



American Jewish Committee
A Century of Leadership

**AJC and the OSCE:
Combating Antisemitism
and Hatred**

AJC

Contents

- Introduction
by Deidre Berger
Director, AJC Berlin Office / Ramer Center
for German-Jewish Relations 2
- The Role of Education
by David A. Harris
Executive Director, American Jewish Committee 4
- Remarks
of Robert S. Rifkind
Chairman of the Administrative Council of the
Jacob Blaustein Institute for the
Advancement of Human Rights 9
- Antisemitism: A Chance for Europe
to Check a Wave of Hate
by Andrew Baker
AJC Director of International Jewish Affairs 12
- After the Promise
Keeping OSCE Commitments to Combat Antisemitism
Jacob Blaustein Institute for the
Advancement of Human Rights 14
- NGO Forum Declaration
Berlin, April 27, 2004
for the OSCE Conference on Anti-Semitism 16
- Recommendations for
the New Federal German Government
NGO Forum Berlin 24
- Results of the European Workshop:
Education on Antisemitism
Taskforce: Education on Antisemitism 27

Introduction

by Deidre Berger
Director, American Jewish Committee
Berlin Office / Ramer Center for
German-Jewish Relations



Following the surge in antisemitism that swept Europe at the advent of the 21st century, a broad coalition of governmental and non-governmental forces emerged to counter this age-old scourge. Concerned about the threat this poses to the fabric of democracy, the U.S. and German governments took the initiative to mobilize interest within the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe to deal with this pressing matter. After the OSCE parliamentary assembly held a special parliamentary hearing on the subject in Berlin on July 8, 2002, with a follow-up hearing in Washington, D.C. on December 10, 2002, the OSCE was persuaded that it should convene an "OSCE Conference on Anti-Semitism" devoted solely to antisemitism at its Vienna headquarters June 19-21, 2003.

After reports at the conference indicated the growing dimensions of the problem, the German government offered to host a follow-up high-level OSCE conference on April 28-29, 2004, to document the phenomenon and propose solutions. At this "OSCE Conference on Anti-Semitism," the Chairman-in-Office of the organization, speaking on behalf of its fifty-five members, presented the Berlin Declaration on Antisemitism, calling for vastly improved monitoring, data collection, law enforcement, education and public awareness within the OSCE region. An international group of NGOs participating in the conference agreed at the NGO

Forum Berlin on a separate resolution on antisemitism, a detailed action program to combat antisemitism.

From June 16-17, 2004, following the Berlin conference, the French government hosted the "OSCE Meeting on the Relationship between Racist, Xenophobic and Antisemitic Propaganda on the Internet and Hate Crimes" dealing specifically with the Internet. Two more OSCE conferences, the "OSCE Conference on Intolerance and the Fight against Racism, Xenophobia and Discrimination" in Brussels, September 13-14, 2004, and the Cordoba conference "OSCE Conference on Anti-Semitism and on Other Forms of Intolerance", June 8-9, 2005, investigated in further depth approaches to contain antisemitism.

Convinced of the severity and ongoing nature of contemporary antisemitism, OSCE member states agreed in December, 2004, to the appointment of a Personal Representative of the OSCE Chairman-in-Office on Combating Antisemitism. German parliamentary member Gert Weisskirchen was appointed to the post in 2005 and reappointed in 2006. The OSCE's Tolerance and Non-Discrimination unit, established in its Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights (ODIHR) following the Berlin Conference, has also included an antisemitism expert since August 2004.

Beginning with the special session in Berlin in 2002, nongovernmental organizations have

played a unique role shaping the OSCE's spotlight on antisemitism. The American Jewish Committee has been in the vanguard, preparing the first working drafts of the Berlin Declaration, organizing NGO cooperation with the OSCE on the renewed threat of antisemitism, helping shape an international response to this fundamental abuse of human rights. At all OSCE conferences and related activities, the AJC has been active in consultative, monitoring and organizational capacities. The AJC continues to work with representatives of national governments as well as with officials of the OSCE and its related organizations to ensure a secure environment for all citizens, free from antisemitism and other forms of hatred.

In this booklet, the AJC's Berlin Office/Ramer Center for German-Jewish Relations documents contributions to OSCE's monitoring of antisemitism made both by AJC representatives and by groups brought together by AJC.

The collection begins with a speech on the OSCE's role in the educational process, delivered by AJC Executive Director David Harris at the Berlin OSCE Conference on Anti-Semitism. This is followed by comments made prior to the conference by Robert Rifkind, Chairman of the Administrative Council of AJC's Jacob Blaustein Institute for the Advancement of Human Rights, calling for OSCE to appoint a special representative on antisemitism, as did happen subsequently.

Next is an article summarizing the challenges for the conference that appeared in the *Süddeutsche Zeitung* during the event, written by AJC's Director of International Jewish Affairs, Andrew Baker. At the conference, the Jacob Blaustein Institute issued a follow-up of state responses made within the OSCE framework to commitments to combat antisemitism, the introduction to which we have documented.

Also included is the text of the NGO Forum Declaration, a comprehensive action plan initiated by the AJC with several dozen co-

signatories. Many of the cooperating organizations in Germany have continued to come together to exchange ideas and increase cooperation on the monitoring of antisemitism. In the summer of 2005, shortly before federal elections in Germany, the NGO Forum participants decided to issue a series of recommendations to the incoming government as a step toward ensuring that the fight against antisemitism would remain a priority.

Finally, the week prior to the Berlin OSCE conference, AJC Berlin's Task Force: Education on Antisemitism organized a three-day European workshop. We have included a summary of the conference, where recommendations were issued that were widely cited during the Berlin conference.

Some of the ideas and suggestions contained in these documents have already been put into practice. However, much remains to be done. Standards and definitions for collecting data need to be promulgated; uniform reporting methods need to be instituted; training on antisemitism should be undertaken in key areas such as the judiciary, the police, and the civil service; closer cooperation between the governmental and nongovernmental sectors should be encouraged; and education and public awareness campaigns need to be implemented on a much broader scale. Projects that have been launched already must be maintained and expanded.

Containing antisemitism is an ongoing battle. Its success depends on the efforts of forthright individuals, the leadership of nongovernmental organizations, and the courage of government leaders to tackle a pressing challenge to the democratic order. The American Jewish Committee, in cooperation with partner organizations and governments, will remain at the forefront of the fight to protect democracy, pluralism and human rights by attacking antisemitism in all its manifestations. It is a struggle we can not afford to lose.

The Role of Education

Address to the OSCE
Conference on Anti-Semitism
Berlin, April 28, 2004

by David A. Harris
Executive Director,
American Jewish Committee



Mr. Chairman, distinguished delegates,

Permit me to commend the 55 OSCE member nations for holding this timely conference on antisemitism. Your concern sends a powerful message about the importance you attach to the current struggle against what has been accurately described as the world's most enduring hatred.

How appropriate that Bulgaria now occupies the chair of the OSCE Permanent Council, given its laudable wartime efforts to protect its Jewish community against the tragic fate that befell six million of their coreligionists. There is much to be learned from the Bulgarian experience.

And allow me to express appreciation to the German government for hosting this gathering. It is entirely fitting that we assemble here in Berlin, which has emerged, after the infinite darkness of the Shoah, as a bright ray of light in the global campaign against anti-semitism.

Distinguished delegates,

Our target audience in this session is youth. In 2000, I led a graduate-level seminar on post-Holocaust issues in Bologna, Italy. As part of the year-long course, I encouraged my students, who came from Europe and

the United States, to help me develop an action plan for dealing with contemporary antisemitism and other forms of bigotry—one example of the potential role of students as partners in this process.

Ten components of a comprehensive plan were identified. It is worth sharing them with you in outline form:

- i. building democratic societies based on the principles of equality before the law and respect for pluralism;
- ii. recognizing antisemitism when it manifests itself, whatever its source, and facing it squarely, without seeking to diminish it through rationalization or justification;
- iii. emphasizing the absolutely indispensable role of political leadership – and political will – in educating and mobilizing a nation;
- iv. ensuring that there are adequate laws to deal specifically with hate crimes, and that law enforcement and the judiciary are up to the task of apprehending and appropriately punishing offenders;

- v. utilizing the UN Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination, the International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, and other pertinent covenants, together with regional and global forums, such as the OSCE and UNESCO, as legal and diplomatic weapons to combat the purveyors of hatred;
- vi. encouraging responsible media outlets to focus the spotlight of exposure on acts of hate, and simultaneously ensuring that these outlets are never used, advertently or inadvertently, as vehicles to propagate bigotry and intolerance;
- vii. building a coalition of conscience in civil society that deems an attack on any group to be an attack on society itself – a kind of nonmilitary collective security pact, if you will;
- viii. urging religious leaders to emphasize the commonalities that unite the human family, even as each faith defends its distinctiveness, but never by denigration of other religions;
- ix. developing educational programs for children from an early age that introduce them to historical awareness, mutual respect, social responsibility, moral clarity, and moral courage;
- x. and celebrating the role of individuals who have made a difference in combating antisemitism and other forms of bigotry, and encouraging others to emulate their example.

Distinguished delegates,

Each of these ten components, I believe, is essential to building a multi-faceted campaign against antisemitism and its related diseases. We must work on parallel tracks and summon the resolve to sustain our efforts. After all, talk is important but only as a first step. It is our action-or inaction-by which we will be ultimately judged. And history has surely taught us that there is no overnight or "wonder-drug" solution for ending the scourge of antisemitism.

In a world buffeted by seemingly endless challenges and plagued by a short attention span, it may prove difficult to focus on a particular issue – in this case, antisemitism – but failure to do so could prove calamitous not only for Jews, but also for the larger well-being of democratic societies.

antisemitism, we must always remember, is like a localized cancer that, if not properly treated in time, runs the risk of metastasizing and ultimately destroying the entire body.

While each of the ten elements is essential, the key in the long run is education, the subject of this plenary session.

When all is said and done, it is really about the inculcation of a set of civic values in children that teaches them right from wrong and encourages them, as they grow up, to exercise what Jean Piaget, the child development expert, called their "autonomous" morality.

These civic values should include the essential propositions that all children, and their families, are full members of society deserving of respect; that differences arising from such factors as race, religion, or ethnicity are sources of strength, not shame; that hatred based on group identity is inimical to a society's self-definition; and that society values moral courage.

There are many laudable educational models that have been developed in the United States and Europe to help achieve these worthy, if daunting, objectives. In this regard, I wish to pay special tribute to the work of the member nations of the Task Force for International Cooperation on Holocaust Education, Remembrance, and Research, launched by the Swedish prime minister in 1998, chaired by my fellow panelist, Ambassador Franchetti Pardo, and advised by this session's chair, Prof. Yehuda Bauer.

I earnestly hope that additional countries represented here at this conference will consider joining the 16-nation task force in the coming months.

Another noteworthy initiative is a new European workshop, cosponsored by the American Jewish Committee and entitled "Education on antisemitism," which just released a document detailing results of a conference of NGOs and educators here in Berlin. The conclusions emphasize the importance of dealing not only with historical antisemitism, but also current trends, including the attempt by some to use antisemitic language and images to demonize and delegitimize the state of Israel.

At the American Jewish Committee, we first developed a school-based program two decades ago entitled "Hands Across the Campus." It is currently being used in many American schools and has recently been adapted for use here in Germany. Its principal objectives are to increase student awareness of the importance of democratic values, civic participation, and diversity, as well as to train student leaders to take an active role in strengthening intergroup relations in their schools.

From our experience with this and other tolerance-building and prejudice-reduction, as well as Holocaust education programs, we have drawn several lessons

that may be helpful to this conference.

First, to maximize the possibility of long-term success, programs must be introduced early on, before a child's mind is fully shaped, and need to be continued throughout the educational process.

Second, these programs should be woven into the larger curriculum, whether through literature, history, or culture, so that messages are channeled and reinforced from many vantage points.

Third, success depends, above all, on the abilities of teachers themselves, regardless of how well conceived the written material might be. Thus, considerable attention must be paid to teacher training, including clear guidelines on how to deal with those students who resist learning about the Shoah or even deny its existence, as has been the case in some European schools.

Fourth, as the prominent philosopher of education John Dewey emphasized, students learn best when they are active, not passive, participants in the process. It is necessary but insufficient to convey to students the raw facts of the history of antisemitism, culminating in the Shoah, or the more generalized danger of group hatred.

Encounters with victims of hate crimes and survivors of the Shoah, field trips to memorial sites and museums, learning not just about victims' deaths but also their lives, becoming involved in hands-on projects to counter prejudice and strengthen respect for diversity, and several other vehicles can help translate the abstract or remote into the here and now, without oversimplifying, much less trivializing, historical events.

Jane Elliott, an American teacher, introduced the "Blue Eyes, Brown Eyes" program in her class in 1968 after discovering that

many of her pupils harbored racist views of African Americans. She divided the class in two – those with brown eyes and those with blue eyes, and gave the former rights and privileges that were denied the latter. The exercise worked. The children came to understand the principle of discrimination based on characteristics they had no control over, in this case eye color. They grasped that it could just as easily have been skin color or religious affiliation.

This program has been used extensively, including by a Dutch anti-racism group in South Africa a few years ago. After participating, a fifteen year-old girl remarked, "A racist environment is very easy to create, much more easy than I thought. And the effects for the minority are much worse than I could ever dream of."

Fifth, emphasis needs to be placed on role models who, by their principled actions, have made a difference. A New York educator was recently honored for her lifelong effort "to eradicate hatred and bigotry through education." She explained her goal in teaching about the Shoah: "I'm trying to prepare children to be able to deal with racism and bigotry, and give them the tools to speak out, to take the role of the rescuer and not the bystander."

And sixth, all school-based programs need to be examined periodically to determine if, in fact, they are achieving their desired results. Good intentions, as we know, do not always necessarily translate into good results. There are various ways of determining this—regularly surveying students' attitudes, designing control groups, and sponsoring longitudinal studies.

Distinguished delegates,

Your commitment to addressing the resurgence of antisemitism through education is

vital and deeply appreciated. I hope that, as a result of this conference, more countries will introduce curricula devoted to Holocaust education and civic values into their school systems, and that an OSCE-wide mechanism for reporting and sharing experiences will be developed. But even as we meet here in Berlin to explore what more the OSCE nations can do – and there is much more to be done – we dare not ignore the fact that elsewhere millions of children are actively being taught to hate those who do not share their identity, including, centrally, Jews.

From the schools of Saudi Arabia to the *madrassas* of Pakistan, schoolchildren are presented with a world divided between the so-called "believer" and the "infidel," and are instructed to abhor the "infidel."

And evidence of similar teachings has even been found in some religious and educational institutions within the OSCE community of nations.

Not only must the OSCE nations do their utmost to monitor what is being taught within their borders at private schools and academies – I know that some countries already are – but many nations represented here also have ample diplomatic opportunities to express concern to those governments that, directly or indirectly, encourage and fund the poisoning of young people's minds.

If we are to mount a truly effective campaign against antisemitism, we ignore at our peril this dimension. The widespread use of satellite technology and cyberspace to transmit antisemitic motifs to Europe and elsewhere only heightens the danger still further.

We rightly want our young people to develop the capacity for moral clarity and moral courage in their own lives. We can expect no less of our own governments.

The very same moral clarity and moral courage must be brought to bear in dealings with those nations and groups that actively seek through the teaching of incitement and hatred, the publication of antisemitic materials, and the spawning of grotesque conspiracy theories—to undermine our shared objectives here in Berlin. We let them succeed only at our collective peril.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for the honor today of addressing this distinguished body.



Remarks

of Robert S. Rifkind

Chairman of the Administrative
Council of the Jacob Blaustein Institute
for the Advancement of Human Rights

Delivered at the NGO Preparatory
Meeting for the OSCE
Conference on Anti-Semitism

Berlin, April 27, 2004

It would take more temerity than I have for an American to tell Europeans how to solve the ancient problem of antisemitism. Notwithstanding the very substantial bonds of culture and community that bridge the Atlantic, American solutions don't necessarily travel any better than fine wines. Moreover, it would be tempting fate to say that we are confident we know how to deal with the eruptions of antisemitism that surface in the United States. Let me confine myself therefore to the more modest task of reporting what a friendly and concerned trans-Atlantic visitor observes.

First, and by way of context, we ought to recognize that there are important respects in which there has been progress. In 1879 Wilhelm Marr could organize the League of Anti-Semites and attract a large following. Down to the middle of the last century important personages were unashamed to be publicly identified as antisemites. Today in Europe antisemitism has become the hatred that dare not state its name. Today antisemites indignantly protest being called such. And that is progress, at least as long as we know antisemitism even when it calls itself by some other name.

Secondly, serious though the rise in antisemitism is, and it is serious indeed, I do not think we are on the eve of Kristallnacht as some

have said. There is a vast difference between the present situation and that presented by a heavily armed major European nation whose unequivocal policy is the extermination of Jewry, and we lose credibility if we do not recognize that distinction.

Indeed, the Holocaust, while demonstrating where racism can lead us, also, like the flash of lightning that illuminates the black night sky and then leaves the eye blinded to shades of gray, can desensitize us to manifestations of antisemitism well short of the hellish fires of the crematoria. I hope that in educational programs we are at pains to make clear that the evil of racism is found not only in gas chambers, but also when Jewish doctors are expelled from their hospitals, Jewish lawyers disbarred, Jewish academics fired, and campaigns of humiliation and hate appear in the press, on the airwaves, in the streets and on public platforms.

Thirdly, we should recognize that, at least since the time of the Copenhagen Conference in June of 1990, the political leaders of Europe have formally recognized that antisemitism represents a problem that must be dealt with. And that, too, is progress. The extent to which the members of the OSCE have lived up to the commitments they made at Copenhagen to take "effective measures" to combat antisemitism is the subject of a de-

tailed report issued yesterday by The Jacob Blaustein Institute for the Advancement of Human Rights. I think it fair to say that the report presents a mixed picture and that, on the whole, the solemn undertakings given at Copenhagen have been met in a less than adequate fashion. But the willingness to enter into those commitments and the gradual emergence from a state of near total denial about the prevalence of antisemitism is in itself a measure of progress.

Having said all that, this is no time for Pollyannas. Antisemitism is on the rise in Europe today. The manifestations are too numerous and the reports from varied credible sources too unanimous to leave any room for doubt. A very high level of anxiety is warranted. Antisemitism is a weapon of mass destruction whose demonstrated lethality is without rival. And it is proliferating.

Moreover, there remains a serious reluctance in many quarters to face the problem squarely, to acknowledge its gravity, and to mount the effort required to deal with it effectively. Of all the forms of denial the most serious is the attempt to dismiss the threat as not really European at all but as an immigrant Arab problem or an Arab-Jewish problem. I do not doubt for a moment — no one who lives as I do under the shadow of the World Trade Center in Manhattan can doubt for a moment — that some Muslims are capable of engaging in acts of homicidal rage against America, against the West, against modernity and, not the least, against Jews and Jewish institutions. Nor do I doubt that from Islamic states pours forth a steady stream of antisemitic agitprop.

However, the fact, if it is a fact, that much of the antisemitic violence in Europe is attributable to Arab immigrants doesn't make it any less of a European problem. One can hardly just shrug one's shoulders and say "boys will be boys". Very serious thought must be given to the question whether Arabs and, more

generally, Islamic states are selling antisemitism precisely because they have found willing and eager buyers in the West, because they have found that they could bond with Europe on this front, as the Grand Mufti of Jerusalem found in Berlin some 65 years ago. It is certainly worth noting that when Islamic spokesmen talk of a new crucifixion, when they circulate that old Czarist forgery, the Protocols of the Elders of Zion, when they invoke the images of the swastika, the SS and the Holocaust, they are not invoking images from deep within Islamic culture. They are dealing in European tropes meant to resonate with European audiences.

It would therefore be helpful if Westerners made it clear that this sort of bonding doesn't work, if they reacted with indignation and contempt, if they applauded less vigorously when Islamic dignitaries begin to sound like Josef Goebbels.

It would also be helpful if, in addition to the focus on street violence, alarming as it is, we focused as well on the violence of the word, the hooliganism of the headline and the cartoon, the bigotry of the academy and the antisemitism of the salon. These all create the atmosphere in which race hatred prospers.

Most dangerous of all is the attempt to explain antisemitism as the regrettable but natural consequence of the behavior of Jews, whether in Israel or otherwise. Let me be very clear: In every age hatred of Jews has been explained in terms that made perfect sense to the populace of the time. It has never lacked for explanations persuasive to the opinion molders of the day. We have been told that antisemitism was understandable by reason of Jewish responsibility for the death of God, or for the ritual murder of Christian youth, or for the poisoning of wells. Hatred of Jews has been ascribed to the perception that Jews are rich, blood-sucking, money lenders or miserably poor rag pickers, that they are arrogant separatists or pushy

assimilations, that they are capitalists or communists, that they are historical fossils or the avatars of unwelcome modernity, that they are timid, unmanly weaklings or storm troopers, that they are landless cosmopolitans or – now – Jewish nationalists. Such supposed explanations, however fervently believed, however obvious they may have seemed, are symptoms of antisemitism and not its cause. They explain nothing except the credulity of the antisemite. In my view, the attempt to explain antisemitism in terms of the behavior of Jews in Jenin, or in Har Homa, or in Wall Street, or in Washington is likewise a manifestation of antisemitism and not an explanation of it. It is the very essence of racism to find the cause of hatred in the victim.

Finally, permit me to suggest that the challenge of antisemitism in Europe will not be met until it is clearly understood that we are no longer talking about what was once called the Jewish Question. We are talking about the European Question. All who care for Europe, for the civilization that emerged here and for its future, must care deeply about this question.

In November 1990, just five months after the Copenhagen Conference, the heads of European states met in Paris and issued a Charter proclaiming the birth of a "New Europe". The Charter of Paris avows that Europe is "liberating itself from the legacy of the past" and opening "a new era of democracy, peace, and unity." The nations reaffirmed the undertakings just given in Copenhagen, including specific reference to antisemitism, and avowed that they had put behind them the forms of madness that had twice in the previous century brought Europe to the abyss. They affirmed that persons belonging to national minorities – ethnic, linguistic, cultural, and religious – have the right freely to express, preserve, and develop that identity without discrimination, that everyone will enjoy recourse to effective remedies, national or in-

ternational, against violation of such rights, and that "full respect for these precepts is the bedrock on which we will construct the New Europe."

Are all those bright hopes to founder on Europe's most ancient fault line: its inability to find the Jew fully within the social compact? If Europe has turned a decisive corner, if there is indeed a New Europe as the Paris Charter declares, then antisemitism must be understood to be un-European. It must be recognized as a form of treason against the aspirations for a new order.

One would hope that antisemitism will then be met with at least as much determination as would be brought to bear on an outbreak of SARS or bubonic plague. A reliable system of data gathering on a continent-wide basis should map the outbreaks and spread of the disease. Responsive measures should not be left to chance but should be coordinated and institutionalized. The OSCE should appoint an outstanding and respected citizen to serve as a special representative or high commissioner to keep a vigilant eye on all the steps that are being taken and to warn of all the gaps in the defenses.

All this calls for greater seriousness of purpose and intensity of effort to meet this threat to Europe's future. I have no doubt of Europe's capacity to do what is needed. It is a question of will. And all of us, Jews and non-Jews, NGOs, the academy, the press, the church, and civil society generally have a responsibility to see to it that Europe survives, overcomes its ancient failure, meets its own historic challenge, and achieves its aspirations for human dignity, for democracy and for peace.

Antisemitism: A Chance for Europe to Check a Wave of Hate

by Andrew Baker
AJC Director of
International Jewish Affairs

April 28, 2004

published in Süddeutsche Zeitung



NEW YORK European leaders may finally be waking up to the severity of antisemitism in their countries. After largely ignoring increasing numbers of attacks on Jews and Jewish institutions for the past three and a half years, some governments have begun to acknowledge this disease and take steps to confront it.

When representatives of the 55 nations that comprise the Organization on Security and Cooperation in Europe gather in Berlin this week for a second conference on antisemitism, they will have an opportunity to develop a plan of action that recognizes that antisemitism is not just an assault on Jews but tears at the fabric of democratic societies.

OSCE members should draw from a recent report by the European Union Monitoring Center. The most extensive compilation of data and opinions on antisemitism to be issued by any European body, it serves as belated recognition by the European establishment of the challenges that Western Europe faces in confronting rising antisemitism.

The 350-page report identified an increase in the intensity of antisemitic incidents in five countries – Belgium, France, Germany, the Netherlands, and Britain. While the re-

port identified white Europeans – that is, neo-Nazis and skinheads – as the primary source of antisemitic incidents in the EU today, illustrating that the “old” antisemitism is alive and well, it also acknowledged that “young Muslims of North Africa or Asian extraction” are perpetrators in some countries, a result of the spillover of the Middle East conflict onto the European street, which many consider evidence of a “new” strain of the old disease.

The report focused much attention on France, which has the largest Jewish community in Europe and has experienced the greatest number of attacks on Jewish targets. Increased security and a “zero tolerance” policy have dramatically reduced these numbers in recent months. Public expressions of solidarity with the Jewish community by President Jacques Chirac and the creation of a commission on antisemitism have sought to quell the anxiety that many French Jews have felt.

In this self-examination, however, the EU monitoring center revealed the inadequacies of its current system of monitoring antisemitic incidents. Several European countries have no provisions at all for the collection of any hate crime information in general, let alone singling out antisemitic incidents.

Thus, all the more important is a companion report based on interviews with Jewish community leaders in eight countries. These views record what Jewish "antennae" pick up today – not only the empirical data of incidents, but also a sense of the public mood and political discourse. They describe a more troubling situation, where considerations of emigration and questions about the future of Jewish communal life are part of the daily conversation.

To its credit, the EU report does address one of the most politically controversial questions: whether anti-Israeli expressions constitute antisemitism. It has concluded that when stereotypes of Jews are applied to the Jewish state, the answer is yes. Hence, depictions of Israel as a deceitful force, as a conveyor of international conspiracies, or as acting for base or crooked motives are manifestations of antisemitism.

The EU monitoring center inexplicably determined that it is not antisemitism if Jews or Jewish institutions are attacked because the perpetrators act out of a dislike of Israel's prime minister or opposition to Israeli policies. There are many civilized ways to express views on Israel, but viewing European Jews as stand-ins for the Israeli government is nothing less than antisemitism.

Following the monitoring center's report, the OSCE should recommend the establishment of an office in every country to collect data on antisemitic incidents and other hate crimes. Second, the OSCE should recognize that Muslim communities in Europe have become a new source of hostility toward Jews, fueled by antisemitic propaganda coming out of the Arab world. And, third, the OSCE should acknowledge that anti-Israeli expressions can themselves constitute a form of antisemitism.

After the Promise

Keeping OSCE Commitments
to Combat Antisemitism

Jacob Blaustein Institute for the
Advancement of Human Rights

April 2004



The goal of the Copenhagen project of the Jacob Blaustein Institute for the Advancement of Human Rights (JBI) is to improve protection against antisemitism in the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) region; another goal is to assess the ways in which OSCE has done and could do more to assist states to meet their commitments to provide such protection. In seeking to accomplish these goals, we have studied the ways in which the states participating in OSCE – and the OSCE institutions themselves – have been able to implement the landmark commitments made in Copenhagen and affirmed thereafter, and to track what they themselves say about their own progress.

As JBI's review of state responses reveals, a majority of OSCE states admit that the problem of antisemitism exists in their countries. Some, but relatively few, also allude to or have spoken out against its manifestation elsewhere. However, these states do not demonstrate that they have clear-cut ideas of how to combat antisemitism.

Governments are willing to endorse anti-discrimination norms and nearly all have done so. Many also openly provide materials to NGO's and the public. But their willingness, and even ability, to act to protect their citizens from violence and

from discrimination, including antisemitism (which they committed themselves to do in Copenhagen), remains largely undemonstrated.

The absence of anti-discrimination legislation in some states impedes the availability of effective remedies to victims and the capacity to monitor progress on combating antisemitism.

The Jacob Blaustein Institute calls on states to bring their domestic legislation into conformity with international norms on non-discrimination, both within the framework of recommendations from European institutions and including also the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR) and the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination (CERD).

Only six countries provided JBI with specific statistics on antisemitic incidents; only two countries submitted information on particular court cases. The low number of states submitting specific statistics on antisemitic incidents supports the concerns already raised by reports of the European Union Monitoring Centre (EUMC) and Human Rights First about the absence of data on antisemitism, its non-comparability, and the problems of under- and over-

reporting. Clearly, monitoring systems must be developed and harmonized among OSCE states.

JBI urges countries meeting in Berlin to develop a more clear-cut framework for legislating against hate crimes and creating precedents and deterrents in court cases. Additionally, states need to establish a system of monitoring incidents of antisemitism in their own countries, as encouraged by the OSCE Ministers meeting in Porto and then in Maastricht.

Twenty-three countries failed to respond to JBI. Of the 32 states responding to JBI, only 9 described Holocaust education projects or curricula, and 12 outlined general educational initiatives to combat discrimination and promote tolerance. However, they do not demonstrate that their programs are linked to active efforts to counter contemporary discrimination or antisemitism. The JBI calls on states to re-visit their educational programs, both those teaching remembrance of the past, including the Holocaust, and those addressing general intolerance, with a renewed focus on combating contemporary antisemitism.

JBI calls upon states to revisit the commitments they affirmed in Copenhagen and to take new and vigorous steps to implement them in practice.

We welcome Decision 607 on antisemitism passed at the OSCE 504th plenary meeting in that it provides a useful task list for monitoring and combating antisemitism. We applaud the call to “[f]ollow closely... antisemitic incidents in the OSCE area making use of all reliable information available” and to make these findings public, and to “[s]ystematically collect and disseminate information throughout the OSCE area on best practices for preventing and responding to antisemitism and, if requested, offer advice to participating

States in their efforts to fight antisemitism.” Surely such a monumental task will require appointment of a well-regarded and well-resourced public figure with the confidence of the participating states to coordinate this work effectively

JBI recommends that a special representative within the OSCE should be created on the model of the special representative on press freedom. Such an official would coordinate the work recommended under Decision 607 of collating information about allegations of antisemitism and state responses to such incidents, develop monitoring systems, investigate situations as needed, work out methods for states to identify ways of preventing antisemitism, and report publicly in the OSCE. The unevenness in reporting and scarcity of hard data even from states responding to our concerns in good faith are themselves indication of the need for a special representative or high commissioner within the OSCE family of institutions. This official would engage states specifically on means of monitoring incidents and creating protective measures, whether in the schools, the courts or elsewhere.

JBI will continue to monitor efforts to combat antisemitism in the context of the Copenhagen commitments. We welcome further contributions and updates from all participating states on their work in this field. JBI urges OSCE participating states to continue to send us materials demonstrating their achievements. antisemitism is both an old and a contemporary problem, profoundly harmful to the societies that tolerate it. Through continuing scrutiny, we aim to help protect against its pernicious influence and destructive impact.

NGO Forum Declaration

Berlin, April 27, 2004

for the
OSCE Conference on
Anti-Semitism,
Berlin, April 28-29, 2004



We, the representatives of non-governmental organizations as well as leaders in the public sector assembled in Berlin on April 27th, 2004, dedicated to the monitoring and eradication of antisemitism – a singular and unusually pernicious form of hatred with deep historical roots, which continues to present a threat to established and transitional democracies – as well as to the development of more effective means to combat the problem,

Identify three main elements in the contemporary wave of anti-Jewish hatred:

- Attacks on Jews by neo-Nazis, white nationalists, right-wing extremists and other radical elements, fueled by anti-semitic and racist ideologies;
- Attacks on Jews by a small number of radicalized Muslim youths who eschew the peaceful coexistence among religions supported by the vast majority of Muslims living in Europe, and who identify increasingly with the propagation of violence, antisemitism and anti-Israeli tenets of radical Islam;
- The demonization of the state and people of Israel, including anti-Zionist attacks on the legitimacy of Israel's right to exist as a Jewish state, in the

media, on the campus, and within public discourse to a degree that is fully one-sided and representative of a double standard used to measure Israel's actions;

Underscore the obligation of government officials, parliamentary representatives, religious leaders, and public opinion leaders to condemn unequivocally acts of antisemitism:

1. In the expectation that leaders will emphasize the Berlin OSCE Parliamentary Assembly resolution from July 10, 2002, stressing that international developments or political issues never justify violence or other manifestations of intolerance against Jews and that such acts of violence obstruct democracy, pluralism and peace, we call on the OSCE, the EU and all governments of the OSCE member states to develop a plan of action, including more effective monitoring mechanisms, swifter prosecution of perpetrators, better coordination of governmental responses to such attacks, and new school curricula and public education programs to raise awareness of the severity of such crimes, to help reverse the rise in antisemitic manifestations, noting that a hesitancy or failure of those in leadership positions to take action can exacerbate the problem;

We are encouraged by some developments in the fight against antisemitism and we:

2. Recall with appreciation the decisions of the OSCE Ministerial Councils at Porto on Dec. 7, 2002, and at Maastricht on Dec. 2, 2003, and the landmark Copenhagen Concluding Document of 1990, which emphasize the necessity to combat antisemitism and discrimination in all its manifestations, and applaud the OSCE's readiness to hold conferences in Vienna on June 19-20, 2003, and Berlin on April 28-29, 2004, recognizing the distinctiveness of the threat of antisemitism to Jews and civilization;

3. Note the increased responsiveness within the OSCE region to confront rising levels of antisemitism through resolutions of parliaments and national assemblies addressing the problem; a series of unequivocal statements by government and public opinion leaders condemning antisemitic violence; improved cooperation between NGOs and government branches on monitoring; and speedier prosecution of acts of antisemitism;

Nonetheless, cognizant of the growing danger to Jewish communities due to antisemitism, we:

4. Caution that verbal, visual and physical acts of antisemitism in the OSCE region are rising rapidly, posing a fundamental challenge to the nature of post-WWII democracy, which was predicated on the international institutionalization of a code of human rights protecting all minorities, including Jews;

5. Deplore the lack of national standards for data collection on this phenomenon and the paucity of mechanisms to disseminate such information;

6. Warn about the consequences of the ongoing success of right-wing populist

parties in some OSCE countries, particularly when leaders of such parties make direct or indirect antisemitic remarks;

7. Express concern about the increase of antisemitism in discussions of global policy issues, particularly regarding the role of the U.S. and Israel in the world arena, co-mingling anti-American, anti-Israeli and antisemitic viewpoints; and warn about growing ideological agreement between some elements of the radical left and the extreme right on such matters;

8. Note with concern a growing tendency to assign collective responsibility to Jews worldwide for the policies of the state of Israel;

9. Signal the dangers of increasingly popular conspiracy theories that consider Jews responsible for the evils of the world;

10. Express alarm at the degree to which Jews are at times singled out at work, at study or in public forums for vilification or attack for no reason other than that of their Jewish identity;

11. Express concern about discrimination against Jews in the academic sphere as well as the atmosphere of intimidation faced by many teachers when trying to discuss the Holocaust and Israel at schools and universities;

12. Note with alarm the degree to which antisemitic literature and stereotypes are published and widely disseminated, including the availability of such literature to members of Muslim minorities living in the OSCE region, who are also exposed to antisemitism in religious schools and gatherings; as well as the propagation of antisemitic stereotypes by public officials and religious leaders;

13. Express concern about the trivialization of the Holocaust through manifestations of historical revisionism in Central and Eastern Europe that put on equal footing the crimes of the Stalinist regime and those of the Nazi regime, neglecting the special character of the Holocaust as a singular expression of state-sponsored genocide. This trivialization is further underscored when gratuitous references are made equating Jewish and/or Israeli behavior and policies to crimes committed by Nazis, blurring the lines between victims and perpetrators;

14. Raise alarm about the commonplace nature of antisemitic attacks in eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union, including comments made by public officials and religious leaders, and the lack of public response to such manifestations, a largely unaddressed challenge due to the limited resources of the emerging civil society in these countries to respond to such attacks;

15. Worry about the increase in antisemitic language and images on websites, offering untold possibilities for the reinforcement of antisemitic stereotypes and the spread of antisemitic propaganda;

We urge a coordinated response in the public arena to counter these trends:

16. The extensive range of sources for antisemitic acts indicates the tenacity in the political, religious, and cultural arena of age-old hatred toward Jews. While currently triggered in part by the Mideast conflict, it is probable that social, economic and political developments will keep antisemitism alive, particularly without closer coordination of existing institutions and resources and a concerted plan of action on the part of the OSCE, national governments and civil society to counter this phenomenon.

We call upon the OSCE to:

17. Allot resources for a central clearinghouse for data collection, based at the ODIHR office, as mandated in Decision No. 4 of the Maastricht Ministerial Council on December 2, 2003, to monitor incidents of antisemitism, based on close cooperation with NGOs and leaders of Jewish communities, recruiting advisory opinions of experts, and publicizing the information collected by issuing reports on a regular basis;

18. Appoint immediately an independent high official tasked with monitoring developments on antisemitism, collecting data, submitting reports regularly and publicly, developing recommendations, implementing counter-measures, and shining a public spotlight when necessary to focus attention on the issue;

19. Develop means for effective transnational police cooperation regarding antisemitic offenses and conduct best practice exchanges among law enforcement officers;

We call upon the administrative bodies and parliament of the European Union to:

20. Issue regular reports through the appropriate offices and organize events, including parliamentary debates, on the subject of antisemitism;

21. Assist incoming member states of the European Union with resources to confront antisemitism, including the development of educational programs and public awareness campaigns for public officials, law enforcement officers, educators, and other sectors of society;

22. Review periodically the subject of antisemitism to monitor progress combating its manifestations;

23. Provide financial resources to NGOs for the development of programming and curricula on antisemitism, as well as for information exchange and networking efforts that would help link those organizations and individuals dealing with the subject;

We call upon national governments to:

24. Improve security protection for Jewish sites where individuals feel a sense of threat, with Jewish communities working closely with law enforcement officials;

25. Ensure that national legal systems provide effective protection against all forms of antisemitism, including clearly designated addresses for filing complaints against antisemitic violence and discrimination;

26. Establish national data collection and monitoring mechanisms on antisemitism, more effective methods to disseminate such information, and improve information sharing among government authorities and local officials;

27. Appoint ombudspersons or official bodies to investigate antisemitic manifestations and develop national recommendations for countering them;

28. Meet on a regular basis with other governments to exchange information on data and response to antisemitic crimes;

29. Improve contacts with NGOs to enable as speedy and accurate a compilation of information on antisemitic incidents as possible;

30. Seek additional sources of funding and strengthen funding in those countries with state support for non-governmental organizations in order to allow NGOs to ex-

pand their current research efforts, develop educational programs and create public awareness campaigns, recognizing the fact that without additional funding the existence of many NGOs working on the issue is threatened;

31. Institute training programs for teachers and civil servants on combating antisemitism, as well as reviewing state educational curricula to remove biased material, address contemporary forms of antisemitism, and expand information on Jewish life and culture;

32. Continue to promote education about the Holocaust for all students in those countries where it is an established part of school curricula, with ongoing modifications to reflect the changing ethnic composition of society, and incorporate Holocaust education into the curricula in those countries where it is not yet taught on a regular basis;

33. Counter societal trends that nourish antisemitism through the promotion of anti-bias and diversity programs, and improve anti-discrimination and integration measures for members of minorities;

We call upon parliaments to:

34. Discuss the issue of antisemitism regularly and pass resolutions condemning the phenomenon, such as the two resolutions passed by the German parliament December 11th, 2003;

35. Initiate and adopt legislation to assess and combat antisemitic violence;

36. Hold legislators and political leaders accountable when they resort to inciteful speech and antisemitic appeals;

37. Establish parliamentary committees to monitor progress on the fight against antisemitism;

38. Pursue additional remedies through deliberations and declarations of the OSCE Parliamentary Assembly and other inter-parliamentary bodies, with the 2002 Berlin resolution offering a useful model and starting point;

We call upon NGOs to:

39. Take the lead in efforts to counter antisemitism through immediate condemnations of antisemitic manifestations, the publication of information that can stimulate public discussion and the development of public awareness campaigns that highlight the danger to democracy posed by antisemitism;

40. Develop new educational efforts directed toward antisemitism and its sources, mindful of the ethnic diversity of most OSCE countries today, reflecting the difficulties to date of countering antisemitism through traditional teaching approaches, to be integrated into civic education, anti-racism work and diversity training;

41. Increase research to create a stronger body of quantitative and qualitative data that can help with the design of new approaches to combat antisemitism;

42. Increase monitoring efforts to collect data in a systematic manner on antisemitic incidents and convey this information to appropriate institutions and government authorities;

43. Continue the networking process of organizations combating antisemitism established at the NGO Forum through a central website, www.ngoforumberlin.org, to facilitate the exchange of information, the sharing of resources, and the development of follow-up activities;

We call upon the media to:

44. Exercise careful and balanced judgment in the way in which they portray current events that have an impact on antisemitism;

45. Be alert to the use of language and images that can evoke antisemitic clichés and metaphors;

We call upon the academic community to:

46. Resist attempts to separate academic colleagues from their counterparts based solely on their Israeli citizenship;

47. Ensure that all discussions on campuses and at academic forums in which subjects such as antisemitism, the Holocaust, and Mideast issues can be freely discussed without fear of verbal harassment, intimidation, or physical attacks;

We call upon all of the above-named representatives:

48. To censure inaction and complacency regarding antisemitic manifestations, recognizing that antisemitism can unravel the fabric of civil society if allowed to flourish unfettered by public condemnation and legal prosecution; and encourage all sectors to work together closely to defend our common democratic tradition against the scourge of antisemitism, racism and xenophobia.

Finally, to combat antisemitism in the 21st century in the most effective manner:

49. We encourage the OSCE to become a model for intergovernmental cooperation in the fight against antisemitism and other forms of hatred and racism, national governments to devote more resources to addressing the problem, and pledge as representatives of NGOs and public opinion bodies to

maintain a watchful eye, stimulating public discussion and exerting public pressure if necessary, to ensure that Jews and members of all minorities in the OSCE region can live lives free of discrimination, harassment, and violence.

NGO FORUM BERLIN STEERING COMMITTEE:

The American Jewish Committee

Amadeu-Antonio Foundation

Central Council of Jews in Germany

Centre for Research on Antisemitism

Heinrich Böll Foundation

Honestly Concerned

Co-Signatories:

Organizations:

- America-Israel Friendship League
- American Friends of Likud
- American Zionist Movement
- AMIT
- Anti-Defamation League
- ARZA / World Union North America
- Association of Jewish Communities of Ukraine
- B'nai B'rith International
- Bridge of Understanding, Munich Germany
- Central Conference of American Rabbis
- Centre Europeen Juif d' information
- Citizen's Watch, St. Petersburg
- Conference of Presidents of Major American Jewish Organizations
- Congress of National Communities of Ukraine
- Die Juedische
- Euro-Asian Jewish Congress

- Federal Union of Jewish Students in Germany
- Federation of Jewish Organizations and Communities of Russia – the Vaad
- Friedrich Ebert Foundation
- Friedrich Naumann Foundation
- German-Israeli Society, Berlin Working Group
- German Israeli Working Circle for Peace in the Middle East, Düsseldorf
- German Media Watch
- German-Israeli Society of Political Scientists
- Hagalil Online
- International Association of Jewish Lawyers and Jurists
- Israel Today – The Christians on Israel's Side
- Jewish Congress of Kazakhstan
- Jewish Institute for National Security Affairs
- Konrad Adenauer Foundation
- Labor Zionist Alliance
- MEMRI Germany
- Mercaz USA
- Mobile Beratung gegen Rechtsextremismus (MBR)
- National Council of Jewish Women
- National Council of Young Israel
- NCSJ Advocates on behalf of Jews in Russia, Ukraine, the Baltic States & Eurasia
- Rabbinical Assembly
- Religious Zionists of America
- Society for Jewish-Christian Cooperation, Berlin

- The Haver Foundation, Hungary
- The Jewish Reconstructionist Federation
- The Jewish Women Union in Germany
- Union for Reform Judaism
- Union of the Belorussian Jewish Associations and Communities
- United Jewish Communities
- United Synagogue of Conservative Judaism
- Verein fuer demokratische Kultur in Berlin
- Verein zur Vorbereitung einer Stiftung Scheunenviertel Berlin e.V.
- Wissenschaftsforum der Sozialdemokratie in Berlin, Brandenburg und Mecklenburg-Vorpommern, Potsdam
- Women of Reform Judaism
- Women's American Ort
- Workmen's Circle
- World Zionist Executive, USA

Individuals:

- Alexander, Fero, Union of Jewish Communities in Slovakia
- Azarlazy, Floriane, Berlin, Germany
- Bali, Rifat, Turkey
- Barnette, Sherwood
- Becker, Ulrich
- Bemayor, J.
- Berilowitz, Avrohom, Federation of Jewish Communities, Moscow, Russia
- Böckmann, Christine, Miteinander-Netzwerk für Demokratie und Weltoffenheit in Sachsen-Anhalt e.v., Magdeburg, Germany
- Brumina, Viktoria, Union of the Belorussian Jewish Associations and Communities
- Chlenov, Michael, Euro-Asian Jewish Congress
- Dreyfus, Jean-Marc, Berlin, Germany
- Elen, H.,

- Eriskat, Doerte, FFI, Berlin
- Faber, Klaus
- von Fallois, Anne, Konrad Adenauer Foundation
- Fechler, Bernd, Jugendbegegnungsstaette Anne Frank
- Folnowerny, Andrey, Forum for Dialogue among Nations, Poland
- Fraenkel, Xenia, Berlin
- Gado, Janos
- Gall, David, haGalil online
- Gebert, Konstanty, Midrasz, Warsaw
- Geller, Maciej, Open Republic, Association Against Anti/Semitism and Xenophobia, Poland
- Gilad, Amit, Embassy of the state of Israel, Berlin, Germany
- Henrix, Hans Hermann, Bischöfliche Akademie des Bistums Aachen
- Herzberg, Fredrik, Stockholm, Sweden
- Hoffmann, Günter, „Bunt statt Braun“, Anklam, e.V.
- Jacobs, Juan, UK
- Kerez, Igor, Congress of National Communities of Ukraine
- Kinzel, Tanja, tacheles reden! e.v.
- Kollberg, Britta, RAA, Berlin
- Körner, Friedrich, German Federal Ministry for the Interior
- Korotaev, Alexey, International League for Human Rights
- Kraus, Tomas, European Council of Jewish Communities, Prague
- Lanyi, Eszter
- Masliah, Leon, Paris
- Masliah, Francine, Paris
- Mazyer, Aiman
- Meth, Robert G., NCSJ
- Meyer zu Utrup, Wolfram
- Munk, Jan
- Munkoff, Hilda, Jewish Council for Public Affairs
- Munkoff, Paul N., Jewish Council for Public Affairs

- Neuer, Hillel, U. N. Watch, Geneva, Switzerland
- Ossiniv, Fedor, Jewish Congress of Kazakhstan
- Ozcan, Yelda, Berlin
- Poerschke, Ralph
- Pollack, Jay L., Hadassah
- Porat, Dina, Tel Aviv University
- Pugnier, Monica Chana, Honestly Concerned
- Rabbi Yoshua Dov Blail
- Rensmann, Joerg, Projekt Archiv, Berlin
- Riedle, Simon, Berlin, Germany
- Rosemann, Nils, World University Service, German Committee
- Rosenheim, Gabrielle, European Council of Jewish Communities
- Rosenthal, Hannah, Jewish Council for Public Affairs
- Schapira, Harry, Standpunkte e. V.
- Scherbakowa, Irina, Memorial, Moscow
- Schmalstieg, Catharina, Mobiles Beratungsteam gegen Rechtsextremismus, Berlin
- Schoen, Edina
- Schröter, Gudrun, tacheles reden! e.v.
- Schwartz, Fred and Allyne, Auschwitz Institute
- Schwiereck, Nicola, Aktion Sühnezeichen Friedensdienste
- Singer, Aca, Federation of Jewish Communities in Serbia & Montenegro
- Spektor, Roman, Federation of Jewish Organizations and Communities of Russia - the Vaad
- Steinwurz, Chana, Standpunkte e. V., Berlin
- Tarnero, Jaques, French, Documentary Film Producer
- Vogt, Achim, Friedrich Ebert Foundation
- Wahdat-Hagh, Wahied, Memri, Berlin
- Walder, Raphael, Consultative Council of Jewish Organization
- Weiss, Iris, haGalil online
- Weitzel, Victor, Le Comité des droits de l'homme, Luxemburg
- Wenges, Fred
- Werners, Franziska, haGalil online
- Whine, Michael, European Jewish Congress
- Wischner, Jane
- Witting, Barbara, Juedische Oberschule, Berlin
- Zais, Petra, Chemnitz, Germany
- Zingeris, Emanuelis, Chairman Evaluation of Nazi and Soviet Crimes
- Zissels, Josef, Association of Jewish Communities of Ukraine

Recommendations for the New Federal German Government

Presented by participating organizations of the NGO Forum Berlin

Berlin, November 9, 2005



Even at the start of the 21st century, antisemitism remains a problem that threatens our democracy. Hence it is necessary to remain watchful and take appropriate countermeasures. The NGO Forum Berlin is a network of non-governmental organizations that met for the first time during preparations for the OSCE Conference in Berlin in April 2004. As professionals with expertise based on lengthy experience in combating antisemitism, we advise the incoming federal government to implement the following measures:

- 1) **Strengthening the OSCE's Berlin and Cordoba Declarations and consistently raising the subject of antisemitism in bilateral relations**

The federal government's pioneering role in combating antisemitism, not least of all within the framework of the OSCE, is expressly welcome. We wish to see the federal government continue playing this role and also be active within other international organizations, like the United Nations, in the framework of the government's foreign policy agenda.

In bilateral relations, too, it is important to be consistent about addressing the problem

of antisemitism. There should not be any promotion of antisemitic propaganda – for example, in the media or schoolbooks – using funds from international development aid. In addition to efforts at the governmental level, civil society initiatives combating antisemitism need to be promoted worldwide. This is, not least of all, in Germany's own interest, since (in an era of transnational media and widespread migration) antisemitism originating abroad does not stop at the borders of the Federal Republic.

We emphatically recommend immediate and sustained implementation of the calls issued at the Berlin and Cordoba OSCE Conferences for stronger observation and detection of antisemitism in Germany and other OSCE member states.

- 2) **Laying the foundations for the fight against antisemitism**

Developing and implementing a series of measures against antisemitism requires a solid empirical foundation. Hence there is a need for continuous monitoring of antisemitic phenomena and incidents. Only a uniform definition that can be used both by governmental offices and civil society organizations together with a coordinated assembly of data can guarantee surveys that are comprehensive and meaningful. The

Working Definition of Antisemitism developed by the European Monitoring Centre on Racism and Xenophobia (EUMC), a definition also employed in their practical work by the Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights (ODIHR) and the Personal Representative of the Chairman-in-Office of the OSCE on Combating Antisemitism, should be used as an official working definition at all levels of policy and administration. The professional expertise of the NGOs and their work in civil society should be enlisted in order to obtain information about the extent of antisemitism throughout society beyond the formally compiled data.

It is vital that society be adequately informed about the extent of antisemitism. Hence, data that are compiled should be routinely made available to the public and appropriate authorities. An annual state-of-the-art report by the federal government on antisemitism and on efforts at combating it would be required in this context.

3) Treating antisemitism in the legislatures

We encourage the German Bundestag and the state legislatures to conduct an annual debate on the subject of antisemitism. This would provide an opportunity to discuss progress made in the fight against antisemitism and to authorize new projects. In addition, the Bundestag and state legislatures should appoint appropriate panels to examine how the agreements made in the framework of the OSCE have been implemented.

4) Condemning hostility to Israel in society at large

In society at large there is an urgent need – above all in political discourse – for a consensus condemning hostility to Israel that is inspired by antisemitism. This includes making sure that government officials and other public actors also avoid any expression of

such hostility. With respect to evaluating what should be viewed as hostility to Israel that is inspired by antisemitism, we recommend the definition of antisemitism employed by the European Monitoring Centre on Racism and Xenophobia (EUMC), the Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights (ODIHR), and the Personal Representative of the Chairman-in-Office of the OSCE on Combating Antisemitism. In addition, it is a worthwhile goal to intensify German-Israeli exchange and encounter programs, since intensive contact is the only long-term way for opinion-makers and the public – and especially young people – to arrive at a realistic picture of Israel.

5) Promoting long-range projects

It would be a welcome development if practical projects against antisemitism were more strongly promoted by the government. In order for these programs to have a more lasting impact, their promotion would have to be arranged for the long term. It would be advisable to integrate projects against antisemitism firmly into federal, state, and local government budgets – independently of current circumstances. The highest priority should be given to projects that treat antisemitism, because of the specific patterns and characteristics that distinguish it from racism, independently. Specifically – as part of the effort to ward off right-wing extremism, xenophobia, and antisemitism – it would be helpful to expand the various action and prevention strategies for tolerance and against violence like those developed by the "Alliance for Democracy and Tolerance – against Extremism and Violence" ("Bündnis für Demokratie und Toleranz – gegen Extremismus und Gewalt"), and especially the programs *Civitas*, *Xenos*, and *entimon*.

6) Police and the legal system

It is important to ensure that antisemitic behavior punishable by law be consistently

prosecuted. We recommend advanced training of police and judicial authorities on the topic of antisemitism, following the model of the program developed by ODIHR, so that the police and other officials are able to identify relevant incidents as motivated by antisemitism.

7) Education

Teachers and pupils can be sensitized against antisemitism and hostility toward Israel by advanced training and projects. It would, therefore, be welcome if this could also take place within the framework of teacher education – primarily (and at a minimum) for teachers of social studies, history, and civics or politics. The best long-term way to create a balanced and informed picture of Judaism in Germany is to include, in addition to the history of the Holocaust, the subject of antisemitism as a fixed component of the curriculum and to intensify classroom discussions that communicate Jewish culture and history.

Educational efforts against antisemitism should not be restricted to communicating knowledge about hostility to Jews and about Judaism. Since antisemitism is always expressed as a fight against democracy and general human emancipation, it is vital that the values of democracy and civil society be communicated in schools and other educational institutions. This facilitates moving against antisemitism as a problem for society at large, not simply as an isolated problem for individual groups. To this end it is also necessary to expand appropriate educational programs.



Taskforce:
Education on Antisemitism

Results of the European Workshop: Education on Antisemitism

Berlin, April 18-20, 2004

This text summarizes the results of a conference held in Berlin on April 18-20, 2004. It was sponsored by the American Jewish Committee, the Anne Frank Jugendbegegnungsstätte (Youth Meeting Center) in Frankfurt, and the Education on antisemitism Task Force. Multipliers involved in both scholastic and extra-scholastic educational work from throughout Germany have been working for the past two years to develop and discuss pedagogical concepts against antisemitism. The conference, funded by the Bundeszentrale für politische Bildung (German National Center for Civic Education) and the Anne Frank Fund from Basel, was attended by experts from 6 countries, including Germany, Switzerland, France, Netherlands, Russia, Poland, and Great Britain.

Preface:

Educational activities against antisemitism must include both historical and current perspectives

Antisemitic statements represent a relationship between the past and the present. They are motivated by the present day, rely on handed-down antisemitic images, and often also reflect the opinions of those expressing them (closure, lessons from the past, forms

of secondary antisemitism) regarding what past crimes against Jews mean today.

Historical education and Holocaust education must be made more specific

Historical education is more than Holocaust education

Historical education can illuminate the history of antisemitism in Europe, thus pointing out that the phenomenon is not new. It can show how antisemitism has influenced the experiences of Jews and non-Jews in Europe. It can also address handed-down antisemitic images; however, this must be done with care because it may serve to anchor antisemitic stereotypes instead of working against them. Educators should always address no more than they are able to work through.

Historical education must not reduce Jewish history merely to the portrayal of conflict and the history of the Shoah. Instead, Jewish history must be given a larger space within the respective national history. In all countries, existing schoolbooks and curriculum design urgently need revision; this has been a demand for many years. For example, the

framework guidelines developed by the Leo Baeck Institute in Frankfurt could serve as a model for revisions.

Conclusions for Holocaust education

1. Holocaust education must be broadly anchored

In some countries, Holocaust education is an obligatory part of school curricula. In contrast, survivors of the Shoah in Russia report that they are subjected to threats when they wish to lecture at schools. Holocaust education is crucial for imparting historical knowledge and recognition of the Jewish experience with persecution. It can enable a shift in perspective, promote empathy, and help to draw lessons from the past. It is particularly important in terms of addressing secondary antisemitic attitudes. Holocaust education must be consolidated where it already exists, and it must be established in those places where it is still lacking.

2. Holocaust education must identify antisemitism as the dominant ideology of National Socialism

Often, antisemitism is not addressed in detail even in the field of Holocaust education. Everyday historical perspectives, which make clear in their portrayal of the experiences and actions of Jews and non-Jews what everyday antisemitism looked like during that era in the German Reich and its occupied countries, have proven effective here. In this, parallels may be drawn to the students' life situations. For example, students may learn how Jewish schoolchildren experienced antisemitism, and how teachers and non-Jewish students conducted themselves.

3. Holocaust education can help to clarify the relationship to one's own history; it should address

the respective specific forms of secondary antisemitism

Holocaust education can contribute to people addressing the relationship to their personal history; this should include dealing with forms of denying memories and motives behind secondary antisemitism. Holocaust education can help to identify and address personal, familial and societal traditions.

4. Holocaust education must establish links to various communities of remembrance

Historical education must connect with target groups whose own respective national history is not their sole frame of reference. This applies, for example, to young people with an immigrant background, or young people in post-colonial countries. It particularly applies to multicultural groups of learners. For example, a Dutch initiative focuses on a cemetery where Moroccan and Jewish soldiers of the Allied armies are buried, thus making clear that Muslims died in the fight against the Germans as well. Educators must also be aware of what claims are formulated by the remembrance communities from which their students come with regard to recognition of victims' experiences. In Poland, for example, "remembrance competition" exists between Jewish and Christian Poles.

Asserted claims for the recognition of victims' experiences should not be neglected in class. However, what function these claims have should be clarified. Educators should work decisively against exploitation, and should correct inaccurate information. Important experiences should be placed within their historical context. In this, it is important to keep historical relations in mind.

In mixed groups, identifying discussion-stoppers and continuing to focus on these points can be helpful. Methods may be

utilized such as encounter education in group configurations, as developed, e.g., in Israel and South Africa. But common learning of young people who come from victim, perpetrator, and bystander contexts is not always feasible.

5. Holocaust education must connect the eras of the past, present and future

Educators must be conscious of the different generational relationships to National Socialism and the Shoah. Most non-Jewish young people consider National Socialism and the persecution of Jews as long ago as the Middle Ages. Therefore, programs are necessary to connect the eras of the past, present and future and place them in relation to one another.

6. Educational activities to promote tolerance, anti-racism and human rights must perceive antisemitism as an independent phenomenon

In programs on anti-racism, tolerance and human rights education, it is important to directly address antisemitism. Anti-racism education should identify the unique nature of antisemitism and must neither reduce antisemitism to its racist component nor make it a sub-category of racism. Programs must emphasize that groups marginalized due to racism may nonetheless make antisemitic arguments. Human rights education should illuminate the historical genesis of various human rights violations. Connections made between human rights violations and the Shoah must place the events within their historical context and place their dimensions in the proper relationship.

7. Advanced teacher training must support educators in becoming a part of the solution

France, Austria the Netherlands, Germany and Switzerland report that teachers themselves bring secondary antisemitic and anti-Israeli attitudes into the classroom. As such, the multipliers are often not only the key individuals for solving the problem, but rather a part of the problem as well. Basic and advanced training for teachers must address the attitudes of educators as well as imparting knowledge and methods.

Historical education is not enough: Education must focus more on current phenomena

8. Education must contribute toward explaining the world in non-antisemitic terms

Due to the plethora of conspiracy theories and reductionist world views in various European countries, expanding basic civic education activities is urgently necessary. In the face of the globalized social reality, increasingly viewed by many EU citizens as rife with conflict and overly complex, educational offerings must promote participation, provide aid in orientation and skills for action, and make global developments comprehensible before demagogues dominate the interpretation of day-to-day experiences. Both young people and adults must be presented with ways to maintain control over their own lives, actively shaping them despite difficult circumstances – without the necessity of escaping to ideologies of inequality. Due to the role played by the media and the Internet in the various European countries in terms of the existence of conspiracy theories, media competence must be enhanced as well.

Educational activities can use cognitive methods to contradict antisemitic lies. They can contribute to a process of self-enlightenment with regard to the societal and subjective function of current antisemitic ideological patterns. However, manifest

conspiracy theories are an expression of irrational, paranoid thought patterns; these are scarcely reachable with rational methods. Promoting the capacity for conflict and empathy, opportunities to act with solidarity, as well as participation in society, is thus an effective preventive tool. Civic education must be a permanent process accompanying democracy; short-term programs are not sufficient. Educational activities cannot replace – but rather only accompany – sound social policy and the preservation of democracy in Europe.

9. Educators must participate in working against Muslim anti-semitism

Within the Western European countries, educators are increasingly confronted with forms of antisemitism from portions of the Muslim minority. The perception of this problem is accompanied by fears, especially from those educators sensitized to anti-racism work, that dealing with it offensively might promote marginalization of those young people and incite Islamophobia. Further, many multipliers are lacking detailed knowledge about the living situation of their Muslim students and the influence of Islamist trends. Racism and antisemitism must not be played off against one another; rather, they must both be fought against.

In these cases, the experiences from German educational work against right-wing extremism can be helpful. Antisemitism and other authoritarian Islamist ideologies must not be trivialized. The key is to protect the victims, although they are not present in the educational process. Defining boundaries can prevent the emergence of space in the discussion for hostile attitudes to be expressed without contradiction. This might also apply in making determinations as to which groups to primarily work with. Pedagogical approaches may begin with information on the ideologies and history of

Islamism, as well as the contradiction between rigid authoritarian ideologies and the desire for personal freedom. Educational activities must promote an understanding of pluralistic identities, because no young person is only a Muslim or only French. It is also important to point out critical Muslim initiatives directed against antisemitism. Furthermore, multipliers must expand their cooperation with those – Muslim educators as well – who have more experience in working with Muslim young people. In the face of experiences such as the broadcast on Arabic television stations of the protocols of the Elders of Zion, which could be seen in Europe via satellite, promotion of overall media competence is necessary as well.

In contributing to stopping the spread of antisemitism among portions of the Muslim minority, pedagogical activities must be not only reactive, but rather preventive as well. In addition to opposing religious instruction influenced by Islamist trends, setting boundaries, and working with Muslim young people, the majority population has a particular responsibility. The people must support integration and, in this process, must be prepared to open up and change themselves. This also includes no longer ignoring the heterogeneous nature of European Muslim life, and gaining a degree of orientation knowledge with respect to problematic developments. For this, teachers specifically need access to knowledge about the living situation of their Muslim students; additional studies are necessary to contribute to this.

10. Educators must take seriously antisemitic forms of criticism of Israel

In all Western European countries, forms of antisemitic criticism of Israel are visible in the mainstream of society, which are reflected in the educational process as well. Addressing this problem must be targeted equally to educators and seminar participants.

Both teachers and learners often reduce the Middle East conflict to simplistic categories of good and evil. Both extremely heterogeneous motivations and insufficient knowledge play a role in this. As such, detailed information must be provided on the history of Israel as well as the background and present-day situation of the Middle East conflict. It is important that the complexity of the Middle East conflict be made comprehensible, and it should be made clear that there are no solutions without some degree of contradiction. Conceivable here would be utilizing educational methods from Israeli practice.

At the same time, antisemitic criticism of Israel and its function should be explained. For example, if the motivation behind comparisons between Israel today and National Socialism is to assuage guilt about one's own national involvement, this should be specifically addressed. However, not all motives behind criticism of Israel – such as an interest in understanding political connections or outrage over events perceived as unjust – may be automatically condemned as "antisemitic."

In the area of promoting overall media competence, the role of the media in the Middle East conflict should be studied in more detail.

Educators should also reflect on their own positions, which are often extremely critical of Israel. Above all, teachers must not impart the impression to their students that an offer of integration is the motive behind tolerance of antisemitic statements, or even that the teachers share antisemitic sentiments. All Western European countries reported that many teachers are biased. Here, as well as in all problematic areas discussed above, we see multipliers involved in both scholastic and extra-scholastic educational activities as one of our primary target groups for future activities.

Initiative support

In order to effectively implement the formative initiatives begun by committed educators and to develop them as models for existing educational practices, support for these efforts must be increased.

It is imperative that concept development and evaluation in pedagogical practices countering antisemitism be financially and institutionally secured. In contrast to pedagogical practices battling racism, those fighting antisemitism lack the necessary materials, methods and concepts.

The following is therefore required:

- a) an inventory of existing pedagogical approaches addressing antisemitism – especially as an exchange between OSCE member states;
- c) scholarly discussion and a definition of goals for pedagogical practices to counter antisemitism, particularly in terms of how they differ from those of anti-racism education and other areas of morals and ethics;
- d) research in developing pedagogical methods and tools for addressing antisemitism such as training programs and materials for instructors, educators, multipliers, etc;
- e) an evaluation of existing pedagogical practices in addressing antisemitism.

*Hanne Thoma, Barbara Schäuble,
April 24, 2004*

Notes

March 2006

American Jewish Committee Berlin Office
Lawrence & Lee Ramer Center for German-Jewish Relations
Mosse Palais · Leipziger Platz 15 · 10117 Berlin
Tel. (030) 22 65 94-0 · Fax (030) 22 65 94-14 · www.ajc.org