the spotlight of exposure on those who preach or practice hatred and intolerance.

Mr. Chairman, never in recent memory has that work been more important. We have witnessed, as others have said today, in the last 3 years in particular a resurgence of anti-Semitism. Some of its manifestations are eerily familiar; others appear in new guises. But the bottom line, Mr. Chairman, is that Jews throughout the world, and notably in Western Europe, are experiencing a level of unease not seen in the postwar years.

I myself have been witness, through my frequent contact with Europe, to the changed situation. I've lived in Europe for 7 years. I speak several European languages. And most recently I spent a sabbatical year in Geneva with my family when this new outbreak of anti-Semitism occurred. I have seen, within that outbreak, a new form of anti-Semitism—the use of criticism of Israel and Israeli practices as justification for violence against Jews, who become "legitimate targets by virtue of their real or presumed identification with Israel, with Zionism, or simply with the Jewish people."

Mr. Chairman, European history, as we know so well, contains glorious chapters of human development and scientific breakthroughs, but it also contains too many centuries filled with an ever-expanding vocabulary of anti-Semitism, from the teaching of contempt for the Jews, to the Spanish and Portuguese Inquisitions, from forced conversions to forced expulsions, from restrictions on employment and education to the introduction of the ghetto, from blood libels to pogroms, and from massacres to the gas chambers at Auschwitz.

Who better than the Europeans should grasp the history of anti-Semitism? Who better than the Europeans should understand the slippery slope that can lead to demonization, dehumanization, and, ultimately, destruction of a people?

What then can Europe do at this moment to address the changed situation of the past 3 years? First and foremost, it can wake up. Precisely because of Europe's history, it is the countries of Europe that still could take, however belatedly, the lead in confronting and combating the growing tide of global anti-Semitism, whatever its source, whatever its manifestation. That would be an extraordinarily positive development. And given Europe's substantial moral weight in the world today, and especially in bodies like the United Nations, that could have real impact.

To date, however, too many European governments and institutions have chosen to live in denial or have sought to contextualize or even rationalize manifestly anti-Semitic behavior.

Whether anti-Semitism comes in its old and familiar guises from the extreme right; in its various disguises from the extreme left, including the combustible mix of anti-Americanism, anti-globalization, and anti-Zionism; or from Muslim sources that peddle malicious conspiracy theories through schools, mosques, and the media to spread hatred of Jews, Europe's voice must be loud, and it must be consistent. More importantly, its actions need to match its words.

One encouraging note in this regard has been the strong condemnation, as my colleague just said a moment ago, by some indi-

vidual European governments, including Italy, Spain, the Netherlands, Germany, and the United Kingdom, in response to the outrageous anti-Semitic remarks of Malaysian Prime Minister Mahathir. But, as Senator Biden said, the failure of the European Union to speak as one last week must be regarded as a profound disappointment and morally indefensible. Silence has never destroyed hate.

Apropos Prime Minister Mahathir's speech, it reminds us once again that, tragically, the center of gravity of anti-Semitism today lies within the Islamic world. And I would respectfully urge the larger Committee on Foreign Relations to consider, at the earliest possible moment, a separate hearing on this pressing issue.

Mr. Chairman, preserving the memory of the Holocaust is highly laudable, as many European countries have sought to do through national days of commemoration, educational initiatives, as Ambassador-Designate O'Donnell spoke of, and memorials and monuments, but demonstrating sensitivity for the legitimate fears of living Jews is no less compelling a task. Whether it is a relatively large Jewish community in France, or a tiny remnant Jewish community in Greece, the fact remains that no Jewish community today comprises more than 1 percent of the total population of any European country, if that. And many remain deeply scarred by the lasting impact of the Holocaust on their numbers, their institutions, and, not least, their psyche.

When the Greek Jewish community awoke one morning shortly after 9/11 to read mainstream press accounts filled with wild assertions of Jewish or Israeli complicity in the plot to attack America, they understandably felt shaken and vulnerable, even if the charges were patently false. With fewer than 5,000 Jews remaining in Greece after the devastation wrought by the Holocaust in a nation of over 10 million, is it any wonder that these Jews might worry for their physical security at just such a moment?

Second, political leaders need to set an example. Joschka Fischer, the Foreign Minister of Germany, is someone who does have a grasp of the lessons of European history—certainly when it comes to the Jews—and he also understands Israel's current difficulties and dilemmas. He has not hesitated to speak out, to write, and to act.

After all, it is political leaders who set the tone for a nation. By their actions or inactions, they send a clear and unmistakable message to their fellow citizens. But how many such principled and outspoken leaders can we point to today? I can count no more than the fingers on my two hands. And, to the contrary, when a French Ambassador to Britain is not penalized for trashing Israel in obscene terms, what is the message to the French people?

Third, many European countries have strict laws, stricter than our own country, regarding anti-Semitism, racism, and Holocaust denial. In fact, to its credit, the French Parliament recently toughened the nation's laws still further. These laws throughout Europe must be used.

In that regard, we were pleased to hear French President Jacques Chirac, at a meeting last month in New York, speak now of a "zero-tolerance policy" toward acts of anti-Semitism, and pen-

alties for those found guilty of such acts that would be, he said, "swift and severe." Better late than never.

No one should ever again be compelled to question the determination of European countries to investigate, prosecute, and seek maximum penalties for those involved in incitement and violence. To cite one specific example, we are watching, with particular interest, what the British home office will do about two British Muslim youths who were quoted earlier this year on page 3 of the New York Times—May 12, 2003—openly calling for the murder of Jews and whose cases were brought to the attention of the British authorities in the spring.

Fourth, Europe faces an enormous long-term challenge in light of major socio-demographic changes. This will require strategies for acculturation and education in the norms and values of postwar democratic Europe, including inculcating a spirit of tolerance and mutual respect.

A recent book in France, the English title of which is "The Lost Territories of the Republic," illustrates the degree of challenge facing schools and teachers in educating new generations of young French who have recently arrived in the country regarding Jews, French history, including the Dreyfus trial, the Holocaust, the status of women, and religious tolerance generally.

We are working with some schools in Europe, as I know the Anti-Defamation League is as well, in an effort to share our experience in America and to expand the zone of tolerance and mutual understanding.

And, finally, all countries that aspire to the highest democratic values, including, but not limited to, European nations, must constantly remind themselves that anti-Semitism is a cancer that may begin with Jews, but never ends with Jews. Anti-Semitism, left unchecked, metastasizes and eventually afflicts the entire democratic body. Given the global nature of anti-Semitism, there is an opportunity here for the democratic nations of the world to act cooperatively.

The United States, to its great credit, has always shown leadership in this regard in the postwar period. It has been an issue that unites our legislative and executive branches and our main political parties.

Much discussion has been heard today about the OSCE process. This is a step forward, offering the chance to assess developments, compare experiences, and set forth both short- and long-term strategies for combating anti-Semitism. This mechanism, while not in itself a panacea, should be regularized for as long as necessary and ought to be viewed as an important vehicle for addressing the issue, but by no means the only one. And we should always remember that such meetings are a means to an end, not ends unto themselves.

Mr. Chairman, I have deliberately omitted any reference to the nations of the former Soviet Union, because my colleague Mark Levin will address that subject in his testimony.

But before closing, let me offer a positive note regarding some of the nations of Central Europe, ten of which have been included in the first and second rounds of NATO enlargement. And I am proud that the American Jewish Committee supported both rounds of

NATO enlargement. While the history of anti-Semitism in many countries in this region runs very deep indeed, we've witnessed important progress in recent years, particularly with the collapse of communism and the ensuing preparations for membership in both NATO and the European Union. There has been a praiseworthy effort by the countries of Central Europe to reach out to Israel and to the larger Jewish world, and to encourage the rebuilding of Jewish communities that suffered enormously under Nazi and, later, Communist rule.

In other words, there's some good news to report here. And one of the reasons for this good news has been the welcome recognition by post-Communist leaders that their commitment to building truly open and democratic societies will be judged in part by how they deal with a range of Jewish issues emanating from the Nazi and Communist eras.

Yet problems remain. In some countries, extremist voices seek votes and attempt to rehabilitate Nazi collaborators, but, fortunately, they are in a distinct minority. And some countries lag behind in bringing to closure the remaining restitution issues arising from Nazi and, later, Communist seizure of property. We hope these matters will soon be addressed with the ongoing encouragement of our government.

Mr. Chairman, by convening this hearing today, the United States has once again underscored its vital role in defending basic human values and human rights around the world. Champions of liberty have always looked to our great country to stand tall and strong in the age-old battle against anti-Semitism. In examining the scope of anti-Semitism today and exploring strategies for combating it, this subcommittee, under your leadership, looms large as a beacon of hope and a voice of conscience. As always, the American Jewish Committee stands ready to assist you and your distinguished colleagues in your admirable efforts.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Harris follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF DAVID A. HARRIS, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, THE AMERICAN JEWISH COMMITTEE, NEW YORK, NY

Mr. Chairman, permit me to express my deepest appreciation to you and to your distinguished colleagues for holding this important and timely hearing, and for affording me the opportunity of testifying before the Subcommittee on European Affairs of the Committee on Foreign Relations regarding the state of anti-Semitism in Europe.

I have the privilege of speaking on behalf of the American Jewish Committee, the oldest human relations organization in the United States. I am proud to represent over 125,000 members and supporters of the American Jewish Committee and a worldwide organization with 33 offices in the United States and 14 overseas posts, including offices in Berlin, Geneva, and Warsaw, and association agreements with the European Council of Jewish Communities and with the Jewish communities in Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Slovakia, and Spain.

Founded in 1906, our core philosophy for nearly a century has been that wherever Jews are threatened, no minority is safe. We have seen over the decades a strikingly close correlation between the level of anti-Semitism in a society and the level of general intolerance and violence against other minorities. Moreover, the treatment of Jews within a given society has become a remarkably accurate barometer of the state of democracy and pluralism in that society. In effect, though it is a role we most certainly did not seek, it can be said that by dint of our historical experience, Jews have become the proverbial miner's canary, often sensing and signaling danger before others are touched.

For nearly a century we have struggled against the scourge of anti-Semitism and its associated pathologies by seeking to advance the principles of democracy, the rule of law, and pluralism; by strengthening ties across ethnic, racial, and religious lines among people of good will; and by shining the spotlight of exposure on those who preach or practice hatred and intolerance.

Never in recent memory has that work been more important. We have witnessed in the last three years in particular a surge in anti-Semitism. Some of its manifestations are eerily familiar; others appear in new guises. But the bottom line is that Jews throughout the world, and notably in Western Europe, are experiencing a level of unease not seen in the postwar years.

I myself have been witness to the changed situation. I spent a sabbatical year in Europe in 2000-01, and continue to travel regularly to Europe, stay in close contact with European political and Jewish leaders, and follow closely the European media.

What sparked this new sense of unease? It cannot be separated from developments on the ground in the Middle East.

If I may be permitted to generalize, too many European governments, civic institutions, and media outlets rushed to condemn Israel after the promising peace talks of 2000 collapsed, despite the determined efforts of the Israeli government, with support from the United States, to reach a historic agreement with the Palestinians. Once the Palestinians returned to the calculated use of violence and terror in September 2000, for many Europeans it was as if those peace talks had never taken place. It was as if there had never been a proposal pushed relentlessly by Prime Minister Ehud Barak, with strong backing from President Bill Clinton, to achieve a two-state solution that included a partition of Jerusalem. And it was as if Chairman Yasir Arafat had not even participated in the talks, much less sabotaged them by rejecting out of hand the landmark deal offered him.

Israel was widely portrayed in Europe as an "aggressor" nation that was "trampling" on the rights of "stateless" and "oppressed" Palestinians. As Israel faced the daunting challenge of defending itself against terrorism, including suicide bombings, some in Europe went still further, seeking to deny it the right reserved to all nations to defend itself against this vicious onslaught. Such an attitude, if you will, became a new form of anti-Semitism.

I fully understand that Israel's actions, like those of any nation trying to cope with a similar threat, may engender discussion and debate or, for that matter, criticism, but what was taking place in these circles was something far more malicious. Tellingly, those engaged in portraying Israel as the "devil incarnate" for every imaginable "sin" were totally silent when it came to the use of Palestinian suicide bombers to kill innocent Israeli women, men, and children; they were even less prepared to address other compelling issues in the region surrounding Israel, such as Syria's longstanding and indefensible occupation of neighboring Lebanon or persistent patterns of gross human rights violations in such countries as Iran, Iraq, Saudi Arabia, and Syria.

The frenzied rhetoric, especially in the media and human rights circles, kept escalating, to the point where some, including a Portuguese Nobel laureate, began recklessly using Nazi terminology to describe Israeli actions. Others, particularly at the time of the stand-off at the Church of the Nativity, reawakened the deadly deicide charge, which had been put to rest by Vatican Council II in 1965.

In highly publicized incidents, a few British intellectuals and journalists called into question Israel's very right to exist, and there were a number of attempts to impose boycotts on Israeli academicians and products. In one notorious case at Oxford University, a professor sought to deny admission to a student applicant based solely on the grounds that he had served in the Israel Defense Forces. Of course, we remember the shocking expletive used by the French ambassador to the Court of St. James regarding Israel, just as we recall that he was never punished by the French Foreign Ministry. And who can forget the travesty in Belgium as Prime Minister Ariel Sharon and a number of Israel military officials were threatened with legal action under the country's universal jurisdiction law, as were several prominent Americans, including former President George Bush, until the country's political leaders finally came to their senses and amended the law?

I could go on at length describing a highly charged atmosphere in Western Europe. Israel was accused, tried, and convicted in the court of public opinion. Furthermore, that court was encouraged, however inadvertently, by governments too quick to condemn Israel's defensive actions and by media outlets that, with a few notable exceptions, presented consistently skewed coverage, frequently blurring the line between factual reporting and editorializing. It would be enough to follow the reporting of some prominent Greek, Italian, Spanish, or even British media outlets for a few days to get a feeling for the inherently unbalanced, at times even inflammatory, coverage of the Middle East. The coverage of the Jenin episode in the spring of 2002

was particularly revealing. Israel was accused of everything from "mass murder" to "genocide," when the reality was a far cry from either, as confirmed by outside human rights experts.

Mr. Chairman, I personally witnessed a pro-Palestinian demonstration in Geneva, just opposite the United Nations headquarters, in which the chant alternated between "jihad, jihad" and "Mort aux juifs," "Death to the Jews." Similar chants could be heard in the streets of France and Belgium. To the best of my knowledge, no action was taken by the authorities in any of these cases.

My children attended a Swiss international school where a 16-year-old Israeli girl was threatened with a knife by a group of Arab pupils. When she complained to school officials, the response was, and I quote, "This is a matter between countries. It does not involve our school." My youngest son had a more or less similar experience on the campus with, again, no action taken by the school authorities.

Is it any wonder that in such an atmosphere many Jews in the countries of Western Europe became concerned on two fronts? First, they were worried for their physical safety as they encountered a new form of anti-Semitism—the use of criticism of Israel and Israeli practices as justification for violence against Jews, who became "legitimate" targets by virtue of their real or presumed identification with Israel, Zionism, or simply the Jewish people. This became evident in the many documented threats and attacks that took place against Jews and Jewish institutions in Europe, especially France. And second, to varying degrees, they were no longer quite as certain that they could rely on the sympathy and understanding of their governments for the physical and, yes, emotional security they needed—the certainty that the state would be there to ensure their protection.

Strikingly, those governments and institutions to a large degree professed ignorance of the problem.

For example, the American Jewish Committee met in November 2001 with the then-foreign minister of France. We raised our concern about growing threats to Jews, as well as growing tolerance for intolerance. In turn, we were treated to a revealing lecture from the minister. Initially, he denied there was any problem at all, though the facts contradicted him. Jews in France were being assaulted, synagogues were being torched, and Jewish parents were anxious about the safety of their children. Then he tried to muddy the problem by suggesting that crime had increased in France and Jews were among its many victims, but certainly not singled out. That, too, was belied by the facts, namely the specificity of the attacks against Jews and Jewish institutions. And finally, he attempted to rationalize the problem by linking it to the Middle East and inferring that, tragic though the anti-Jewish incidents were, they were an inevitable consequence of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict and would likely continue until that conflict was resolved.

Frankly, we were appalled by this response. Could it be that the foreign minister of a country which had given birth to the Declaration of the Rights of Man, and which had been the first European country to extend full protection to its Jewish community, had been unwilling or incapable of understanding and responding to what was going on in his own nation? In reality, France fell short in its responsibility to provide protection to its citizens from the fall of 2000 until the summer of 2002, a 20-month period during which many French Jews felt abandoned and left to their own devices.

Meanwhile, French officials created a straw man—the false charge that France was being depicted as an anti-Semitic country—and went about refuting it. In reality, those concerned with developments in France were talking about anti-Semitic acts within France and never sought to describe the nation as a whole as anti-Semitic, which would have been an unfair and inaccurate characterization.

While much attention has been focused on France because it is home to Europe's largest Jewish community and the greatest number of violent acts against Jews have taken place there in the past three years, the discussion by no means should be limited to France. During this period, we have also met with European Union commissioners in Brussels to discuss our concerns, but with little apparent success. Further, we have met with government leaders in other Western European countries and, with the exception of Germany, our efforts to call attention to a festering problem have fallen on largely deaf ears.

The obvious question is why there has been such a widespread failure to acknowledge and address a problem as obvious as it is real.

Could it be linked to hostility to Israel, particularly after the left-of-center Barak government gave way to the right-of-center Sharon government? Could it be an unwillingness to confront the reality that within the remarkable zone of prosperity and cooperation created by the European Union, a cancer was still lurking that needed treatment? Could it be a fear of antagonizing growing Muslim populations in countries like Belgium and France, where they were rapidly becoming an electoral factor

and, in some cases, were proving restive because of their difficulty in integrating? Or could it be a subliminal reaction, perhaps, to the decade of the 1990s when many countries had been compelled to look at their wartime actions in the mirror yet resented those who held up the mirror?

Whatever the reason, it is clear that anti-Semitism still lurks in Europe, but not only in Europe, of course. Its main center of gravity today is in the Muslim world. The speech earlier this month by Malaysian Prime Minister Mahathir Mohamad at the Organization of the Islamic Conference was a prime example of the use of classical anti-Semitic themes. And not only did none of the many political leaders in attendance walk out of the hall to protest his offensive remarks, but he was greeted with a standing ovation and, subsequently, laudatory comments to the media by such leading officials as Egypt's foreign minister.

European history, as we know so well, contains glorious chapters of human development and scientific breakthroughs. But it also contains too many centuries filled with an ever expanding vocabulary of anti-Semitism—from the teaching of contempt of the Jews to the Spanish and Portuguese Inquisitions; from forced conversions to forced expulsions; from restrictions on employment and education to the introduction of the ghetto; from blood libels to pogroms; and from massacres to the gas chambers at Auschwitz.

Who better than the Europeans should grasp the history of anti-Semitism? Who better than the Europeans should understand the slippery slope that can lead to demonization, dehumanization, and, ultimately, destruction of a people?

What, then, can Europe do at this moment to address the changed situation of the past three years?

First and foremost, precisely because of their history, it is the countries of Europe that could take the lead in confronting and combating the growing tide of global anti-Semitism, whatever its source, whatever its manifestation. That would be an extraordinarily positive development. And given Europe's substantial moral weight in the world today, it could have real impact.

Whether anti-Semitism comes in its old and familiar guises from the extreme right; in its various disguises from the extreme left, including the combustible mix of anti-Americanism, anti-globalization, and anti-Zionism; or from Muslim sources that peddle malicious conspiracy theories through schools, mosques, and the media to spread hatred of Jews, Europe's voice must be loud and consistent. Its actions need to match its words.

To date, experience has shown that a strong European response is far more likely when anti-Semitism emanates from the extreme right than when it comes from either the extreme left or the Islamic world. The reaction must be the same regardless of who is the purveyor.

Preserving the memory of the Holocaust is highly laudable, as many European countries have sought to do through national days of commemoration, educational initiatives, and memorials and monuments. But demonstrating sensitivity for the legitimate fears of living Jews is no less compelling a task. Whether it is a relatively large Jewish community in France or a tiny, remnant Jewish community in Greece, the fact remains that no Jewish community comprises more than one percent of the total population of any European country, if that, and many remain deeply scarred by the lasting impact of the Holocaust on their numbers, their institutions, and, not least, their psyche.

When the Greek Jewish community awoke one morning shortly after 9/11 to read mainstream press accounts filled with wild assertions of Jewish or Israeli complicity in the plot to attack America, they understandably felt shaken and vulnerable, even if the charges were patently false. With less than five thousand Jews remaining in Greece after the devastation wrought by the Holocaust in a nation of over ten million, is it any wonder that these Jews might worry for their physical security at such a moment?

Second, political leaders need to set an example. Joschka Fischer, the foreign minister of Germany, is someone who has a grasp of the lessons of history when it comes to Europe and the Jews, and he understands Israel's current difficulties and dilemmas. He has not hesitated to speak out, to write, and to act. After all, it is political leaders who set the tone for a nation. By their actions or inactions, they send a clear and unmistakable message to their fellow citizens. When a French ambassador is not penalized for trashing Israel in obscene terms, what are the French people left to conclude? The same can be said of Lech Walesa, the former Polish president, who in 1995 remained silent in the face of a fiery anti-Semitic sermon delivered in his presence by his parish priest in Gdansk. He only reluctantly addressed the issue ten days later after pressure from several governments, including the United States.

Third, many European countries have strict laws on the books regarding anti-Semitism, racism, and Holocaust denial. In fact, to its credit, the French parliament recently toughened the nation's laws still further. These laws throughout Europe must be used. In that regard, we were pleased to hear French President Jacques Chirac, at a meeting last month in New York with American Jewish leaders, speak now of a "zero-tolerance" policy toward acts of anti-Semitism and penalties for those found guilty of such acts that would be "swift and severe." He also expressed concern about the unchecked influence of the Internet in spreading anti-Semitism and other forms of racism, and indicated a desire to explore means for restricting this influence.

No one should ever again be compelled to question the determination of European countries to investigate, prosecute, and seek maximum penalties for those involved in incitement and violence.

To cite one specific example, we are watching with particular interest what the British Home Office will do about two British Muslim youths who were quoted earlier this year in the New York Times (May 12, 2003) calling for the murder of Jews and whose cases were brought to the attention of the authorities.

And finally, all countries that aspire to the highest democratic values, including but not limited to European nations, must constantly remind themselves that anti-Semitism is a cancer that may begin with Jews but never ends with Jews. Anti-Semitism left unchecked metastasizes and eventually afflicts the entire democratic body.

Given the global nature of anti-Semitism, there is an opportunity for the democratic nations of the world to work cooperatively. The United States has always shown leadership in this regard. It has been an issue that unites our executive and legislative branches and our main political parties.

One venue that currently exists for such cooperation is the 55-member Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE), which in June held its first conference devoted exclusively to the subject of anti-Semitism. This is a step forward, offering the chance to assess developments, compare experiences, and set forth short- and long-term strategies for combating anti-Semitism. This mechanism, while not in itself a panacea, should be regularized for as long as necessary, and ought to be viewed as an important vehicle for addressing the issue, but by no means the only one.

Mr. Chairman, I have deliberately omitted any reference to the nations of the Former Soviet Union because my colleague, Mark Levin of NCSJ, will address that subject in his testimony. But let me offer a positive note regarding the nations of Central Europe, ten of which have been included in the first and second rounds of NATO enlargement. I should add in this context that the American Jewish Committee was among the first nongovernmental organizations in this country to enthusiastically support both rounds of NATO enlargement.

While the history of anti-Semitism in many countries in this region runs very deep indeed, we have witnessed important progress in recent years, particularly with the collapse of communism and the ensuing preparations for membership in both NATO and the European Union. There has been a praiseworthy effort by the countries of Central Europe to reach out to Israel and the larger Jewish world, and to encourage the rebuilding of Jewish communities that suffered enormously under Nazi occupation and later under communist rule.

In other words, there is good news to report here. And one of the reasons for this good news has been the welcome recognition by post-communist leaders that their commitment to building truly open and democratic societies will be judged in part by how they deal with the range of Jewish issues resulting from the Nazi and communist eras.

Yet problems remain. In some countries, extremist voices seek votes and attempt to rehabilitate Nazi collaborators, but, fortunately, they are in the distinct minority. And some countries lag behind in bringing to closure the remaining restitution issues arising from Nazi and, later, communist seizure of property. We hope these matters will soon be addressed, with the ongoing encouragement of the United States government.

Mr. Chairman, by convening this hearing today, the United States Senate has once again underscored its vital role in defending basic human values and human rights around the world. Champions of liberty have always looked to our great country to stand tall and strong in the age-old battle against anti-Semitism.

In examining the scope of anti-Semitism today and exploring strategies for combating it, this subcommittee, under your leadership, looms large as a beacon of hope and a voice of conscience. As always, the American Jewish Committee stands ready to assist you and your distinguished colleagues in your admirable efforts.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

APPENDIX A

ANTI-AMERICANISM AND ANTI-SEMITISM: A NEW FRONTIER OF BIGOTRY

By Dr. Alvin H. Rosenfeld*

*Alvin H. Rosenfeld is a professor of English and Jewish Studies and Director of the Institute for Jewish Culture and Arts at Indiana University. He was named by President George W. Bush to the United States Holocaust Memorial Council in May 2002. This essay was published by the American Jewish Committee in August 2003.

"Hitler Had Two Sons: Bush and Sharon" reads the slogan on a so-called "peace-poster" carried in European anti-war rallies; and in this and countless other crude formulations of a similar nature, one finds expressed a hostility toward America, Israel, and the Jews that has been gaining force across much of Europe in the last few years. The American-led war against Saddam Hussein's Iraq, launched in March 2003, may have brought this animus to a head, but it was in evidence well before the war began. Indeed, an American Jew visiting Europe in the spring of 2002 would have been justified in feeling doubly uneasy, for these passions were then at their most intense: Anti-Semitism of a vocal and sometimes violent variety was in greater evidence than at any time since the end of World War II; and anti-Americanism was making itself felt as an increasingly common and acceptable form of public expression.

As I intend to show, anti-Semitism and anti-Americanism reveal certain structural similarities and often take recourse to a common vocabulary of defamation and denunciation. While their developmental histories may differ, the hostilities they release may converge, driven as they are by the same negative energies of fear, anger, envy, and resentment. We are witnessing such a convergence today, with consequences that have the potential to do serious harm.

In the news media, over the Internet, in street demonstrations, and in common parlance, anti-Semitism and anti-Americanism have taken on global dimensions and now have a worldwide reach. They have become intimately bound up with one another, so much so that it sometimes seems that the growing hatred of America is but another form of Judeophobia—and vice versa. Precisely what drives these animosities is not always clear, but their resurgence in our time is an ominous development and should not be treated lightly. Observing the extremity of some of the rhetoric being voiced these days about America, Israel, and the Jews, one becomes aware that it moves well beyond principled disagreements with American or Israeli policies and into the realm of the fantastic.

To demonstrate how anti-American and anti-Semitic attitudes mingle in this bizarre realm and to expose the kinds of trouble they can create, I turn first to an examination of these trends in Germany, a country in which even the slightest offense of this nature makes one sit up and take notice. Thereafter I shall look at some of the same issues on a broader front, examining in particular France, the European country that seems most seriously infected with anti-American and anti-Semitic biases.[1]

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF GERMANY

Europe's largest and economically most powerful country, Germany exerts a sizable influence on the continent's political priorities and some of its more prominent social and cultural trends. In addition, its close diplomatic alliance with France and determined effort to act with that country as a European counterweight to American interests in foreign affairs puts Germany in the foreground of attention. Add to these reasons Germany's Nazi past, and it should be clear why any signs of hostility to Jews and others within its borders warrant serious attention. German authorities are well aware of the damage their country could suffer if these tendencies get out of hand, and they usually make special efforts to restrain the open expression of anti-Semitic and anti-American biases.

These animosities sometimes seem to have a will of their own, however, and erupt periodically in ways that can introduce a note of discord into the country's cultural life and disrupt its normally well-managed international relations. Tensions of this kind surfaced this past year on both the cultural and diplomatic fronts.

I was in Germany for two weeks in May 2002, when some of these trends were coming to the fore. Before describing what I observed, however, it will be helpful to advance the calendar by a few months and recall that on September 22, 2002, German voters reelected Gerhard Schröder to a second term as chancellor. Schröder's victory was by no means a certainty in the months leading up to the election. In fact, for most of that time, the polls showed him several points behind his chief rival, Edmund Stoiber, the prime minister of Bavaria and the candidate of the

conservative alliance of the Christian Democratic Union and the Christian Social Union parties. In the final weeks of the campaign, Schröder closed this gap and ultimately prevailed.

According to most commentators, he won the election as a result of two key factors: his media-savvy handling of a crisis in the eastern part of the country brought on by a destructive flood; and his clever but costly strategy of running the last leg of his race not so much against Stoiber as against President George W. Bush. The American president, who was accused of "playing around with war," became a prominent election issue, and Schröder did not hesitate to level heavy rhetorical assaults against him. The chancellor declared that he would not "click his heels" to an American commander-in-chief and categorically refused any German support for American military "adventures" in Iraq, even if such action had the sanction of a United Nations mandate. These moves were calculated to attract voters on the left of the German political spectrum, among whom a militant pacifism is part of the cultural norm. (In fact, an ingrained pacifism has become a part of the postwar mentality of much of the younger generation of Germans.) At the same time, Schröder's evocation of a special "German way" in the formulation of foreign policy might sit well with nationalist sentiment on the political right. His open defiance of the United States would also appeal to voters in the former communist states in the eastern part of Germany, who had been educated to see America as the enemy and still hold lingering resentments against it. The strategy worked, and Schröder managed to squeak through by the thinnest of margins.

But at a price. Angela Merkel, leader of the opposition Christian Democrats, went on record on the day of the election as saying, "German-American relations were never as bad as they are this evening. . . . This is a high price to pay for this campaign."[2] Wolfgang Schäuble, a fellow Christian Democrat, agreed, stating, "German-American relations are at their lowest level since the founding of the state in 1949."[3] Coming from two prominent members of the political opposition, these views are not surprising, but other, less partisan voices confirmed this negative assessment. Christian Hacke, a political scientist at Bonn University, for instance, declared: "For the first time in fifty years a German government has become anti-American in both style and substance. This is a catastrophe."[4] Seemingly agreeing with this sentiment, Donald Rumsfeld, the U.S. secretary of defense, saw German-American relations as "poisoned" and refused to meet with Peter Struck, his German counterpart, at an international meeting of allied defense ministers in Warsaw shortly after Schröder's victory.

Whether for opportunistic or other reasons, a change of attitude toward America was becoming apparent in Germany. Moreover, while Schröder certainly exploited anti-American feelings for his own purposes, he did not have to newly create them. Such sentiments were there already and, as Henry Kissinger wrote at the time, may now be a "permanent feature of German politics."[5] It did not take long for these sentiments to surface aggressively under the sanction that the German chancellor's blunt and highly public criticism of the American president had seemed to give them. In one especially notorious incident, Schröder's justice minister, Herta Däubler-Gmelin, reportedly compared President Bush's tactics toward Iraq to those of Hitler: "Bush wants to divert attention from his domestic problems. It's a classic tactic. It's one that Hitler also used."[6] In another instance, Ludwig Stiegler, a member of Parliament from Mr. Schröder's party, likened Mr. Bush to an imperialist Roman emperor bent on subjugating Germany. (Embarrassed by these incidents, Schröder relieved both of his colleagues of their jobs in the postelection period, but by then the damage had already been done.) If further proof were needed that the climate had turned nasty, it was provided by Rudolf Scharping, Schröder's former defense minister, who reportedly stated, at a meeting in Berlin on August 27, 2002, that President Bush was being encouraged to go to war against Iraq by a "powerful—perhaps overly powerful—Jewish lobby" in the United States.[7] In Scharping's formulation, reminiscent of older, far-right claims about excessive Jewish power, anti-Americanism and anti-Semitism come together as common bedfellows.

ANTI-BUSH DEMONSTRATIONS

I was in Berlin on May 22, 2002, when President Bush came for a stay of less than twenty-four hours. It was his first trip to Germany and followed an earlier visit to the White House by Chancellor Schröder. (As matters transpired, it was probably to be the last visit to the White House by Schröder or any other German government official for a long time.) Anti-Bush sentiments, including popular derision of the American president as an unruly Texas "cowboy," had surfaced long before this visit and intensified notably during the president's brief stay in Berlin. Ten thousand German police, some in riot gear and backed up by armored vehicles, were

assigned to safeguard him. The center of Berlin was cleared of all traffic, and the area around the Brandenburg Gate, where the president's hotel was located, was closed off almost entirely.

Public protests began on Tuesday and carried on for two more days. On Wednesday, a crowd estimated at 20,000 was out on the streets, most peacefully demonstrating, but some determined to be more aggressive in voicing their opposition to the American president. Signs denouncing Bush as a "terrorist" and a "warmonger" were on display, together with others declaring that "war is terror" and demanding a "stop [to] Bush's global war." By now, such public displays of oppositional politics had become common fare throughout Europe and were hardly restricted to Germany. But to be in Berlin at the same time as the American president and observe that it was deemed necessary to field a small army of German police to protect him was startling. One is no longer surprised to learn of virulent anti-Americanism in places like Cairo, Tehran, and Ramallah, but to witness the public torching of America's flag in the capital of a European country that supposedly is a close ally was disconcerting and brought me to reflect on what was stirring in Germany to fuel such passions.

German spokesmen took pains at the time to explain that these protests were not directed at America per se or at the American people but only against specific policies being promoted by President Bush. In part, such explanations ring true, but only in part. There is widespread dislike of what is commonly denounced as American "unilateralism" and open displeasure over America's pulling away from international agreements on the environment, ballistic missiles, trade, and other things. Many West Europeans do not take well to this American president's personal style any more than they like his policies, and this generation of Germans, in particular, has been nervous about what they see as his penchant for aggressive use of the military to solve international problems.

These and a host of other differences had contributed to a widening gap between Washington and Europe—a "continental drift" that had preceded President Bush's assumption of office, but his coming into power brought numerous problems to the fore. It was precisely to quiet German nerves on these matters, and especially on the matter of a possible war with Iraq, that President Bush came to Berlin and addressed the German Parliament. As one commentator put it at the time, he could not possibly settle people's minds on all of these issues with even the best of speeches, but he gave a "moving and important speech, if there's anyone left in Europe to be moved." [8]

The skepticism in these words is justified, for the more closely one looks at anti-American rhetoric, the more one sees that it often moves beyond criticism of specific policies to expose envies, fears, and resentments of a deeper kind. These are not new, and no matter what it is that may prompt them, their recurrence and exaggerated expression suggest that a cultural repetition compulsion is at play. Consider the following news items, for instance, taken from the German press:

> A cover page of *Stern* magazine . . . showed an American missile piercing the heart of a dove of peace. . . . Prominent German politicians also freely [have] expressed such attitudes. Oskar Lafontaine, deputy cochairman of the Social Democratic Party [SPD], called the United States "an aggressor nation." Rudolf Hartnung, chairman of the youth organization of the SPD, accused the United States of "ideologically inspired genocide" in Central America, among other places. Another SPD politician, state legislator Jürgen Busack, had this to say: "The warmongers and international arsonists do not govern in the Kremlin. They govern in Washington. The United States must lie, cheat, and deceive in an effort to thwart resistance to its insane foreign policy adventures. The United States is headed for war." [9]

Students of German political history will recognize that, while the language quoted is of a piece with today's accusatory rhetoric, it actually comes from the Germany of the early 1980s. Some twenty years ago, when another American president was regularly identified with the Wild West and denounced as a trigger-happy cowboy, Germany's media and many of its political figures were voicing the same charges against President Reagan now made against President Bush. The images in both cases were virtually identical: Governed by political leaders who are not only crude philistines but reckless and aggressive warriors, America is a menacing country that threatens world peace. It is for this reason that, in confronting German and other European views of America, one is tempted to consider anti-Americanism not just as a form of cultural and political criticism but as a form of psychopathology.

DEFINITION OF ANTI-AMERICANISM

To understand its nature, let's borrow a working definition of anti-Americanism from Paul Hollander's book on the subject: The term "anti-Americanism," Hollander writes, denotes a "particular mind-set, an attitude of distaste, aversion, or intense hostility the roots of which may be found in matters unrelated to the actual qualities or attributes of American society or the foreign policies of the United States. In short, . . . anti-Americanism refers to a negative predisposition, a type of bias which is to various degrees unfounded. . . . It is an attitude similar to [such other] hostile predispositions as racism, sexism, or anti-Semitism." [10]

Hollander is correct in recognizing that anti-Americanism implies more than taking a critical view of real American shortcomings, but rather has an irrational side. It expresses a sharp distrust and dislike not just of what America sometimes does but of what it is alleged to be—a mighty but willful, arrogant, self-righteous, domineering, and dangerously threatening power. What we confront here are fantasies that posit an untamed, ferocious country, unrestrained by moral conscience or international laws—in short, an "American abomination" or "American peril." Observing that America is sometimes seen in just such terms, Hollander correctly notes the resemblance of anti-Americanism to other kinds of deeply felt aversions and hostilities, including those that fuel anti-Semitism. The link between these two biases became evident during my time in Germany last spring.

GEORGE BUSH AND ARIEL SHARON: PARALLEL IMAGES

One way to observe this linkage is to reflect on the two figures who, more than any others, seem to occupy the German and general European imagination today as larger-than-life figures of menace: George Bush and Ariel Sharon. Popular images of the American president as a wild man and a warmonger have already been cited. As exaggerated as these are, they are at least matched, and sometimes even superceded in their extremity, by the images projected of Ariel Sharon. Ever since the Israeli prime minister's visit to Jerusalem's Temple Mount, on September 28, 2000, Sharon has been regularly described in the German media in terms that demonize him as a "bull," a "bulldozer," a "warmonger," and a "slaughterer." He has been compared to Hitler and Nero and said to be "Israel's highest-ranking arsonist." Other references peg him as a "political pyromaniac," an ungainly "old war criminal," a "right-wing extremist," a "warhorse," and "catastrophe personified." In addition to these epithets, Sharon is frequently referred to in terms of his physical traits and mocked as being "constipated" and "pot-bellied," a "fat, lonely old man' with the "sluggish gait of an elephant." He is also described as being "politically deranged" and thirsty for Palestinian blood. (According to *Die Welt,* "a lot of blood clings to his hands, starting from his Kibiya days in the 1950s, to Sabra and Shatila, up to his most recent provocation in the mosque in [September] 2000.") In sum, the Israeli prime minister is seen as a loathsome monster running amok, the very personification of "the ugly Israeli."

Insofar as Ariel Sharon is seen as representative of his country's Jewish populace, Israeli society too is being portrayed as implacably brutal and as associated with the rule of war criminals.11 It is little wonder, then, that Israel has taken on something like pariah status and is sometimes even referred to as "the most hated country in the world."[12]

The distinction of being reviled in such terms is one that Israel shares with only one other country: the United States of America. The two are now commonly denounced as "outlaw nations" or, in the demonology of Muslim orators, as "the Great Satan" and "the Little Satan."

German political rhetoric does not generally approach anything so extreme, although the German philosopher Peter Sloterdijk not long ago named America and Israel as the only two countries today that strike him as being "rogue states."[13] More typically, Germans are content if they feel they have the right to "criticize" Israel. At the same time, they bristle at the thought that some of the more extreme forms their criticism may take might themselves be subjected to criticism not to their liking. In the run-up to the German elections in the spring of 2002, for instance, when the FDP politician Jürgen Möllemann seemed to lend public sanction to the murderous assaults of Palestinian suicide bombers against Israeli civilians, Jews in Germany were troubled. Michel Friedman, a prominent figure in the Jewish community of Frankfurt and the host of a popular television talk show, was especially sharp in his criticism of Mr. Möllemann, who in turn excoriated Mr. Friedman, declaring that it was figures like Ariel Sharon and Friedman himself, "with his intolerant and malicious manner," who provoke anti-Semitism in Germany.[14] Although Mr. Möllemann's colleagues in the FDP were slow to react to these ill-tempered charges, Jews in the country immediately recognized that in blaming the

Jews for anti-Semitism and then complaining that he was being unfairly called to task for doing so, Möllemann was employing a tactic from the familiar repertoire of anti-Semitic clichés. At about the same time, Martin Walser, a prominent German writer, published a highly controversial novel, *Tod eines Kritikers* ("The Death of a Critic"), which liberally exploited this same repertoire by projecting an altogether contemptible Jew as one of his main characters. Walser's novel was roundly denounced as a "document of hate" by some critics and defended by others. Before long, a debate about lifting the taboos regarding criticism of Israel and Jews living in Germany became another in a long series of German debates about anti-Semitism and the burden of Holocaust memory on postwar German society.[15]

PAIRING AMERICA AND ISRAEL AS ROGUE STATES

To return to Sloterdijk's singling out of America and Israel as rogue states: Pairing the two countries in this way is hardly new, nor is the temptation to link them as outlaw nations indulged in only by German intellectuals. Some thirty years ago, the British historian Arnold Toynbee remarked that "the United States and Israel must be today the two most dangerous of the 125 sovereign states among which the land surface of this planet is at present partitioned."[16] And more recently the British columnist Polly Toynbee, granddaughter of Arnold, has written that "ugly Israel is the Middle East representative of ugly America."[17] Numerous other references of this kind could be cited as well, linking the Jewish state and the United States as paramount threats to world peace. The message is unsubtle and can be handily summed up by a few words on a popular sign-board carried at European peace rallies: "Bush and Sharon, Murderers," or, in a more extreme formulation of this same charge, "Bush + Sharon = Hitler."

What lies behind these obscenities is worth pondering. The easy application of Nazi-era references to Israel and America is one of the most repugnant features of present-day anti-Semitic and anti-American rhetoric. It is also becoming commonplace, and not only in the sensationalizing language of the mob talk that often accompanies street demonstrations. The Portuguese writer and Nobel Prize laureate José Saramago famously likened the Israeli siege of Yasir Arafat's compound in the West Bank city of Ramallah to nothing less than Nazi actions against Jews in Auschwitz.

The Israeli incursion into Jenin, which cost the lives of twenty-three Israeli soldiers while killing some fifty-two Palestinians, most of them armed fighters, was likened to "Leningrad" and denounced as "genocide." Others in Europe, mainly on the intellectual left, think in similarly extravagant terms. When they say "Israeli" or "Jew"—and in the minds of many, the two have become almost one—they are not far from thinking "oppressor" or "murderer." The shorthand term for this despised type is now "Sharon" or, stated simply but perversely, "Nazi."

President Bush is similarly branded, his visage adorned with swastikas and his name changed to "George W. Hitler." As in the case of the former German Minister of Justice, such coarse semantic switches are now made all too easily, as if an off-the-cuff association of the president of the United States with the most monstrous figure in German history were both natural and acceptable.

As Dan Diner has shown convincingly in two recent books on this subject, anti-Americanism has a well-established history in Germany dating back at least to the nineteenth century. Animated at times by cultural motives and at other times by political motives, German hostility to America crystallized ideologically in the early twentieth century as a reaction to modernity itself. Urbanization, commercialization, secularization, social mobility, mass culture, meritocracy, democracy, feminism—these and other components of modernity were considered unwelcome encroachments on traditional ways of life. In opposing them, German critics of the United States tended to conflate fears and resentments regarding America's alleged imperial hegemony with similar fears regarding imagined Jewish money, power, influence, and control. Diner quotes Max Horkheimer to this effect: ". . . everywhere that one finds anti-Americanism, anti-Semitism is also prevalent." Horkheimer further explains that America is frequently singled out as the scapegoat for a host of German and general European problems, brought on, at the time he was writing, by "the general malaise caused by cultural decline." In seeking causes for this malaise, people "find the Americans and, in America itself, once again the Jews, who supposedly rule America."[18]

Horkheimer was hardly alone in this analysis. Following the defeat of Germany in World War I, numerous others expressed anti-American sentiments in ways that directly implicated the Jews. According to Diner:

> It became commonplace to characterize America, according to the words of Werner Sombart, as a "state of Jews" (*Judenstaat*). In particular after

> Taft's presidency, this view saw the "Jewish" influence on public life in the United States as having gained the upper hand. Jews were thought to be pulling the strings in the trade unions, which were also centers of power and influence. During the war they succeeded in moving into big capital and supposedly profited substantially from Allied war loans. Jews were also believed to have considerable intellectual influence. In early nationalist literature, for instance, Wilson's Fourteen Points were depicted as a product of Jewish minds. The "enslavement" of Germany was also ascribed to the Jews.[19]

In the aftermath of World War I and into the Nazi period, charges of this kind became prevalent in Germany, and an ideologically tempered anti-Americanism intimately linked to anti-Semitism became commonplace. It saw American culture as degenerate, its debased condition a function of Jewish influence. "My feelings against America are those of hatred and repugnance," Hitler said, "half-Judaized, half-negrified, with everything built on the dollar."[20] Beyond purportedly corrupting culture, however, this presumed Jewish influence was seen to be everywhere: in the person of Bernard Baruch, Wilson's hand-picked representative at the Versailles Conference, who was prominently identified as a Wall Street financial magnate who allegedly had pushed hard for war to advance his personal fortune as well as the aims of Jewish world domination; in the person of Henry Morgenthau, Roosevelt's secretary of finance during World War II, who was widely seen as a Jewish avenger out to destroy Germany economically; and other "Jewish" influentials who were regarded as hostile to German interests, such as New York mayor Fiorello LaGuardia; Felix Frankfurter, the law professor and Roosevelt confidante; and even President Roosevelt himself, sometimes (mis)identified as being really named "Rosenfeld." America, in sum, was under a "Jewish dictatorship" and, as such, implacably anti-German. Indeed, it was the Jews, so the charge went, who forced the United States to enter the war in the first place.[21]

Following the defeat of Nazi Germany, blatant conspiracy theories were not commonly voiced in Germany. Nevertheless, the notion that Jewish "influence"" continued to make itself felt in invidious ways hardly disappeared, and to this day polls of German public opinion regularly show sizable numbers of Germans affirming the notion that Jews exercise too much power in world affairs. Jews are believed to do so in their own right and through their alleged "control" over American foreign policy. For instance, in 1991, prominent figures on the German left held Jews responsible for the first Persian Gulf war, alleging that the battle was being waged on Israel's behalf, not Kuwait's. As Sander Gilman summed up the mood at the time, the Gulf War "showed how anti-Americanism in Germany and especially anti-Jewish resentment in the peace movement and among its fellow travelers saw the war as an American/Jewish/Israeli invasion. The virulent shouts that it was *Israel* that was causing the Gulf War, rather than Iraqi expansionism, simply echoed the cries against American imperial hegemony that carried on the anti-Semitic associations of Jew and American from the nineteenth century."[22]

A "CABAL" OF NEOCONSERVATIVES

The issues examined here within a German context are now observable on a much broader front, and the Jews once again have been blamed for propelling America into war in the Persian Gulf. A powerful "cabal" of American supporters of Israel—Paul Wolfowitz, Richard Perle, Douglas Feith, Elliott Abrams, William Kristol, and others of the so-called "neoconservative war party"—are said to be shaping American foreign policy and to have pushed President Bush into attacking Iraq to serve the ends of a stronger Israel. In this view, President Bush is portrayed as little more than a client of Ariel Sharon, and American national security interests remain in the grip of the "Zionist lobby" or powerful "East Coast" influentials—code words employed by writers who seem to believe, but generally will not bring themselves to say outright, that the Jews are really running America's affairs.

The use of coded language has gone so far that it is no longer unusual for writers who comment on the neoconservative movement to use the term "neocon" as synonymous with "Jew," excepting those with similar views who lack Jewish roots. Whenever such inferences are drawn, it is now common to point to "plots" underway that threaten to steer American policy in the wrong direction—namely, the direction its Jewish manipulators, and not America's elected officials, would have it go.

Antiwar conservatives like Patrick J. Buchanan espoused conspiracy theories regarding the origins of the war against Iraq. Buchanan wrote in the *American Conservative* on March 24, 2003:

> Here was a cabal of intellectuals telling the Commander-in-Chief, nine days after an attack on America, that if he did not follow their war plans, he would be charged with surrendering to terror. . . . What these neoconservatives seek is to conscript American blood to make the world safe for Israel. They want the peace of the sword imposed on Islam and American soldiers to die if necessary to impose it.[23]

But it wasn't only right-wingers like Buchanan who claimed that the war served Israel's, not America's, security objectives. On the left, too, there were those who saw the war as being waged at the behest of Israel and, more cynically, also in pursuit of American Jewish political support. In writing about the "power" of the neocons in the *New York Review of Books,* Elizabeth Drew refers to both of these motives.

> Because some—but certainly not all—of the neoconservatives are Jewish and virtually all are strong supporters of the Likud Party's policies, the accusation has been made that their aim to "democratize" the region is driven by their desire to surround Israel with more sympathetic neighbors. . . . But it is also the case that Bush and his chief political adviser Karl Rove are eager both to win more of the Jewish vote in 2004 than Bush did in 2000 and to maintain the support of the Christian right, whose members are also strong supporters of Israel.[24]

To those who share these views, the Jewish hand is to be seen virtually everywhere. Robert J. Lieber, summing up the conspiracy theory in the *Chronicle of Higher Education,* found that it had many proponents:

> A small band of neoconservative (read, Jewish) defense intellectuals, led by the "mastermind," Deputy Secretary of Defense Paul Wolfowitz (according to Michael Lind, writing in the *New Statesman*), has taken advantage of 9/11 to put their ideas over on an ignorant, inexperienced, and "easily manipulated" president (Eric Alterman in The Nation), his "elderly figurehead" Defense Secretary (as Lind put it), and the "dutiful servant of power" who is our secretary of state (Edward Said, *London Review of Books*).[25]

The tendency to ascribe exaggerated power to Jews in public life is not new—nor is the belief that "Jewish power" is deployed to achieve Israeli objectives. Here, for instance, is how the historian Perry Anderson puts it:

> Entrenched in business, government, and media, American Zionism has since the sixties acquired a firm grip on the levers of public opinion and official policy toward Israel. . . . The colonists have in this sense at length acquired something like the metropolitan state—or state within a state—they initially lacked.[26]

Sentiments of this nature exist among Germans, but they are usually muted, especially with reference to Jews. With regard to America, the German rhetoric became less inhibited in the time leading up to the invasion of Iraq. The writer Peter Schneider recently said that he has "never seen so much anti-Americanism in my life, not in the Vietnam war, never."[27]

The public voicing of such sentiments regarding both Jews and Americans is by no means confined to Germany. Abandoning coded language altogether, Tam Dalyell, a member of the British Parliament from the Labour Party, told an interviewer for *Vanity Fair* flat out that both Tony Blair and George Bush were "being unduly influenced by a cabal of Jewish advisers." Never mind that most of George Bush's closest advisers are Protestants or that most of those helping to guide British Middle East policy are also not Jewish.[28] To Mr. Dalyell and others like him, it has become open hunting season on Jews, and even the suspicion of Jewish ancestry is enough to inspire wild accusations.

We are living at a time when hostility to America has become almost a worldwide phenomenon, and a parallel dislike of Israel and distrust of the Jews frequently accompany this hostility. When a member of the Canadian Parliament can be heard to declare on television, "Damn Americans. I hate those bastards"; when a French diplomat posted to England is widely quoted as referring to Israel as that "shitty little country" pushing the world toward war; when a prominent Irish poet denounces Jewish settlers living on the West Bank as "Nazis [and] racists" who "should be shot dead" and is on record as stating, "I never believed that Israel had the right to exist at all," we are in a troubled time.[29]

Much of the worst of this trouble has taken place over the past two years in France, where anti-Americanism has become highly vocal in both political and cultural life and anti-Semitism has turned more openly aggressive than at any time since the end of World War II. These antagonisms reflect a political disposition toward the Middle East conflict that is highly critical of Israel and also sharply at odds with the United States, understood to be Israel's guardian. French attitudes toward both countries are often negative. It is small wonder then that militant members of France's large Muslim communities openly proclaim their hatred of the United States and regard French Jews as surrogate Israelis whom they feel entitled to abuse at will. Some have been doing just that, as if the verbal violence against Israel in the French media can be taken as justification for physical assaults against French Jews.

At the same time, teachers who are prepared to teach about the Holocaust in French classrooms are often intimidated from doing so by angry Muslim students, some of whom act aggressively to prevent knowledge of Jewish victimization during World War II from being disseminated in the schools. The subject has fallen effectively under a taboo, and many of these schools are now almost extraterritorial enclaves.[30] The suppression of this history, together with frequently expressed attitudes of hostility toward Israel, adds to the unease of Jews in today's France.

Anti-Jewish hostilities began to surge in France in the fall of 2000 and have continued in waves of greater or lesser virulence to this day. On the night of October 3, 2000, a synagogue in the town of Villepinte, not far from Paris, was set ablaze. French police at first explained the incident as accidental, but six Molotov cocktails discovered at the site belied the notion that the building's near destruction was the result of nothing more than a trash fire.[31] Within the next ten days, four more synagogues in the greater Paris area also were burned, and nineteen Jewish homes and businesses likewise became the target of arson attempts. There have been hundreds of other assaults against individual Jews and Jewish property throughout France, most of them perpetrated by young Muslims. In the spring of 2002, the front gates of a synagogue in Lyon were intentionally rammed by two cars driven by masked and hooded men, and the synagogue itself was then set on fire. In April, the Or Aviv Synagogue in Marseilles was torched, and in Toulouse shots were fired at a kosher butcher shop. A bus carrying Jewish children to the Tiferet Israel School in Sarcelle was stoned; shortly afterward, the school itself was destroyed by fire; the same happened to the Gan Pardess School in Marseilles; Molotov cocktails were thrown at a Jewish school in Créteil and at a synagogue in Garges-les-Gonesse; Jewish students have been assaulted at Metro stops in central Paris and subjected to verbal and physical abuse in schools; Jews walking to synagogue have been variously insulted and harassed; a Jewish soccer team was roughed up at Bondy, a suburb of Paris; and in March 2003 Jewish teenagers were beaten with metal bars during antiwar protest marches in the French capital; banners equating Sharon with Hitler and intermingling the Star of David with the Nazi swastika have become familiar sights at these marches; and at some, shouts of "Kill the Jews!" can be heard.

French authorities were slow to acknowledge the true character of these outrageous actions and for too long passed them off as part of a general social unruliness that reigns in France's often destitute immigrant suburbs. Criminal acts against Jews, in other words, were to be understood as merely part of a more general phenomenon of heightened criminality in French cities as a whole. Or the anti-Jewish violence was explained away as part of a "natural" interethnic rivalry, an inevitable spillover onto French shores of the continuing violence between Arabs and Jews in the Middle East. President Jacques Chirac for a time even insisted, "There is no anti-Semitism at all in France." Jewish houses of worship were being set on fire, but during the height of these outrages, neither Chirac nor then Prime Minister Lionel Jospin saw fit to visit the sites of the desecrated synagogues. (Only later, on the eve of his reelection campaign in the spring of 2002, did the French president bother to pay a sympathy call to Le Havre, where a small synagogue had been attacked.)

The sheer volume of assaults on Jews and Jewish institutions render such public denial untenable, however, and in recent months, with the appointment of Nicolas Sarkozy as the new interior minister, a greater resolve to curb such violence seems in evidence. And well it should, for the dynamic of French anti-Semitism long ago moved beyond public slurs against Jewish symbols to open aggression against Jews and Jewish property. Between January and May 2001, more than 300 attacks against Jews took place in France. By the spring of 2003, the number of such hate crimes since January 2001 stood at over 1,000. Marie Brenner, who has reported on these incidents extensively, notes that in the first three months of 2003 there

were already 326 verified reports of anti-Jewish violence in Paris alone. While any analogies to Vichy would be far-fetched, the social environment has clearly changed for Jews in today's France, and the country no longer seems so hospitable. As French writer Alain Finkelkraut recently put it, "To their own amazement, [French] Jews are now sad and scared."[32] Some are leaving the country for Israel or are giving serious thought to settling in the United States or Canada.

The outbreak of violent anti-Semitism in France has occurred at a time when anti-Americanism has also become a more prominent feature of French political and intellectual life. Hostile attitudes toward America are not new but have a history in France that dates back to the eighteenth century. The degree of French antipathy to the United States has heightened in the last few years, however, for reasons that are as much related to France's ambivalence about its place in the new Europe and its reduced standing in the world as about real policy differences with America. The latter are not insignificant, as became all too clear in the diplomatic feud that Paris aggressively waged with Washington during the run-up to the war against Iraq. However, over and beyond the tensions between the two countries that accompany France's determination to present itself as a rival power to America in the international arena, the polemical nature of French anti-Americanism has deeper causes.

The best analysts of this phenomenon are the French themselves, and in the past two years French authors have produced a number of perceptive books on the obsession with and national disdain for America. Among the best of these are Philippe Roger's *L'Ennemi américain: Généalogie de l'antiaméricanisme francais* ("The American Enemy: A Genealogy of French Anti-Americanism") and Jean-Francois Revel's *L'Obsession anti-américaine: Son fonctionnement, ses causes, ses inconséquences* ("The Anti-American Obsession: Its Functioning, Causes, and Inconsistencies").[33] In addition to these studies, there has also been a spate of books on "Why the Whole World Hates America," which exemplify the very phenomenon that the analytical studies set out to clarify. The most extreme of these is Thierry Meyssan's *L'Effroyable imposture* ("The Frightening Deception"). Its bizarre thesis is that the received accounts of the 9/11 terror attacks are mostly an American government fabrication; in fact, so Meyssan alleges, the strikes were actually carried out by reactionary elements of the American military. Yet this outlandish work quickly became a big hit, selling almost a quarter of a million copies in the first few months of publication. While one would be hard put to find many serious people in France who would credit Meyssan's argument as plausible, his book's popularity underscores the basically irrational, but evidently appealing, character of French anti-Americanism.

David Pryce-Jones partly clarifies the psychological grounds of this appeal in commenting on Phillipe Roger's study: "Since the eighteenth century, the French have been treating America less as a real country than as a theater in which to work out fears and fantasies of their own."[34] Or, in the words of Roger himself, "We keep creating a mythological America in order to avoid asking ourselves questions about our real problems."[35]

WHY ANTI-AMERICANISM FUNCTIONS LIKE ANTI-SEMITISM

Anti-Americanism, in this understanding, clearly has some benefits for those who embrace it. It functions as both a distraction and a relief, diverting attention from issues that can be divisive within French society: ongoing economic concerns, political discord, the challenges of absorbing large and still growing immigrant populations, and vexed questions of national identity in a society rapidly becoming more diverse in its ethnic, racial, and religious makeup. To one degree or another, many European countries have problems of this nature, but not all of them look to place the blame for their troubles on America. To the degree that France does, it gains neither credit nor effective help. Far from being an efficient way to engage real problems, anti-Americanism is no more than a trumped-up means of diverting attention from them.

Seen in this light, anti-Americanism functions in much the same way that anti-Semitism has over the centuries—as a convenient focus for discontents of many different kinds and a ready-made explanation of internal weaknesses, disappointments, and failures. It is, in short, both fraudulent and counterproductive.

The French writer Pascal Bruckner precisely captures the self-deluding nature of anti-Americanism and sees its link to anti-Semitism: "We delight in casting all our sins onto this ideal scapegoat, because everything that goes wrong in the world can be laid at Washington's door. In the imagination of many intellectuals and political leaders, America plays the role the Jews once did in National Socialist demonology."[36]

If hostility to America were confined to the French elites that Bruckner singles out, it would be bad enough, but there is evidence that anti-Americanism is now

broadly shared by the French public at large. At the height of the war against Iraq, for instance, *Le Monde* published the results of a poll that showed 30 percent of the French actually wanted Iraq, and not the coalition led by America, to win the war.[37] This view is of a piece with notions, also broadly held in France and elsewhere, that between George Bush and Saddam Hussein, it was the American president who was the more menacing figure and the greater threat to world peace. Such judgments are less political in nature than pathological, but they can take on a political resonance of a harmful kind. In light of such extreme prospects, Bruckner concludes: "It is hard to tell what is most hateful in present-day anti-Americanism: the stupidity and bitterness it manifests or the willing servitude that it presupposes toward a superiority it denounces. . . . The time for being anti-American has passed."[38]

One can only voice a hearty "amen" to Bruckner's words and add to them the wish that the time for being hateful to Jews might also quickly pass. Unfortunately, though, most of the signs point to an increase rather than a lessening of anti-American and anti-Semitic hostilities. Indeed, many of the same kinds of developments described within the borders of Germany and France have been occurring across much of Europe over the past two years or so and show no signs of diminishing. According to a recent report, the number of anti-Semitic attacks in Great Britain increased by 75 percent during the first three months of 2003.[39] There has also been a rise of such incidents in the Netherlands, Belgium, Italy, the former Soviet Union, and elsewhere. In all of these countries, anti-American resentments have surfaced alongside resentments of Israel, and allegations are commonly made that "Zionist interests" and the "Jewish lobbies" are working manipulatively behind the scenes to the detriment of the world order.

In an especially irresponsible display of such accusations, the *New Statesman* of London on January 14, 2002, ran a cover displaying a gold Star of David piercing the British Union Jack over the caption "A Kosher Conspiracy?" Similarly vicious graphics have appeared in newspapers and journals elsewhere in Europe. Almost everywhere, the passions that give rise to regular denunciations of Israel and conspiratorial charges against the Jews are blended with sentiments that British writer Michael Gove says produce "myths of America the Hateful." "Yankee-phobia," as Gove calls it, and Judeophobia have now coalesced, and what they have produced is not good: "Both America and Israel were founded by peoples who were refugees from prejudice in Europe. Europe's tragedy is that prejudice has been given new life, in antipathy to both those states."[40]

WHO IS AN ANTI-SEMITE?

What has brought us to such a sorry moment, how long it is likely to last, and what its consequences may be are matters that deserve serious reflection. Yet not everyone agrees that Europe is witnessing a serious increase in hostility to either Jews or America. The former, it is argued, is an unpleasant but limited affair, carried out mostly by disaffected Muslim immigrants, who are themselves subjected to acts of racial hatred and discrimination. What Jews label as anti-Semitism is something that really does not exist in Europe in any substantial way, but whose "purported existence is being cynically manipulated by some in the Israeli government to try to silence debate about the policies of the Sharon government."[41] In this view, the Jews are seeking to squelch criticism of Israeli actions against the Palestinians by putting those who make such criticisms beyond the pale. In the words of one British commentator, "Criticize Israel and you are an anti-Semite just as surely as if you were throwing paint at a synagogue in Paris."[42] To cite the words of another, Timothy Garton Ash, "Pro-Palestinian Europeans [are] infuriated by the way criticism of Sharon is labeled anti-Semitism."[43] Those who are so accused, the argument goes, then turn against their accusers and brand them as media manipulators working on behalf of the "Jewish lobby" to advance Jewish and Israeli interests.

This is a vexed and increasingly contentious issue. No one likes to be called an anti-Semite, and no one should be called an anti-Semite who is not one. At the same time, anti-Semites exist, and their words and actions cause great harm. It should come as no surprise, then, that Jews who are alert to the resurgence of anti-Jewish hostilities in Europe are naturally concerned and are not reluctant to call attention to them. They understand that Israel, like all states, makes its share of mistakes and should not be immune from criticism. At the same time, legitimate criticism of Israeli policies sometimes escalates into condemnation of Israel as an entity. Especially on the left, the European debate about the Arab-Israeli conflict has taken on the character of a polemic about the Zionist project itself and calls into question the moral standing of the Jewish state and sometimes even its right to exist. At its furthest extreme, such "criticism" of Israel amounts to a rejection of Israel, mirrored

in the vilification of the Israeli prime minister as a "war criminal" comparable to Milosevic and of the Israeli people as latter-day fascists or Nazis. In the Muslim world, these views are standard fare, but they show up in Europe as well. To call them anti-Semitic is to call them by their proper name.

On another level, the European media debate about Israel is less crude and not necessarily hostile in tone, but its obsessional quality and its espousal by people who focus their criticism almost exclusively on Israel and show little interest in injustice elsewhere in the world raise questions of another kind. Shalom Lappin, a professor at King's College, London, has written about this phenomenon in an especially perceptive way and comes to conclusions that are sobering. After making the by-now ritual acknowledgment that not all criticism of Israel is unfair, he demonstrates that a lot of European commentary is in fact excessive, historically inaccurate, and distorted by ideological prejudices:

> A large part of the contemporary European left has inherited the liberal and revolutionary antipathy toward a Jewish collectivity, with Israel becoming the focus of this attitude. While acculturated intellectuals and progressive Jewish activists are held in high esteem, a Jewish country is treated as an illegitimate entity not worthy of a people whose history should have taught them the folly of nationalism. The current intifada is regarded as decisively exposing the bankruptcy not so much of a policy of occupation and settlement, but of the very idea of a Jewish polity.[44]

In other words, the arguments that some of Israel's most determined critics now pose are no longer about 1967 and political issues involving territories that Israel has held since the Six-Day War, but about 1948 and existential issues involving the fundamental right of the Jews to a state of their own. Hostility to Israel along these lines, in sum, is the result of a basic failure to reconcile with the idea of Jewish political independence and national sovereignty. Such opposition was prominent in some circles prior to the establishment of the Jewish state. No less a figure than Karl Marx, for example, famously held that a "state which presupposes religion is not yet a true, real state" and that "the political emancipation of the Jew . . . is the emancipation of the state from Judaism."[45] But the reappearance of this idea after more than half a century of Jewish statehood is astonishing. Lappin correctly claims that attitudes of this kind render illicit any idea of the Jewish people as a nation. Deeply rooted in both religious and secular European culture, as well as in the Islamic world, such attitudes represent an aversion to the idea of Jewish empowerment itself and, in essence, delegitimize the State of Israel in its present configuration. Most Jews would see the public voicing of such an aversion as inherently anti-Semitic. But whatever one calls the propagation of such ideas is less important than the recognition of their fundamentally hostile character. Not to see them for what they are and not to resist them would be to live in denial, a luxury that Jews, of all people, cannot afford.

DENIAL OF ANTI-AMERICANISM

Just as there are those who deny that anti-Semitism exists, there are also those who deny that anti-Americanism exists. They stress that the world publicly expressed its sympathy for America in the immediate aftermath of the September 11, 2001, terrorist strikes against New York and Washington, and they claim America has squandered the goodwill it enjoyed at the time through its arrogant and ill-conceived policies in the international arena.

It is true that large numbers of people in many countries displayed solidarity with America following the shocks of 9/11, a solidarity they evidently could express readily so long as they perceived Americans to be victims. (As Pascal Bruckner reminds, us, though, "By the evening of September 11, a majority of our citizens, despite their obvious sympathy for the victims, were telling themselves that the Americans had it coming."[46]) At times, the world's sympathy has also flowed toward the Jews, when it has been perceived that they, too, have been victimized. Assertions of American or Jewish *strength,* however, seem to quickly neutralize these benevolent reactions and turn them into their opposite.

Some of what animates anti-Americanism and anti-Semitism, in other words, is distrust of American and Jewish power and the fear that such power will be used in menacing ways. "The American administration is now a bloodthirsty wild animal," declared British playwright Harold Pinter, long before a drop of blood was spilled in the second Gulf War;[47] and, similarly, bloodthirsty behavior was also widely attributed to Ariel Sharon. In both cases, it is the specter of the unrestrained use of force that seems to generate such concerns. They are heightened many times over when the Jews are imagined to be the ones who actually control such might

and can unleash it anytime, against anyone, and in unpredictable ways. In a climate of such exaggerated feeling, restraints on political rhetoric fall away. So an American congressman, Representative James Moran, Democrat of Virginia, charges in public, "If it were not for the strong support of the Jewish community for this war with Iraq, we would not be doing this. The leaders of the Jewish community are influential enough that they could change the direction of where this is going, and I think they should."[48] An American poet, Amiri Baraka, links Israel to the terrorist attacks against the World Trade Center, alleging that the Jews had advance warning of what was coming on September 11 and stayed home from work in the Twin Towers on that day; and various people throughout the world indulge in the fantasy that the space shuttle *Columbia* disaster was actually the work of "a secret Jewish-Israeli conspiracy."[49] As evidenced by these and other similarly wild charges, conspiracy theories about the pernicious effects of American-Jewish "power" seem widespread.

As already noted, some of what drives this lunacy may be fear, but analysts of anti-Americanism and anti-Semitism also recognize other factors at work. Writing shortly after 9/11, the British historian Bernard Wasserstein noted:

> A century ago, anti-Semitism was called "the socialism of fools." Now something similar threatens to become rampant: anti-Americanism. Psychologically, it fulfills some of the same functions as anti-Semitism. It gives vent to a hatred of the successful, and is fueled by envy and frustration. . . . Like historical anti-Semitism, [anti-Americanism] transcends ideological barriers and brings together economic, social, religious, and national animosities in a murderous brew.[50]

The brew is a poisonous one, mixing such noxious ingredients as classical anti-Semitic blood libel charges and conspiracy theories about a Jewish drive for world domination with annihilationist rhetoric, directed against both Israel and America. As part of this destructive mix, Hitler-era language, as we have seen, is often used to smear the American president and the Israeli prime minister, and Holocaust denial also sometimes figures in. In such a climate, Jews are regularly denounced as "Zionist pigs" and Americans as rapacious thugs and murderers. In general, when Jews are now demonized, anti-American charges are likely to proliferate as well. It is a heady combination, especially in the Muslim world, where the language of violence has helped to unleash the most destructive forces aimed at those who are routinely condemned as "the enemies of Islam"—preeminently "Crusaders" (= Americans) and "Jews."[51]

In analyzing this situation, Josef Joffe, editor of the prominent German newspaper *Die Zeit,* finds a number of common links:

> Images that were in the past directed against the Jews are now aimed at the Americans: the desire to rule the world; the allegation that the Americans, like the Jews in the past, are invested only in money and have no real feeling for culture or social distress. There are also some people who connect the two and maintain that the Jewish desire to rule the word is being realized today . . . by the "American conquest."

Joffe also sees envy as a factor contributing to a common hostility against Americans and Jews:

> They are the two most successful states in their surroundings—the U.S. in global surroundings, and Israel in the Middle East. Israel is in fact a constant reminder to the Arab world of its failure in economic, social, political, and gender-related development. So much so that it is difficult to decide whether the Jews are hated because of their close alliance with the U.S., or whether the U.S. is hated because of its alliance with the Jews.[52]

To many, Americans and Jews are not only paired but are now virtually interchangeable as targets of a common hostility. During the Nazi period, a popular slogan clearly identified the source of Germany's troubles: "The Jews are our misfortune." Today it is the Americans who are the focus of such an exaggerated grievance. But the Jews have hardly disappeared. Rather, negative images of them have blended with negative images of Americans, and the two together—symbolized by the ubiquitous bogeymen, "Bush and Sharon"—are commonly denounced in a single breath. Indeed, in France one now finds the new coinage "Busharon" to designate this invented ogre. As a French Jewish woman recently put it, "When they say 'America' they think 'Israel,' and when they think 'Israel,' they think 'Jewish.'"[53]

Or, one could say more accurately, they don't think at all. For what I have been describing has very little to do with real Americans and real Jews and points instead to largely phantasmagoric figures that inhabit the heads of growing numbers of people throughout the world. In confronting the passions that fuel anti-Americanism and anti-Semitism, in other words, we enter the realm of symbolic identities and see mostly spectral figures—imagined Americans, imagined Jews.

A phenomenon as widespread and intensely animated as this one is not likely to soon pass from the scene. The branding of the United States and Israel as outlaw nations is a serious matter, and the political, ideological, and religious passions that give rise to such hostility will not quickly dissipate. Writing in 1985, years before the American-led wars in the Persian Gulf, Stephen Haseler predicted: "Anti-Americanism is here to stay, as long as the United States retains its powerful role on the world stage." Since it is unlikely that America will soon reduce its power or the reach of its global presence, it is also unlikely that opposition to it will lessen; on the contrary, it is likely to only increase. Some fifteen years ago, Haseler, in fact, accurately predicted the present moment with uncanny insight:

> The United States will continue to be isolated at the United Nations; anti-American protests and rioting will increase; tensions within America's alliance systems will continue; and a powerful intellectual and emotional critique of the direction of American foreign and defense policy can be expected at home.[54]

The new era ushered in by the terror attacks of 9/11 was not in sight when Haseler offered this view, but otherwise his prognosis is accurate.

As to what might be done to counter such developments, the best antidote to anti-American animosities, Haseler avers, is not a lessening of American power and resolve but the opposite—a reassertion of American strength and self-confidence. Such assertions of national will were marshaled impressively in the war against Iraq, and yet it is precisely the projection of such power that unnerves people abroad and contributes to their wariness of the United States. Ironically, therefore, while it may be true that nothing succeeds like success, success American-style seems to have the unintended consequence of provoking the kinds of fear and resentment that help to foster anti-American sentiments.

As for antidotes to anti-Semitism, these are harder to identify, largely because anti-Jewish passions have been around for so long and are energized today on so many different fronts. In the Muslim world, Jew-hatred is now pervasive, but in Europe and elsewhere, anti-Semitisms of every imaginable kind—political, social, cultural, theological, economic—are no longer held in check by the taboos that have restrained them in recent years but circulate openly and broadly. Judeophobias are so many and various today, in fact, that a full taxonomy would require a large book. The reemergence of such hostility has come as a shock, especially to those who have thought that the scandal of the Holocaust was so great as to inhibit public manifestations of anti-Jewish feelings for generations to come. In fact, though, that sense of the scandalousness of the Holocaust has greatly weakened over the years or been perversely transferred to Israel, which is repeatedly accused of resembling a Nazi state for its allegedly "genocidal" treatment of the Palestinians, who have been elevated to supreme victim status as the "new Jews."

Among the many pernicious elements in the repertoire of anti-Semitic stereotypes, the inversion and manipulation of the Holocaust is potentially the most lethal. For those intent on usurping the history of Jewish suffering and mobilizing it against the Jewish state are also intent on bringing about the end of that state by delegitimizing the very ground of its existence. If, after all, there really is no difference between Israelis and Nazis, then Israel itself has no moral basis for continuing. That is what the sinister equation "Sharon = Hitler" really means. Adding the name of the president of the United States to this formula, as in the vile epithet at the beginning of this essay, only deepens the aggression and adds to the challenges that we face in a world in which anti-Semitism, a notoriously light sleeper, is now awake and stirring and has been joined by a resurgent anti-Americanism. Neither is new, but their convergence is potent and the obsessive focus of so much of their negative energies on Israel and on America as a faithful ally of Israel is ominous. Unless they are effectively checked, the two together will influence the condition of life for Americans and Jews in the years ahead in ways that will not be easy for either.

June 27, 2003

NOTES

[1] The National Consultative Committee on Human Rights, a French government watchdog organization, reports an "explosion" in anti-Semitic incidents in France in 2002—a sixfold increase over 2001 in acts of violence against Jewish property and persons. See Elaine Sciolino, "French Rallies against War Shift Focus to Israel," *New York Times,* March 30, 2003.

[2] *New York Times,* September 23, 2002.

[3] Wolfgang Schäuble, "How Germany Became Saddam's Favorite State," *Wall Street Journal,* September 19, 2002.

[4] Charles P. Wallace, "Recalcitrant Ally," *Time,* September 23, 2002.

[5] Henry Kissinger, "Why U.S.-German Rift Could Set Europe Back 100 Years," *Scotland on Sunday,* October 20, 2002.

[6] *New York Times,* September 20, 2002.

[7] William Safire, "The German Problem," *New York Times,* September 19, 2002.

[8] Robert Kagan, as quoted by Steven Erlanger, "Wary Praise for Berlin Speech," *International Herald Tribune,* May 24, 2002. For a well-informed analysis of the growing divisions between Europe and America, see Kagan's brief but important book, Of Paradise and Power (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2003).

[9] Paul Hollander, *Anti-Americanism: Critiques at Home and Abroad* 1965-1990 (New York: Oxford University Press, 1992), p. 381. Hollander republished this book, adding some new material to it, under the title *Anti-Americanism: Irrational and Rational* (New Brunswick, N.J.: Transaction Publishers, 1995). For more on anti-Americanism, see Stephen Haseler, ed., *The Varieties of Anti-Americanism: Reflex and Response* (Washington, D.C.: Ethics and Public Policy Center, 1985) and *Anti-Americanism: Origins and Context,* a special edition of the *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science,* ed. by Thomas Perry Thornton (Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications, 1988). For studies specifically focused on manifestations of anti-Americanism within Germany, see Andrei S. Markovits, "On Anti-Americanism in West Germany," *New German Critique,* Issue 34 (Winter 1985), pp. 3-27 and, by the same author, "Anti-Americanism and the Struggle for a West-German Identity," in Peter H. Merkl, ed., *The Federal Republic of Germany at Forty* (New York: New York University Press, 1989), pp. 35-54; see also Konrad Jarausch, "Intellectual Dissonance: German-American (Mis)Understandings in the 1990s," and Berndt Ostendorf, "The Americanization-of-Germany Debate: An Archaeology of Tacit Background Assumptions," in Frank Trommler and Elliott Shore, eds., *The German-American Encounter: Conflict and Cooperation between Two Cultures, 1800-2000* (New York: Berghan Books, 2001), pp. 219-33, 267-84. For a highly informed study of the history of German anti-Americanism and its links to anti-Semitism, see Dan Diner, *Verkerhrte Welten* (Frankfurt: Vito von Eichborn Verlag, 1993), published in English translation under the title *America in the Eyes of the Germans: An Essay on Anti-Americanism* (Princeton, N.J.: Markus Wiener Publishers, 1996); Diner republished this book, with new material, under the title *Feindbild Amerika: Uber die Beständigkeit eines Ressentiments* (Munich: Propyla4en Verlag, 2002).

[10] Hollander, *Anti-Americanism: Critiques at Home and Abroad,* p.viii.

[11] Citations are from a report commissioned by the American Jewish Committee entitled "The Mideast Coverage of the Second Intifada in the German Print Media, with Particular Attention to the Image of Israel," June 2002, http://www.ajc.org/InTheMedia/Publications.-asp?did=539. The report was done by scholars at the Duisburger Institut für Sprach-und Sozialforschung and covered the period from September 2000 to August 2001.

[12] Avishai Margalit, "The Suicide Bombers," *New York Review of Books,* January 16, 2003.

[13] Sloterdijk made these remarks in an interview that appeared in the Austrian journal *Profil,* September 24, 2002.

[14] Michel Friedman, vice president of the Central Council of Jews in Germany, came under a barrage of negative publicity recently when he was the object of a drug raid that allegedly turned up traces of cocaine in his home and office. His subsequent suspension from his television talk show and the lack of charges against him brought new discussions of what is "normal" in German Jewish life. See Mark Landler, "German TV Host Finds Shoe on Other Foot," *New York Times,* June 27, 2003. Möllemann died on June 5, 2003, in a parachuting accident in Marl-Loehmühle that police officials consider a possible suicide. There were hostile comments made after Friedman's drug raid that Möllemann should have lived to see Friedman's humiliation.

[15] For more on Möllemann, Walser, and related matters, see Alvin H. Rosenfeld, "Feeling Alone, Again": The Growing Unease among Germany's Jews (New York: American Jewish Committee, International Perspectives 49, 2002).

[16] Toynbee's words are cited by David Brooks in "Among the Bourgeoisophobes: Why the Europeans and Arabs, Each in Their Own Way, Hate America and Israel," *The Weekly Standard,* April 15, 2002.

[17] Polly Toynbee's words are quoted by Murray Gordon in The "New Anti-Semitism" in Western Europe, American Jewish Committee, International Perspectives 50, 2002.

[18] Diner, "America in the Eyes of the Germans," pp. 26, 21.

[19] Ibid., p. 62

[20] Hitler's words are cited in ibid., p. 83.

[21] Ibid., pp. 63, 97.

[22] Sander Gilman, in the Introduction to ibid., p. xiv.

[23] Patrick J. Buchanan, "Whose War?," *The American Conservative,* March 24, 2003.

[24] Elizabeth Drew, "The Neocons in Power," *New York Review of Books,* June 12, 2003, p. 22.

[25] Robert J. Lieber, "The Neoconservative-Conspiracy Theory: Pure Myth," *The Chronicle of Higher Education,* May 2, 2003. See also David Frum, "Unpatriotic Conservatives: A War Against America," *National Review,* April 7, 2003, pg. 40. Frum labels this movement "paleoconservatism" and describes it as wishing "to see the United States defeated in the War on Terror."

[26] Perry Anderson, "Scurrying Towards Bethlehem," *New Left Review* (July-August 2001). For a brief but penetrating analysis of Anderson's position, see Shalom Lappin, "Israel and the New Anti-Semitism," *Dissent,* Spring 2003, pp. 18-24.

[27] Schneider's words are cited in Nina Bernstein, "Young Germans Ask: Thanks for What?" *New York Times,* March 9, 2003.

[28] Colin Brown and Chris Hastings, "Brit MP Dalyell Attacks Bush and Blair's 'Jewish Cabal,'" *The Telegraph,* May 3, 2003.

[29] Nicholas D. Kristof, "Losses, Before Bullets Fly," *New York Times,* March 7, 2003. For further examples of North American invective against Israel and the Bush administration, see Lawrence F. Kaplan, "Toxic Talk on War," *Washington Post,* February 18, 2003. See also "Hateful Name-Calling vs. Calling for Hateful Action," *New York Times,* November 23, 2002.

[30] Emmanuel Brenner, *Les Territoires Perdus de la Republique* (Paris: Mille et une nuits, 2002).

[31] For a report of this incident and much else of a similar nature, see Marie Brenner, "France's Scarlet Letter," *Vanity Fair,* June 2003, pp. 106-128. See also Murray Gordon, The "New Anti-Semitism" in *Western Europe* (New York: American Jewish Committee, International Perspectives 50, 2002), and Michel Gurfinkel, "France's Jewish Problem," Commentary, July-August 2002, pp. 38-45. I owe much of the information here recorded about French anti-Semitism to material in these sources.

[32] Finkelkraut's words are taken from a paper he delivered at a YIVO-sponsored conference on anti-Semitism, held in May 2003 at the Center for Jewish History in New York.

[33] For a well-informed review of this literature, see Tony Judt, "Anti-Americans Abroad," *New York Review of Books,* May 1, 2003, pp. 24-27.

[34] David Pryce-Jones, "The Latest Paris Fashion . . . and Also an Old One: Anti-Americanism in the Land of Tocqueville," *National Review,* November 11, 2000.

[35] Quoted in John Vinocur, "Why France Disdains America," *International Herald Tribune,* October 9, 2002.

[36] Pascal Bruckner, "Europe: Remorse and Exhaustion," *Dissent,* Spring 2003, p.14.

[37] Brenner, "France's Scarlet Letter," p. 128.

[38] Bruckner, "Europe: Remorse and Exhaustion," p. 15.

[39] The figures are from the Community Security Trust, which monitors anti-Semitic incidents in the U.K. "Hundreds of Graves Desecrated," BBC News (May 9, 2003), http://news.bb.co.uk/2/hi/uk.

[40] Michael Gove, "The Hatred of America Is the Socialism of Fools," *The Times* (London), January 8, 2003.

[41] Peter Beaumont, "The New Anti-Semitism?" *The Observer,* February 17, 2002.

[42] Ibid.

[43] Timothy Garton Ash, "Anti-Europeanism in America," *New York Review of Books,* February 13, 2003, p. 34.

[44] Shalom Lappin, "Israel and the New Anti-Semitism," *Dissent,* Spring 2003, p. 23.

[45] Karl Marx, "On the Jewish Question," *Deutsch-FranzösischeJahrbücher, 1844,* http://www.yorku.ca/hjackman/Teaching/1000.06b-fall2002/ojq.html. *Deutsch-Französische Jahrbücher,* find date or.

[46] Bruckner, "Europe: Remorse and Exhaustion," p. 12.

[47] Pinter's words are quoted by Norman Mailer in "Only in America," *New York Review of Books,* March 27, 2003, p. 49.

[48] Representative Moran's remarks are quoted in "Congressman Is Chastised for Remarks on Jews and Iraq Policy," *New York Times,* March 12, 2003.

[49] Shlomo Shamir, "Anti-Semitic Shuttle Conspiracy Theories Swamp the Internet," *International Herald Tribune Online,* http://www.iht.com /cgi-bin/generic.cgi?template=articleprint.tmplh&Articled= 87387.

[50] Bernard Wasserstein, "Anti-Semitism and Anti-Americanism," *Chronicle of Higher Education,* September 28, 2001.

[51] On anti-Semitism in the Muslim world, see Bernard Lewis, "Semites and Antisemites: An Inquiry into Conflict and Prejudice, with a New Afterword" (New York: Norton, 1999), and Robert S. Wistrich, "Muslim Anti-Semitism: A Clear and Present Danger" (New York.: The American Jewish Committee, 2002).

[52] Joffe's words are quoted in Yair Peleg, "Enemies, a Post-National Story," *Ha'aretz,* English edition, March 9, 2003.

[53] See Craig Smith, "French Jews Tell of a New and Threatening Wave of Anti-Semitism," *New York Times,* March 22, 2003.

[54] Stephen Haseler, "The Varieties of Anti-Americanism," pp. 42, 43.

APPENDIX B

LETTER FROM THE ANTI-SEMITISM FRONT

BY DAVID A. HARRIS, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, AMERICAN JEWISH COMMITTEE

July 31, 2003

Much has been written and said—and rightly so—about changing attitudes toward Jews. There is no need to restate the case at length. Suffice it to say that an increasing number of Jews—and some non-Jews as well—have noted a growth in anti-Semitism, including new mutations of the world's oldest social pathology, and,

as disturbingly importantly, a steady decline in the antibodies that have fought it off in the postwar period.

This change appears most pronounced in Western Europe, where various combinations of anti-Americanism, anti-Semitism, anti-Zionism, and anti-globalization are merging in a dangerous mix. Purveyors tend to come overwhelmingly from the precincts of the universities, the intelligentsia, the media, and the extreme left.

And, of course, the extreme right, finding new life in railing against the growing immigrant populations in Western European countries, may have put the Jews on the back burner for the moment, but the essential ingredients of racism, xenophobia, and, yes, anti-Semitism remain intact as the pillars of their ideology and pose no less a long-term threat to us.

The principal danger, though, emanates from within the Islamic world. Since Muslims comprise a majority in 56 countries and a growing minority in scores of others, in essence, this represents a global phenomenon.

IIt would be highly irresponsible to paint with a broad brush stroke and suggest that all Muslims are implicated, when in fact this is far from the truth. At the same time, it would be equally shortsighted to pretend that anti-Semitism is non-existent in the Islamic world, or restricted to a tiny number of extremists, or nothing more than discontent with this or that Israeli policy. The problem is real, it is serious, and it can't be swept under the rug.

By contrast, in the United States, Jews have felt relatively secure and immune from the disturbing trends abroad, believing in the "exceptionalism" of American society. Yet a series of recent and highly publicized events on American campuses and in the lead-up to the war in Iraq has raised concerns about whether these are simply isolated and ephemeral incidents or, conversely, harbingers of more to come from a country undergoing profound sociocultural changes.

What's been less discussed, however, is what to do about all this.

Let's be realistic. Given its longevity, anti-Semitism in one form or another is likely to outlive us all. That seems like a safe, if unfortunate, bet. No Jonas Salk has yet come along with an immunization protocol to eradicate forever the anti-Semitic virus, nor is any major breakthrough likely in the foreseeable future.

Even the devastation wrought by the Shoah did not engender any moral compunction on the part of the Kremlin about pursuing its own postwar anti-Semitic policies, including what can only be labeled as an attempt at cultural genocide. The same was true in Poland, a Soviet satellite, when a new wave of anti-Semitism in 1968 targeted the few remaining survivors of the Holocaust.

Europe's sense of responsibility and guilt for acts of commission and omission during the Shoah, such as it may have been, is rapidly waning. Instead, we hear any number of unapologetic references from various quarters to Israelis as the "new Nazis," descriptions of Jews as "manipulative," "clannish," and "excessively influential," and even paeans to terrorists and suicide bombers as "freedom fighters." Not very encouraging, is it, especially against the backdrop of a Holocaust that took place on European soil and that was preceded by centuries of mistreatment of Jews?.

And not long after celebrating the milestone of an observant Jew being selected by a major political party for the second spot on its presidential ticket, American Jews have witnessed the "poet laureate" of New Jersey, who bizarrely ascribed placed blame for 9/11 to on Israel, being given a standing ovation by audiences at such leading universities such as Yale. Meanwhile, pro-Palestinian students are planning a national conference at Rutgers in October that calls for a Palestinian state "from the river to the sea" and glorifies homicide bombers who kill Israeli women, men and children. And a U.S. congressman publicly called on Jews to press the Bush administration regarding Iraq, suggesting that Jews, having allegedly pushed for war, were uniquely positioned, by dint of the power ascribed to them, to stop it.

At the same time, we've learned something about how best to try to contain anti-Semitism, marginalize it, discredit it, and build a firewall around it. In other words, we've come to understand what's likely to work and, for that matter, what's not.

Given everything that's going on, this may be a good moment to review, however briefly (even if this letter is not short), various strategies. I've identified at least eight key "actors" in the fight against anti-Semitism.

First, let's get down to basics.

Even aAt the risk of stating the obvious, societies based on democracy, pluralism, and equality before the law are the best guarantors for Jews or any minority (and, unquestionably, for the majority as well). Freedom and respect for all mean freedom and respect for everyone.

When that notion is deeply entrenche, the results can speak for themselves. Among the best examples, perhaps, was the Danish rescue of its Jewish population,

who were targeted for deportation by the occupying Nazis exactly sixty years ago. The Jews were seen as Danes who happened to attend a different house of worship. In helping the Jews, non-Jewish Danes felt they were simply assisting fellow Danes, an entirely natural and unexceptional thing in their own minds.

Second, democraticsuch societies are a necessary but insufficient condition for defending against anti-Semitism (or other forms of racially, religiously, or ethnically motivated hatred). Translating lofty ideals into daily realities requires many things, not least the exercise of political leadership. And this is where we meet head-on the challenge of what works and what doesn't.

Let me explain this point at some length because it is especially important. Political leaders set the tone for a country. By their actions or inactions, by their words or silence, by their engagement or indifference, they are able to send messages of one kind or another to the nation as a whole.

With few exceptions, leaders in Europe in recent years have fallen short when it comes to confronting anti-Semitism.

It's hardly worth considering the role of leaders in those Muslim countries where the problem is most virulent because they've either been encouraging anti-Semitism, perhaps with just a wink and a nod, or else they've lacked the courage and will to tackle it. In any case, democracy, pluralism, and equality before the law are rare commodities in such places.

Still, I can't help but wonder what would happen if a prominent Arab leader like President Hosni Mubarak of Egypt would wake up one morning and decided that enough is enough—anti-Semitism is not only wrong, but a stain on the Arab self-image of tolerance and moderation—and lead a campaign in the Arab world against those who demonize and otherwise dehumanize Jews. The effect would be electrifying. Dream on, you probably say, and I can't argue with you, but hope does spring eternal.

In Europe, with few exceptions, leaders in recent years have fallen short when it comes to confronting anti-Semitism.

Take the case of Lech Walesa, the hero of the Solidarity movement. In 1995, as president of democratic Poland, he attended a church service at a Catholic church in Gdansk. The priest, Rev. Henryk Jankowski, a known anti-Semite, did not disappoint. He referred to the Star of David as "associated with the symbols of the swastika as well as the hammer and sickle," and that wasn't the half of it.

What did President Walesa do in response? Did he walk out of the sermon? Did he issue a statement immediately after the service? Did he disassociate himself from Father Jankowski? No, none of the above. Instead, he simply chose to remain silent.

The American Jewish Committee met with President Walesa shortly after this incident took place. It was a revealing session.

We pressed the Polish leader to speak out and quickly. We argued that any further delay would only reinforce the image that Father Jankowski's venomous remarks were acceptable to Walesa and that such unabashed expressions of anti-Semitism were, as a consequence, legitimate in mainstream Polish society.

He pushed back, contending that he knew Father Jankowski well enough to know that he was not an anti-Semite and, furthermore, there was no point in turning a small incident into a national story.

We responded that the presence of the Polish president in the church during such a sermon made it, by definition, a national, indeed, an international, story. and the onus was on Walesa to repudiate the priest's bigotry.

Our message, we feared, fell on deaf ears. We left the meeting feeling we had utterly failed in our mission.

Ten days after the sermon, though, and with pressure coming from the U.S. and Israeli governments, the president grudgingly issued a statement, but the damage had been done. A not-so-subtle message had already been sent to the people of Poland. And, in any case, there was no specific condemnation of the priest, only some general words about Walesa's repugnance of anti-Semitism and his appreciation of the Star of David.

Or take the case of Jacques Chirac, the French president. No one who knows him would ever suggest that he harbors any anti-Semitic feelings. To the contrary, he has always demonstrated friendship for the French Jewish community, even if his foreign policy is heavily tilted toward the Arab world.

Yet this leader, who had the courage in 1995 to accept French responsibility for the crimes of Vichy—something none of his predecessors had done—was painfully slow to react to the wave of anti-Semitic attacks that hit France starting in the fall of 2000.

And, to be fair, since there was a government of "cohabitation" between Chirac and Lionel Jospin, the prime minister at the time and a Chirac foe, Jospin's cabinet

was no quicker to respond than the president. Yet Jospin, like Chirac, was known as a friend of the Jewish community.

Why, then, the delayed reflexes when these leaders must have understood that not only Jews were under attacked, but—and this point must be emphasized again and again—the highest values of democratic France as well?

Whatever the reasons, and there is much speculation about them, the bottom line is that, however unintentionally, inevitably, a message was sent out to the perpetrators—North African youth living in the suburbs of major French cities—that their despicable acts were not taken terribly seriously. The result: they concluded they could act with impunity.

Incidentally, in the past year since a new prime minister and cabinet have taken office, a very different—and much tougher—message has been projected, especially by the Mminister of the Iinterior, responsible for law enforcement, and the Mminister of Eeducation. Some positive results have been achieved, even if though the challenge is enormous, and the French Jewish community at least no longer feels a sense of total abandonment by the government.

Let me offer one other example, though it involves only indirectly non- Jews. Nonetheless, it is instructive.

Beginning in the early 1990s, shortly after German unification, right-wing violence against so-called foreigners erupted. The towns of Rostock, Mölln, Hoyerswerda, and Solingen became synonymous with expressions of hatred. In Solingen, for example, five women of Turkish origin were killed when skinheads torched a home. And in Rostock, not only was a shelter for foreigners, mostly Vietnamese and Romanian gypsies, burned to the ground, but many town residents took to the streets and openly encouraged the right-wing extremists.

Chancellor Helmut Kohl, a decent man who skillfully presided over the mammoth task of German unification, underestimated the significance of these tragic events.

Rather than speak out forcefully and seek opportunities to identify with the targeted victims, thereby sending a message of inclusion and compassion to the nation, he adopted a low profile, to put it charitably. When the American Jewish Committee and others urged the chancellor to be more visible, a spokesman indicated that Kohl did not engage in "condolence tourism." I wish he had.

I could offer many more examples.

It's striking how many times we've raised the issue of anti-Semitis with European leaders in the last couple of years, and raised the issue of anti-Semitism, only to be told, in the case of a European Union commissioner, that she was "unaware of its existence," or, in the case of a foreign minister, that there was no evidence of anti-Semitism, even as a poll had just come out indicating that anti-Semitic stereotypes were a serious problem indeed in his country. Why the blind spot? Why the denial? Again, there are several possible explanations, none of which offers any reassurance.

By way of contrast, Joschka Fischer, the German foreign minister, challenged his compatriots to confront the problem of anti-Semitism frontally. In a newspaper article he wrote:

> Do we actually comprehend what Nazi barbarism and its genocidal anti-Semitism did to us, to Germany, its people and its culture? What Hitler and the Nazis did to Germany's Jews they did first and foremost to Germans, to Germans of the Jewish faith! Albert Einstein was as much a German as was Max Planck. . . . That is why the question whether German Jews feel secure in our democracy and, though even today this can only be a hope, might one day be able to feel "at home" in it again, is not a minor one, but a question par excellence about the credibility of German democracy.

More such thoughtful and courageous statements from political leaders, bolstered by appropriate actions, are precisely what's are needed. In America, perhaps, we've come to expect them, as when our government publicly condemned the rash of anti-Semitic canards blaming Jews for 9/11 or, just before, boycotted the hate fest under UN auspices at Durban. But elsewhere, at least when it comes to Jews, such statements and actions have been far less frequent or forceful.

Frankly, given Europe's historical record, it should be precisely these countries—knowing as they do where the slippery slope of hatred can lead—which assume worldwide leadership in the struggle against the cancer of anti-Semitism. Wouldn't that send a powerful message about learning from the past? We've challenged many European leaders to play just such a role, but admittedly with only limited success to date.

The words of Soren Kierkegaard, the nineteenth-century Danish philosopher, ought to serve as a useful reminder: "Life must be lived forward, but can only be understood backward."

The third area for consideration is the role of law, law enforcement, and the judiciary.

This gets tricky, I realize. American and European laws on what constitutes a punishable crime in the realm of incitement can be quite different. There are varying approaches to the proper balance between protecting free speech and criminalizing the propagation of racial or religious hatred.

For instance, a number of European countries, including Austria, Belgium, France, Germany, Spain, and Switzerland, have laws that make denial of the Holocaust a criminal offense, whereas the United States does not.

As one illustration, Switzerland adopted a law in 1994 that outlaws "public denial, trivialization and disputation of genocide or other crimes against humanity," with a maximum prison sentence of three years.

Ironically, we hear persistent complaints from countries like Austria and Germany that much of their anti-Semitic material, including video games and books, originates in the United States. The problem has only grown more acute because of the rapidly increasing popularity of the Internet. We are often asked if there isn't a way around First Amendment protections to stop these unwelcome American "exports."

Meanwhile, in the United Kingdom, as we learned in a recent meeting with the Parliamentary Under Secretary of State:

> It is an offense to use threatening, abusive, or insulting words or behavior with intent or likelihood to stir up racial hatred against anyone on the grounds of color, race, nationality, or ethnic or national origins. Under recent anti-terrorism legislation, the maximum penalty for the offense was increased from two to seven years' imprisonment. Under the same legislation, it is also now an offense to stir up hatred against a racial group abroad, *such as Jews in Israel* [emphasis added]."

The range of ways in which democratic, law-based societies seek to deal with hate speech and hate crimes could fill volumes, as would an evaluation of such efforts.

Moreover, there is an entire body of international conventions (and organizations) to consider in the struggle against anti-Semitism.

The Soviet Jewry movement relied heavily on such instruments as the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the Helsinki Final Act to buttress the case for the rights of Jews in the USSR.

So, too, do we need to consider as tools the protections enshrined in documents like the UN Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination and the International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. Article 20 of the latter document, as one example, includes the following language: "Any advocacy of national, racial, or religious hatred that constitutes incitement to discrimination, hostility, or violence shall be prohibited by law."

One recent and effective use of an international organization was the two-day meeting in Vienna devoted to anti-Semitism that was convened by the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe. Importantly, there is agreement among the governments involved to gather again next year.

The topic of national and international law and covenants, touched on only briefly here, is unquestionably important. In the final analysis, it goes without saying, what really counts is not just the laws and mechanisms on the books, significant though they may be, but the degree of commitment to their implementation and enforcement.

Fourth, there is the media, which, as we all well know, plays an extraordinarily powerful role not only in shaping individual attitudes, but also in influencing the public policy agenda and priorities of decision-makers. As someone once suggested, "If CNN didn't report on it, did it ever actually happen?"

In parts of the Muslim world, of course, the media, whether in government or private hands, or the murky space in between, is a convenient vehicle for propagating anti-Semitism. Professor Robert Wistrich, an expert on anti-Semitism and the author of a superb monograph for the American Jewish Committee entitled "Muslim Anti-Semitism: A Clear and Present Danger," offers several examples of the media's role in peddling unadulterated anti-Semitism.

In Europe over the past three years, there have also been numerous documented instances of anti-Semitic images and stereotypes seeping into mainstream, not fringe, outlets.

Among the most disturbing developments were during the period of the Church of the Nativity standoff, when some newspapers reawakened the deicide charge—finally put to bed by the Catholic Church, in 1965, at Vatican Council II—and, more generally, the transference of Nazi images onto Israel, with the Israeli prime min-

ister equated with the Fuehrer, the Israeli military likened to the Wehrmacht or even the SS, and the West Bank represented as an Israeli-run concentration camp.

Such depictions go well beyond any conceivable legitimate criticism of Israel to something far deeper and more pernicious, and must not be left unchallenged.

Here in the United States, while there have been some distressing images, my principal concern has more to do with belated—and insufficient—reporting on anti-Semitism in the Arab world as well as its reemergence in Europe. The media must be helped to understand the significance and newsworthiness of these issues. It's certainly not a lost cause, but it is an uphill battle.

To be sure, there have been stories here and there and the occasional column or editorial. But they have been relatively few and far between. I was especially struck by the lack of media interest in the Wistrich study, which, incidentally, makes for hair-raising reading.

Released at a press conference at the National Press Club in May 2002, it generated only a few articles, all in the Jewish or Israeli press. A Reuters reporter covered the event and filed a long story, but, we later learned, her editors apparently didn't find the topic of sufficient interest. One wonders what it would take to capture their attention on the subject. And this is not the only such example, either.

The study of Saudi textbooks, cosponsored by the American Jewish Committee and released in January 2003, met essentially the same fate. The major media outlets never reported on what was the first detailed report documenting the hatred and contempt of the West that Saudi children are taught from Grade One. Is this not deemed relevant to a fuller understanding both of 9/11 and the larger war on international terrorism?

Fifth, there is the role of the "values" community, including religious, ethnic, racial, and human rights leaders and their institutions.

Ideally, each of these actors should regard an assault on any one constituency, e.g., an anti-Semitic or racist incident, as an attack on all—and on the kind of world we are seeking to create—and respond forcefully. In a way, without wishing to stretch the analogy, it would be akin to a NATO member seeking support from other members under Article 5, which deems an attack on one as an attack against all.

Alas, there is no charter binding the values community, although there is an important provision in the Fundamental Agreement between the Holy See and the State of Israel, signed in December 1993, which might provide a model. Article 2 includes the following language:

The Holy See and the State of Israel are committed to appropriate cooperation in combating all forms of anti-Semitism and all kinds of racism and of religious intolerance, and in promoting mutual understanding among nations, tolerance among communities and respect for human life and dignity.

Virtually identical language could be used to create a charter for nongovernmental organizations committed to advancing human relations and mutual respect. What's needed, in effect, is a Coalition of Conscience in the voluntary sector.

Meanwhile, there are best-practice examples that can help guide us.

Shockingly, a cinder block was thrown through a bedroom window displaying a Chanukah menorah in Billings, Montana, ten years ago. It was the room of a five-year-old boy. Fortunately, he wasn't hurt. What followed was quite remarkable.

Led by local church leaders, the police chief, and the editor of the Billings Gazette, the town, previously quite apathetic, responded by placing thousands of paper menorahs in the windows of shops and homes. It was an exceptional and effective way of reacting. It said to the hate mongers: We are one community and we will not allow you to divide us.

In the same spirit, responding to the wave of arson attacks targeting African-American churches in the south in the 1990s, the American Jewish Committee joined with the National Council of Churches and the National Conference of Catholic Bishops, in a display of ecumenical partnership, to raise millions of dollars to rebuild the damaged houses of worship. Moreover, AJC adopted the Gay's Hill Baptist Church in Millen, Georgia, and helped construct it from the ground up after it was completely destroyed in an act of hate.

The concept of a Coalition of Conscience also explains why the American Jewish Committee sent a delegation to a mosque in Cologne, Germany, in 1993 to attend the funerals of the five women of Turkish origin killed in their home in Solingen, and why, more recently, we chose to mobilize our resources to assist Muslim victims of Serbia's ethnic cleansing in Kosovo.

Every major religion has a variation of the golden rule. As Rabbi Abraham Joshua Heschel once remarked, "We are commanded to love our neighbor: this must mean that we can." We can, but do we?

Words are important, but timely and principled actions are what really count. And those within each faith tradition committed to the values of compassion and concern for all must lead the way.

Sixth, there is the long-term and irreplaceable role of education. As the Southern Poverty Law Center put it:

> Bias is learned in childhood. By the age of three, children are aware of racial differences and may have the perception that "white" is desirable. By the age of 12, they hold stereotypes about numerous ethnic, racial, and religious groups, according to the Leadership Conference Education Fund. Because stereotypes underlie hate, and half of all hate crimes are committed by young men under 20, tolerance education is critical.
>
> About 10 percent of hate crimes occur in schools and colleges, but schools can be an ideal environment to counter bias. Schools mix youths of different backgrounds, place them on equal footing and allow one-on-one interaction. Children are naturally curious about people who are different.

There are a number of tested and successful school-based programs designed to teach mutual respect. Incidentally, I'm not a big fan of using the word "tolerance" in this particular case; it strikes me as rather weak. The goal should not be simply to teach people to "tolerate" one another, but, ideally, to respect and understand one another.

That said, organizations like the Southern Poverty Law Center, Facing History, the Anti-Defamation League, and the American Jewish Committee have all developed acclaimed programs used in schools across the U.S. and, increasingly, in other countries where diversity is a factor in the population, which these days is just about everywhere. And the State of New Jersey has led the way in creating a curriculum based on the lessons of the Holocaust for all high-school students.

The challenge in the United States, given its vast size and decentralized school system, is to reach enough schools, then to get a long-term commitment to inclusion of such programs in the curriculum. Moreover, there is a need, of course, for adequate teacher training and also for monitoring impact, both over the short term and the longer term as well.

In addition to such programs, the American Jewish Committee has developed another model for schools. Named the Catholic/Jewish Educational Enrichment Program, or C/JEEP, it links Catholic and Jewish parochial schools in several American cities. Priests and rabbis visit each other's schools to break down barriers and familiarize students with basic elements of the two faith traditions. Students who might otherwise never meet have an opportunity to come to know one another. The goal is to "demystify" and "humanize" the "other," and it works.

Again, as with the curriculum-based programs, the biggest challenge here is the sheer number of schools and the resources involved—not to mention the occasional bureaucratic hurdle—in order to reach anything approaching a critical mass of students.

(It remains to be seen what impact Mel Gibson's upcoming film, "The Passion," will have on Catholic attitudes toward Jews, but, given current reports, it is hardly likely to be positive.)

One more word on education. When schools in Saudi Arabia or *madrassas* in Pakistan teach contempt, distrust, or hatred of others, be they Christians, Jews, or Hindus, or, for that matter women, we face a whole other challenge.

Shining the spotlight of exposure on these school systems is vital, which is why the American Jewish Committee cosponsored the Saudi study. Sharing the information with governments that have influence in these countries is necessary. For instance, Saudi spin doctors talk of the "enduring values" between their country and the United States. Surely, then, that gives Washington some leverage in Riyadh. And from our long experience in dealing with problematic curricula and textbooks, perseverance is the key; Things seldom happen overnight.

Seventh, there is the role of the individual. In a more perfect world, the combination of family environment, education, religious upbringing, and popular culture all lead in the same direction—to molding individuals with a strong commitment to the values of mutual respect and mutual understanding, social responsibility, and moral courage.

Our world is far from perfect. We may never succeed in completely eliminating anti-Semitism or other forms of hatred. Still, we must always strive to build the kinds of societies in which the altruistic personalities of the good women and men of Denmark, or the French village of Le Chambon-sur-Lignon (described as "the safest place in [Nazi-occupied] Europe for Jews"), or the likes of an Abraham Joshua Heschel, Jan Karski, Raoul Wallenberg, Martin Luther King, Jr., or Andrei Sakharov, are increasingly the norm, not the exception.

As I look around today, I see countless decent people, whether in the United States or elsewhere, who reject any form of anti-Semitism. But, frankly, there are too few prominent non-Jews of the likes of a Per Ahlmark, the former deputy prime minister of Sweden, prepared to speak out on the danger posed by contemporary anti-Semitism.

And finally, in the struggle against anti-Semitism, new or old, we must take into account the key role of the Jewish world, including the State of Israel and local, national, and international Jewish organizations.

The Jewish community looks radically different than it did, say, sixty or seventy years ago. Today, there is an Israel; then, there was not. Today, there are sophisticated, savvy, and well-connected Jewish institutions; then, Jewish institutions were much less confident and sure-footed.

Collectively, we have the capacity to track trends in anti-Semitism, exchange information on a timely basis with other interested parties, reach centers of power, build alliances within and across borders, and consider the best mix of diplomatic, political, legal, and other strategies for countering troubling developments.

We may not succeed in each and every case. But we've come a very long way thanks to a steely determination, in Israel and the Diaspora, to fight vigorously against anti-Semitism, while simultaneously helping to build a world in which anti-Semitism—and everything it stands for—is in irreversible decline.

APPENDIX C

TESTIMONY OF AMBASSADOR ALFRED H. MOSES, FORMER PRESIDENT, AMERICAN JEWISH COMMITTEE, BEFORE THE COMMISSION ON SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE, ON "COMBATING ANTI-SEMITISM IN THE OSCE REGION."—DECEMBER 10, 2002

Mr. Chairman,

I would like to thank you for the privilege of addressing this inter-parliamentary forum on behalf of the American Jewish Committee and its more than 125,000 members and supporters.

As a Past President of the American Jewish Committee and current Chairman of its Geneva-based UN Watch institute, and as an American with a record of four decades of service to my country and to the causes it champions around the world, I have viewed the resurgence of anti-Semitism in Europe the past two years with alarm.

Prior to the fall of the Berlin Wall in 1989, I visited Europe regularly to assist in the flight of Jews and Christians from Communist oppression, particularly in Romania, where I later served as U.S. Ambassador.

While anti-Jewish sentiment was still apparent after World War II, it was visibly and encouragingly in decline in the ensuing decades, only to reemerge in the last few years in forms not previously seen. We are witnessing a reemergence of anti-Semitism that has left many European Jews feeling more vulnerable and, as a consequence, disillusioned and even more frightened than at any time since the Holocaust.

Mr. Chairman, the past two years have seen hundreds of aggressive, often violent, acts targeting Jewish individuals and institutions in the OSCE region.

Just last Wednesday night, 300 skinheads interrupted a Chanukah candle-lighting ceremony in downtown Budapest for over an hour with shouts of "Hungary is for Hungarians, and it's better that those who are not Hungarians leave."

In Ukraine earlier this year, 50 youths marched two miles to attack a synagogue in Kiev, where they beat the Lubavitch principal of a yeshiva.

In France, the problem has been particularly acute. Scores of synagogues and Jewish day schools have been firebombed and desecrated. In the month of April 2002 alone, the French Jewish community reported 119 anti-Semitic acts and 448 anti-Semitic threats—while the Government was dismissing these outrages as simple acts of vandalism.

In Belgium, where politically motivated legal proceedings (now dismissed) have been brought against Israeli Prime Minister Ariel Sharon, the Chief Rabbi and a friend were assaulted and spit upon by a gang as they left a restaurant.

In Denmark, the widely circulated newspaper, Jutland Posten, ran a radical Islamic group's offer of a $35,000 reward for the murder of a prominent Danish Jew.

In Germany, morbid reminders of the Holocaust have appeared in the form of slogans like "Six million is not enough," which was scrawled on the walls of synagogues in Berlin and elsewhere. Jewish memorials have been defaced with swas-

tikas, Jews have been attacked in the streets—leading some German municipal officials to warn Jews not to wear identifiable Jewish symbols.

In Greece, newspapers have bombarded readers with anti-Semitic editorials and cartoons comparing the Israeli military operation in Jenin—where false cries of "massacre" have since been disproven—to the Holocaust and likening Prime Minister Sharon to Adolph Hitler. Such polemics reached a fevered pitch of hysteria and antisemitism in Greece.

These manifestations of Jew-hatred are rooted in a tradition of anti-Semitism that has plagued Europe for centuries. The historic, theologically based Judeophobia gave way to an ethno-centric nationalism in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries in which Jews were viewed as an alien presence in the states of Europe, leading to suspicion, vilification, exclusion, expulsion and, ultimately, for two-thirds of the Jews of Europe, extermination.

The historical anti-Semitism of Europe has been given new life by voices on both the political right and the left. There are a number of factors at work here:

- The Israeli-Palestinian conflict, and its distorted image in much of the popular media in Europe, has provided a pretext for anti-Semitic characterizations of Israel and its leaders and attacks on Jews and Jewish institutions.
- Israel, closely identified with the United States, has become a surrogate target for anti-American and anti-globalization protests—making Jew-bashing an all-too-common mode of attack.
- Holocaust restitution issues have opened much that was long dormant—both bank accounts and anti-Semitic feelings.
- Those right-wing parties that have always been anti-Semitic at their roots have gained new vigor in Europe by playing on anti-immigrant and anti-foreigner sentiments, which easily spill over into anti-Semitism. Jean-Marie Le Pen and Joerg Haider may be the best-known proponents of these views—but lesser-known and just as dangerous political personalities are on the rise in other Western European states.

These factors have provided traditional antisemites with new intellectual cover to rationalize their anti-Semitism—and swell the ranks of the new forces of hate.

Comments such as the reference by the French ambassador to Britain, who described Israel with a well-reported epithet not to be repeated here, or the criticism by a Swiss politician of "international Judaism" in the wake of the Swiss bank negotiations, are but examples, as are the words of a Liberal member of Britain's House of Lords: "Well, the Jews have been asking for it and now, thank God, we can say what we think at last."

I know from my personal experience that anti-Semitism is never far below the surface in Central and Eastern Europe. Openly anti-Semitic political figures—among them Vadim Tudor of Romania, Vladimir Zhirinovsky of Russia, and Istfan Czurka of Hungary—are among the names most familiar to this Commission, but they are not alone.

Against this backdrop, the pronounced growth of Europe's Arab and Muslim population presents another factor. The Muslim community in Europe today may number close to 20 million. In France alone, some six million inhabitants with roots in the Maghreb region of North Africa are not integrated into French society nor held to the same standards when it comes to acts of violence. It is generally understood that most of the recent attacks on Jews and Jewish institutions in France have been carried out by members of this community.

Arabic-language cable TV networks such as Al Jazeera, print publications, and Internet sites, which offer predictably one-sided, inflammatory coverage of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, are also spreading virulent anti-Semitism. The Arabic media is awash in a "tidal wave of antisemitism," according to Professor Robert Wistrich in an American Jewish Committee report, Muslim Anti-Semitism: A Clear and Present Danger. These outlets employ primitive Jewish stereotypes in service of their anti-Zionist message, often borrowing symbols and motifs from Nazi propaganda. Thus, one sees images of Jews as ghoulish, even satanic, caricatures with misshapen noses, and of Israelis bearing swastikas or drinking the blood of children. During the Ramadan that just ended, Arabic communities were treated to satellite broadcasts from Cairo and throughout the Middle East of a televised version of the Protocols of the Elders of Zion. Today, Arabic editions of Mein Kampf sell briskly in London and other European capitals.

Sadly, many officials in the OSCE region persist in viewing anti-Semitism as a purely political phenomenon related to the Middle East conflict; once the Middle East conflict subsides, violence against Jews, they claim, will also diminish. They have refused to recognize the severity of the problem as a longstanding issue of hate, racism, discrimination and, ultimately, human rights. Too often, they have

failed to speak out against anti-Semitism with a pragmatism, intensity and a conviction that the current situation demands. They have also ignored the way in which the "new anti-Semitism" uses criticism of Israel and Israeli practices as a justification for acts of violence against Jews. As I stated at the outset, the problem of anti-Semitism today is more acute than it has been in decades.

There are exceptions to the prevailing lack of official will and vision in confronting anti-Semitism—few, unfortunately, as inspiring as that offered by German Foreign Minister Joschka Fischer. But since many leaders in the OSCE region still cannot accept the gravity of present circumstances, they need to hear often and emphatically from U.S. officials, in the Administration and in the Congress, that anti-Semitism is again a serious problem in Europe, one that they must address. The United States has a great deal of positive influence at its disposal, and should use it.

The most recent round of NATO enlargement, announced at the Prague Summit last month, provided an example of the constructive role that the U.S. can play in this arena. Thanks to America's determined insistence over the past decade, governments in Central and Eastern Europe understand that they must address problems related to their Holocaust-era past before they can finally join NATO. The actions these countries have taken in this regard are directly connected to the NATO aspirations of their governments. For example, Romania—one of the seven republics formally invited to NATO accession talks last month, and a country I know well—has officially rejected the rehabilitation of its fascist war-time dictator, Marshal Antonescu, while the government has instituted a Holocaust studies program at its military academy in Bucharest and a course on tolerance at the University of Cluj, long a hotbed of Romanian-Hungarian tension—and even violence.

As Romania and the other six countries slated for NATO accession in 2004 undergo further review in the lead-up to ratification, the United States must remain vigilant lest these governments backslide on these issues. The Prague Summit is not the end; the Administration and the Congress must continue to hold these countries accountable in combating anti-Semitism and should encourage their ongoing efforts at Holocaust education and commemoration.

At the same time, the European Union should be encouraged to hold EU-aspirant countries to the same standard as that structure enlarges. Germany, as the country with the greatest awareness of the Holocaust and of the dangers of anti-Semitism, has a special responsibility in this regard.

Through its membership in OSCE—its "seat at the table" of a multilateral organization centered in Europe—the United States should work with EU member-states to make the problem of anti-Semitism a top priority.

Inter-governmental mechanisms such as the Council of Europe's European Commission on Racism and Intolerance and the European Union Monitoring Centre on Racism and Xenophobia have not effectively addressed the scourge of anti-Semitic acts. The United States and Germany have already shown leadership to overcome this failure.

The resolution adopted at the Parliamentary Assembly in Berlin was the key step initiated by you, Congressman Smith, together with German Parliamentarian Gert Weisskirchen, to mobilize participating states. Later, U.S. Ambassador to the OSCE Stephan Minikes led the way in Warsaw and beyond to garner support for the first-ever separate OSCE meeting on anti-Semitism, which we expect to take place in 2003. By focusing on the issue through an international forum, national experts and policy-makers will be able to create a system to assess and analyze the origins of anti-Semitism in order to build the legal and educational standards to eradicate the scourge.

Mr. Chairman, only last week Jews around the world marked the holiday of Chanukah, a festival that celebrates the triumph of freedom over tyranny—in which leadership made the critical difference. In our lifetimes, we have seen freedom's hard-won victory over oppression across Europe—vanquishing Nazism and throwing off the yoke of Communism. And we have seen the unique, irreplaceable role of political leadership in these struggles.

I recall, twenty years ago, celebrating Chanukah with my then-young daughters in a small Romanian village deep in the Carpathian Mountains. As we marked the Festival of Lights with our Romanian brethren, a menacing group marched on the synagogue in darkness. Suddenly, a Romanian police force appeared, turned back the mob—and saved this small remnant of Romanian Jewry that had gathered to light the lights of Chanukah. Violence was averted by official action, and the Chanukah celebration continued on.

Mr. Chairman, the history that befell European Jewry in my lifetime is a tragic one. With anti-Semitism now at its greatest peak since the most tragic of all human episodes, the Holocaust, let us be mindful of this history. Let us speak out; let us

use our influence; let us remember the price of inaction or denial; and let us act now.

Thank you.

Senator ALLEN. Thank you for your very strong statement, and we will stand strong for freedom on this committee, and I know I speak for my colleagues, as well. In Virginia, we call religious freedom the first freedom, since Mr. Jefferson authored the Declaration, the Statute of Religious Freedom, and we're very proud of that. And thank you for your strong statement.

Now, we're going to conclude the panel with Mr. Levin.

STATEMENT OF MARK B. LEVIN, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, NATIONAL CONFERENCE ON SOVIET JEWRY, WASHINGTON, DC

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Chairman, it is also my privilege to appear before you today.

I ask that my full prepared statement be entered into the record.

Senator ALLEN. It will be.

And, Mr. Harris, your full statement and recommendations are in the record, as well.

Mr. LEVIN. As you know, NCSJ is an umbrella organization of nearly 50 national agencies, including the ADL and the American Jewish Committee, and over 300 local community federations and community councils across the United States.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to begin by recognizing the leadership you have demonstrated since assuming the helm of this subcommittee, as reflected by your initiative in calling this hearing. I also want to recognize the leadership and commitment of your colleagues, who I'm sorry aren't here right now, but I've had the privilege of working with Senator Biden and Senator Sarbanes for more than 20 years on the plight of Jews in the now former Soviet Union, but on human rights issues in general, and with Senator Voinovich over the last couple of years. And it's through the commitment of you and your colleagues that we've been able to move forward on so many issues. And that's why, again, it is a privilege to be here.

My testimony will focus on governmental responses to anti-Semitism, region-wide efforts at coordination, and how the United States can play, and is playing, an instrumental role.

American leadership has already advanced the campaign against European anti-Semitism in significant ways. By facilitating a new consensus to support concerted action, primarily through the OSCE, the U.S. Government and Congress have begun breaking down the excuses for inaction.

The Senate has an opportunity to continue the U.S. role in ensuring respect for human rights at home and abroad. This committee can help dispel the myth that anti-Semitism is a consequence of Israeli or American policies.

Fittingly, several post-Soviet states have demonstrated their early support for the OSCE initiative. Some of these societies harbor endemic anti-Semitism, but they are taking steps to confront and neutralize it, to educate the public, and protect minorities from popular or politically motivated threats. Most still have a distance to travel, but they realize the imperative.

Last June, in Vienna, the OSCE launched a new framework that explicitly recognizes anti-Semitism as a distinct human-rights concern and a real threat to regional stability. This historic step would have been impossible without strong support from Capitol Hill, including Senator Voinovich's intervention at a particularly critical moment.

It is vital to begin collecting information and proposals from all 55 OSCE participating states—now—so that the data on anti-Semitic hate crimes, constructive legislation, and education and media initiatives can be assembled in time for next spring's OSCE conference in Berlin. It is vital that the United States sustain this momentum with high-level representation at the OSCE ministerial in December, ideally by Secretary of State Powell.

Government response to anti-Semitism in the successor states has been improving during the past few years. Several countries, with a long history of anti-Semitism, have undertaken efforts to implement laws against incitement, to speak out against anti-Semitism, and to promote research and education regarding Jewish heritage, the holocaust, and tolerance. But many difficulties remain.

While official or state anti-Semitism has been relegated to the past, popular anti-Semitism persists. Even leaders who speak out strongly against anti-Semitic rhetoric or activities often avoid repudiating anti-Semitic speeches by political allies and challengers.

We hold the leaders responsible, not for the sentiments of their constituents, but for their commitment to impacting those sentiments. To be truly free societies, whether in France or Russia, anti-Semitism cannot be considered a risk-free political device. There must be consequences, be they legal, political, or social.

Important elections are approaching in Russia and Ukraine. In the past, politicians in both of these countries have been tempted to resort to anti-Semitic appeals to further their standing in the polls. We are watching the situation very closely. It is our hope that we don't see a repeat of what we have seen in past parliamentary and Presidential elections in both of these countries.

In several countries, government officials still tend to classify anti-Semitic violence as hooliganism rather than anti-Semitism. Belarus has a mixed record, reflecting the need for more involvement by the national, regional, and local authorities in addressing issues of vandalism, cemetery desecration, and construction over Jewish graves. These difficulties are only compounded by a sweeping new religion law which enshrines the Orthodox Church as the preeminent faith. In the last several weeks, Mr. Chairman, in Belarus, there have been several anti-Semitic acts, acts of desecration, acts against Jewish institutions.

Our work is far from complete, and we must not allow the latest Western European eruption of anti-Semitism to make us forget about the very real and ongoing societal undercurrent of anti-Semitism which persists, especially in the former Soviet Union. Beyond bolstering frameworks like the OSCE, there is much that we, as a nation, must do to fill them with substance and content. Some programs and laws that have succeeded at home may be applicable to situations in Western and Eastern Europe. We must work with the local communities in the successor states and elsewhere to tailor our approach as much as to empower emerging leaders on the

ground. Close contact and cooperation with local activists reinforces their role in society and enhances the legitimacy of citizen-based advocacy.

The responsibility of the United States, as a nation steeped in its own history of intolerance, must be to motivate, but we must also be willing to bear some of the cost of realizing this investment in humanity. If some of these nations in the former Soviet Union continue to lag in their democratic progress, the response should be to increase, rather than reduce, assistance to non-governmental and citizen groups. Rather than reducing American-funded broadcasts to Central and Eastern Europe, these should be broadened and infused with even greater attention to pluralism and minority issues. Mr. Chairman, NCSJ and a host of organizations here and abroad know of the Senate's commitment and effectiveness on this issue.

Thank you, again, for this opportunity and for the continued leadership that you and your colleagues have shown. Mr. Chairman, in my prepared statement, I have a series of recommendations for the OSCE, specifically, and for the U.S. Government, in general.

Thank you.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Levin follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF MARK B. LEVIN, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, NCSJ: ADVOCATES ON BEHALF OF JEWS IN RUSSIA, UKRAINE, THE BALTIC STATES AND EURASIA

Mr. Chairman, Senator Biden and Members of the Subcommittee, it is my privilege to appear before you today. I am joined here today by my colleagues, Shai Franklin, NCSJ's Director of Governmental Relations, and Lesley Weiss, NCSJ's Director of Community Services and Cultural Affairs.

As you know, NCSJ is an umbrella of nearly 50 national organizations and over 300 local community federations and community councils across the United States. We coordinate and represent the organized American Jewish community on advocacy relating to the former Soviet Union, and our membership includes the American Jewish Committee, Anti-Defamation League, B'nai B'rith International, Conference of Presidents of Major American Jewish Organizations, Hebrew Immigrant Aid Society, Jewish Council for Public Affairs, United Jewish Communities, and many other well-known agencies devoted to promoting tolerance and combating prejudice and anti-Semitism around the world. This combined experience and expertise has significantly informed my comments to you today.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to begin by recognizing the leadership you have demonstrated since assuming the helm of this Subcommittee, as reflected by your initiative in calling this hearing. We have long appreciated Senator Biden's leadership on our issues of concern, particularly this body's consistent bipartisan commitment to combating anti-Semitism. I must also pay tribute to Senator Voinovich, whose personal role during the past two years—including his service on the U.S. Helsinki Commission—has been instrumental in securing concerted international coordination on today's topic.

My testimony will focus on governmental responses to anti-Semitism, region-wide efforts at coordination, and how the United States can play and is playing an instrumental role.

A major feature of European history—both recent and distant—is deep-seated anti-Semitism and anti-Jewish violence. The upsurge of anti-Semitism in Europe during the past two years is often attributed to Muslim or Middle Eastern communities. The responsibility for law enforcement and shaping public attitudes, however, resides with European society as a whole, with European governments, and with multilateral security and humanitarian agencies. Since the 19th century, the United States Senate has actively addressed European anti-Semitism with the understanding that European stability is incompatible with unchecked popular or state-sponsored anti-Semitism.

Mr. Chairman, American leadership has already advanced the campaign against European anti-Semitism in significant ways. Europe's instinctive tendency to address anti-Semitism as a mere manifestation of broader xenophobia and bigotry, rather than as a distinct and separate form of human rights violation, is a

misreading of history. Rather than an outgrowth of generalized ethnic hatred, anti-Semitism is the medieval and modern prototype for the racial and ethnic bigotry that has sadly become diversified throughout the continent. Only by addressing anti-Semitism as a unique phenomenon can Europeans begin to correct the social ills of broad-based xenophobia.

By facilitating a new consensus to support concerted action, primarily through the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE), the United States Government and Congress have begun breaking down the excuses for inaction. Against the backdrop of U.S. leadership in the Middle East crisis, and given the history of U.S. leadership during the decades of Cold War confrontation, the Senate has an opportunity to continue the U.S. role in ensuring respect for human rights at home and abroad—focusing on concern for renewed anti-Semitic violence in Western Europe and the former Soviet Union.

In highlighting the efforts by Members of Congress and the United States Government, this Committee can help dispel the myth that anti-Semitism is a consequence of Israeli or American policies, that anti-Semitism is somehow an outgrowth of newer strains of intolerance, or that combating anti-Semitism need not be a priority for nations seeking to emulate the progress of Western nations.

Fittingly, it is such newly democratic nations that have stepped to the forefront in this cooperative effort. Among the post-Soviet states, Latvia, Lithuania, Russia, Azerbaijan, Ukraine, Georgia and others demonstrated their early support. Bulgaria, Poland and Romania, reemerging from decades of Soviet domination, have also led the way with the United States, Germany, and a few other Western nations. Some of these post-Communist societies still harbor endemic anti-Semitism, but they are taking steps to confront and neutralize it, to educate the public and protect minorities from popular or politically motivated threats. Most still have a distance to travel along this path, but they realize the imperative. They also realize the necessity of transnational cooperation, and have supported the effort to open a new track of the historic Helsinki process, one devoted to combating anti-Semitism.

Last June, at the first-ever OSCE Conference on Anti-Semitism, governments began to share information, ideas and commitments for combating anti-Semitism at home and throughout the OSCE region, under the chairmanship of the Netherlands. They did so within a new framework that implicitly recognizes anti-Semitism as a distinct human rights concern and a real threat to regional stability. This historic step would have been impossible without strong support from Capitol Hill, including Senator Voinovich at a critical point, and in turn the commitment and talents of American diplomats including former Special Envoy for Holocaust Issues Randolph Bell, and Stephan Minikes, U.S. Ambassador to the OSCE. The leadership and presence of former New York Mayor Rudolph Giuliani set the tone for delegations from the other 54 participating states.

Concretizing this break with "business as usual" means providing an effective mandate through this winter's OSCE Ministerial Council, setting a high profile for next year's Berlin conference on anti-Semitism, assigning a specific responsibility within the Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights (ODIHR), and ongoing consultation and oversight among participating States. It is vital to begin collecting information and proposals from all 55 OSCE participating states now, so that data on anti-Semitic hate crimes, constructive legislation and education and media initiatives can be assembled in time for next spring's conference in Berlin. It is vital that the United States sustain this momentum with high-level representation at the Maastricht Ministerial in December, and by giving all possible support to the new and well-qualified Special Envoy, Ambassador-Designate Edward O'Donnell.

FORMER SOVIET UNION

Government response to anti-Semitism in the successor states has been improving during the past few years. Several countries with a long history of anti-Semitism have undertaken efforts to implement laws against incitement, to speak out against anti-Semitism, and to promote research and education regarding Jewish heritage, the Holocaust, and tolerance.

While official or state anti-Semitism has been relegated to the past, political anti-Semitism by individual parliamentarians and local officials persists. Even leaders who speak out strongly against anti-Semitic rhetoric or activities often avoid repudiating anti-Semitic speeches by political allies and challengers. We hold the leaders responsible, not for the sentiments of their constituents but for their commitment to impacting those sentiments. To be truly free societies, whether in France or Russia, anti-Semitism cannot be considered a risk-free political device. There must be consequences, be they legal, political, or social.

In past elections in Russia and Ukraine, media and politicians have been tempted to resort to anti-Semitic appeals. As both countries prepare to enter a new cycle of national elections, we look to the leadership of these countries, their parliaments and political parties to act responsibly and to strongly denounce any appeals to anti-Semitism. Delaying a response until after the election only reinforces the impression that anti-Semitism is a safe campaign tactic.

Even in countries like Ukraine, where public anti-Semitism is rare and the state has supported the Jewish community revival and prosecutes perpetrators of anti-Semitic violence, officials still tend to classify such crimes as "hooliganism" rather than anti-Semitism.

Belarus has a mixed record, reflecting the need for more involvement by the national government in encouraging regional and local authorities to address issues of vandalism, cemetery desecration, and construction over Jewish graves: at Grodno and Mozer, where new construction is unearthing Jewish remains as I speak; at the Yama memorial in the Minsk ghetto, where vandals defaced prominent memorial sculptures and plaques; at the Kuropaty gravesite, where then-President Clinton dedicated a memorial bench that has since been damaged twice; at Gomel, where Jewish remains are being unearthed to make room for new Christian burials. These difficulties are only compounded by a sweeping new religion law, which enshrines the Orthodox Church as the pre-eminent faith.

Dr. Yevgeny Satanovsky, President of the Russian Jewish Congress, recently complained that anti-Semitic media and extremists from Western Europe are inspiring a new wave of anti-Semitism in his country. Russia certainly has its own indigenous forms of anti-Semitism, but Western European nations must recognize that anti-Semitism is a cross-border phenomenon, particularly as the European Union consolidates and expands. And Western neglect and excuses for popular anti-Semitism send a dangerous signal to the East that anti-Semitism is acceptable in modern society. Fortunately, U.S. leadership and post-Communist vigilance are beginning to challenge the complacency and remind governments of their obligations to their citizens and neighbors.

What positive example can Western Europe offer to its eastern neighbors? Surely, many cultural and political accomplishments come to mind. Yet, when it comes to sensitivity on minority issues, sadly, Western Europe has taken too much for granted. Thus it is not surprising that Russians can defend restrictions on minority faiths by pointing to comparable practices in France, Belgium, and Germany. Nor is it surprising when successor states defend votes in favor of anti-Israel and seemingly anti-Semitic United Nations resolutions by claiming to follow "the Western European example."

Mr. Chairman, when I testified before a similar hearing of this Subcommittee in April 2000, I quoted former Czech President Vaclav Havel, who has written: "The time of hard, everyday work has come, a time in which conflicting interests have surfaced, a time for sobering up, a time when all of us—and especially those in politics—must make it very clear what we stand for." Havel and I were both referring to the so-called "new" democracies of Central and Eastern Europe, but events of the past two years necessitate a broader reading.

We do not judge post-Communist governments by what they found among the shards of Soviet tyranny, we judge them by their commitment to moving forward. We hold them accountable for efforts to condition public attitudes through education and public statements, and we challenge them to enact and enforce laws to protect minorities and others. How can we afford to hold Western governments to a lower standard?

At a March 2002 conference in Bucharest, organized by the American Jewish Committee, Latvian Jewish leader Gregory Krupnikov remarked, "There is no state anti-Semitism. Obviously there is some level of public 'street' anti-Semitism, although it does not differ from the degree of anti-Semitism that typically exists in Europe." Fortunately, Latvia has not experienced "the degree of anti-Semitism" prevailing in Western Europe during the many months since the Bucharest conference. Latvia, so long under the yoke of Soviet occupation and the site of the worst kinds of atrocities during the Holocaust, was among the few courageous nations in Durban to vocally denounce the anti-Zionist and anti-Jewish draft platform of the 2001 World Conference Against Racism. However, we are disappointed that wartime pro-Nazi military units are still being honored with monuments and marches, including the recent dedication of a new memorial at the Lestene cemetery with the participation of government officials.

In the former Soviet republics, we need to continue supporting programs that foster tolerance and understanding, public campaigns to lift the cloak of legitimacy from those resorting to anti-Semitism, official condemnations of actions or state-

ments that diminish the humanity of any individual or group, and legal and institutional commitment to this cause.

According to the latest report by the Federation of Jewish Communities of the CIS and Baltic States, anti-Semitism is an ongoing trend to which the authorities are responding with increasing consistency. In Bryansk, Russia, where the municipality hired security guards for a Jewish school, they proved ineffective in stopping anti-Semitic vandalism and the community has retained private security. In Novgorod, a newspaper editor is now under investigation for inciting national discord during last year's mayoral election. In Volgograd, the regional administration sponsors a newspaper that regularly publishes anti-Semitic articles. In Estonia, a local court convicted a woman for selling a newspaper published by the banned Russian National Unity movement.

Behind these results lie decades of hard work by this Committee and many U.S. Government bodies, and by non-governmental organizations and their counterparts in the former Soviet Union. This work is far from complete, and we must not allow the latest Western European eruption of anti-Semitism to make us forget about the very real and ongoing societal undercurrent of anti-Semitism which persists, especially in Russia, Ukraine, Belarus, and Moldova.

Having already addressed the mechanism for regional cooperation in fighting anti-Semitism, I would like to list the key lessons we have learned in the former Soviet Union:

- The need to monitor incidents and attitudes, practices and policies, in the successor states has never been so obvious in light of the alarming developments to their west. Monitoring empowers local activists, it compels our diplomats to become experts and advocates in this area, and it reminds foreign governments and societies that these issues are integral to the Western culture they seek to emulate. Sharing this data on a regional level promotes additional awareness and coordination.
- Legislation to counter extremism and racial violence is also gaining support in the region, as evidenced by the new Russian law. At the same time, unfortunately laws that set up two classes of religion—traditional and non-traditional—or abdicate decision-making authority to local officials give further credence to the notion that the state can decide which religious groups are legitimate and which are not.
- Without enforcement of laws on the national and local levels, obviously, no legislation can have an impact. This requires active supervision by senior officials, as well as training programs for police, government workers and community leaders in tolerance and in combating hate crimes.
- Without an effective court system, either violators go free or public opinion doubts the fairness of their sentencing. This may be the most neglected facet of efforts to reduce outbreaks of anti-Semitism and xenophobia, and to transform post-Soviet societies. If judges cannot become role models, their statements and decisions ultimately have little impact.
- Public education efforts are gaining momentum, particularly in the Baltic states, which are teaching their children the lessons of the Holocaust, and the United States would do well to redouble support for such efforts. To be truly successful and far-reaching, these efforts must be undertaken at the earliest possible age, but should also encompass opportunities for adult learning.
- The "bully pulpit" is not only available to presidents. Public statements by government leaders at every level are indispensable to motivating society, bureaucracies, and legislators. Official condemnation of anti-Semitism and calls for greater protection of minorities help shape public attitudes and reduce ambiguity.
- Religious leaders must also take responsibility. The Lithuanian Catholic Church condemned anti-Semitism three years ago at a bishops' conference, and expressed regret that during the German occupation "a portion of the faithful failed to demonstrate charity to the persecuted Jews, did not grasp any opportunity to defend them, and lacked the determination to influence those who aided the Nazis." Together with Jewish Women International and Russian-based partners, NCSJ recently concluded a State Department grant to promote tolerance within religious communities in two Russian cities.

U.S. POLICY

In large part due to Congressional initiative, the U.S. Government has multiple channels for addressing anti-Semitism overseas. Among these are the U.S. Commis-

sion on Security and Cooperation in Europe, or Helsinki Commission, which is headquartered in the U.S. Congress; the U.S. Commission for International Religious Freedom, the Office of International Religious Freedom, and the Ambassador at Large; the U.S. Government Roundtable on Religious Freedom; the Special Envoy for Holocaust Issues; and annual reviews such as the State Department's Country Reports on Human Rights Practices and on Religious Freedom.

The involvement of the non-governmental community in each of these processes is a cornerstone of their authority and their success, and NCSJ has participated within and alongside the official U.S. delegations to numerous international fora during the past 30 years, most recently in Vienna at the June 2003 OSCE Conference on Anti-Semitism and just last week in Warsaw at the OSCE Human Dimension Implementation Meeting. (I would ask to include NCSJ's Warsaw statement in the record of this hearing.)

Beyond bolstering frameworks like the OSCE, there is much that we as a nation must do to fill them with substance and content. Some programs and laws that have succeeded at home may be applicable to situations in Western and Eastern Europe. These include the well-known initiatives by the Anti-Defamation League, the American Jewish Committee, and other members of the NCSJ umbrella. At the same time, we can identify programs that have worked in Europe and consider how to adapt them to an American context.

We must work with the local communities in the successor states and elsewhere, to tailor our approach as much as to empower emerging leaders on the ground. Close contact and cooperation with local activists reinforces their role in society and enhances the legitimacy of citizen-based advocacy.

Without a doubt, the United States must commit more human and financial resources to initiating, aiding and propagating effective tolerance and enforcement mechanisms overseas. With the spread of freedom and return of national sovereignty to Eastern and Central Europe, we are seeing a long-awaited readiness to take real steps in combating anti-Semitism and the myriad other forms of xenophobia it has engendered and legitimized. We are also seeing a grudging and growing recognition in the West of its own problems and obligations.

The responsibility of the United States, as a nation steeped in its own history of intolerance, must be to motivate. But we must also be willing to bear some of the cost of realizing this investment in humanity. Whether through direct funding, non-governmental grants or government-to-government partnerships, the United States must follow through. Representing an umbrella of national organizations and local communities, NCSJ urges the Senate to support full or increased funding for the overseas programs that are fulfilling the unprecedented potential for tolerance and pluralism in Europe. If some of these nations continue to lag in their democratic progress, the response should be to increase rather than reduce assistance to non-governmental and citizen groups. Rather than reducing American-funded broadcasts to Central and Eastern Europe, these should be broadened and infused with even greater attention to pluralism and minority issues.

Mr. Chairman, NCSJ and a host of organizations—here and abroad—know of the Senate's commitment and effectiveness on this issue. Thank you again for this opportunity, and for the continued leadership that you and your colleagues have shown.

[Attachment].

NCSJ: ADVOCATES ON BEHALF OF JEWS IN RUSSIA, UKRAINE, THE BALTIC STATES & EURASIA

STATEMENT TO THE 2003 OSCE IMPLEMENTATION MEETING, WORKING SESSION 12: "PREVENTION OF DISCRIMINATION, RACISM, XENOPHOBIA AND ANTI-SEMITISM"—WARSAW, OCTOBER 14, 2003

DELIVERED BY SHAI FRANKLIN, DIRECTOR OF GOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS

Distinguished Moderator and Delegates,

I would first commend to your attention the concise recommendations assembled by a coalition of non-governmental organizations, including NCSJ, and to express appreciation for the dedicated work of the American delegation, headed by Ambassadors Pamela Hyde Smith and Stephan Minikes.

As the representative of an organization relating to issues in the Baltics and the Soviet successor states, which has worked within the Helsinki process since its inception, I also wish to highlight the constructive leadership of parliamentarians including our own Members of Congress who are attending today, who have worked with Dr. Gert Weisskirchen to forge a multilateral coalition of legislators from

across the OSCE region. Dr. Weisskirchen's colleague, German Delegate Claudia Roth, first proposed a 2004 Berlin conference on anti-Semitism this past June and is here again with the same passionate call; I urge any delegations that have yet to endorse the 2004 conference to do so today.

As an umbrella organization that includes nearly 50 national American Jewish organizations and 300 local community groups, including a number of those participating here, NCSJ would like to associate itself with the interventions of those partner organizations.

Last June, at the first-ever OSCE Conference on Anti-Semitism, governments began to share information, ideas and commitments for combating anti-Semitism at home and throughout the OSCE region, under the chairmanship of the Netherlands. They did so within a new framework that implicitly recognizes anti-Semitism as a distinct human rights concern and a real threat to regional stability.

Of the series of worthy recommendations, with which you are all probably familiar, I wish to highlight just a few: Training of law enforcement, education of youth and the public, and meetings of experts on these and other topics—opportunities that occur outside this and other chambers, in between the periodic assemblies. These are just a few of the many examples.

Notably, in advocating for a separate OSCE focus on anti-Semitism, nations once under Communist control are among the leaders: Latvia, Russia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, Ukraine, and others. These so-called "new" societies do take seriously both the threat of anti-Semitism and the necessity of coordinating a transnational strategy through the OSCE. This was evident a few minutes ago during the side event focusing on post-Soviet responses.

By enunciating the OSCE's substantive commitment, Europe and North America are breaking with a collective past that began with anti-Semitism, propagated an abundance of hatreds and phobias, and retains the disguise of latent neglect and a cloak of "cultural context".

To become the truly free society that the Helsinki process promised we should be, all participating States must assume responsibility for the safety and acceptance of all faiths and ethnicities. Sixty years since the Holocaust, Europeans and North Americans are finally breaking unequivocally with the past—not by commemorating it, by repudiating it, or by forgetting it, but by applying its lessons to ongoing manifestations of anti-Semitism.

Concretizing this break with "business as usual" means providing an effective mandate through this winter's Ministerial Council, setting a high profile for next year's Berlin conference on anti-Semitism, assigning a specific responsibility within ODIHR, and ongoing consultation and oversight among participating States.

Without directly and distinctly addressing contemporary anti-Semitism, we cannot say we are better than our predecessors, nor can we ensure lasting protection from newer forms of prejudice and hatred. Nations that were not free 15 years ago already appreciate this imperative, and they have reiterated it here.

The specific recommendations for governments and society are well documented in the report from Vienna. The recommendations for the next steps in the OSCE process are summarized in the NGO statement which I referenced. What the delegates here today can contribute to this process, beyond your own recommendations and initiatives, is to prepare the ground for Berlin, to work with your governments on clear and strong language in the 2003 Ministerial Declaration, and to create an oversight and coordination function within ODIHR.

Thank you very much.

Senator ALLEN. Thank you, Mr. Levin.

I'm not sure when the other Senators will get back, but let me start with the questioning.

You all shortened your remarks, and it's good testimony and recommendations and appendices that you've all presented. All have commented, one way or the other, that some countries, whether it's France or others, have actually put in stronger laws for anti-Semitic or hateful acts or religious bigotry actions, not verbiage, but for actions—and they seem to be, I suppose, relatively new laws, which ought to be commended. Can you determine how they're being prosecuted, do you see a trend?

First of all, passing a law is very important. That's absolutely essential. Then there is the enforcement, the prosecution, and what

sort of sentences are handed down or meted out to those who are found guilty of these specific crimes. Is it too early, or can any of you share with us how you feel that those laws are being enforced and carried out?

Yes, sir, Mr. Foxman.

Mr. FOXMAN. There are also laws on the books of Europe on verbiage, by the way, because they do not have the constitutional first amendment, as we do, and there are certain expressions, in terms of Naziism and Holocaust denial, which are punishable by expression. And, in fact, we had a conflict-of-laws problem with our Internet. You cannot buy "Mein Kampf" in Germany or Austria, but you can buy it by Internet. And so there are delicate issues that need to be resolved with respecting our constitutional provisions and their legal provisions.

The question you ask is a very good one, and it does not lend itself to a general trend analysis, because the laws are on the books. Whether there is a will to implement them, act against them, depends on the political atmosphere, depends on the party in power, depends on the pressure from America, depends on all kinds of other factors.

Take France, for example. France has all the laws needed to fight anti-Semitism, and yet during the period of 2000, 2001, and 2002, they didn't do very much—there were over 400 incidents of violent anti-Semitism—because nobody issued the orders, nobody indicated that it's significant, et cetera.

After the election, however, all of a sudden there is implementation, and there are arrests, there are statements from Chirac down to the Minister of Interior to the police chiefs, et cetera, that this is a crime in France and that it will be prosecuted.

And so there are cycles out there. In Russia, for example—and Mark can be more specific—the statements are good, the laws have been finally enacted, and President Putin speaks out very frequently, and yet the order hasn't gone down to arrest, to prosecute, and then you take a look, sometimes when they do, what the sentences are.

So it's a question of political will. It's no longer a question—same question that you asked earlier about Holocaust education. The list that you're going to get is many countries, and what Mr. Harris said is, ironically and interestingly, there is so much more activity in the former Soviet Union, in the Bulgarias, and the Hungarys, Romania. Now we'll probably go in excess to teach, or at least proclaim that it's teaching, the Holocaust.

So it's not a question of the laws, it's not a question of the statements; it's the question, "So you have the book. What are you doing with it?"

Argentina, for example, has a textbook on the Holocaust. Well, so what? Sweden put together a conference which talked about the responsibility, the need, to teach the lessons of the past and the future. It's there. The material is there. I need to say, $25,000 for a country in a task force to deal with educating on the Holocaust in Europe is almost sadly laughable. And because they also don't have budgets for textbooks, they don't have budgets to teach their teachers how to teach, and they have another defense mechanism, if they want it, and that is, we don't—that all the education is done

locally. So we have now engaged, as the committee has and the ADL has, we are offering services to teach prejudice reduction, to teach Holocaust education. We are offering services to teach law enforcement how to be sensitive to difference, more tolerant. Because law enforcement is what helped Hitler—you know, he broke—they broke down the system for him.

So that by looking at the laws, Mr. Chairman, you don't have an answer. One needs to take a look at, "So what do they do with them?" How many arrests? How many, in fact—and this is why we're talking about monitoring. We talked last June, in this year, Vienna, about setting standards for monitoring. So one is to designate what is a anti-Semitic act, and then what can be done and should be done.

So we need some standardized criteria for them. And, again, we need to lead them, we need to urge them, we need to help them, and only then can we answer your question.

Senator ALLEN. Well, the reason I asked the question is that it's good to have laws on the books, but then you have to enforce those laws. In some cases, what you're saying is that it vacillates or is uneven?

On the education, I'm not going to tell folks in other countries how to run their school systems, anymore than I like the Federal Government telling us in Virginia what we ought to do. However, a good way of determining whether or not it is just a book on a library shelf or a book that, "Here, your students can read this if you so desire," is to determine if they have accountability. Is there testing, is this one of the subjects that students will be tested upon, just like the reading and writing and spelling of the Polish, French or the Danish languages. I mean, if that's part of it, like mathematics and so forth, then you recognize that they are serious about it. Otherwise, it's a mere suggestion. But if it's a requirement, a standard that is tested——

Yes, Mr. Harris.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I could make two comments——

Senator ALLEN. Sure.

Mr. HARRIS [continuing]. In response to what you've just said.

On the issue of education, I agree completely on its importance, but I don't think we should underestimate the challenges faced in countries like France. I made reference to this in my testimony moments ago. There are some schools in France that cannot follow the national curriculum. And in France there has been a national curriculum since the Napoleonic days. The teachers cannot teach the segments on the Dreyfus case, they cannot teach the mandated segments on the Holocaust, because the students are resisting it, challenging the teachers, and not permitting them to teach as the curriculum requires because of the highly charged atmosphere. Mostly, this involves students from North Africa. This has been amply documented. To his credit, the Minister of Education in France is trying to grapple with this issue. The curriculum itself is fine in France. That's not the problem.

And the second issue is to followup on what was said by my colleague a moment ago on political will.

Let me take you, just for one moment, into a room where we met with the Foreign Minister of France in November 2001. He was joined by the then Foreign Minister of Italy and the Director General of the Spanish Foreign Ministry. The three of them sat there with a delegation from the American Jewish Committee in New York, and we raised the very same concerns we're raising here, Mr. Chairman, regarding the vulnerability of Jewish communities.

His response to us was three-pronged, and I think this goes to the issue of political will. The issue was not the law; the issue was the will. His first response was denial. He became rather upset, and he challenged us. "After all," said he, "I know my country better than you do. There is no problem of anti-Semitism."

We pointed to the documented attacks, we pointed to statements by Jewish leaders. He went to the second level of response, which was obfuscation. He admitted the fact that there were attacks, but he said they were in the context of a rising crime rate in France and growing insecurity for all French. Well, indeed, there is a growing crime rate in France, but the specificity of attacks against synagogues or Jewish children en route to a Jewish school is not part of a general crime problem; these are hate crimes.

And then he moved to a third level of response, which I would call rationalization. He admitted there was a problem finally, after a long discussion, but he said, "You know, it's linked to the Middle East, and you have to understand, these young teenagers from North Africa, who are rather poor, whose parents are often unemployed, watch Al Jazeera, see the oppression by the Israelis of Palestinians, get angry, go out in the streets, and take it out on the surrogates for Israel," meaning Jews.

And what he said was, "The answer to this is to find the solution to the Middle East problem." Is that the answer you would expect from a country that gave birth to the Declaration of the Rights of Man in 1791? Is that the response we expect?

So the laws are there. The educational curriculum is there. The real challenge is the political will.

Senator ALLEN. Mr. Levin.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Chairman, in the former Soviet Union, it's a combination of developing the will, developing the laws, developing the educational institutions. We have to remember that we're dealing with a region that more or less has been open or free for a little more than a decade. And to have leaders speak out and address these issues in a forthright way is important, to have laws developed is important, to have those laws implemented becomes even more important, but we have to remember we're dealing with countries whose institutions—the institutions, whether they be legal, educational, medical, cultural, were perverted for over seven decades. So they're starting from the beginning, and in the beginning it is important to have leaders speak out, it is important to develop laws and, again, to have those laws implemented.

But let me give you two quick examples of what's happened in the region. Over the last several months, in Belarus, in a town called Grodno, there has been an ongoing effort to re-bury Jewish remains that have been dug up during the renovation of a soccer stadium. Unfortunately, in the 1950s and 1960s, a soccer stadium was constructed on top of a Jewish cemetery in the middle of this

city. A year ago or so, there was an attempt to begin a renovation that would bring the stadium up to European stadiums so Belarus could host European and international soccer competitions. Well, during this process, not hundreds, but thousands of remains were discovered. And rather than taking the time to re-bury them or store them until the appropriate religious leaders could take over, they threw them aside. Some were dumped in a warehouse, some were just left on the streets surrounding the stadium. We began a process, working with the local Jewish community, to try to get local authorities to be more sensitive, to be more concerned about what was going on. It proved to be futile for many months.

We have tried to engage the national government, which actually was somewhat responsive, and they did begin a dialog with the local officials. It wasn't until a few weeks ago that the local authorities began to address this issue forthrightly. And the only reason they began to address the issue is because a group of American Jews demonstrated in front of the Belarus mission in New York, a group of three or four hundred people, who promised that if the issue wasn't addressed, there would be thousands the next week or the next month.

And with our support the Governor of the region is now willing to have all the remains collected and re-buried, and to look at developing an appropriate memorial at the site of the soccer stadium.

The reason I mention it is because, up until this point, the level of what I would call anti-Semitic rhetoric was very high in this town of Grodno, directed not just at local Jewish leaders but at national and international Jewish leaders, that this was part of a Zionist conspiracy to embarrass these local officials.

The second example, and I'll make it very brief, is the fact that the President of the Russian Federation, as Mr. Foxman has said, has spoken out numerous times now, when there have been anti-Semitic incidents in his country. The hope is that he will begin to direct his law-enforcement officials to go after these individuals who have engaged in these types of crimes. The record in Russia is not a good one right now, but I think a lot has to do with understanding, with education, education of the law-enforcement officials, both the police and the prosecutors.

Senator ALLEN. I'm going to turn it over to Senator Voinovich, allow him to ask questions.

In listening to your responses here on this and also in reading your testimony, the rationalization that you were talking about in France, the third level, after denial and obfuscation, was there's a lot of citizens from North Africa. I assume you're saying that that they are Muslim, from North Africa, former territories of France. And your testimony—"the major feature of European history," I assume you're talking about it in Russia, "is anti-Semitism is often attributed to Muslim or Middle Eastern communities."

My question is this just an excuse of blaming people who have a different religion than the predominant religion in Russia or France or other countries? I assume you're saying there are Muslim students that they can't teach these courses to, or this curriculum to, in France. Mr. Harris, you brought that up.

The other question—and I know this is very sensitive, but it's important for us to fully understand this—is this a rationalization

or an excuse for them not to enforce the law? Are they trying to blame people who are of Islamic faith, for their failures to enforce the law or have a curriculum that applies to all the people of their country? Or enforce the law for all the people in the country, regardless of their religious belief, their ethnicity, or their race?

Mr. HARRIS. I think there are as I said, Mr. Chairman, in my testimony, three principal sources of anti-Semitism that we have been watching carefully, all of us. One is the traditional extreme right anti-Semitism.

Senator ALLEN. That's more of the neo-Nazi.

Mr. HARRIS. Neo-Nazi and then its more recent incarnations, Jean-Marie Le Pen's National Front, which got nearly 20 percent of the votes in the first round of the French Presidential elections in the spring of 2002. And there are other similar parties.

Senator ALLEN. Now, when you take Le Pen, Le Pen, Le Pen is very anti- as best as I understand and I'm not an expert on French politics—but is very anti-immigrant and anti-North African.

Mr. HARRIS. The irony is that among groups that are otherwise deeply divided on issues, we tend to become the uniting force for them. So you have the extreme right and its traditional anti-Semitism, which also today, as you say, manifests itself in anti-immigrant, xenophobic forms. And you have the extreme left, for whom, there is a kind of mix of, increasingly, anti-Americanism, which I think we may need to take far more into account here in our calculations, together with anti-Zionism, which questions the right of the Jewish people to self-determination, and, if you will, anti-globalization. And these three groups come together in various forms and often in what we would consider an anti-Semitic manner.

And the third is the growing Muslim population in Europe. Let me be clear. We're not trying to paint everyone with a broad brush stroke. No one is accusing all Muslims, much less all of anyone, of anti-Semitism. But we'd be equally naive, I believe, to deny the fact that within the Muslim populations of Europe, there are those who have been infected, either through teaching of the mosques or the media, with the virus of anti-Semitism.

Is Europe trying to blame the Muslims? I don't believe so. I would say, to the contrary, Europe is afraid of further arousing restive Muslim populations that are already on the margins of society, and that, in some respects, show the symptoms of the inner-city pathology that we have known in this country, that is, the cycle of social problems. And so precisely because governments are afraid of arousing them further, I think they've backed off of it.

When you add to that the European interest in North Africa and the Middle East—the political, diplomatic, economic, and energy interests—all the more reason why they're reluctant to take on this problem frontally, for fear of being labeled anti-Muslim.

Mr. FOXMAN. Mr. Chairman, it's everything that Mr. Harris, plus. And that is, when—the French say, it's not we. This is not France. France is not anti-Semitic. Nobody said France is anti-Semitic. We said, you know, there's anti-Semitism in France. But the response is a denial, it's not me. It's they. It's they. They do it. They're doing it. And you know why they're doing it? Not as Frenchmen. They're doing it because they're upset about what's

going on in the Middle East. So, yes, it is denial. Yes, it saying they're not Frenchmen.

And the irony of all of this is, if you log on today to the right-wing neo-Nazi Web sites in this country, you will find this bizarre—no longer bizarre to us, because we've seen it—the right-wing extremists have now found a new poster boy. And the poster boy of the right-wing neo-Nazi hate groups in this country for this week is the Prime Minister of Malaysia. They are praising him.

Now, we also know, look, on the other part of the Web site, they're anti-black, they're anti-brown, they're anti- OK? But for this moment, they're anti-Jewish, can say that they're anti-African-American, they're anti-Arab, they're anti-Muslim, et cetera, et cetera, et cetera. So that plays there.

You know, from time to time, it's pure political expediency. Mr. Chirac and company, before election, were not willing—forget about the greater issue of enraging the Muslim world, which we now—is being explained why, you know, he was so nice to Mahathir, but it was votes. Ten percent of the population of France is votes. It backfired, because in the primary, Le Pen did well, because the people who are xenophobic hate the other, voted for Le Pen because they felt that Chirac and the ruling government was not dealing with the prime problem with issues of—with the other issues. And after the primary, the government began to change.

So it plays all kinds of roles, whether it's politics, whether it's political expediency, whether it's history, whether it's culture, and whether it's the blame game, or to put it off. All of it comes together, tragically, primarily today in Europe.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Chairman, a bit of good news, if I can. In the Central Asian countries, Jews and Muslims have been living together in some cases for thousands of years.

Senator ALLEN. Central Asia?

Mr. LEVIN. In the Central—in Uzbekistan, Kazakhstan, Kurdistan, Tajikistan, and in some of the Caucasus countries, as well. So, in fact, the leadership in the—the Jewish leadership in the Central Asian countries have held several meetings among—that included Jewish, Muslim, and Christian religious leaders.

I was in Kazakhstan in late February with a number of other representatives of American Jewish organizations, and we participated in a conference that brought together the political and religious leadership of the Central Asian countries, and it belies the fact that for some, particularly who try to use it as a crutch, that Jews and Muslims can't live together and that the problems in the Middle East are the cause for everything that's happening throughout Europe and the rest of the world. In Russia and Ukraine, as Mr. Harris talked about in other parts of Europe, you know, we call it a Red-Brown Coalition that sometimes—that comes together, where the Communists and the ultra-nationalists have common cause. And usually it's centered around the Russian-Ukrainian Jewish citizens.

Senator ALLEN. Thank you, gentlemen.

Senator Voinovich.

Senator VOINOVICH. Thank you very much. Thank you for coming today.

What I'm interested in is institutionalizing a procedure so that we can move forward and make some progress, one that can be monitored and one that can bring in the best ideas. You've got specific problems—how do you deal with countries that have got more Muslims coming in? How do you—in terms of education—how do you reach them? There are best practices. There are a lot of things that are out there. And the question I have is, how well do you think we're doing, in terms of this effort with the OSCE, to move forward and to institutionalize this effort to eliminate the cancer of anti-Semitism?

Mr. FOXMAN. Well——

Senator VOINOVICH. I mean, I was impressed with Mr. O'Donnell about what has happened. I just wonder, from your perspective, what do you think?

Mr. FOXMAN. Well, I think it still needs work. I think we've—there's been a tremendous amount of progress. And, again, we've said it—I think all of us said it in our own ways—it wouldn't have happened if not for the leadership of the Secretary of State, your leadership, Senator, others, Senator Smith, others, who wherever they went raised the issue and said this is important, this is a cancer, this is a disease that needs to be addressed.

Now, many of those who acquiesced, acquiesced thinking this is a one-shot deal, we'll do it, we'll get over it, and we'll move on, and don't bother us.

Senator VOINOVICH. OK.

Mr. FOXMAN. They're now learning that it's not. And so the next step forward was, well, let's do it with xenophobia, let's do it with Islama-phobia, let's do a potpourri, a smorgasbord of "isms," and, you know, everybody will be happy.

And I think they're also realizing today all of us are working out there. There are some European nations who understand that unfortunately this disease is 2,000 years old, unfortunately on the European Continent it destroyed six million in our lifetimes, forget about the 2,000 years before, and that, at the very least, it merits to focus on this disease until we get an antidote, what to do with it and about it.

We, the American Jewish Committee, the ADL, and others of us, have used the September visitations to the General Assembly as an opportunity to do one-on-ones and three-on-ones with most of certainly the European nations. And with everyone, on our agenda was the second conference. And most of them have made commitments that they've lived up to and said that they will so instruct the Prime Ministers, the Prime Ministers will so instruct their Ambassadors. We'll see in December at the meeting. The Warsaw meeting indicated that there is a consensus moving forward, although there are some who are still opposed to it.

So I don't think it's a done deal. And from that perspective, to set standards and to get monitoring, we're not there yet. We need to talk about it. That will be very difficult. But we're still in a phase of convincing them that there's a need, it's their need, not only our need, it's for their democracy, it is a canary in the coal mine of democracy, it is—if you want to measure civility in Europe, that's what it's all about. But we still need that—and they operate by consensus—that consensus and then the will. If we have that

consensus and it happens again, we can then face the issues of standards, which will be difficult. What constitutes anti-Semitism? What constitutes an act? Now, these are very serious questions which we'll have to grapple with.

We haven't come to an agreement in this country, in terms of the monitoring. Federal monitoring is different than state and local. We do the monitoring, the ADL does the monitoring, but there's again different numbers because of our definitions, but at least we're on the same track. I think we—I think the question's very important, because we can't relax yet. And then we can hand it over to the professionals to try to determine standards, definitions, et cetera. But we still need to cross that hurdle that it's an accepted consensus that this is what it should be.

Mr. HARRIS. Senator Voinovich, I would just like to add one suggestion, and that is that if the chairman would agree, at least in principle, that one year from today you schedule another hearing such as this on anti-Semitism in Europe, and let it be known early, because I can tell you that there was a great deal of interest in the fact that you were holding this hearing, that many European governments were very well aware of this hearing and chose to watch it very carefully. I think it's important that Europe and the world know that there will be an ongoing scrutiny of these issues by the U.S. Senate. So I would urge the continuation of this process in which we're engaged today.

Senator VOINOVICH. Well, the real issue is—and, Mark, I apologize that I had to step out during your testimony, but what we've been trying to do is to try and make sure that we get your best input on what it is that we're going to accomplish in April at that meeting, and what are some concrete steps that can be taken. Can we institutionalize it, and get the OSCE involved in it? That involves staffing and monitoring—and come up with some practical things——

Mr. FOXMAN. And funding.

Senator VOINOVICH. And funding, exactly. I mean, he was just talking about the task force on education, and that $25,000 a country, that's not very much. Salt in the soup. But, anyhow—around here, at least—but all I'm saying is that I'm really interested in getting the best thoughts that can be used—work through the State Department, have them make the commitment, get them to the meeting, get down to—dot the i's, cross the t's, get this institutionalized, start the process of monitoring, develop strategies that deal with some of the specific problems that are out there in various countries, finding out best practices, as I mentioned before, from some other place. You know, I'd be interested in whether you think that makes sense or not.

Mr. LEVIN. Senator, I think everything you said makes a great deal of sense, and much of what you suggested I think is in all three of our testimonies. I think, you know, a couple of concrete steps to take right away is to reiterate the importance that you attach to the OSCE process to our administration. We've been in the forefront, we have to remain in the forefront. It would be vitally important to have a strong congressional delegation participate in the Berlin meeting. Last week, a number of our organizations were in Warsaw attending the Human Dimensions meeting under the

OSCE, and there was a congressional delegation. And the fact that three or four, maybe five, U.S. Members of Congress were there spoke volumes to their European counterparts.

Mayor Giuliani, in Vienna, made a suggestion about tracking hate crimes as a first step. I think, as Mr. Foxman has said, it's tracking, it's education, it's doing all of this, and there's no reason it can't be done under the OSCE. It's one of the few umbrella organizations, that includes Western and Eastern European countries together, and we should take advantage of that.

Senator VOINOVICH. And their sole purpose is to monitor human rights. I remember being in Moscow and sitting down with the head of the Duma there and talking about, several years ago, some anti-Semitic remarks being made by members of the Duma, and wondering what are they going to be doing about it? There's a lot of in-your-face, "what are you guys doing?" type of thing. So I think it's the organization to really get the job done and, frankly, might give it some more meaning.

Mr. HARRIS. Senator Voinovich, the OSCE will do its job if there's the political will at the highest levels in member countries to ensure that it does its job. And if there is not the political will, or if the signals are mixed or weak, then I fear that the OSCE will become a relatively ineffective instrument.

President Bush has himself expressed concern about growing anti-Semitism in Europe. It's important that at the level of the President and the Secretary of State, this conversation continue to take place with their European counterparts to ensure that there is instruction from the highest levels in the European capitals to continue this process, both within Europe and as a part of the transatlantic dialog.

Senator VOINOVICH. Well, the thing that's neat about this is that some of these countries that you might think might be recalcitrant have also made some very strong statements, and they're making it very difficult for somebody to say, we don't want to participate in this, when Chirac has made certain statements and Germany has made certain statements, and other places. You know, they're onboard. The issue was, then, actions speak louder than words.

And the other thought, and I don't know whether it makes sense or not, I'd be interested in, that meeting, patting some people on the back for some good things that they've done to address this issue.

Mr. FOXMAN. Well, it goes to your best practices. I think what we should do together is find those best practices and find them in as many countries as we can, and appreciate them and reward them and show them off. Again, we have to be careful it's not, I mean, you know, "we do." And there are some good things going on, which may need encouragement, which may need funding, which may need support. Absolutely. And, again, it's very preliminary, but maybe there should be a day that deals just with best practices where we reward, award, embrace, appreciate, you know, find ways of doing it, so there's an incentive, starting even now, that they know that in April Sweden can be, you know, praised for what they've done, or France for the Minister of Education. Absolutely, absolutely. One of the best Holocaust creative approach that has come up.

Senator VOINOVICH. Well, I did that in my state. We had a Governor's challenge every 2 years dealing with racism in Ohio and dealing with good inter-human relations. And what we did was, we honored communities for what they had done. And that, in itself, was good. The others who were there got a chance to see what they were doing, and there was some feeling of, you know, this is the right thing to do, and get onboard.

Mr. FOXMAN. Senator, we still honor righteous Christians from 60 years ago, because that's the best lesson, best message, that one can give, in terms of what people can do, even today, 60 years later. And I believe now we should do it with their children. We should honor their children so that they know what heroes of humanity their parents and grandparents were. So that—I don't know anything else that works better. I'm living proof that it works. I'm here.

Mr. LEVIN. And, Senators, there's no reason why it can't be done in the U.S. Congress. Bring your counterparts to recognize what's been done.

Senator VOINOVICH. Mr. Chairman, I think what might be really worthwhile is that maybe the organizations that are represented here today could come back with some ideas on how to make the meeting in Berlin the most worthwhile that it can be, to do some preliminary work and get it to our people that will be at the OSCE meeting in Maastricht—to maybe have a little background on it. And if you could share that with us, we could get a letter signed by the chairman and the members of the Foreign Relations Committee urging the administration to go forward and move on this, and let them know that we're behind it, and also indicate to them that if there's some resources that they're going to need to get the job done, that we're willing to even make that available to them so they can do the job they're supposed to be doing.

Because, I'll tell you, I like the idea of coming back here a year from now, but if we don't really get into this and start to spend some time on it, it won't happen. It won't. It really won't. This is tough stuff. It is. And I'm hoping, Mr. Chairman, that the position that you and I and some others have taken on Iraq is going to help the situation. I think the fact that we show that we're interested in setting up a democracy in that part of the world.

And I think the other thing that we need to do is to raise awareness to the stuff on television every night. If they say they're for the State of Israel, then they need to take action and get the anti-Semitism out of their children's textbooks and get the propaganda off television. I mean, these are significant signs that people mean business. And I think what it boils down to is, it's almost like a full-court press, it's like OSCE and then some efforts over here. But to have a regular plan in place to just keep staying on this and grind away at it every day and be persistent and be unrelenting. And I think if we do that, then I think we can be successful.

What do you think?

Senator ALLEN. I think they're good ideas. As we conclude this hearing, I have several observations. Yes, I think those are good ideas that I'll take under consideration.

No. 1—and I'll close with four points—No. 1, the funding issue—granted, $25,000 is just not enough, but regardless, the point is, it's

leadership. You did it as Governor of Ohio, I did it as Governor of the Commonwealth of Virginia in having the Holocaust as part of the curriculum. All of our history standards, science standards, and all that, we didn't wait around for the Federal Government to give us money, or the United Nations or some other country, we made it a priority. And most of these countries, particularly the Western European countries, can fund it themselves. In fact, most of the Central European countries can. It may be a different situation for Eastern European countries. Regardless, they don't need the United States to be funding their textbooks.

Now, there are certain things that I do think are important, when you get the media into Eastern and Central Europe, and that is radio and TV, to make sure they are getting unbiased media, nformation and news. I think that's a value, just as Radio Marti is into Cuba to go into those countries, where the concept of individual rights, individual freedoms and religions rights have not taken root very long. They've been under either Communist dictatorships or monarchies, either way, not very satisfactory or enlightened forms of government.

The OSCE, this is point No. 2—this is an organization that seems to be a logical, formal conduit that we ought to use. I'm not saying "use" in a bad sense, but utilize in such a way as to get these ideas, these measurements and these benchmarks achieved. That's something there is an agreement on, their participation.

Third, that's the whole reason I held this hearing. And I know it's a controversial hearing on a controversial subject, and we didn't want to upset anyone, but it is important to shine the light on what is going on, examine it, recognize that we're concerned about it, look at best practices or ways of measuring improvement in those areas. I think that we ought to have ongoing scrutiny in this subcommittee and, indeed, the whole committee, if you wanted to make it worldwide. Our focus, of course, is Europe on this committee, and, obviously, it does get into a few other continents. Nonetheless, this will be an ongoing scrutiny that we'll have, I will say, as chairman of this subcommittee.

Fourth, and this is where you see some of the optimism. You listen to these problems in some of these countries that are democracies, they're representative democracies, and it makes you appreciate this country, our foundation and values. I mentioned the Statute of Religious Freedom but, you know, it took a long time before our country was a perfect union. This is not a country without blemishes, insofar as our race relations, our treatment of people of different ethnicities, religions and certainly women. Women didn't have the right to vote until the last century. Same with African-Americans, until the mid 1860s, and then, even then, it wasn't until the 1960s that true civil rights and equality was afforded to people who are African-American.

And so in this country, we are finally at that more perfect union, where there is a tolerance, there is a respect for people of different races or ethnicity or religion. We find people of the Jewish faith or Muslim faith getting along. They're neighbors. They might not agree on everything, but, nevertheless, there's not the hatred. You find people who are Pakistani and Indian getting along well here. And that's something that's really wonderful about this country

and really something to celebrate. How we can be that shining light for the rest of the world is very important. This country is prosperous, free, there's opportunity, folks' rights are not enhanced, nor diminished on account of their religious beliefs. That's is, in itself, an empowering principle of our country.

And so while we say we're the model, we need to be careful and respectful that it took us a long time to reach that perfect union and that true equal opportunity for all people in this country.

Some of these nations have been breathing the sweet nectar of freedom for just 10 years, or a decade, and so we need to be helpful, be respectful, but also understand that we need to be firm that anti-Semitism, discrimination, hatred on the basis of someone's religion or ethnicity cannot be tolerated. But let's do it in a way that's sensitive and, therefore, effective in achieving our shared goals.

And I thank all three of you gentlemen and my good colleague, Senator Voinovich, for your participation. We will fight on for freedom together.

Thank you. And the committee meeting is adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 5:05 p.m., the subcommittee adjourned, to reconvene subject to the call of the Chair.]

ADDITIONAL SUBMISSIONS FOR THE RECORD

THE FIGHT AGAINST ANTI-SEMITISM IN FRANCE

1—THE SITUATION IN FRANCE

The Jewish community in France is the second largest in the world after the United States, except for Israel.

French Public Opinion

When President Chirac met with leaders of American Jewish organizations in New York on September 22, 2003, he said: "France is not an anti-Semitic country. It [anti-Semitism] has never been in its culture and never will be." President Chirac recalled that he had acknowledged the responsibility of the French state during the Nazi occupation and added that it was important to remember the Resistance and the help that many French people had given to members of the Jewish community.

Recent polls confirm that the French are not anti-Semitic: 80% of young people say they would have no problem living with a Jewish partner. 87% consider anti-Semitic acts disgraceful and believe there should be severe penalties (UEJF poll, 2000). As of April 2003, 85% of the French said they are sympathetic to the Jews, compared with 82% in 2002 and 72% in February 1990 (CSA, Le Figaro, 2003).

Figures on Anti-Semitic Acts in France

The first figures available for 2003 show a marked decrease in the number of anti-Semitic acts (172 anti-Semitic acts from January to August 2002, 72 for the corresponding period in 2003; 647 anti-Semitic threats from January to August 2002 against 247 for this period in 2003—see attached report). These are encouraging figures which strengthen the determination of the French authorities in pursuing their policy of zero tolerance.

French Interior Minister Nicolas Sarkozy was awarded the 2003 Tolerance Prize of the Simon Wiesenthal Center for his work in combating anti-Semitism in France. "Confronted with anti-Semitism and racism, I know only two words," said Sarkozy: "Zero tolerance." "You don't explain anti-Semitism and racism," he said: "You fight it." President Chirac fully supports zero tolerance.

2—STEPS TAKEN TO COMBAT ANTI-SEMITISM

2.1 A Tougher Law. Parliament beefed up legislation against anti-Semitism, passing a law on February 5, 2002 mandating tougher penalties for racist, anti-Semitic or xenophobic offences. The law, now in force, was adopted unanimously—proof that the people's representatives are united and determined in the face of a phenomenon

that will not be tolerated. Whereas prior legislation penalized racist behavior when it was manifestly that, it is now possible to penalize individuals more severely for attacks or insults when the investigation shows that anti-Semitism is the hidden reason for the offence.

2.2 Robust Measures Adopted.

- The French authorities are closely monitoring anti-Semitic incidents in France so as to be able to respond immediately. In liaison with organizations representing the Jewish community in France, the authorities have refined the statistical counting method of anti-Semitic incidents so that it is much more precise than before;
- A prevention/protection squad has been set up consisting of 13 units of mobile forces (1,200 CRS-riot police and mobile gendarmes); these units have been deployed specifically to protect synagogues, local associations and schools in consultation with representatives of the Jewish community;
- Law-enforcement response to anti-Semitic offences is very strict: public prosecutors have been instructed to ensure that there are no delays in prosecuting offenders. Whenever the perpetrators of anti-Semitic offences have been identified and convicted, the sentences have been quite harsh (immediate imprisonment not suspended sentences, including for damage to property).

These firm measures, which reflect the government's determination, have largely contributed to the drop in the number of anti-Semitic offences.

2.3. Lastly, the government has taken the fight against anti-Semitism to schools. Let nothing pass without explanation and punishment is the maxim that sums up the principle of the approach to combating anti-Semitism in schools in France.

On February 27, 2003, Education Minister Luc Ferry presented a ten-point program of action to deal with the problem of anti-Semitism and racism in schools. It includes special teams in schools to identify and track incidents with the aid of mediators, tougher penalties, and handbooks for teachers. The minister explained, "It's important to intervene at the slightest incident, even if it's verbal, and to let nothing pass without punishment and explanation."

- Help for teaching staff: teams have been set up in schools to monitor for incidents;
- Tougher penalties have been introduced for anti-Semitic or racist comments. Immediately an offence is known, it is reported to the judicial services and youth protection services. School chancellors have been instructed to be absolutely firm in such matters.
- Education in tolerance: a "Holocaust Memorial Day" is now observed in French schools for the remembrance of the Holocaust and the prevention of crimes against humanity. France chose January 27 for this day, the anniversary of the liberation of Auschwitz. The initiative, a proposal by France, was adopted at the colloquium of the International Action Group for the Remembrance of the Shoah, currently chaired by the United States, and the seminar of education ministers organized by the Council of Europe in October 2002.

3—TACKLING ANTI-SEMITISM AT THE INTERNATIONAL LEVEL

3.1 To be effective, the fight against anti-Semitism has also to be addressed at the international level. France sent a delegation led by Robert Badinter, a distinguished French jurist and intellectual, to the special meeting of the OSCE on anti-Semitism in Vienna in June 2003 which it fully supported and at which it took an active part. France is in favor of a follow-up conference. The French parliamentary delegation to the OSCE aligned itself last February, in Vienna, with the letter of intent on anti-Semitism, signed by Congressman Smith, (Republican, New Jersey) and German Parliamentarian Gert Weisskirchen (of the SPD party), to bolster efforts against anti-Semitism in OSCE member states.

3.2. New forms of communication, especially the Internet, are wonderful for promoting human rights but at the same time they can be used for hateful expressions of racism and anti-Semitism in defiance of national or international legislation prohibiting such "speech."

Since the suit against Yahoo in 2000, France has been working actively in several international bodies for a collective debate on anti-Semitism, racism and xenophobia on the Internet. The government raised the matter in the G8 bodies for example.

France was instrumental in ensuring that the question of the Internet and anti-Semitism was placed on the agenda of the OSCE conference on anti-Semitism. In spite of misgivings by some delegations, the third session will be devoted to the role of the media, including new technologies and the Internet.

As president of the G8, France proposed a discussion on ways to prevent the Internet from being used for anti-Semitic comments and incitement to racial hatred and violence, and the prosecution of offenders.

France also took a key role in the negotiations in the Council of Europe on the Cybercrime Convention and additional protocol on racism and xenophobia. France made a point of being one of the first signatories of the convention and protocol.

ANTI-SEMITISM IN FRANCE—COMPARATIVE TABLES: 2002 AND 2003

	2002	2003
1—ANTI-SEMITIC ACTS IN FRANCE		
January	3	3
February	2	4
March	32	15
April	118	23
May	12	10
June	8	10
July	3	6
August	0	1
Total:	178	72
September	4	
October	2	
November	7	
December	2	
Total 2002:	193 acts	

	2002	2003
2—ANTI-SEMITIC THREATS IN FRANCE		
January	33	34
February	26	40
March	46	56
April	448	58
May	47	27
June	26	19
July	15	10
August	6	3
Total:	647	247
September	18	
October	20	
November	27	
December	20	
Total 2002:	732 threats	

UNITED STATES COMMISSION ON INTERNATIONAL RELIGIOUS FREEDOM

On October 14, 2003, U.S. Commission on International Religious Freedom Vice Chair Felice D. Gaer addressed the special session on anti-Semitism at the Annual Human Dimension Implementation Meeting of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OS CE) in Warsaw, Poland.

Ms. Gaer stated that acts of anti-Semitism must be seen not as hooliganism, but as "a form of human rights abuse that states should vigorously combat by implementing their worldwide human rights commitments." She called on the OSCE Ministerial Council, at its December 2003 meeting in Maastricht, Netherlands, to accept the German government's invitation to host a special meeting on anti-Semitism in Berlin in 2004. She also urged the OSCE to report regularly on the implementation of OSCE member states' commitments to combat anti-Semitism. Ms. Gaer was participating with the U.S. delegation to the OSCE Human Dimension Implementation Meeting.

The U.S. Commission on International Religious Freedom requests the following remarks be included in the "Anti-Semitism in Europe" hearing record for October 22, 2003.

STATEMENT BY FELICE D. GAER, VICE CHAIR, U.S. COMMISSION ON INTERNATIONAL RELIGIOUS FREEDOM

I am speaking on behalf of the U.S. Commission on International Religious Freedom, which is an independent United States government agency that monitors conditions of freedom of thought, conscience, and religion around the globe. The Commission makes independent policy recommendations to the U.S. administration and the Congress on how to advance this fundamental right and all those related to it through U.S. foreign policy.

We have emphasized a simple but extremely important point: that acts of anti-Semitism must be seen for what they are: they're not hooliganism; they are human rights abuses. They are a form of human rights abuse that states should vigorously combat by implementing their worldwide human rights commitments.

Anti-Semitism is both a local and an international problem, requiring states to take concrete steps on both the domestic and international levels. Recognition of a resurgence of anti-Semitism throughout the OSCE is a good first step. The OSCE Conference on Anti-Semitism last June provided a constructive venue to examine the problem and propose programs and practices to address it. We must move beyond recognition of the problem to concrete action within the OSCE to ensure that all participating states are living up to their commitments in this area, in particular to combat anti-Semitism, as contained in the 1990 Copenhagen Document: These include adopting laws to protect against incitement to violence based on discrimination including anti-Semitism, and providing the individual with effective remedies to initiate complaints against acts of discrimination.

The German government invited states to a meeting on anti-Semitism in Berlin in 2004, and we urge the HDIM to recommend its acceptance and, in turn, urge the Ministerial meeting to endorse it.

The history of anti-Semitism in the OSCE region has unfortunately been a distinctive one and its recent resurgence in the OSCE countries has followed its own course, as well. States that have had the most success in combating anti-Semitism have done so by taking measures specifically aimed at eradicating anti-Semitism, including some within the context of measures to combat discrimination, intolerance, xenophobia, etc. In other words, a separate track and separate attention is needed.

Statistics, monitoring, reporting publicly and regularly about compliance and violations are essential to realize any serious human rights commitments.

We emphasize the need for:

- Assignment within OSCE, perhaps in the Office of Democratic Institutions and Human Rights of the responsibility to monitor and report regularly on anti-Semitic incidents and the implementation of state's Copenhagen commitments.
- Review of state compliance within the OSCE on a regular basis.
- Acceptance of the German invitation to host an OSCE meeting on anti-Semitism in Berlin.

The meeting in Berlin should be different than the first, and participating states and the ODHIR should ensure that the meeting moves us forward in evaluating the strategies, documentation, commitments, and implementation of the OSCE states with regard to the struggle against anti-Semitism.

In terms of international cooperation on combating anti-Semitism, as with many human rights issues, the OSCE is a key venue through which to advance this. And the OSCE has a special obligation to exhibit vigorous leadership on this issue to show the rest of the international community that this is an important issue and that political will can make a real difference in combating anti-Semitism. We hope that kind of leadership will be emerging in other international and regional institutions. But we have been disappointed by their failure to address this topic seriously in their reporting and other human rights work. We earnestly hope OSCE will not continue in their direction. That is why the recommendations that emerge from this meeting are so vital and so closely monitored.

In conclusion, we reiterate: anti-Semitism is not hooliganism, it's human rights abuse.

AMBASSADE DE FRANCE
AUX ETATS-UNIS
October 23rd, 2003

DEAR SIR,

Please find attached a few documents related to the European reaction to a statement delivered by Mr. Mahathir, Prime Minster of Malaysia:

— Statement of the European Presidency

— Letter sent by the French President to the Malaysian Prime Minister

— Letter sent by the French President to Mr. Foxman (Chairman of the Anti-Defamation League)

— Letter to the editor sent by the French Charge d'Affaires in Tel Aviv to the Israeli newspaper "Maariv."

Best regards,

JEAN-DAVID LEVITTE
L'Ambassadeur

MR. PRIME MINISTER,

The quality and long-standing nature of our relations have made it possible for us many times to exchange views about the international situation in all frankness.

It is in this spirit that I believe it is my duty today to convey the thoughts elicited by your speech on October 16 at the opening of the Organization of the Islamic Conference.

Your remarks on the role of Jews provoked very strong disapproval in France and around the world. Even though you and your government were careful to reject all accusations of anti-Semitism, these remarks can only be condemned by all those who remember the Holocaust.

You are certainly aware of the statement by the Presidency of the European Union on October 17.

I noted with interest moreover that your speech at Putrajaya included in particular condemnation of suicide attacks and clear and courageous thoughts for the world's Moslems and their leaders, comments that I can only approve.

That is why the French authorities have appealed for reciprocal respect between the Organization of the Islamic Conference and the other faiths in accordance with the spirit of tolerance which is also Islam's.

[Complimentary close]

JACQUES CHIRAC

PRESIDENT OF THE EUROPEAN COMMISSION
Brussels, December 8, 2003

The Honourable ROBERT WEXLER
Ranking Minority Member
Subcommittee on Europe
Committee on International Relations
U.S. House of Representaeives
Washington, D.C. 20515
USA

DEAR MR. WEXLER,

Thank you for your letter of 21 July regarding incidents of anti-Semitism in Europe.

I align myself fully with High Representative Solana's reply of 30 July to your letter addressed to him. There is no complacency in Europe with regard to the scourge of racism in all its forms, including discrimination on the grounds of religion, be it Judaism, Islam or any other religion. We must never allow our vigilance in this respect to waver.

The European Union's founding fathers undertook a brave and radical experiment to rescue this continent from the scourge of intolerance, nationalism and xenophobia. We are still building our European Union on shared values of tolerance and pluralism. Europe's history casts a long shadow, and it remains constantly within our field of vision. This is why we continue to place such emphasis on concrete measures to combat racism and intolerance.

I will not repeat High Representative Solana's derailed inventory of actions undertaken by the European Union in this respect, nor his clarification regarding the work of the European Union Monitonng Centre on Racism and Xenophobia. Let me simply reaffirm the intention of the European Commission to work tirelessly with EU Member States to fight racism both within our own borders, and in the wider global context. The Anti-Defamation League's recent report on the rise of anti-Semitism in the United States [1] shows that there is no room for complacency on either side of the Atlantic. We hope therefore that the European Union and the United States can work together to combat discrimination in all its forms wherever it occurs in the world.

Finally, let me again underline the importance of distinguishing between legitimate political expressions and criticisms of the policies of the government of Israel on the one hand, and anti-Semitism on the other. As High Representative Solana wrote in his letter to you, the European Union will not tolerate anti-Semitism, nor will it tolerate any insinuation that its policy towards the Middle East is driven by anti-Semitism.

Yours sincerely,

ROMANO PRODI
President

EUROPEAN UNION
DELEGATION OF THE EUROPEAN COMMISSION
Washington, 22 October, 2004

The Honorable GEORGE ALLEN
Chairman, Subcommittee on European Affairs
Committee on Foreign Relations
United States Senate
Washington, D.C. 20510

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN,

I am writing to you to provide some material for the official record of your subcommittee's hearing on "Anti-Semitism in Europe" to be held on 22 October 2003. This is a serious subject which merits investigation leading to a better understanding in the United States of the European Union's position and policies in the area of over all human rights protection. I have attached copies of letters of the European Union's High Representative, Javier Solana, and the European Commission's President, Romano Prodi, who were each sent letters of inquiry on this same subject earlier this summer by four members of the House of Representatives, Messrs

[1] http://www.adl.org/presrele/asus__12/4243__12.asp

Wexler, Lantos and Ackerman and Ms. Ros Lehtinen. The correspondence outlines in some details about the European Union's role in the establishment of the concept of protecting the individual and preventing any form of discrimination based on ethnic, religious or national origins among other things for anyone living in the boundaries of the European Union. It also addresses some of the concerns I understand are of interest to you for the purposes of your hearing.

I would note that when the founding members of the European Communities signed the Rome Treaty, there was no provision in that document regarding these types of rights, because all of the six founding countries had just signed the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms signed also in Rome on 4 November 1950. The two treaties were considered mutually compatible at the time and therefore there was no need to merge the two concepts.

However, with the growth and development of the European Union during the 1980s and early 1990s it became apparent that additional rights of citizens of the EU needed to be explicitly delineated within the EU legal system. This required a modification of the Rome Treaty which began with the Treaty on European Union, signed in Maastricht (entered into force November 1, 1993), Article F.

Subsequently the Treaty on European Union was amended by the Amsterdam Treaty (entered into force February 1999) whereby the prior Article F was changed to Article 6. This is currently in force.

"Article 6

1. The Union is founded on the principles of liberty, democracy, respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms, and the rule of law, principles which are common to the Member States.

2. The Union shall respect fundamental rights, as guaranteed by the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms signed in Rome on 4 November 1950 and as they result from the constitutional traditions common to the Member States, as general principles of Community law.

3. The Union shall respect the national identities of its Member States.

4. The Union shall provide itself with the means necessary to attain its objectives and carry through its policies."

The Treaty on European Community as amended and consolidated by Amsterdam also introduced Articles 12 and 13 and now reads:

"Article 12

Within the scope of application of this Treaty, and without prejudice to any special provisions contained therein, any discrimination on grounds of nationality shall be prohibited. The Council, acting in accordance with the procedure referred to in Article 251, may adopt rules designed to prohibit such discrimination.

"Article 13(*)

1. Without prejudice to the other provisions of this Treaty and within the limits of the powers conferred by it upon the Community, the Council, acting unanimously on a proposal from the Commission and after consulting the European Parliament, may take appropriate action to combat discrimination based on sex, racial or ethnic origin, religion or belief, disability, age or sexual orientation.

2. By way of derogation from paragraph 1, when the Council adopts Community incentive measures, excluding any harmonisation of the laws and regulations of the Member States, to support action taken by the Member States in order to contribute to the achievement of the objectives referred to in paragraph 1, it shall act in accordance with the procedure referred to in Article 251."

Member states of the European Union whether the historic founding members or the applicant countries must provide that their legal systems enforce these specific measures in the EU Treaties, just as they must enforce all other parts of the EU Treaties. Indeed, several of the applicant countries of Central and Eastern Europe had to amend their own constitutions in this area to remove any law that provided discriminatory practices in order to be successful candidates for EU membership. Membership in the European Union is far more than membership in a simple trading area. It has a substantial normative setting power that is advancing the principle of the protection of the individual by law and democratic institutions across the continent of Europe. This is an element of the EU which I find Americans often under estimate or don't quite fully appreciate.

At this point in time I should point out that the standards of guarantees and protections of individuals and groups of citizens of the EU are established at the EU level, what in the US would be termed the "Federal Level." However, unlike the US,

the responsibility for enforcement of the provisions in the EU falls to each of the member state governments and their judicial and law enforcement agencies. This is true of much of European Union policy such as custom controls and other EU regulations. Member States must adjust their internal legal structures to not conflict with EU law, but further they must adjust policing authorities to enforce EU laws. This is perhaps a different interpretation of Federalism from the US version where a Federal bureaucracy tends to enforce only the Federal Laws and State authorities look primarily at state law. In the EU, member state governments must enforce both sets of law.

For the record, I have also attached a copy of the Charter of Fundamental Rights that will become an integral part of the European Convention, which will in the near future become the functioning equivalent of a constitution for the enlarged European Union of twenty-five member states. Let me conclude by thanking you for the opportunity of providing these statements to your subcommittee for inclusion in the formal record of the hearing and let me also assure you that I fully agree with the sentiments rejecting anti-Semitism as strongly expressed in the letters from President Prodi and High Commissioner Solana.

Sincerely,

DR. GÜNTER BURGHARDT
Ambassador-Head of Delegation

BRUSSELS, 29 JULY 2003

Hon. Rep. ROBERT WEXIER
Ranking Member
Subcommittee on Europe

Hon. Rep. TOM LANTOS
Ranking Member
House International. Relations Committee

Hon. Rep. ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN
Chairwoman
Subcommittee on Middle East & Central Asia

Hon. Rep. GARY ACKERMAN
Ranking member
Subcommittee on Middle East & Central Asia

HONORABLE MEMBERS OF CONGRESS,

Thank you for your letter to me of July 21 2003. Allow me to repeat my thanks to you for giving me the opportunity to attend the joint Europe and Middle East Subcommittee meeting on June 25 2003 in Washington. I value such contacts as an important contribution to transatlantic understanding, and I was pleased to be able to discuss with the Subcommittee the many areas of policy where the European Union and the United States are co-operating in an intense and productive fashion.

In your letter you raise one specific point that came up during our very wide-ranging discussions, namely the issue of anti-Semitism in Europe. I will attempt to answer the points in the same spirit of co-operation that you raise them.

To begin with, allow me to recall what I have said repeatedly in public about the scourge of anti-Semitism. None of us must ever be complacent. Racism, in all its forms, is a poison that will be removed from our societies only with vigour and determination. The acts of anti-Semitism that have taken place in several parts of Europe are outrageous and simply cannot be tolerated, regardless of their source or motivation. This is the sincerely held view of all in the European political mainstream, as reflected in the conclusions of the Council of the European Union on 25-26 April 2002.

You have criticised my reluctance to characterise these acts of anti-Semitism in Europe as constituting a "wave of anti-Semitism" and you refer to several reports to support your criticism. I do not wish to enter into a polemic about what statistical threshold must be breached before the word "wave" is correctly applied. However we characterise it, I do not for a moment deny that there has been a significant number of expressions of anti-Semitism in several parts of Europe, both violent and non-violent. The fact is that a single act of anti-Semitism is one act too many. European political leaders recognise this fact and have committed themselves by word and deed to addressing the problem.

The European Union entirely agrees with your emphasis on treating anti-Semitism as a form of racism and racial discrimination. Consequently, anti-Semitism is an integral part of EU initiatives against racial discrimination. The European Union's Institutions have condemned intolerance, racism and xenophobia on numerous occasions. In 1997—the European Year against Racism—we introduced Article 13 in the Treaty establishing the European Community, giving the Community new

powers to combat discrimination on the grounds of racial or ethnic origin, religion or belief, age, disability and sexual orientation.

The EU's commitment to combat discrimination was further underlined by the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union, which was jointly proclaimed by the EU Institutions on 7 December 2000. Article 21 of the Charter prohibits all discrimination based on any ground such as sex, race, colour, ethnic or social origin, genetic features, language, religion or belief, political or any other opinion, membership of a national minority, property, birth, disability, age or sexual orientation.

In 2000 the EU Council adopted a package of measures on the basis of Article 13 of the EC Treaty. Council Directive 2000/43/EC prohibits any direct or indirect discrimination based on such grounds, notably in the fields of access to employment, access to vocational guidance and training, employment and working conditions, membership of organisations, social protection, social advantages, education and access to and supply of goods and services. The Directive applies to both the public and private sectors within the EU. A second Directive (Council Directive 2000/78/EC) establishes a general framework for combating discrimination on the grounds of religion or belief, disability, age or sexual orientation.

Furthermore, in November 2000 the EU adopted an Action Programme to Combat Discrimination and support activities designed to promote measures to prevent and combat discrimination based on racial or ethnic origin, religion or belief, disability, age or sexual orientation. With a budget of EUR 14,15 million in 2001 this programme has funded a wide range of activities.

The European Union is considering further measures in the fight against racism and xenophobia. The European Commission has presented a proposal for a framework decision with two main purposes: firstly to ensure that racism and xenophobia are punishable in all Member States by effective, proportionate and dissuasive criminal penalties, which can give rise to extradition and surrender, and secondly to improve and encourage judicial co-operation by removing potential obstacles. The proposed instrument provides that the same racist and xenophobic conducts would be punishable in all Member States, which would define a common EU criminal approach to this phenomenon.

Great efforts are also being made to mainstream the fight against racism into all aspects of Community policies and actions, at all levels, as provided for by the 1998 Action Plan Against Racism. Areas concerned include, in particular, employment, the European Structural Funds, education, training and youth programmes, public procurement policy, research activities, external relations, information work and cultural and sports initiatives.

Your letter refers to the European Monitoring Centre on Racism and Xenophobia. This Centre was established in 1997 with the express purpose of providing the Union and its Member States with objective, reliable and comparable information on the phenomena of racism, xenophobia and anti-Semitism in order to help them when they take measures or formulate courses of action within their respective spheres of competence. Since its inception the EUMC has treated anti-Semitism as a form of racism and racial discrimination, and, as such, anti-Semitism has been included in the regular monitoring reports the EUMC receives from its national focal points and subsequently publishes in its annual reports.

I understand that in the context of this work, the EUMC has continuously drawn attention to the lack of comparable data and definitions of anti-Semitism at the national level in the EU. To encourage the establishment of clear criteria for reporting racist acts, and thereby to improve monitoring at national level, is one of the EUMC's ongoing objectives. The EUMC has repeatedly stated that without such data collected at Member States' level it is difficult to draw conclusions about the extent, nature and trends associated with all forms of racism. I have been informed that the European Commission and the EUMC are both carrying out work related to improving data collection and data comparability, and I am sure that U.S. experience in this field will be taken into account in their deliberations.

In your letter you refer to a draft report of the EUMC on anti-Semitism. Having contacted the EUMC, I understand that its Management Board examines reports to determine their suitability for publication. I am told that the Board assesses reports on the basis of specific criteria associated with the relevant study and general quality standards. I have been informed that the draft report in question, as has been the case with a number of other reports, did not meet the criteria of consistency and quality of data. The decision was therefore taken to refrain from publishing a report at this moment, as it would neither contribute authoritative data, nor enhance the discussion on anti-Semitism or bring added value to the debate.

I am pleased that you recognise that legitimate political expressions and criticisms of Israel cannot be equated with anti-Semitism. The European Union will not

tolerate anti-Semitism, but neither can it tolerate any insinuation that its policy towards the Middle East is driven by anti-Semitism. To criticise acts and policies simply cannot be equated with hatred for an entire people. We are neither anti-Israeli nor anti-Palestinian. We are pro-peace, pro-security, pro-justice.

I hope that I have assured you that the issue of anti-Semitism is of the utmost importance to the European Union, and that real efforts are being undertaken to address this scourge. I am sure that you will agree that all of us, on both sides of the Atlantic, must remain vigilant to combat racism and discrimination in all its forms.

Yours sincerely,

"signed"

JAVIER SOLANA

PROCLAMACIÓN SOLEMNE

HØJTIDELIG PROKLAMATION

FEIERLICHE PROKLAMATION

ΠΑΝΗΓΥΡΙΚΗ ΔΙΑΚΗΡΥΞΗ

SOLEMN PROCLAMATION

PROCLAMATION SOLENNELLE

FORÓGRA SOLLÚNTA

PROCLAMAZIONE SOLENNE

PLECHTIGE AFKONDIGING

PROCLAMAÇÃO SOLENE

JUHLALLINEN JULISTUS

HÖGTIDLIG PROKLAMATION

El Parlamento Europeo, el Consejo y la Comisión proclaman solemnemente en tanto que Carta de los Derechos Fundamentales de la Unión Europea el texto que figura a continuación.

Europa-Parlamentet, Rådet og Kommissionen proklamerer højtideligt den tekst, der følger nedenfor, som Den Europæiske Unions charter om grundlæggende rettigheder.

Das Europäische Parlament, der Rat und die Kommission proklamieren feierlich den nachstehenden Text als Charta der Grundrechte der Europäischen Union.

Το Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινοβούλιο, το Συμβούλιο και η Επιτροπή διακηρύσσουν πανηγυρικά, ως Χάρτη Θεμελιωδών Δικαιωμάτων της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης, το κείμενο που ακολουθεί.

The European Parliament, the Council and the Commission solemnly proclaim the text below as the Charter of fundamental rights of the European Union.

Le Parlement européen, le Conseil et la Commission proclament solennellement en tant que Charte des droits fondamentaux de l'Union européenne le texte repris ci-après.

Forógraíonn Parlaimint na hEorpa, an Chomhairle agus an Coimisiún go sollúnta an téacs thíos mar an Chairt um Chearta Bunúsacha den Aontas Eorpach.

Il Parlamento europeo, il Consiglio e la Commissione proclamano solennemente quale Carta dei diritti fondamentali dell'Unione europea il testo riportato in appresso.

Het Europees Parlement, de Raad en de Commissie kondigen plechtig als Handvest van de grondrechten van de Europese Unie de hierna opgenomen tekst af.

O Parlamento Europeu, o Conselho e a Comissão proclamam solenemente, enquanto Carta dos Direitos Fundamentais da União Europeia, o texto a seguir transcrito.

Euroopan parlamentti, neuvosto ja komissio juhlallisesti julistavat jäljempänä esitetyn tekstin Euroopan unionin perusoikeuskirjaksi.

Europaparlamentet, rådet och kommissionen tillkännager högtidligt denna text såsom stadga om de grundläggande rättigheterna i Europeiska unionen.

Hecho en Niza, el siete de diciembre del año dos mil.

Udfærdiget i Nice den syvende december to tusind.

Geschehen zu Nizza am siebten Dezember zweitausend.

Έγινε στη Νίκαια, στις επτά Δεκεμβρίου δύο χιλιάδες.

Done at Nice on the seventh day of December in the year two thousand.

Fait à Nice, le sept décembre deux mille.

Arna dhéanamh i Nice, an seachtú lá de Nollaig sa bhliain dhá mhíle.

Fatto a Nizza, addì sette dicembre duemila.

Gedaan te Nice, de zevende december tweeduizend.

Feito em Nice, em sete de Dezembro de dois mil.

Tehty Nizzassa seitsemäntenä päivänä joulukuuta vuonna kaksituhatta.

Som skedde i Nice den sjunde december tjugohundra.

Por el Parlamento Europeo
For Europa-Parlamentet
Für das Europäische Parlament
Για το Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινοβούλιο
For the European Parliament
Pour le Parlement européen
Thar ceann Pharlaimint na hEorpa
Per il Parlamento europeo
Voor het Europees Parlement
Pelo Parlamento Europeu
Euroopan parlamentin puolesta
För Europaparlamentet

Por el Consejo de la Unión Europea
For Rådet for Den Europæiske Union
Für den Rat der Europäischen Union
Για το Συμβούλιο της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης
For the Council of the European Union
Pour le Conseil de l'Union européenne
Thar ceann Chomhairle an Aontais Eorpaigh
Per il Consiglio dell'Unione europea
Voor de Raad van de Europese Unie
Pelo Conselho da União Europeia
Euroopan unionin neuvoston puolesta
För Europeiska unionens råd

Por la Comisión Europea
For Europa-kommissionen
Für die Europäische Kommission
Για την Ευρωπαϊκή Επιτροπή
For the European Commission
Pour la Commission européenne
Thar ceann an Choimisiúin Eorpaigh
Per la Commissione europea
Voor de Europese Commissie
Pela Comissão Europeia
Euroopan komission puolesta
För Europeiska kommissionen

PREAMBLE

The peoples of Europe, in creating an ever closer union among them, are resolved to share a peaceful future based on common values.

Conscious of its spiritual and moral heritage, the Union is founded on the indivisible, universal values of human dignity, freedom, equality and solidarity; it is based on the principles of democracy and the rule of law. It places the individual at the heart of its activities, by establishing the citizenship of the Union and by creating an area of freedom, security and justice.

The Union contributes to the preservation and to the development of these common values while respecting the diversity of the cultures and traditions of the peoples of Europe as well as the national identities of the Member States and the organisation of their public authorities at national, regional and local levels; it seeks to promote balanced and sustainable development and ensures free movement of persons, goods, services and capital, and the freedom of establishment.

To this end, it is necessary to strengthen the protection of fundamental rights in the light of changes in society, social progress and scientific and technological developments by making those rights more visible in a Charter.

This Charter reaffirms, with due regard for the powers and tasks of the Community and the Union and the principle of subsidiarity, the rights as they result, in particular, from the constitutional traditions and international obligations common to the Member States, the Treaty on European Union, the Community Treaties, the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, the Social Charters adopted by the Community and by the Council of Europe and the case-law of the Court of Justice of the European Communities and of the European Court of Human Rights.

Enjoyment of these rights entails responsibilities and duties with regard to other persons, to the human community and to future generations.

The Union therefore recognises the rights, freedoms and principles set out hereafter.

CHAPTER I

DIGNITY

Article 1

Human dignity

Human dignity is inviolable. It must be respected and protected.

Article 2

Right to life

1. Everyone has the right to life.

2. No one shall be condemned to the death penalty, or executed.

Article 3

Right to the integrity of the person

1. Everyone has the right to respect for his or her physical and mental integrity.

2. In the fields of medicine and biology, the following must be respected in particular:

— the free and informed consent of the person concerned, according to the procedures laid down by law,

— the prohibition of eugenic practices, in particular those aiming at the selection of persons,

— the prohibition on making the human body and its parts as such a source of financial gain,

— the prohibition of the reproductive cloning of human beings.

Article 4

Prohibition of torture and inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment

No one shall be subjected to torture or to inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment.

Article 5

Prohibition of slavery and forced labour

1. No one shall be held in slavery or servitude.

2. No one shall be required to perform forced or compulsory labour.

3. Trafficking in human beings is prohibited.

CHAPTER II

FREEDOMS

Article 6

Right to liberty and security

Everyone has the right to liberty and security of person.

Article 7

Respect for private and family life

Everyone has the right to respect for his or her private and family life, home and communications.

Article 8

Protection of personal data

1. Everyone has the right to the protection of personal data concerning him or her.

2. Such data must be processed fairly for specified purposes and on the basis of the consent of the person concerned or some other legitimate basis laid down by law. Everyone has the right of access to data which has been collected concerning him or her, and the right to have it rectified.

3. Compliance with these rules shall be subject to control by an independent authority.

Article 9

Right to marry and right to found a family

The right to marry and the right to found a family shall be guaranteed in accordance with the national laws governing the exercise of these rights.

Article 10

Freedom of thought, conscience and religion

1. Everyone has the right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion. This right includes freedom to change religion or belief and freedom, either alone or in community with others and in public or in private, to manifest religion or belief, in worship, teaching, practice and observance.

2. The right to conscientious objection is recognised, in accordance with the national laws governing the exercise of this right.

Article 11

Freedom of expression and information

1. Everyone has the right to freedom of expression. This right shall include freedom to hold opinions and to receive and impart information and ideas without interference by public authority and regardless of frontiers.

2. The freedom and pluralism of the media shall be respected.

Article 12

Freedom of assembly and of association

1. Everyone has the right to freedom of peaceful assembly and to freedom of association at all levels, in particular in political, trade union and civic matters, which implies the right of everyone to form and to join trade unions for the protection of his or her interests.

2. Political parties at Union level contribute to expressing the political will of the citizens of the Union.

Article 13

Freedom of the arts and sciences

The arts and scientific research shall be free of constraint. Academic freedom shall be respected.

Article 14

Right to education

1. Everyone has the right to education and to have access to vocational and continuing training.

2. This right includes the possibility to receive free compulsory education.

3. The freedom to found educational establishments with due respect for democratic principles and the right of parents to ensure the education and teaching of their children in conformity with their religious, philosophical and pedagogical convictions shall be respected, in accordance with the national laws governing the exercise of such freedom and right.

Article 15

Freedom to choose an occupation and right to engage in work

1. Everyone has the right to engage in work and to pursue a freely chosen or accepted occupation.

2. Every citizen of the Union has the freedom to seek employment, to work, to exercise the right of establishment and to provide services in any Member State.

3. Nationals of third countries who are authorised to work in the territories of the Member States are entitled to working conditions equivalent to those of citizens of the Union.

Article 16

Freedom to conduct a business

The freedom to conduct a business in accordance with Community law and national laws and practices is recognised.

Article 17

Right to property

1. Everyone has the right to own, use, dispose of and bequeath his or her lawfully acquired possessions. No one may be deprived of his or her possessions, except in the public interest and in the cases and under the conditions provided for by law, subject to fair compensation being paid in good time for their loss. The use of property may be regulated by law in so far as is necessary for the general interest.

2. Intellectual property shall be protected.

Article 18

Right to asylum

The right to asylum shall be guaranteed with due respect for the rules of the Geneva Convention of 28 July 1951 and the Protocol of 31 January 1967 relating to the status of refugees and in accordance with the Treaty establishing the European Community.

Article 19

Protection in the event of removal, expulsion or extradition

1. Collective expulsions are prohibited.

2. No one may be removed, expelled or extradited to a State where there is a serious risk that he or she would be subjected to the death penalty, torture or other inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment.

CHAPTER III

EQUALITY

Article 20

Equality before the law

Everyone is equal before the law.

Article 21

Non-discrimination

1. Any discrimination based on any ground such as sex, race, colour, ethnic or social origin, genetic features, language, religion or belief, political or any other opinion, membership of a national minority, property, birth, disability, age or sexual orientation shall be prohibited.

2. Within the scope of application of the Treaty establishing the European Community and of the Treaty on European Union, and without prejudice to the special provisions of those Treaties, any discrimination on grounds of nationality shall be prohibited.

Article 22

Cultural, religious and linguistic diversity

The Union shall respect cultural, religious and linguistic diversity.

Article 23

Equality between men and women

Equality between men and women must be ensured in all areas, including employment, work and pay.

The principle of equality shall not prevent the maintenance or adoption of measures providing for specific advantages in favour of the under-represented sex.

Article 24

The rights of the child

1. Children shall have the right to such protection and care as is necessary for their well-being. They may express their views freely. Such views shall be taken into consideration on matters which concern them in accordance with their age and maturity.

2. In all actions relating to children, whether taken by public authorities or private institutions, the child's best interests must be a primary consideration.

3. Every child shall have the right to maintain on a regular basis a personal relationship and direct contact with both his or her parents, unless that is contrary to his or her interests.

Article 25

The rights of the elderly

The Union recognises and respects the rights of the elderly to lead a life of dignity and independence and to participate in social and cultural life.

Article 26

Integration of persons with disabilities

The Union recognises and respects the right of persons with disabilities to benefit from measures designed to ensure their independence, social and occupational integration and participation in the life of the community.

CHAPTER IV

SOLIDARITY

Article 27

Workers' right to information and consultation within the undertaking

Workers or their representatives must, at the appropriate levels, be guaranteed information and consultation in good time in the cases and under the conditions provided for by Community law and national laws and practices.

Article 28

Right of collective bargaining and action

Workers and employers, or their respective organisations, have, in accordance with Community law and national laws and practices, the right to negotiate and conclude collective agreements at the appropriate levels and, in cases of conflicts of interest, to take collective action to defend their interests, including strike action.

Article 29

Right of access to placement services

Everyone has the right of access to a free placement service.

Article 30

Protection in the event of unjustified dismissal

Every worker has the right to protection against unjustified dismissal, in accordance with Community law and national laws and practices.

Article 31

Fair and just working conditions

1. Every worker has the right to working conditions which respect his or her health, safety and dignity.

2. Every worker has the right to limitation of maximum working hours, to daily and weekly rest periods and to an annual period of paid leave.

Article 32

Prohibition of child labour and protection of young people at work

The employment of children is prohibited. The minimum age of admission to employment may not be lower than the minimum school-leaving age, without prejudice to such rules as may be more favourable to young people and except for limited derogations.

Young people admitted to work must have working conditions appropriate to their age and be protected against economic exploitation and any work likely to harm their safety, health or physical, mental, moral or social development or to interfere with their education.

Article 33

Family and professional life

1. The family shall enjoy legal, economic and social protection.

2. To reconcile family and professional life, everyone shall have the right to protection from dismissal for a reason connected with maternity and the right to paid maternity leave and to parental leave following the birth or adoption of a child.

Article 34

Social security and social assistance

1. The Union recognises and respects the entitlement to social security benefits and social services providing protection in cases such as maternity, illness, industrial accidents, dependency or old age, and in the case of loss of employment, in accordance with the rules laid down by Community law and national laws and practices.

2. Everyone residing and moving legally within the European Union is entitled to social security benefits and social advantages in accordance with Community law and national laws and practices.

3. In order to combat social exclusion and poverty, the Union recognises and respects the right to social and housing assistance so as to ensure a decent existence for all those who lack sufficient resources, in accordance with the rules laid down by Community law and national laws and practices.

Article 35

Health care

Everyone has the right of access to preventive health care and the right to benefit from medical treatment under the conditions established by national laws and practices. A high level of human health protection shall be ensured in the definition and implementation of all Union policies and activities.

Article 36

Access to services of general economic interest

The Union recognises and respects access to services of general economic interest as provided for in national laws and practices, in accordance with the Treaty establishing the European Community, in order to promote the social and territorial cohesion of the Union.

Article 37

Environmental protection

A high level of environmental protection and the improvement of the quality of the environment must be integrated into the policies of the Union and ensured in accordance with the principle of sustainable development.

Article 38

Consumer protection

Union policies shall ensure a high level of consumer protection.

CHAPTER V

CITIZENS' RIGHTS

Article 39

Right to vote and to stand as a candidate at elections to the European Parliament

1. Every citizen of the Union has the right to vote and to stand as a candidate at elections to the European Parliament in the Member State in which he or she resides, under the same conditions as nationals of that State.

2. Members of the European Parliament shall be elected by direct universal suffrage in a free and secret ballot.

Article 40

Right to vote and to stand as a candidate at municipal elections

Every citizen of the Union has the right to vote and to stand as a candidate at municipal elections in the Member State in which he or she resides under the same conditions as nationals of that State.

Article 41

Right to good administration

1. Every person has the right to have his or her affairs handled impartially, fairly and within a reasonable time by the institutions and bodies of the Union.

2. This right includes:

— the right of every person to be heard, before any individual measure which would affect him or her adversely is taken;

— the right of every person to have access to his or her file, while respecting the legitimate interests of confidentiality and of professional and business secrecy;

— the obligation of the administration to give reasons for its decisions.

3. Every person has the right to have the Community make good any damage caused by its institutions or by its servants in the performance of their duties, in accordance with the general principles common to the laws of the Member States.

4. Every person may write to the institutions of the Union in one of the languages of the Treaties and must have an answer in the same language.

Article 42

Right of access to documents

Any citizen of the Union, and any natural or legal person residing or having its registered office in a Member State, has a right of access to European Parliament, Council and Commission documents.

Article 43

Ombudsman

Any citizen of the Union and any natural or legal person residing or having its registered office in a Member State has the right to refer to the Ombudsman of the Union cases of maladministration in the activities of the Community institutions or bodies, with the exception of the Court of Justice and the Court of First Instance acting in their judicial role.

Article 44

Right to petition

Any citizen of the Union and any natural or legal person residing or having its registered office in a Member State has the right to petition the European Parliament.

Article 45

Freedom of movement and of residence

1. Every citizen of the Union has the right to move and reside freely within the territory of the Member States.

2. Freedom of movement and residence may be granted, in accordance with the Treaty establishing the European Community, to nationals of third countries legally resident in the territory of a Member State.

Article 46

Diplomatic and consular protection

Every citizen of the Union shall, in the territory of a third country in which the Member State of which he or she is a national is not represented, be entitled to protection by the diplomatic or consular authorities of any Member State, on the same conditions as the nationals of that Member State.

CHAPTER VI

JUSTICE

Article 47

Right to an effective remedy and to a fair trial

Everyone whose rights and freedoms guaranteed by the law of the Union are violated has the right to an effective remedy before a tribunal in compliance with the conditions laid down in this Article.

Everyone is entitled to a fair and public hearing within a reasonable time by an independent and impartial tribunal previously established by law. Everyone shall have the possibility of being advised, defended and represented.

Legal aid shall be made available to those who lack sufficient resources in so far as such aid is necessary to ensure effective access to justice.

Article 48

Presumption of innocence and right of defence

1. Everyone who has been charged shall be presumed innocent until proved guilty according to law.

2. Respect for the rights of the defence of anyone who has been charged shall be guaranteed.

Article 49

Principles of legality and proportionality of criminal offences and penalties

1. No one shall be held guilty of any criminal offence on account of any act or omission which did not constitute a criminal offence under national law or international law at the time when it was committed. Nor shall a heavier penalty be imposed than that which was applicable at the time the criminal offence was committed. If, subsequent to the commission of a criminal offence, the law provides for a lighter penalty, that penalty shall be applicable.

2. This Article shall not prejudice the trial and punishment of any person for any act or omission which, at the time when it was committed, was criminal according to the general principles recognised by the community of nations.

3. The severity of penalties must not be disproportionate to the criminal offence.

Article 50

Right not to be tried or punished twice in criminal proceedings for the same criminal offence

No one shall be liable to be tried or punished again in criminal proceedings for an offence for which he or she has already been finally acquitted or convicted within the Union in accordance with the law.

CHAPTER VII

GENERAL PROVISIONS

Article 51

Scope

1. The provisions of this Charter are addressed to the institutions and bodies of the Union with due regard for the principle of subsidiarity and to the Member States only when they are implementing Union law. They shall therefore respect the rights, observe the principles and promote the application thereof in accordance with their respective powers.

2. This Charter does not establish any new power or task for the Community or the Union, or modify powers and tasks defined by the Treaties.

Article 52

Scope of guaranteed rights

1. Any limitation on the exercise of the rights and freedoms recognised by this Charter must be provided for by law and respect the essence of those rights and freedoms. Subject to the principle of proportionality, limitations may be made only if they are necessary and genuinely meet objectives of general interest recognised by the Union or the need to protect the rights and freedoms of others.

2. Rights recognised by this Charter which are based on the Community Treaties or the Treaty on European Union shall be exercised under the conditions and within the limits defined by those Treaties.

3. In so far as this Charter contains rights which correspond to rights guaranteed by the Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, the meaning and scope of those rights shall be the same as those laid down by the said Convention. This provision shall not prevent Union law providing more extensive protection.

Article 53

Level of protection

Nothing in this Charter shall be interpreted as restricting or adversely affecting human rights and fundamental freedoms as recognised, in their respective fields of application, by Union law and international law and by international agreements to which the Union, the Community or all the Member States are party, including the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and by the Member States' constitutions.

Article 54

Prohibition of abuse of rights

Nothing in this Charter shall be interpreted as implying any right to engage in any activity or to perform any act aimed at the destruction of any of the rights and freedoms recognised in this Charter or at their limitation to a greater extent than is provided for herein.

○