

TOOLS FOR COMBATING ANTI-SEMITISM: POLICE TRAINING AND HOLOCAUST EDUCATION



May 9, 2006

**Briefing of the
Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe**

Washington: 2008

Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe
234 Ford House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515
202-225-1901
csce@mail.house.gov
http://www.csce.gov

Legislative Branch Commissioners

HOUSE

CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH, NEW JERSEY,
Co-Chairman
FRANK R. WOLF, VIRGINIA
JOSEPH R. PITTS, PENNSYLVANIA
ROBERT B. ADERHOLT, ALABAMA
MIKE PENCE, INDIANA
BENJAMIN L. CARDIN, MARYLAND
LOUISE McINTOSH SLAUGHTER,
NEW YORK
ALCEE L. HASTINGS, FLORIDA
MIKE McINTYRE, NORTH CAROLINA

SENATE

SAM BROWNBACK, KANSAS,
Chairman
GORDON SMITH, OREGON
SAXBY CHAMBLISS, GEORGIA
RICHARD BURR, NORTH CAROLINA
DAVID VITTER, LOUISIANA
CHRISTOPHER J. DODD, CONNECTICUT
RUSSELL D. FEINGOLD, WISCONSIN
HILLARY RODHAM CLINTON, NEW YORK
VACANT

Executive Branch Commissioners

VACANT, DEPARTMENT OF STATE
VACANT, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
VACANT, DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

ABOUT THE ORGANIZATION FOR SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE

The Helsinki process, formally titled the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, traces its origin to the signing of the Helsinki Final Act in Finland on August 1, 1975, by the leaders of 33 European countries, the United States and Canada. As of January 1, 1995, the Helsinki process was renamed the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE). The membership of the OSCE has expanded to 55 participating States, reflecting the breakup of the Soviet Union, Czechoslovakia, and Yugoslavia.

The OSCE Secretariat is in Vienna, Austria, where weekly meetings of the participating States' permanent representatives are held. In addition, specialized seminars and meetings are convened in various locations. Periodic consultations are held among Senior Officials, Ministers and Heads of State or Government.

Although the OSCE continues to engage in standard setting in the fields of military security, economic and environmental cooperation, and human rights and humanitarian concerns, the Organization is primarily focused on initiatives designed to prevent, manage and resolve conflict within and among the participating States. The Organization deploys numerous missions and field activities located in Southeastern and Eastern Europe, the Caucasus, and Central Asia. The website of the OSCE is: <www.osce.org>.

ABOUT THE COMMISSION ON SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE

The Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe, also known as the Helsinki Commission, is a U.S. Government agency created in 1976 to monitor and encourage compliance by the participating States with their OSCE commitments, with a particular emphasis on human rights.

The Commission consists of nine members from the United States Senate, nine members from the House of Representatives, and one member each from the Departments of State, Defense and Commerce. The positions of Chair and Co-Chair rotate between the Senate and House every two years, when a new Congress convenes. A professional staff assists the Commissioners in their work.

In fulfilling its mandate, the Commission gathers and disseminates relevant information to the U.S. Congress and the public by convening hearings, issuing reports that reflect the views of Members of the Commission and/or its staff, and providing details about the activities of the Helsinki process and developments in OSCE participating States.

The Commission also contributes to the formulation and execution of U.S. policy regarding the OSCE, including through Member and staff participation on U.S. Delegations to OSCE meetings. Members of the Commission have regular contact with parliamentarians, government officials, representatives of non-governmental organizations, and private individuals from participating States. The website of the Commission is: <www.csce.gov>.

TOOLS FOR COMBATING ANTI-SEMITISM: POLICE TRAINING AND HOLOCAUST EDUCATION

MAY 9, 2006

COMMISSIONER

	Page
Hon. Christopher H. Smith, Co-Chairman, Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe	1

PARTICIPANTS

Paul Goldenberg, Special Advisor, OSCE Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights	3
Kathrin Meyer, Adviser on Anti-Semitism Issues, OSCE Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights	7
Rabbi Andrew Baker, Director of International Jewish Affairs, American Jewish Committee	17
Stacy Burdett, Associate Director of Government and National Affairs, Anti-Defamation League	20
Liebe Geft, Director, Simon Wiesenthal Center's Museum of Tolerance	22

APPENDICES

Prepared statement of Hon. Sam Brownback, Chairman, Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe	32
Prepared statement of Hon. Christopher H. Smith, Co-Chairman	33
Prepared statement of Paul Goldenberg, Special Advisor, OSCE Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights	35
Prepared statement of Kathrin Meyer, Adviser on Anti-Semitism Issues, OSCE Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights	41
Prepared statement of Rabbi Andrew Baker, Director of International Jewish Affairs, American Jewish Committee	45
Prepared statement of Stacy Burdett, Associate Director of Government and National Affairs, Anti-Defamation League	47
Prepared statement of Liebe Geft, Director, Simon Wiesenthal Center's Museum of Tolerance	54

TOOLS FOR COMBATING ANTI-SEMITISM: POLICE TRAINING AND HOLOCAUST EDUCATION

MAY 9, 2006

Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe Washington, DC

The briefing was held at 2:30 p.m. in room 628 Dirksen Senate Office Building, Washington, DC, Hon. Christopher H. Smith, Co-Chairman, Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe, moderating.

Commissioner present: Christopher H. Smith, Co-Chairman, Commission on Cooperation and Security in Europe.

Panelists: Paul Goldenberg, Special Advisor, OSCE Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights; Kathrin Meyer, Adviser on Anti-Semitism Issues, OSCE Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights; Rabbi Andrew Baker, Director of International Jewish Affairs, American Jewish Committee; Stacy Burdett, Associate Director of Government and National Affairs, Anti-Defamation League; and Liebe Geft, Director, Simon Wiesenthal Center's Museum of Tolerance.

Mr. THAMES. Good afternoon, and welcome everyone to this Helsinki Commission briefing. We are very fortunate to have Commission Co-Chairman Chris Smith here to give an opening statement. At this point, I will turn it over to Congressman Smith.

Mr. SMITH. Thank you, Knox, and thank you all for coming out to this briefing of the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe. Just by way of background, I have been on this Commission now for 24 years of my 26 years as a Member of Congress. It is a bipartisan Commission, as I think you know, and is completely committed to try to ensure that the Helsinki Final Act and all the follow-on agreements are adhered to, particularly in the area of human rights. This is the area we have emphasized for many years.

Two weeks ago, during the Holocaust commemoration, "Days of Remembrance Week," students in my home State of New Jersey held a vigil at Rutgers University to honor Ilan Halimi. Ilan was a French Jew who was kidnapped and gruesomely tortured to death earlier this year because of his faith. His tragedy made brutally clear that Jews are still attacked because they are Jews, and that our work to eradicate all types of anti-Semitism in all its ugly forms and manifestations is far from done.

Other groups also suffer from violent acts of hatred throughout the OSCE region, including right here in our own country.

Despite a slight decline, ADL's annual audit of anti-Semitic incidents recently found that the number of anti-Semitic incidents in the United States remained at disturbing levels in 2005.

As Co-Chairman, I am likewise concerned with the recent wave of violence against ethnic and religious minorities that has spiked in Russia. All too often, police there seem incapable or unwilling to vigorously protect minorities, including Roma and persons with dark skin.

I would note parenthetically that some 10 years ago, on February 27, I held what was my first comprehensive hearing on the persecution of Jews; we entitled it the "World-wide Persecution of Jews." I will never forget hearing at that time how there was a rising tide of anti-Semitic activity occurring throughout the world, in Argentina and parts of Asia, certainly in the Middle East and in many of the OSCE countries, including the United States and Canada.

We then held a number of subsequent follow-up hearings, but probably the most important hearing that we held was four years ago this month when we held a hearing on this rising tide, which was getting worse in many of the OSCE countries. That hearing was instrumental in elevating this issue and related concerns at the OSCE itself, and at the OSCE Parliamentary Assembly. Strong leadership by the United States and other countries has led to greater engagement by the OSCE and our Assembly in efforts to combat anti-Semitism and other forms of hate, as well as an increased focus on Holocaust education.

On the first panel for today's Helsinki Commission briefing, we will highlight that work through the presentations of two internationally renowned experts, Paul Goldenberg and Dr. Kathrin Meyer. The second panel will add the insights of three very distinguished NGOs: the American Jewish Committee, the Anti-Defamation League, and the Simon Wiesenthal Center Museum of Tolerance.

Paul Goldenberg is the former chief of the New Jersey Bias Crime Unit and now serves as special advisor to ODIHR on hate crimes training. Paul has done a tremendous job in bringing into reality the OSCE-ODIHR law enforcement officers hate crimes training program.

The training program has created a flexible hate crimes training curriculum designed to meet the needs of the law enforcement community within any OSCE participating state or country.

The curriculum includes the fundamentals of response, investigation and management of anti-Semitic crimes and hate crimes in tandem with community engagement and mutual capacity building. Training law enforcement personnel in both Europe and North America on these methods will go far in winning the war against hatred and anti-Semitism. I remember when we first talked about this, Paul made it clear that it was important that the trainers train the trainers, that they are not likely to listen to politicians or diplomats, but they will listen to people who have worked in criminal law enforcement and they will listen to cops who convey best practices to them.

Paul has overseen the successful implementation of this program in Spain, Hungary, Croatia, and Ukraine. I am very pleased with how the program is developing and salute him for his extraordinary work.

Dr. Kathrin Meyer is the adviser on anti-Semitism issues for OSCE's Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights in Warsaw, Poland. This past January, during the

commemoration of the international day for Holocaust remembrance, ODIHR and Yad Vashem released guidelines on Holocaust commemoration, specifically designed for educators. Kathrin played a key role in developing these guidelines, which are a hands-on asset for teachers as they work to ensure the lessons of the Holocaust are inculcated with children in the classroom. If we are to remember the Holocaust, our children must be taught its lessons at an early age. I am pleased that ODIHR has diligently committed itself to this important issue.

Our second panel of three organizations are no strangers to the Helsinki Commission, and have been extraordinary leaders in ensuring that this fight against global anti-Semitism continues unabated. First, Rabbi Andrew Baker of the AJC will share his thoughts on where the OSCE tolerance process is going and what needs to be done. We will then hear from Stacy Burdett who will speak about ADL's programs to combat hate crimes and educate law enforcement officials; and last, Liebe Geft, who is the Director of the Simon Wiesenthal Center Museum of Tolerance, will talk about how the museum works with police to ensure they understand and appreciate the importance of tolerance.

I would just note parenthetically that my Holocaust education began when I was 14 when my father introduced me to a Holocaust survivor. I also mentioned this at the Berlin OSCE Conference on Anti-Semitism, where I spoke at the plenary session. I will never forget when he rolled up his sleeve and there was this dark ink number that designated that he was a concentration camp victim, one of the lucky ones, one of the survivors, but nevertheless a victim. I remember asking him a series of questions over lunch, and that dialogue really continued for years because he was a regular at this luncheonette that I used to go to as well. And that was the beginning of my Holocaust education, and frankly when we began this work, I remembered him and his profound impact on my life.

So I would like to now turn it over to Paul Goldenberg for any opening comments he might have, and then to Dr. Meyer.

Mr. GOLDENBERG. Thank you.

It is really a wonderful opportunity for me to be here today. It is interesting that I am going to present these notes to you today. I was invited by a new, dear friend of mine, John Minick, to visit the Holocaust Museum, which I did all morning with my son who is turning 13, and will be bar mitzvahed on Saturday. On a personal note, he and I had the opportunity for the first time, for him it was the first time, for me I had been there a couple of times, but have never seen it through the eyes of my son.

We visited the Holocaust Museum this morning. It is always a stark reminder of importance of the work we are discussing here today, providing tangibles to our communities in need. It is really essential to recall the horrendous and horrific outcomes from the past.

Again, even though I have been to that museum on many occasions—and that museum is a treasure—a treasure for what it teaches me every time, but to see it through the eyes of my own child made it even that much more remarkable.

So I start out by thanking you, Co-Chairman Smith, Commission members, ladies and gentlemen. It gives me great pleasure to speak to you today about issues of community safety and civil governance from the perspective of police and community relations and the advancement of human rights across the 55 nations of the OSCE, for all these issues and many more can be impacted by a single event, by a single hate crime. Communities within the OSCE region have turned from tranquil to chaotic in an instant, the

events that have led to this pioneering program that I am going to speak to you about this afternoon.

Hate crimes or bias crimes, as we have come to know them across the United States, are criminal offenses committed against a target, either a person or a place, because of their actual or perceived connection with a group that may be defined by race, creed, color, nationality, orientation, religion, or other discriminatory grounds. The heinous nature of a hate crime is the fact that they strike at our communities, not just a single person, place or institution, but rather whole sectors of our society can be isolated by a virtual wall of fear by just a single calculated act of violence, when the victim is a community icon or perceived to be a community icon.

It is because of this broad impact that these types of crimes, these hate crimes, have such an appeal to those who advance and promote the causes of hatred. While the commission of these crimes is reprehensible, the consequences are more far-reaching than other types of crimes, for these are the events that can divide communities, neighborhoods and states. These are the events that can create tension where none had existed, and breed dissent where once there was harmony, and incite distrust where once there was collaboration.

In short, these are the crimes that threaten democracy and democratic institutions. They are crimes that impact upon governments, as well as its people and communities. An ineffective police response can be viewed as the inaction of a government that doesn't care about the victim or the community. Such attitudes and beliefs can be the catalyst for change or retribution, sometimes through violence and social upheaval. The modest costs associated with the delivery of the law enforcement officer training program to combat hate crimes pale in comparison to the policing costs associated with just a single demonstration. Although social turmoil may start with a single event, it seldom ends that way.

As we have recently seen in several countries across Western Europe, social unrest in one European nation recently resulted in \$250 million in damages and direct policing costs. Many real or perceived hate crimes across the OSCE region, which includes the United States and Canada, with much more of Europe and parts of Asia, have been the flashpoints for recent as well as historical community unrest. Civil disturbances arising from such crimes, injustices and inequality of treatment have resulted in clashes with police, riots and social uprisings that form violent challenges to legitimate, democratically elected governments.

All of these have had monumental significant costs, not only in money that is needed to equip the police and support the response to such actions, but also in the impact that they have on the communities and the safety of those communities, on political stability, on economic well being and productivity of a nation. Like an unwanted wave, this economic impact of social upheaval can wash over such areas such as tourism, foreign investment, manufacturing, service industries. It literally washes away the growth, opportunity and advantages that may be key components of a nation's economy.

The Office of Democratic Institutions and Human Rights of the OSCE has commissioned the development of the law enforcement officer training program for combating hate crimes, which I have been honored to lead for the past 18 months. It has been through the vision and commitment of the ODIHR Director, Ambassador Christian Strohal, and the tireless, unwavering efforts of Ms. Jo-Anne Bishop, head of the ODIHR's

tolerance and non-discrimination program, that this program has received the support and recognition that has allowed it to be such an international success.

The political will and efforts of such notables as Canadian Senator Jeremiah Grafstein have advanced this issue, while this Commission's Co-Chairman, Representative Chris Smith, challenged all of us to turn concept into reality, and to move beyond the rhetoric of theory and to develop practices and the creation of tangible outcomes that could be seen, that would have an impact, and that would finally make a difference.

All these supporters recognized the positive role that police play in our communities, and the impact that police have on positive social change. Although some may consider that law enforcement has contributed to this problem, the ODIHR and this Commission have viewed the men and women of law enforcement as an integral part of the solution. They have also recognized both the need and the value of police-to-police professional training, the philosophy upon which this program is based. Support for this fundamental concept has been truly universal.

This law enforcement program is one that touches on many segments of the community and the diverse components of the national police service within participating States. The program team is comprised of subject matter experts in the field of hate crimes, drawn from police services in the United States, the United Kingdom, France, Canada, Hungary, Spain, and now Croatia and Ukraine will be joining our cadre.

This program has brought together these outstanding police professionals who have joined together with some of the world's most talented and innovative human rights advocates. Together, we have forged an unprecedented alliance which has led to the development of this unique training initiative, a program that is customized for each region; a program that gives a voice to minority communities within each state; and a program that grows and improves with each new state, with each new agency, and each application.

This international implementation team has expertise in other areas as well, that contribute to the program's success, such as conflict resolution, community capacity building, partnership development, and most important, community engagement and involvement. This engagement began with the consultation phase, where impacted communities and their representatives in participating States were brought together to provide input on how they see police responding to crimes of hate, what they need to do, and what they feel would be an important component to the program.

The international implementation team has been successful in reaching out to groups that have been victims of hate crimes and groups that see themselves on the fringes of society. We have asked them how they would like to be engaged, how they can help law enforcement and society stem the tide of hatred and its deteriorating effects on their people and their communities. We have been successful in using this process to build strong partnerships between governments and their people, using law enforcement as the vehicle for greater collaboration and problem-solving on issues that affect people where and how they live in a free society.

The consultation phase of the hate crimes program also engages the judiciary and the legislators to determine their needs and to solidify their participation as partners in the program. Finally, we consult with the police services, including command officers, specialized unit commanders, and front-line officers. We seek input from all levels of the police organization and integrate their views, address their concerns, and evaluate their

recommendations for change. We believe that this has truly contributed to the success of the program and we envision continuing to advance this level of consultation.

Beyond consultation, the program includes a comprehensive training and capacity-building component for each participating police service. We believe that our training curriculum is the most comprehensive and expansive training available on this topic in the OSCE region, and draws on the best practices of the participating States of the OSCE. Program participants include senior police training staff, who receive direct hands-on training in recognizing and responding to hate crimes, and in helping communities and individuals recover from the effects hate crimes have on victims and victimized targeted communities.

Participants have received manuals, workbooks, training guides, films, sound files, and animated crime scenes that we have developed for the program to help them deliver that training and to train all others within their respective nations.

Most of you here have my full statement. For the sake of time, I ask that you take a look at it, that you review it. The program, we are proud to say, will soon be back on the ground in places like Serbia, which really has been an area in the Balkans region of concern to all of us. The Serbian Government has stated that they are most interested in becoming the first nation to develop a national office for the prevention and investigation of hate crimes, which is an extremely important element, particularly given what has been happening in the Balkans.

The good news is that the law enforcement communities are now very much a catalyst for social change. They have come to the realization that Europe is fast changing, and without the respect from the community, and without engaging the community, we will see problems continue each and every day.

As important, what we do forget is that when people across the 55 OSCE nations, including the United States, we pour millions and millions of dollars into military and into police actions, which is something that on many occasions is extremely important and is a need. We need to also think about the first line of defense, the police, the first responder, the police. And we have to think about education, and educating those officers to better understand the communities that they are responsible for policing.

So Congressman Smith, we are very pleased to be here today to advise Congress on the program and, of course, before I leave here today, we hope that you will continue your support. We need additional support to carry this throughout the rest of the OSCE nations, and we look forward to working with you, sir, in the future.

Thank you.

Mr. SMITH. Thank you very much, Paul.

Before I go on to Dr. Meyer, I think as you know, we have made a request to the appropriators to provide approximately \$200,000 for this, as an additional support, going into fiscal year 2007.

Mr. GOLDENBERG. Excellent.

Mr. SMITH. So that is a pending request, and hopefully we can take the information we glean from this briefing and use it, including your testimony, to give it a real shot in the arm. So thank you so much.

Mr. GOLDENBERG. Thank you, Congressman.

Mr. SMITH. Dr. Meyer?

Ms. MEYER. Thank you very much.

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, I would like to thank you for the opportunity to speak to you today about our activities in the field of Holocaust education and education to combat anti-Semitism on behalf of the OSCE's Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights.

It might not be clear on the first sight why the OSCE as the world's largest regional security organization is involved in the field of Holocaust remembrance and education. Just allow me to give you a brief background to that question before I present our activities in the field of Holocaust education.

The 55 participating States of the OSCE from Europe, Central Asia and North America reacted to the dramatic increase of racist, xenophobic, and anti-Semitic acts throughout the region with several high-level conferences and ministerial decisions on tolerance and nondiscrimination since 2002. In these declarations, the participating States acknowledged the need for a specific approach to improve data-collection, legislation, training, and education.

The ODIHR's initiatives in the field of Holocaust remembrance is based on the declaration that came out of the Berlin Conference on Anti-Semitism in April, 2004. At this conference, the participating States recognized that anti-Semitism has new forms and expressions, and that anti-Semitism poses a threat to democracy, the values of civilization, and to the overall security in the OSCE region and beyond. The same occurs to other forms of intolerance and discrimination recognized in other OSCE declarations.

With the Berlin declaration, the OSCE participating States committed themselves to promote educational programs to combat anti-Semitism, to promote the remembrance of and education on the Holocaust, and to promote respect for all ethnic and religious groups. The ODIHR was tasked to disseminate best practices and to assist the states to implement these commitments.

Recognizing that anti-Semitism poses a threat to the overall security in the region compels us to identify all different forms of this phenomenon. While the Holocaust was based on anti-Semitism, we can see today that Holocaust denial or the diminishing of the Holocaust is one form of anti-Semitism that occurs more and more often and is used as a justification for anti-Semitic acts, discrimination and hate crimes. That is why these two fields are strongly connected for us and that is why my office is involved in the field of Holocaust education.

In order to fulfill our mandate, the ODIHR started the work in this field with an evaluation. We developed the study, "Education on the Holocaust and on Anti-Semitism in the OSCE Region: An Overview and Analysis of Educational Approaches" as our first project. I apologize for not bringing very many hard copies, but it was pretty heavy to carry overseas, but the study is available online.

This study gives a general analytical overview of ongoing activities in the OSCE region on Holocaust education and provides a country-by-country overview. It also analyzes the need for specific educational programs to address contemporary anti-Semitism. We are currently developing a similar evaluation for the general field of tolerance education within the OSCE region.

With the study, the ODIHR evaluated existing initiatives in the OSCE states, we identified those that could be developed successfully elsewhere, and identified good prac-

tices to support future efforts by OSCE states and civil society. But we also identified gaps and areas where teaching about Holocaust and anti-Semitism need to be strengthened.

The analysis shows that the interest in the history of the Holocaust is growing in the region, that the Holocaust is a topic of history lessons, but also is being taught in literature, languages, civic education, ethics and theology, as well as in extracurricular activities. So far, 33 out of the 55 participating States commemorate Holocaust memorial days in the region.

But we also identified obstacles. There is a lack of official directives specifically related to Holocaust education. There is a lack of appropriate teaching materials for Holocaust education, but especially to address contemporary anti-Semitism. And there is a lack of teacher training in many OSCE countries.

The study provides therefore comprehensive recommendations. Let me highlight today just a few of them. Holocaust education should be implemented in each participating State and needs to be strengthened in many. Contemporary anti-Semitism cannot be sufficiently addressed by Holocaust education. It should be acknowledged as an issue of itself. Teacher training should be implemented in the OSCE states and supported by the governments. Sufficient teaching materials should be developed, and there should be cooperation within the region between educators and an exchange of experience.

In order to follow our own recommendations, we established close cooperation with key international organizations such as the Task Force for International Cooperation on Holocaust Education, Remembrance and Research, the ITF, with the Yad Vashem in Israel and the Anne Frank House Amsterdam. With those partners, we developed joint assistance projects to support the implementation in the participating States.

To follow our mandate to assist the implementation and to give very practical assistance to the states in the field of Holocaust remembrance and combating anti-Semitism, but also in order to disseminate good practices, the ODIHR started to develop teaching tools on contemporary anti-Semitism and on Holocaust memorial days.

In cooperation with the Anne Frank House Amsterdam and experts from seven countries, those countries are The Netherlands, Croatia, Lithuania, Poland, Ukraine, and Germany, and just recently Denmark joined the project, teaching material on anti-Semitism in seven special country adaptations have been developed, based on the historical and social background of each country. I brought very few, very bad black-and-white copies of this. It is still under development, but it will online very soon.

The material has been translated and is recently being tested in schools in each of those countries. This material is a novelty not only because of the international cooperation on it, but also because there is almost no teaching material that deals with anti-Semitism and is not specifically focused on Holocaust education.

This ready-to-use material that will give detailed information, graphics and assignments for the students will come in three parts for the students and one special teacher's guide. Part one is on the history of anti-Semitism, part two on contemporary forms of anti-Semitism, and part three puts anti-Semitism into perspective with other forms of discrimination. The material, in seven different languages and versions, will be ready for the next school year as PDF documents on our Web site.

This important educational program has been supported so far only by very few states financially. And if we would get support in the future, we would be able to provide

printed copies of that material to teachers and students in countries where access to the Internet and proper printers is difficult for teachers that are willing to use the material.

Based on the commitment to commemorate the victims of the Holocaust and the experience that Holocaust denial becomes more and more common in some regions, we developed suggestions for educators on Holocaust memorial days. This document is distributed today in a proper version, actually, and I hope with enough copies for all of you, in close cooperation between the ODIHR and Yad Vashem.

Funded only by Germany so far, the ODIHR brought together experts from 12 countries at Yad Vashem for an expert forum. Those countries were Austria, Sweden, the Netherlands, Croatia, Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, United Kingdom, the Russian Federation, Ukraine, Germany, and Israel.

The document that came out of this cooperation has been circulated to you today for your information. These suggestions have been launched by the OSCE's Chair in Office, the Belgian Minister of Foreign Affairs during the celebration on January 27 in Brussels. The ODIHR provided an English and a Russian version. These versions are online. The Belgian Government developed French and Flemish translations, and in Italy, Croatia and Hungary, the ministries of education provided translation into their own languages and made the guidelines available on their Web sites. Just one week ago, the Polish Government called informing me that they are working on a translation that will also go online at the end of this month.

Our suggestions for educators highlight really amazing initiatives of schools, educators and communities on Holocaust memorial days from 12 countries so far. They are being very well received. On the ODIHR's and Yad Vashem's Web sites, there were 400 to 800 downloads of the document in each language each month.

If we will receive more funding for this project, we want this document eventually to be distributed in printed copies as well and it should come with a CD of good practices. It also would consist of a second part, "Why and How to Address Contemporary Anti-Semitism," according to our understanding that both fields are strongly connected, and that teachers are hesitant to address contemporary anti-Semitism if they do not find the guidance on how to do that. Both the CD and the second part are under development right now.

This practical tool will help educators that have not had the opportunity to attend teacher trainings and have not been involved in Holocaust education, to understand how many different activities could be undertaken by remembering those millions of men, women and children who perished during the Holocaust. I hope that these examples from our suggestions for educators will not only serve as an inspiration for activities on Holocaust memorial days, but also as an encouragement to start remembrance of the Holocaust where it is not commemorated so far. I am convinced that the remembrance of the victims of the Holocaust has an important influence on young people and what they learn from that experience will make a difference in today's world.

We hope that all our practical teaching tools will help to engage more governments to incorporate Holocaust education and educational tools to address contemporary forms of anti-Semitism, as well as other forms of discrimination, into their national curricula. We hope more governments will not only send us initiatives from their countries, but also translate the guidelines, and make them accessible to educators in their countries, and to fund the ODIHR's educational program. This will allow us to continue our work and

enable us to make the material that we developed so far available to educators all over the OSCE region.

My office is happy to cooperate with governments, and we are ready to give advice, share experience, and assist in the implementation of Holocaust remembrance activities and teaching activities that aim to combat anti-Semitism today.

Thank you very much.

Mr. SMITH. Dr. Meyer, thank you so very much. I would just like to begin questioning, if I could.

Dr. Meyer, in reading the book that has been prepared by your office, you mention a number of things, including some of the opinions of educators, including teachers unions, can be a detriment to the promotion of Holocaust education. One of the things that strikes me, I remember when we were looking at some of the French schools that were unwilling to take up the Holocaust, the teachers unions stuck out like a sore thumb among those who seemed unwilling to embrace it. Could you speak to those efforts to try to get officials? It all comes down to the teachers. If the teacher is unwilling or unable, or is antagonistic, or is a Holocaust-denier himself or herself, the outcome is certainly going to be a disaster.

On Holocaust-fatigue, that reminds me of compassion-fatigue that we often see on humanitarian efforts, you know, the truth hurts. It seems to me that to suggest as a defense for doing little or nothing, not you, but those who might use that, well, we have been there, we have talked about it, let's just move on. Well, the lesson of history needs to be learned, it seems to me, if it is not to be repeated.

And then the issue of the number of hours. I noted in your report that of those 23 states that did report on the number of hours spent, the average was 1 to 3 hours, which would seem to me, and I would appreciate your thoughts on it, to be wholly inadequate to explain a horrible, horrific phenomenon that claimed 6 million Jews.

And then we will go any questions our audience might have.

Ms. MEYER. Yes, thank you very much for your comments and your questions. You are exactly right. It all depends on the educator. It depends on the teachers themselves. We are an intergovernmental organization so we are in contact with the governments. We are in close cooperation with many governments, and we are supported by many governments. But when it gets to the concrete, those who we have to reach are the teachers.

That is why we focus on producing material that is easy to use, ready to use. They do not need to attend teacher training. They do not need even the agreement of the principals, usually, when using this stuff. It is a different story with anti-Semitism material, but the Holocaust remembrance guidelines is just a service, a source of inspiration for teachers.

We also work in close cooperation with those organizations that provide teacher training, that have teachers over to the Holocaust Memorial Museum, Yad Vashem, here in the United States definitely, other organizations involved in that. We share our material with them. That is one of the reasons why it is so important to us that this material is accessible.

When I say "accessible," I mean not only online. Teachers in the United States and France and Germany, they can easily download documents, but when it comes to Ukraine, Belarus, the Russian Federation, these people do not have access to the Internet. If we cannot provide printed copies of our material, hand it over to them, and they take to their

schools and they hand it to their students, we are just lost. They will not use it. They just cannot use it. We try to be as practical as possible in order to provide the teachers with assistance, and on the political level we address the general issues of the hesitation to teach about the Holocaust by the ministries of education.

Mr. SMITH. Just based on your country summaries, would you be willing to venture what countries you found to be the best and which ones you found to be the worst?

Ms. MEYER. I think it is difficult to say which countries are the best. I think some countries are doing an amazing job. One of the countries that is really, I think it is deeply impressive how much they achieved in very little time is, for example, Lithuania. Lithuania built tolerance centers everywhere. They do Holocaust education day. They send their teachers to teaching seminars. Croatia is one of those countries. Croatia was the only country that sent experts from the ministry to our expert teams to develop this teaching material on anti-Semitism. So they are strongly involved and will hold a conference on educational issues.

Just to highlight those as very good role models doesn't mean that other countries are not doing well. I mean countries such as the United States or Germany or France actually are already teaching about the Holocaust at a very high level. We talk about the average of hours dedicated to the Holocaust, they teach it quite extensively. So you can imagine that many other countries are below in hours because it is just an average number. So there are definitely many countries that do a very, very good job.

And some countries, if you look at a country-by-country overview, you will see for example a country such as Azerbaijan that has nothing going on in this field, but it is a success actually already to get 54 out of 55 OSCE states responding officially to us, and if we have an official response from the ministry of education from Azerbaijan to tell us unfortunately we do not have any Holocaust education in our schools, that enables us to contact the authorities and to ask them to help to implement. So even not having anything, I think this is a success, that they stated this very openly and honestly.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. Goldenberg, you mentioned Serbia as being enthusiastic about embracing. What other countries are next?

Mr. GOLDENBERG. We have interest from several countries. We have Georgia, which is sending us a letter shortly. There has been interest from Switzerland. We right now, you talked about the Halimi murder, but just weeks after that I was invited by the ambassador of France himself, from the OSCE, to visit Paris and to work with the ministry there, to see if we could enhance any of their training programs. So we are also working in Paris right now.

And just to note as well that the French police are very much a part of our international cadre. We have two lieutenant colonels who are with us who are just a tremendous asset. So those are the countries right now that are on the radar screen.

Mr. SMITH. Thank you.

Anybody else? Any questions?

QUESTIONER. I was actually curious about the extent to which the Holocaust education in the different OSCE countries may look at it within a historical context or if it isolates it? I just know from the research on Holocaust education that was done in the 1980s, the first research on Holocaust education, that that was one of the major problems with actually getting it to have any impact, at least U.S. research. I am just wondering to what extent what you have developed says about that?

I had another question, too, but I will let you answer that one first.

Ms. MEYER. In our evaluation, we looked at the basics. Having the background from the United States and me personally from Germany, I think we think Holocaust education already is on a pretty high level. We looked mainly at the question: Do they address the Holocaust at all? Is the Holocaust ever being mentioned in school? Is it explained to the students what took place? Do they get a very, very general overview of what happened? So going into the details, I was asked also yesterday during meetings whether we do schoolbook evaluation and go in-depth with our analysis. We are far, far away from being able to go too much into depth with what they actually do.

Our point is really to encourage that the Holocaust is mentioned at all, and that it is part of the official curriculum. So we want all the official curricula, that they incorporate Holocaust education, whether they do it in language classes, and if they will do it in sports. It doesn't matter to us as long as the students hear about it and have a first chance to learn about it. Because our experience on this subject, and this is what we have heard from many educators, once the topic is introduced, the students gain interest in it. They want to know more. They want to have projects. That is why also the guidelines are focused on research projects, local research students can do on the Jewish community in their region before the Holocaust, and what was being developed after the Holocaust, stuff like that.

So I appreciate your question. It is just that you are on a level that the average of the OSCE countries just cannot meet at all.

QUESTIONER. The second question was kind of for both of you. You had mentioned, Mr. Goldenberg, the possibility of working in Serbia. In the Balkan region right now, there are a lot of problems with just tolerance in general towards the different religious and ethnic communities. I am wondering to what extent the ODIHR might be expanding education on religious tolerance per se into that region and in general to the whole region, if that is maybe the next step after the anti-Semitism-Holocaust unit.

Mr. GOLDENBERG. One of the things that the ODIHR is doing right now, and I think that is very effective, is they are engaged in capacity-building between NGOs and law enforcement, which is extremely important. There are NGOs that have really had absolutely no contact with police ever, or they have tried and they have not been successful. Unlike here in the United States where for years police have been engaged with the NGOs.

When I headed up a statewide policing agency, my main focal points were working and engaging with the minority communities and NGOs. So that is good news because really the police now are really being compelled to work closer with the minority communities, the religious communities. Also, we are finding that we now have diversity officers that are being trained. Serbia is creating diversity officers. In almost every province or region within Serbia, I could tell you probably within about three months there will be diversity officers.

Kent Police in the UK have done a terrific job and they are working with us now at the ODIHR and at the OSCE. We are collaborating with them, we are working with their agencies. These officers are receiving education in sensitivities to dealing with different religious faiths and backgrounds.

So I can speak only as far as the law enforcement training. I really can't address the Holocaust side.

Ms. MEYER. As I mentioned briefly, my colleague who is working on anti-racist topics, she develops an evaluation on general tolerance education that is being undertaken in the region. My other colleague, Thomas Kampf, who is our adviser on freedom of religion, I believe, is currently developing an educational program on the topic or issue, if you will, of religious freedom and the freedom of religion and belief. And we have a close, close eye on what is going on in Serbia at this point, especially with the law that just came out.

So there are things under development. It is important to keep in mind that my program started functioning, to officially work, only one year ago, so it is a pretty new program and most of the staff started much later. So we are just in the beginning of starting our activities in this field, but it is being undertaken.

QUESTIONER. Thank you very much, Congressman Smith, Dr. Goldenberg, and Dr. Meyer.

I am aware of your effort. It is a significant effort, and in that respect I would like to know, what do you actually consider to be your most significant obstacle in terms of both expert and political levels in what you are doing? And how do you believe you should be supported by the 55 participating States most? Where is it that you need to be helped and what is the most difficult obstacle that you have?

Thank you.

Mr. GOLDENBERG. The ODIHR, the OSCE, working very closely with many NGOs and many, many governments, we have really put together a remarkable group, an international group representing states across Europe, of experts, practitioners, people that have taken it from theory and are now practitioners.

Unfortunately, when we talk about support, and there isn't anyone in this building that hasn't heard the same thing, it comes down to financial support. We need financial support. One of the statements that I made, and I was very clear in what I was saying, although I tiptoed around it, that we spend hundreds of millions of dollars, and again rightfully so, on things that help us enforce the law. Well, we really need to work on education that helps us prevent us to getting to that point.

Again, I go back to that same word, and that is what brings Dr. Meyer and I together, is education. She is talking about educating our young and our old to help them really re-think what hatred and bigotry do, and we are talking about educating the first responder in any government. If it is Bulgaria or the United States, the common denominators between our law enforcement communities are very, very, very similar.

For the most part, they want to uphold the law and do the right thing by their communities. The populations see the police as the first line of defense from their government. So I guess what I am saying is we really need to spend some time thinking about how we can support efforts that impact our police and impact our educational systems. So it is financial.

Ms. MEYER. I would add that it definitely is financial. Just to give you an impression, the guidelines for educators, how to commemorate Holocaust memorial days, including the second part on how and why to address contemporary anti-Semitism, I had 10,000 euros for that. So I developed with 10,000 euros these guidelines, in I don't know how many languages, and for educators. And now I don't have the money to produce copies. So we are not even talking big money here.

The money issue is related to the political support. I mentioned Croatia. Croatia did not put any money into this project, and some countries just can't put money into these

projects. But what they can do, and what some countries do, is they send experts for 1 or 2 days to these meetings, and they have put this stuff on their Web site. They step up and they get up in meetings and say, we implement this in our country.

So if another country pays for the Croatian version or the Lithuanian version, they do that, and they are a good role model with that. So it is not only the financial question. It is also the question of the political willingness and to be outspoken to implement the commitment, and not just to have the commitment on the paper and then we have to be the watch dog and we are the bad guys who have to name and shame and give a list of the five worst countries. That is not what we want to do.

So if we have countries, national delegations, institutions that just get up and say this is good material, this is a good program we want to implement, usually then the financial part will follow. So it goes hand in hand. It is a political willingness to implement and to make that public. Those countries who do that should make it public and should get up and say this is good, and we do that.

QUESTIONER. One issue we have discussed in the past is the use of the Internet and the role of the Internet. I believe we have had some special conferences on that. Could you talk about some of the challenges you have in terms of the Internet in combating anti-Semitic racism and xenophobia? And also, are there any best practices or any positive uses you have seen in countries, again because of the negative impact we are seeing of the Internet in spreading this material? And anything you could share with the panel?

Thank you.

Ms. MEYER. Paul Goldenberg mentioned our civil society capacity unit. These colleagues of mine reach out to the civil society and within the civil society in several countries we have NGOs monitoring the Internet, writing reports, addressing this on the international and national levels constantly. What we did is we put a training together for NGOs from countries that do not do such monitoring. We trained them on how to monitor the Internet, how to report it, to whom to report to.

So what we do not only in the field of the Internet, but also in general, we support increased capacity of NGOs to monitor any form of hate crime wherever it occurs or hate speech on the Internet. We will go online in July with our databases. One is with reports. It is kind of an online library with tons of material from intergovernmental organizations, everything all the different participating States put out there, and a special search engine that allows you to search the NGO Web sites through our Web site on specific topics in all different languages. That is one thing.

The other database is a good practice database, a practical initiative database. In this database, we highlight those initiatives being undertaken whether it is by NGOs or by other organizations, that do monitoring searches, and whoever searches this can make contact, can look at what they are doing. So we try to do this through our augmented disseminated good practices.

Mr. GOLDENBERG. I would like to add just one thing, a personal statement, that I think is something probably more threatening than the Internet, is the hate music. I am baffled at how little we know about the impact of this music. Now, of course in the United States, there is the First Amendment, and rightfully so, but in many countries across Europe we have this music being distributed to young people, disenfranchised, disengaged young people. The message of that music is absolutely unbelievable.

If anyone really takes a close look, it is not just music. This is not music-bashing. Believe me when I tell you, 13 years ago when I was in charge of the hate crimes unit, I had the privilege of working with the German Government. We actually assisted with closing down Rock-a-rama Records. If anybody wants to Google Rock-a-rama Records, when they raided it in Brule (ph), West Germany, they not only got out CDs, but they took out weapons and machine guns and all kinds of firearms.

The organized hate industry has really captured this medium. It is amazing. It is amazing on how the message spreads. You remember when the wall came down in Germany, people could not understand how quickly the young on the West were communicating with the young on the East, way before anybody else was. It wasn't just Germany. It was Poland. And I can go on and on and on.

So the music is really something that we focus on not only from a standpoint of using parts or lyrics that wind up as part of a criminal crime scene. I can share dozens and dozens of incidences not only here in the United States from 15 or 20 years ago, but now, where the lyrics wind up as parts of crime scenes. So anybody that says this is just a bunch of young hooligans, I don't think so. I think we have some savvy people out there that have turned it into a multi-million dollar industry that are taking that money and really going into the stream and buying firearms as well.

So I just wanted to mention that. Thank you.

Mr. SMITH. Just a very brief question. Dr. Meyer, the guidelines for the anti-Semitism education, when can we expect those? And will this book be updated periodically, especially the country summaries, so we get an ongoing look at how well or poorly each country is doing?

Ms. MEYER. We didn't plan an update. It just came out a week ago, so yes, we will have to update it at one point. If more countries establish programs, we have to mention that, of course. The guidelines on Holocaust memorial days are already online, so they are online available. Just the second part that deals with how and why we address contemporary anti-Semitism will be added at one point. Particular material on anti-Semitism, that will come in seven different countries, and will be ready to use for the next school year. So we will present this at the OSCE conference on educational questions in Croatia in the fall. We hope that more countries than the first seven will step up for country adaptations, and this will be ready and on the Internet in the late summer.

QUESTIONER. For 8 years, I ran the Speakers Bureau at the Holocaust Museum, and for the last 2 years I have been detailed to another Federal agency. I have attended literally hundreds of Holocaust memorial presentations in schools and to teachers' workshops and to the police, to Indian reservations out in Utah, and in front of the military.

One thing I hope is included in this, and I am sure it is, is the emphasis on including Holocaust survivors' first-hand testimony when possible, for as long as possible. I think my friends at the Holocaust Museum would probably say that when the questionnaires about the effectiveness of the program or what is the most important highlight, almost universally it is what the Holocaust survivors said. I have seen several Holocaust survivors literally turn around anti-Semitism initiatives at a school, confronting people.

I really don't have a question, other than I feel obligated, because they are not here, to raise that aspect. Thank you.

Ms. MEYER. I appreciate your comment very much. I think you are absolutely right. The opportunity for students to meet Holocaust survivors is unique and that really

changes most students' lives, definitely. If I would say why I am ending up in this job, whenever I meet Holocaust survivors, this is when I feel, not only know, but I feel why I do this job and why I am in this field. So this is something that is important to us.

We are just currently thinking about putting special emphasis on those educational activities that do not only have Holocaust survivors speaking to students or with students, but also those initiatives that have been undertaken lately to preserve their testimonies. There are initiatives in schools where each student takes over or adopts one story of one survivor to make it his family's testimony and to bear witness over generations and generations. I mean, everything that is related to the testimonies and to the experience of the survivors is really important, and we try to put emphasis on that as much as possible.

Thank you.

QUESTIONER. For Mr. Goldenberg, obviously a natural development from your work with law enforcement is transmitting the valuable information that they can collect in terms of the occurrence of incidents of an anti-Semitic or other nature. I wonder how that factor enters into your work or cooperation with participating States that have voluntarily come forward to participate in the program?

The reason why I ask that is I remember looking at some data a few years ago from a very large participating State of the OSCE where they, according to their information, claimed that there were only something ludicrous like three incidents in their very, very expansive country. So I wondered how much your work with them also involves accurate collection of data, as well as the dissemination, hopefully transparent dissemination of that information?

And then I had one quick question for Dr. Meyer. Obviously your work is focused on OSCE-participating States, but there has been a traditional linkage between OSCE and the littoral Mediterranean countries and now partners in the Asian region as well. One of the things that we find is that a very troubling development is that some of those countries through state television actually are active dissemination of anti-Semitic propaganda and other forms of hatred.

So I wondered if some thought has been given to expanding your work beyond the participating States, but also capturing, if you will, cooperation from those Mediterranean and other partner countries that might be very key, as many of them have large populations of their compatriots who are now living in the European part of the OSCE.

Mr. GOLDENBERG. To answer the question, and I am hoping I am going to get this right, but basically right now many of the OSCE states do not collect any data on hate crimes. It is really hit or miss. What our program has in fact done is we have developed a model hate crime definition that has been pretty widely accepted by many of the states out there. This definition is now put forth as a model definition, not only for the investigation of hate crimes, but also as a model for legislation to take a look at and say, here we go, this sounds pretty good, we don't have to reinvent the wheel.

Of course, each nation has its own culture. Each state has its own culture, but this is a pretty high-level definition that can really be tweaked to meet the needs of the respective state.

We also developed a model hate crime data collection format. We actually worked with someone. Who is it, Mike Lieberman? You asked me about a member of our team, Dr. James Nolan, who is the former chief of the FBI unit that responsible for developing

these forms, working way back when in the days with the Anti-Defamation League. I am going back 18, maybe 20 years, that we worked together on that, 20 years, on the data collection form.

So we have put together a real good group. Now, we have the form and it is a model, and we have put it out there. However, there are many challenges state-to-state because the collection of data, how data is collected. The confidentiality issues are an unbelievable challenge state by state. Where you may collect data on something in one country, you cannot collect it in another. So we have really had to go state-specific on that, but OSCE ODIHR is working very aggressively with these countries to give them advice and counsel on how to do just that. So it is not a quick fix, but we have some really good models out there, and some of the countries are most interested.

I will tell you, Ukraine told us that they would in fact use the process. Again, whether it comes to fruition or not, I am not questioning whether Ukraine will or won't, but that is how interested they were. They looked at it and said this looks good, and we will in fact go ahead and do it. So that is one example where if you put it out there and if it meets the need of the state, it may have a good shot.

Ms. MEYER. Thank you for mentioning the partner states. You are absolutely right. It is important to get more involved and to get more of them involved. But with the partner states, it is the same as it is with the participating States, even more difficult. If there is no support from their side or interest on their side, it is difficult for us. It is not up to us to go to them and say, OK, I mean, we invite them to meetings. We try to incorporate institutions from these states into our expert meetings, NGO meetings. We definitely always try to have them with us at the table. If there is interest, we are more than happy to deal with that.

I think when it comes to the tensions between different forms of discrimination, which is sometimes an issue and has been an issue lately, this is one of the situations when everybody says, well, let's also talk to the partner states. So we try to do that, we definitely try to do that, and we are aware about the trends ongoing in some of those countries and the influence it has on the OSCE participating States, not only the partner states. But it is a sensitive question because it is not up to us to tell them what to do. But if they want to cooperate with us, we are more than happy to do that, and definitely we aim to do so.

Mr. SMITH. I want to thank our first panel so much for your testimony and for providing us some additional insights that the Commission and those who are concerned here can carry forth from here. I look forward to reading the book. Thank you for presenting us with copies of it today.

Ms. MEYER. Thank you.

Mr. SMITH. I would like to now ask our second panel if they wouldn't mind coming to the table. We have Rabbi Andrew Baker, Stacy Burdett, and Liebe Geft.

Rabbi Baker, if you could begin?

Rabbi BAKER. Sure.

At the outset, Congressman, I really want to thank you personally. I am struck by the fact we are here talking about how the OSCE can address the problem of anti-Semitism, and only a few years ago what that meant was can we insert the word "anti-Semitism" in some document. We took a certain sense of achievement if that had happened.

So there is no question, looking back now on these last few years, that there has been a remarkable set of achievements in getting the OSCE to address this issue and to address it seriously and substantively. I think that we know full well that that effort really began here. It began with your work, the work of the Commission, the staff of the Commission, to in the first instance get the U.S. Government to press in this complicated 55-member consensus organization, really to do something tangible.

So when we look back, we have seen the first conference on anti-Semitism in Vienna in 2003, followed by the conference in Berlin a year later, and the Berlin Declaration, which really was an expression of specific commitments that governments would undertake and that the OSCE itself would undertake in addressing the problem of anti-Semitism.

We heard in this first panel the work of Dr. Kathrin Meyer in the area now that there is a unit established for the issues of tolerance and nondiscrimination, and tangible programs in the area of combating anti-Semitism, collecting data and the like. I think those of us, too, who were at Berlin, and at Vienna in fact, remember Mayor Rudy Giuliani talking about the importance of collecting data, of using that information in training and securing a police involvement in this. We heard from Paul Goldenberg in terms of what this work now is as part of the official program of the OSCE and of ODIHR.

When one considers the frayed relationship between the United States and many of our allies in Europe, sometimes we look back and what was viewed as a kind of American intrusion in pressing our European allies to deal with these issues, I think we can look at this particular program with a certain sense of pride and achievement. It is something that the European governments want from us. It is really a contribution, the American experience in dealing with hate crimes, in training police to deal with them, that they now these days welcome.

The OSCE also appointed a special representative, a personal representative of the chair, specifically with a focus on the issue of combating anti-Semitism. Again, another initiative that really began here, and that has succeeded. The idea of the personal representative is to be able to hold up governments to account, to prod those that need some prodding, and also I think to see that the work inside the OSCE goes as expected.

These achievements we recognize now looking back are things to which we should take a certain extent, a certain degree of pride in accomplishment. We can remember when we spoke to European leaders about the problem of anti-Semitism, often it was not seen, it was not recognized, we were told. The EUMC, which is the official body of the European Union to conduct data collection and monitoring, when it issued its own report on anti-Semitism in Europe, the then-15 countries of the EU, admitted that over half of them had no definition for anti-Semitism. Those that did, no two countries had the same definition.

And so there was a circular pattern. If you didn't define it, the monitors didn't record it. If it wasn't recorded, it didn't occur. And if you spoke to these leaders, there wasn't a problem. So these days in a way I think have passed. We really have seen significant developments.

I think right now we are in really critical point, a point where we may be in danger of losing these gains. We have heard already that if this police training program is going to continue, it needs support. It needs financial support. Perhaps Paul Goldenberg himself would not say it, but other countries have seconded professionals to work in this area.

Perhaps this is now a possibility for the United States to help undergird the support and the work of Paul himself. I think that is something that we need to consider and certainly take the lead as we prod other countries to contribute funds necessary to support the police training program.

I think we have seen as well that there is a historical memory of the battles in the political arena. We see changes in our own State Department. So as people come in with responsibility for the OSCE, they are not really familiar with what has gone on. In fact, that is all the more reason why there is a special appreciation for this Commission and for its staff, who have been in the trenches for so long in dealing with this issue.

So we need to see that this kind of commitment, that the political pressure on the OSCE continues, to recognize, too, that ODIHR had its own set of commitments placed upon it at that Berlin conference and through that Berlin Declaration, to collect data and also to try, we hope, to analyze and report as to what that data means, where things are going.

The U.S. Government at the OSCE ministerial meeting in Ljubljana in December last year endorsed the holding of another high-level conference on this issue that would ideally it was proposed by hosted by Romania in 2007. I think we need to work to see that the Permanent Council of the OSCE adopts this in a formal way, so work on that conference can begin. It also spoke about holding several expert-level implementation meetings. I think here, too, we need to see these meetings are still in planning stages, but that the area of anti-Semitism represents a significant component of them.

We do know that the personal representative, Gert Weisskirchen, wants to convene in Berlin in November an expert meeting with those involved specifically in the area of anti-Semitism. The Berlin government, the German foreign ministry intends to provide logistical support in this. I think we need to be present to assist in ways we can. I think within the OSCE, as you well know, Germany has been a great ally, the French ambassador is another, in supporting these efforts and marshaling it through that 55-nation consensus process.

In closing, I would say that perhaps those who thought, and many of us as well, that we would not see a re-emergence of the problem of anti-Semitism in the 21st century. It would be, we had hoped, more an issue of historical interest and concern than one of the present day. Sadly, that has not proven to be the case, and I think we have seen as well that it was not simply a brief chapter, but that this re-emergence of anti-Semitism as a problem here in the 21st century is going to be with us for a long time.

So therefore I think we need to ensure that efforts that have been undertaken within the OSCE are not viewed as themselves a passing chapter, while the governments look to other issues and other places. We need now, really, to consolidate those commitments, to put down roots within the instruments of the OSCE so that this struggle can continue. I know those of us who have been working on it in Jewish organizations and other NGOs really salute you for what you have done and what you do here today in fact in making sure that this issue stays front and center.

Thank you.

Mr. SMITH. Thank you very much, Rabbi Baker. And thank you for your leadership. I remember doing one critical moment after another, one week after another. When text was being negotiated, I remember the conversation we had at the Holocaust Museum about what language should be in the Berlin Declaration. You provided an amazing

amount of insight and suggestions that were very well accepted by our side. So I want to thank you for that leadership. It was extraordinary.

Rabbi BAKER. Thanks so much.

Mr. SMITH. Ms. Burdett?

Ms. BURDETT. Thank you. I want to echo the thanks of everyone here who has noted the work of the Helsinki Commission, not just in having briefings like this and for all your work on the issue, but really in being the institutional memory of this movement that has really originated in Congress. So thanks very much.

You noted in your opening comments that in the number of anti-Semitic incidents, we did see a decline in incidents, a small 3 percent decline, and that has been the case in a lot of countries in places like the UK, Canada, and France. There has been a decline in incidents, but the common denominator is that in all of those countries and many others, the year 2004 was really a record high in terms of incidents.

So any decline is always encouraging, but the reflexes, the trends that are so worrisome are really still there. You mentioned Russia, where hate crimes in general are really reaching an epidemic proportion. It is a place of concern. Congress has been focused also on problems in Ukraine, where there is a university that is espousing virulent anti-Semitism. The government is making positive statements, but we haven't really seen follow-up on those statements.

There was an example of what we have seen in some other places. In January, the Swedish chancellor of justice stopped an investigation into Stockholm's Grand Mosque, where tapes of anti-Semitic sermons were on film. He acknowledged that the sermons were calling Jews brothers of apes and pigs, and urging wannabe jihadis to kill them. But he chose not to use Sweden's anti-incitement law because he said the calls, those sermons should be judged differently and be considered allowed because they are used by one side in a continuing profound conflict, where battle cries and invective are part of everyday occurrences in the rhetoric that surrounds the Middle East conflicts. So the reflex, the things that bothered us even two or three years ago, those trends are still active. So the need to sustain the kind of political momentum that Rabbi Baker talked about is very urgent.

I want to move on and talk a little bit about some programmatic responses in the focus of today's briefing. One of the strengths of the ministerial decisions in OSCE and the declarations and the conferences has been they have always highlighted that the primary responsibility for implementing commitments for addressing acts of intolerance rests with participating States, and focusing on areas like education and law enforcement.

Putting those commitments into action has been a challenge, and certainly the ODIHR surveys and work of NGOs has shown a pretty startling lack of implementation. But again, the strength of these programs has been, and hearings and briefings like this, has been the ability to showcase the kinds of initiatives that are available to governments. What is lacking, not just funding, is really political will. States really have at their disposal, and it will be evident when ODIHR has their database of best practices in the region, they really have at their disposal some impressive resources and some excellent programs, a couple of which were talked about during the first panel.

I want to talk about just a few initiatives, just to show the range of resources that are out there, not just for my own organization, but there are other fabulous resources out there. The U.S. Government has the models that members of the Helsinki Commis-

sion, Members of Congress, people in the U.S. delegations to these meetings have really put forward through programs like Paul Goldenberg's. He talked about the model hate crime definition. The FBI has circulated excellent training materials on how to identify and report and respond to hate crimes. The Department of Education's Office of Civil Rights published, in association with the National Association of Attorneys General, an excellent program for schools. It is a guide called "Protecting Students from Harassment and Hate Crimes."

And even without an excellent hate crimes law and a model definition, states can train law enforcement, issue guidelines, and help officers respond to hate crimes. There are a number of good resources, and when you go to the Helsinki Commission Web site and look at these statements, you will see links to some of the resources put out by groups like the International Association of Chiefs of Police, the Organization for Chinese Americans, and others.

Our own ADL law enforcement training has a couple of different focuses and target audiences. We do a hate crimes training program like the one you heard about earlier. We also do anti-bias training. For example, in Austria, ADL works with a team of about 50 civilian and law enforcement trainers to conduct training for every professional and new recruit in the country. In only a few years, we have reached about 10 percent of the law enforcement force with this program. So you can really have an impact.

Another kind of program that could be replicated, the Anti-Defamation League has a Web site for law enforcement. It is called the "Law Enforcement Agency Resource Network," and there are all kinds of tools there that law enforcement can use, a hate symbols database. Imagine a police officer arriving at the scene of a hate crime and seeing a marking or a tattoo, and imagine a police officer who can connect that symbol to an ideology, to a conspiracy theory, to a hate movement. So the value of these programs is really impossible to measure in how it can impact on individual crimes and individual victims.

Because the role of law enforcement is so unique in their place in the community, their own ability to have good cross-cultural understanding and skills is very important. So a similar anti-bias training program to the one we use in schools we also do for law enforcement. One area that is becoming very important is the area of extremism training. I mentioned the hate symbols database. We conduct an advanced training school to help police officers learn more about extremist groups; things like hate group recruitment in Web chat rooms, and in prisons and other areas.

In schools, I will just mention one new innovation. I know Congressman Smith has talked in the past about ADL's education programs, our "World of Difference" anti-bias training programs for teachers. We have just previewed an online training institute so that that program can now reach anyone with a computer capability and not just someone who is able to be part of a school that has a training program. So that is a very exciting development.

I think one thing that you will find when you read the ODIHR study online and look at its recommendations, and something we found in our own experience, is that changing political atmosphere, changing dynamics, really forced teachers to refine their tools for different situations. I know we have talked a great deal in these kinds of fora about how the Middle East conflict has crept into the classroom. Our programs for teachers provide tools, but the content is something that is updated. After 9-11, in this country when issues of anti-Muslim bias and bias against people who look Middle Eastern was a big problem, we were able to take the tools that we had and put changing content in them.

You heard also before that there is such a lack of Holocaust education, but we really need almost a new generation of Holocaust education tools. We have developed some of those, and again they would be very adaptable. We had a new curriculum called “Echoes and Reflections” that uses videos of survivor testimony. One member of the audience mentioned how that is important to try to capture on DVD the survivor testimony so students can have a more personal connection to their lessons.

The Holocaust is also a good tool to use for law enforcement. Working together with the Holocaust Museum, our program called “Law Enforcement and Society” uses the Holocaust to help law enforcement explore their own role as protectors of individual rights, and to really ask tough questions about faith in law enforcement, the questions that faced them 60 years ago and questions that still face them today. That is the kind of program that is linked to a site, the Holocaust Museum, and in so many places in the OSCE region there are Holocaust memorial sites that could be used in this way.

I just want to say that we talk about issues of funding, but so many of these programs are available at minimal cost and sometimes for free. You can look all through the region at wonderful NGOs that are doing programs that don’t require significant funding. I think all we really need to do is sustain the political momentum to get ministries to open their doors and let the experts they have at their disposal come in and help them.

So we look forward to working with members of the Commission to keep that momentum going, and let the good experts you heard from today come in and do their jobs.

Thank you.

Mr. SMITH. Stacy, thank you so very much.

Now, I would like to ask Liebe Geft?

Ms. GEFT. Thank you very much. Good afternoon, Mr. Chairman, members of the Commission, and ladies and gentlemen. I, too, would like to echo the sentiments of my colleagues here in expressing thanks for this platform and the essential opportunity to bring together the areas of expertise and resources to address this question. I am certainly very appreciative of the invitation to participate this afternoon.

My report, I believe, will reinforce many of the compelling and critical issues that have been addressed by previous panelists, and perhaps add some additional resources. As an accredited NGO at the UN, UNESCO, the OSCE, the Council of Europe, the Simon Wiesenthal Center is vitally concerned with the challenges of Holocaust education and police training in the context of globally resurgent anti-Semitism.

Last year when American officials joined European leaders at Auschwitz-Birkenau to bow their heads in tribute to Hitler’s victims at the 60th anniversary commemorations of the end of World War II, their concern extended to the growing threat to democratic societies posed by today’s hate movements, including those that target Jewish individuals and institutions from one end of the continent to the other.

For Simon Wiesenthal, the namesake of our organization who died last September at the age of 96, the past was always portent, if not prelude. He was gravely concerned with the current rise of ferocious anti-Semitism in Europe and warned again and again that the most important abettor of future injustices and hate-motivated criminality is the silence of the apathetic and the intimidated majority.

Last June, the founder and dean of the Simon Wiesenthal Center, Rabbi Marvin Hier, was one of the U.S. delegates to the Cordoba Conference on Anti-Semitism and other

Forms of Intolerance. There, Rabbi Hier called for members states of the OSCE to establish museums, resource centers, educational centers as focal points of education that can also support law enforcement professional development and best practices. We are deeply committed to the efforts of the OSCE and eager to share our experience and knowledge in this area. Indeed, we have already begun to do so, both in the training of delegates from numerous European countries, and by working with OSCE-ODIHR to map out future areas of cooperation, including sharing the resources and expertise.

My colleague, Mark Weitzman, the director of the Wiesenthal Center's Task Force Against Hate, sits on ODIHR's advisory panel of experts on freedom of religion or belief, and has been a member of the U.S. delegation to the International Task Force, the ITF, since its earliest stages. The Wiesenthal Center commends the energetic leadership of Ambassador Christian Strohal and particularly the efforts of Dr. Kathrin Meyer and Paul Goldenberg, whose earlier testimony reflects their commitment and achievements, often under difficult circumstances.

We are also pleased to take this opportunity to recognize the efforts of the International Task Force on Holocaust Education, Remembrance and Research, ITF, now comprising 24 member countries. This unique enterprise brings together government and NGO participants in a cooperative effort to encourage Holocaust education, including open access to World War II archives. It has become one of the most important initiatives in Holocaust education today.

The commitment of democratic governments to the cause of Holocaust education underscores its importance. Here we would especially like to acknowledge the support of the State Department, particularly the Office of Holocaust Issues headed by Ambassador Edward O'Donnell and his staff, who have tirelessly pursued every opportunity to strengthen and support these efforts.

It must also be said, however, that important areas still need to be strengthened. Membership in the ITF must be viewed as a beginning, not an end, and a commitment to further intensify ongoing efforts. Anything short of that will only strengthen those who actively try to destroy Holocaust education, whether they come from the ranks of Islamist extremists or from the corps of extreme right-wing nationalists.

We are particularly concerned with how justifiable complaints over anti-Arab and anti-Muslim prejudice have been perverted and exploited to undermine support for educating new generations about Hitler's crimes. We believe that teaching about prejudice and punishing hate crimes are not zero-sum activities that benefit some minorities at the expense of others. Instead, our basic assumption is that learning about Europe's historic persecution, culminating in the Holocaust of its archetypal minority, the Jews, can educate other minorities, including today's Muslim immigrant communities in Europe, about the dynamics of prejudice and discrimination against which they seek to empower themselves.

The Simon Wiesenthal Center's new documentary film entitled, ironically, "Ever Again," warns about extremists exploiting current European turmoil, particularly in Europe's growing Muslim community, that is experiencing a veritable war for hearts and minds between the moderates and the hate merchants who unfortunately have the largest megaphones.

To make matters worse, and this has already been raised, their pernicious influence is projected into cyberspace by a metastasizing network of thousands of Holocaust-denying

Web sites and chat rooms. The challenge of the Internet is a special focus of the Simon Wiesenthal Center Task Force Against Hate Initiatives, that has just released its eighth annual CD-ROM on digital terrorism and hate. I have a handful here, which I am happy to distribute. They are available, translated this time in several different languages, and cover the gamut of hate on the Internet, including the spread of hate music which Paul Goldenberg addressed very powerfully earlier.

Anti-Semitism is the primary manifestation of the hater's diabolical purpose and must continue to be tracked with specific focus, not lost in an amorphous holistic category with all forms of intolerance, as some OSCE members have suggested. The monitoring of hate is the responsibility of both government and law enforcement.

The Simon Wiesenthal Center has extensive experience in law enforcement training through its educational arm, the Museum of Tolerance. The museum's Tools for Tolerance for law enforcement and criminal justice programs have served well over 75,000 U.S. officers and law enforcement personnel since the inception of the program in 1996, constituting perhaps the largest training program of its kind in the Nation. The success and recognition of this program prompted the creation of the New York Tolerance Center in Manhattan, thereby creating bicoastal, powerful learning environments for these innovative programs to bridge personal, local and global issues, and to challenge participants to redefine their professional roles in an increasingly complex and changing world.

The Tools for Tolerance law enforcement program now offers 10 distinct courses, broadening its reach in New York to the National Guard, corrections and many others. This expands a national audience already established through the National Institute Against Hate Crimes and Terrorism, an intense 4-day program that has thus far brought together multi-disciplinary teams from law enforcement and criminal justice from 199 jurisdictions in 37 States across the United States, to focus on critically analyzing the unique elements that differentiate hate crimes and terrorist threats from other acts of violence, and provide a structure for the creation of effective strategies for prevention and intervention.

I would mention but one other program, and that is that Tools for Tolerance is the official trainer in California, the trainer of trainers for the controversial topic of racial profiling. Our staff and faculty also train trainers around the country. More than 12,000 officers have completed a one-day core program called Perspectives on Profiling, which utilizes this cutting-edge training tool, a unique interactive device that allows officers to confront a number of conflicts issues surrounding the debate on racial profiling. This is available to all agencies.

Tools for Tolerance has welcomed and customized training programs for delegations from numerous countries. The German military has been visiting the Museum of Tolerance since 1999. We hold a special program, Crimes of Racism and Hate, sharing experiences, sharing knowledge at the Museum of Tolerance. In March of 2003—with the French national police—and they have given us great feedback as a result of that conference. Last year, we welcomed 16 heads of police and anti-terrorism from Stavropol, Russia, as part of the Climate of Trust program. We look forward to more this year.

Recently, delegations from Manchester, England have met with us to explore the possibility of promoting these programs to Europe and the UK under their auspices. This month, we have a number of command staff programs and law enforcement delegations visiting us from Canada. And the New York Tolerance Center is also reaching an international community through the United Nations, which is our neighbor in Manhattan,

and hosts visitors from the U.S. Department of State, including most recently a delegation of Muslim imams and Russian Orthodox priests from the Urals.

In the experience of the Simon Wiesenthal Center, Holocaust education, rather than being discarded or marginalized, can and must be integrated into the corps of necessary new educational paradigms. We welcome the opportunity to continue to work together with European law enforcement, lawmakers, and educators, to ensure that Holocaust education continues to contribute to the field and to the future of human rights.

The ultimate positive goal of Holocaust education should be for all nations of Europe and the world to embrace the 1998 declaration of the Stockholm International Forum of the Holocaust, and join the Task Force of International Cooperation on Holocaust Education, Remembrance and Research. Prevention trumps punishment, and Holocaust education is a preventive to 21st century evils that we cannot afford to forego.

Mr. SMITH. Thank you so much for that testimony and for your many years of great service. When we had our hearing several years ago, 5 years ago, I remember that the Wiesenthal Center was one of those that provided us with very useful insights. We took the information and worked at our own State Department, first, our own Parliamentary Assembly, what we called side presentations at our PA in Vienna and in Berlin. We had one here in the United States, and then of course, as we all know, at Vienna and Berlin and then Cordoba that followed it. So thank you again.

Let me just ask a couple of questions, and then go to anybody who would like to ask a question. Last year, Senator Voinovich and I, I was the House sponsor and Senator Voinovich the Senate sponsor and Tom Lantos was our principal cosponsor, drafted legislation that was signed into law by President Bush called the "Global Anti-Semitism Review Act." That legislation established an office, and Ambassador O'Donnell, who was mentioned earlier, heads it. A report was issued and I was wondering if you thought that report was adequate. Rabbi Baker, you might want to speak to that.

As part of the Annual Report on International Religious Freedom and the Country Reports on Human Rights Practices, we standardized and asked for enhanced focus on the anti-Semitism and related incidents in countries around the world, not just the OSCE, although that is important, but other countries like Argentina, Malaysia, and elsewhere, all were to be looked at. I wondered if you have had a chance to look at the reporting, and what your sense is as to the accuracy; whether or not we got it right; and whether or not we need to go back to State and say, you need to do more.

Rabbi BAKER. By the way, the act also called for the appointment of a special envoy in the State Department and that position is still vacant. I think that is a troubling situation. I think the report that was issued, and it was issued with a deadline and sort of limited staff, was successful for two reasons. One is it did as good a job as one could under the circumstances in collecting information on the problem in as many countries as possible, drawing on resources through our embassies, through the NGO network and so on. But what was I think remarkable about it, and important to recognize, is because it was issued by the U.S. Government, it received attention that that same information coming out of an NGO, say, coming from maybe an office in the Israeli government or perhaps an intergovernmental body in Europe, simply didn't have. It brought the attention. I think a number of us know of quite specific situations where the U.S. Ambassador was called in by respective foreign ministers or others, trying to respond to this, maybe asking more about it. But clearly, it got attention.

I would hope that recognizing that, we can say that this should not be a one-time event. I think that we now know that our embassies have officers that are tasked with the job of following human rights issues and questions of religious freedom. Anti-Semitism is recognized too as part of that. But when it comes in the form of a very large document that finds its way, a paragraph here or a paragraph there, I think the issue is not so much is this accurate, but does it have the kind of impact that that stand-alone report had. I don't think it does. So consider perhaps doing this again.

Mr. SMITH. So it is diluted?

Rabbi BAKER. Yes.

Mr. SMITH. Thank you.

Stacy?

Ms. BURDETT. I would just add, the most important thing about that report was the executive summary that really set out markers for what constitutes anti-Semitism. It said in the introduction that it is not a definition, but it certainly laid down some markers. If it does nothing else than help human rights officers in U.S. Embassies know what they are looking for, even in the context of the country reports on human rights and religious freedoms, it will have moved the ball forward.

Mr. SMITH. Rabbi Baker, you mentioned an anonymous statement in your testimony that right now, at this very moment, we are in danger of losing these gains. I think what we use this briefing to redouble our efforts as a Commission, especially with the Romanian conference in the offing and those special conferences. I think we have a good road map here that is the beginning, and I hope it will become periodic, if not annual. I think countries, just like individuals, need to be held to task on a very, very ongoing basis, or else we all fall off. And we don't want to get that fatigue that was talked about earlier, whether it be Holocaust or combating anti-Semitism fatigue.

One of the things, as we all know, that we are up against early on, and I think we are up against it again now, is the idea of folding the whole effort. Rather than a breakout on anti-Semitism because of its uniqueness in Europe, into one big racism, xenophobia, almost like the human rights report, excellent report, but you are right, Rabbi Baker, it does get lost, it does get diluted because it is paragraphs here or paragraphs there, and it loses its potency on things.

So you might want to briefly elaborate on this danger of losing these gains. Not only are you suggesting we won't go forward, but we might lose the modest gains we have had thus far.

Rabbi BAKER. Yes, I think we can speak of it in a couple of areas. I think you have just identified almost on a philosophical level, the idea that we should look at. The Belgians have spoken of the holistic approach to problems. We have heard these criticisms of hierarchy of oppressions, almost to suggest that if you say the subject of anti-Semitism needs to be addressed as the unique phenomenon it is, you are putting yourself outside where some of these countries want you to be.

We have been successful in seeing that there have been separate conferences on anti-Semitism. As you recall, for many there was probably the sense, reluctantly some governments agreed to a conference in Vienna thinking it would be one time and that was it. It followed with Berlin with the active efforts of the German Government in offering to host it. In Cordoba, which itself was, as has been noted, a conference on anti-Semitism and other forms of intolerance, but recognized that there comes a time and place to look

at the subject by itself if you are really going to understand its problem and come up with solutions, even while we know that some of those solutions are broadly directed to other forms of intolerance and hatred as well. Police training is one obvious example.

So I think we need to be always present, because within this OSCE and particularly within the EU members of the OSCE, I think we find continued efforts to say no, no, no, fold them together again. I do hope that enough has been achieved until now that even some of these critics recognize that it is a phenomenon that is very hard to categorize, at least as a subset of some overall generic heading, as we have seen it morph in different ways from different places.

The second point in terms of recognizing this then goes to some of the institutional programs that have been established. You heard from Kathrin Meyer and this unit on tolerance and nondiscrimination. Her position is a seconded position. If that ends, if the German Government decides it cannot continue, if other resources are not available in a year or 2 years, it could disappear. And by the way, not only her position, but I think the position of the other experts there. It is by no means yet recognized that this has to remain.

So I think that is the other part of this. We need to see that those resources are part of a permanent budget that these positions are there. I have to say it is embarrassing to hear of what are good programs, and then there is no money even to publish a text. You can say, well, it is available on the Internet. It is so silly, really, to go through all this work and not have those additional resources.

So I think to the extent to which the United States can push, what you can do here in Congress, but also in the Parliamentary Assembly, to encourage other governments to come in, I think that is something that now is the time to do. That is what I mean by the danger of losing these gains.

Mr. SMITH. I appreciate that.

Yes?

Ms. GEFT. Congressman, if I may. There is another area in which I think we may be sliding back and losing an edge that the international community established at Nuremberg. That addresses the fear that radicals are taking over and we don't have the mechanism to contain or to stop them. In Nuremberg, Julius Streicher was convicted and hanged not on the basis of evidence of having murdered people, but on the clear connection between the incitement to do so and the results that he caused.

There are in the world today religious and political leaders who are openly calling for the murder and the destruction of Jews and there is no mechanism in place that can in any way restrict or isolate them. Thirty years after World War II, the United States had a travel watch, which was on the lookout for Nazi war criminals and restricted their travel. We don't have a similar mechanism to in any way signal these people, and more importantly the moderate folks in this world who should not be influenced by them, but would be if we don't intervene.

The scourge of suicide bombing and the potential catastrophic implications as technology improves, that is an area of concern where we should not lose our edge and our opportunity.

Mr. SMITH. Let me just ask one final question. I would agree, Rabbi Baker, with all of what everyone is saying here, but personnel is policy. If we lose dedicated personnel, seasoned individuals, the programs will wither. They may still be there, but if they are

not properly financed and staffed, that is a very good admonition to us to be on the lookout for what we can do to enhance that.

Recently I was again in Warsaw and met with the curator and some of the leaders of the new Jewish Museum that is being created there, which is tremendous as you know, and you are supportive of it, but maybe you could speak to it; all of you, if you would like.

What I was struck by, and some of the people who briefed me on it kept saying how it is not just a focus on how Jews died, and certainly the Holocaust will be well represented there, because it is a despicable part of history, but the past is prologue also in the positive, to show how at times Jews were fully integrated into society. One thing which was brought to my attention and of which I was not fully aware was that at least half of all Jews lived in Poland. Although the boundaries were a bit different, that is a fact that is not largely recognized.

As you probably know, I introduced a piece of legislation that would authorize \$5 million from the U.S. Government for the museum, because we have not, to the best of my knowledge, provided any seed capital to that operation. It is over a \$60 million enterprise, and it seems to me that we should be out there providing some tangible assistance. I know individual Jews and Jewish organizations and people who care about this issue have been donors, but it is time we did this as well.

One-thousand years of history needs to be brought to the fore, and that might have some mitigating impact on the anti-Semites that are out there, especially as young people, college and high school students, trek through it and learn. It could enhance the educational efforts as well and become an additional resource for education.

Your thoughts?

Rabbi BAKER. Again, I really commend you for introducing this. I hope it is successful. We may hope teaching about history will combat anti-Semitism or intolerance, but people I think have an interest and an obligation in knowing their past. I can recall that at one of the human dimension meetings in Warsaw in the Victoria Hotel, walking into the gift shop and you could find for sale in the gift shop the kind of folk item you find sometimes on the streets of Poland. It is a carved image of a Jew, in this case with very pronounced, sort of stereotypical features, and stuffed in his pockets and in his hands are coins. So this really horrible stereotypical image is part of, dare I say, the Polish folk tradition. There I was, as people are gathered for this human dimension meeting of the OSCE, sitting a few feet away on a gift shop's shelf.

I think starting first with Poland today, there has come about a recognition that Polish history is also Jewish history; that the most significant period in the history of the Jewish community from really medieval until the early part of the 20th century was largely lived out in Poland. As we know, tragically over three million Jews died in the Holocaust.

So the museum of the history of the Jews of Poland that your measure would support is in the first instance completing the story of the history of Poland. I think for those in the Jewish world who were supportive of this from the beginning, one of the key questions was to what extent the Polish Government would embrace this. It is not just that the majority of American Jews trace their own ancestry to Poland. It is not just that we know that this is the root for many of us, of our culture, of our traditions, of our customs, of

the food we eat, the music that is part of our religious liturgy and the like, but it was an integral part of what was the history of Poland.

I think it was only recently, only in the last couple of years, that the Polish Government, the then-mayor of Warsaw and now the new President of Poland, Lech Kaczynski, embraced this saying this is something we need to teach our own Polish kids about, and provide not just space to build a museum, but clear and significant financial support to make it a reality.

As you said, it is going to describe the life of Polish Jewry. There are, tragically, too many places on the territory of Poland where Jews in enormous numbers were murdered by the Germans in death camps and concentration camps, that have museums that tell the story of that era. This really will present I think not only of course in the first instance to Poles, to Polish students, but to the many people that increasingly are visiting Warsaw as it is an attractive new capital in Europe. It will provide them with a special picture of this.

As you in your introduction to the bill indicate, it is also a reflection on the history that many Americans hold as part of their own cultural past.

Mr. SMITH. I do have one final question. Reference was made earlier in one of the questions about the Internet. I recently held a hearing on legislation I have introduced called the "Global Online Freedom Act of 2006." It would set up an office that would look at Internet-restricting countries like China, Belarus, Uzbekistan, Ethiopia. There are a number of them.

In preparing for that hearing, I immersed myself in a lot of things. I read a book called "IBM and the Holocaust." In painstaking detail, the author lays out with a lot of heavy footnotes how IBM Germany and IBM US really helped and enabled the Gestapo to find Jews whenever and wherever they wanted to find Jews, which was virtually everywhere. As he points out even in the opening, did you ever wonder why the SS man always had a list? Where did the list come from? It was a very disturbing read. But then when we heard from Cisco, Google, Microsoft, and Yahoo!, all of the representatives were pretty much saying, well, we are in China and we are doing this or doing that, not realizing that they are enabling dictatorships, the secret police, to find individuals, but they are also amplifying the propaganda. For instance, if you go to Google.CN, the Chinese search engine, you get sent to the disinformation sites of the government. You don't get information that is credible or reliable or free.

My question is since that technology does exist to screen our virulent hatred or screen out democracy messages, as the Chinese Government does, why are we so unsuccessful? I know the First Amendment here is powerful, but it is not absolute. Incitement to hatred and to violence certainly is not protected speech. Obscenity is not protected speech. I wonder why we have not been more effective here, and why Europe has not been more effective in taking what Cisco and the others can provide and using it for good to weed out the hate-mongers among us? They have it.

I was amazed myself just going through how capable these companies really are. We have to be careful about freedom, but it seems to me that there is a line and I think we are nowhere near it right now, certainly not here in the United States.

Ms. BURDETT. I would just say, you know, obviously we as Americans would never want to regulate speech over the Internet or anywhere else, but we have had positive experiences. Technology, the same way, you know, using an IBM computer to gather

names and addresses of Jews and put them on a file challenged someone to make a moral decision, who made the wrong decision. The Internet challenges us and challenges kids to get the right information.

We have had good experiences in working with providers. I am sure you have as well, and getting them to put either in their terms of service agreements and take responsibility for warning people about how their products are meant to be used, whether it is hate video games or extremists using their Web sites. We work with an international coalition of NGOs called the International Network Against Cyber-Hate. It is NGOs in Poland and France and the Netherlands who are here working together as a global community because that is what the Internet is.

I think the bottom line, and we have all kinds of guides for families, parents, go on the Internet with your kids, there is no better filter than the educated knowledge of a child who has sat in front of a computer with their mom and dad. So it is just an ongoing education effort, and working with providers to help them do the right thing.

Ms. GEFT. Many of the countries of Europe actually do have laws that do not allow this, and so these hate groups are posting their sites on U.S. service, and First Amendment issues allow that.

I agree that our task is really to amplify voices of hope and use the Internet for its better uses, at least as masterfully as the haters are using it and manipulating it to their own purpose. Part of the purpose of our products every year is to unmask and expose the pernicious nature of the sites, which one would never guess very often are so dangerous because they are presented with the appearance of authentic scholarship and very, very convincing material, to bring in young children with all kinds of games, to attract other people.

It is not only in the area of Holocaust-denial or anti-Semitism, but they will take historical sites like MLK.org and present sites which every child might innocently go to for a history project, only to discover two or three pages in that it is a vicious attack on the Reverend Martin Luther King.

I believe that much more does need to be done in this, but regulating speech is not attractive to anyone in the United States.

Rabbi BAKER. You know, I think you do it in a very challenging way. It is an obvious dilemma, but clearly a problem. If you visit the Holocaust Museum, you see one of those early card-sorting IBM machines, and now the new Memorial de la Shoah in Paris in the first room you see this orderly set of shelves with the card files that were used to gather all of the Jews in Paris which led to the deportation and death of over 70,000 of them. So we do see how technology was used.

I think when you contrast what you see in China, for example, where these search engine companies are able to design their product so effectively, politically challenging sites do not appear, as we heard and read about, in order to be able to secure the support of the government and enter the Chinese market. As you say, they know very well how to filter out things that are undesirable, while directing users to other places.

As my colleagues have said, in Europe there is precisely that interest, but one would say for the purpose of filtering out the hate-mongers on the Internet and directing people to what they had initially intended to seek, particularly where there would be surreptitious ways to move them about. But in both cases, I think you can see how the purveyors

of the Internet are able to work. It isn't necessarily always a matter of what laws prohibit in doing this, but it is how they can adapt.

So I think you need to use, and perhaps through the legislation it will do this, the authority here to try to direct these companies to work in that way, that advances clearly an openness and freedom, particularly in those countries that don't have this, while at the same time be mindful of how they can be challenged to control the kinds of things on the Internet that we have heard described here.

Mr. SMITH. Thank you.

Anybody else?

Thank you so much. I look forward to working with you going forward.

[Whereupon, at 4:44 p.m., the briefing was adjourned.]

APPENDICES

PREPARED STATEMENT OF HON. SAM BROWNBACK, CHAIRMAN, COMMISSION ON SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE

Last summer a speech of mine was presented in Seville, Spain, at a preparatory NGO meeting for the OSCE Cordoba Conference on Anti-Semitism and Other Forms of Intolerance. I was honored to be able to address that distinguished gathering of religious leaders and human rights advocates. As I noted in my taped address, Cordoba was an opportunity for governments to report on the specific measures they have undertaken to implement relevant OSCE commitments on combating anti-Semitism and other forms of racism. Regrettably, implementation was, and remains, uneven.

However, while government follow-through could be better, our Helsinki Commission briefing today will highlight how the OSCE Office of Democratic Institutions and Human Rights has continued to forge ahead.

One area is Holocaust education, which is a critical component in any campaign to fight anti-Semitism. By teaching the lessons of history properly, we honor the memory of those brave souls who were murdered by the Nazis and the lives of those who survived. I salute the hard work of Dr. Kathrin Meyer and her colleagues at ODIHR for developing guidelines for educators on commemoration for Holocaust Remembrance Days. I also look forward to the completion of ODIHR's teacher guidelines to combat anti-Semitism and other forms of intolerance, which will be a natural companion to this first work. I am glad she will be presenting at our briefing today.

In addition, ODIHR has broken new ground in developing police training materials that help ensure law enforcement officials understand how to categorize crimes and the importance of working with affected communities to prevent further acts of violence. Paul Goldenberg and his team are to be commended for their hard work. If police are silent in the face of anti-Semitic violence, or equivocate when anti-Semitic incidents occur, it will only encourage the perpetrators of these vile deeds to strike again with greater viciousness. I am equally pleased that Paul will be speaking.

I commend ODIHR for its good work and encourage all participating States to utilize these resources. The upcoming tolerance meetings, the first in Almaty in June, will provide additional opportunities for participating States to demonstrate their commitment to these important issues.

As we are learning today in our struggle to defeat contemporary forms of genocide, such as in Darfur, the forces of evil are not easily defeated. However, as Chairman of the U.S. Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe, I will continue to raise the importance of vigilance when I meet other government leaders and parliamentarians. I believe elected leaders and government officials have a responsibility to speak out against acts of violence, ensuring that police vigorously combat these manifestations and that educators teach our children the lessons of the Holocaust.

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

Two weeks ago during the Holocaust commemoration, “Days of Remembrance Week,” students in my home State of New Jersey held a vigil at Rutgers University to honor Ilan Halimi. Ilan was a French Jew who was kidnapped and gruesomely tortured to death earlier this year because of his faith. Ilan’s tragedy made brutally clear that Jews are still attacked because they are Jews, and that our work to eradicate the evil of anti-Semitism in all its ugly forms and manifestations is far from done.

Other groups also suffer from violent acts of hatred throughout the OSCE region, including right here in our own country. Despite a slight decline, ADL’s annual Audit of Anti-Semitic Incidents recently found that the number of anti-Semitic incidents in the United States remained at disturbing levels in 2005.

As Co-Chairman, I am likewise concerned with the recent wave of violence against ethnic and religious minorities that has spiked in Russia. All too often, police there seem incapable or unwilling to vigorously protect minorities, including Roma and persons with dark skin.

Four years ago this month, the Helsinki Commission held a hearing on escalating anti-Semitism and related violence in Europe. That hearing was instrumental in elevating this issue and related concerns at the OSCE. Strong leadership by the United States and others has led to greater engagement by the OSCE and the OSCE Parliamentary Assembly in efforts to combat anti-Semitism and other forms of hate, as well as increased its focus on Holocaust education. On the first panel for today’s Helsinki Commission briefing, we will highlight that work through the presentations of two experts, Paul Goldenberg and Dr. Kathrin Meyer. The second panel will add the insights of three very distinguished NGOs—the American Jewish Committee, the Anti-Defamation League, and the Simon Wiesenthal Center Museum of Tolerance.

Paul Goldenberg is the former Chief of the New Jersey Bias Crime unit and now serves as Special Advisor to ODIHR on hate crimes training. Paul has done a tremendous job in bringing into reality the OSCE/ODIHR Law Enforcement Officers Hate Crimes Training Program. The Training Program has created a flexible hate crimes training curriculum designed to meet the needs of the law enforcement community within any OSCE participating State. The curriculum includes the fundamentals of response, investigation and management of anti-Semitic crimes and hate crimes in tandem with community engagement and mutual capacity building. Training law enforcement personnel in both Europe and North America on these methods will go far in winning the war against hatred and anti-Semitism.

Paul has overseen the successful implementation of the program in Spain, Hungary, Croatia and Ukraine. I’m very pleased with how the program is developing and hope to see it implemented in additional countries.

Dr. Kathrin Meyer is the Adviser on Anti-Semitism Issues for OSCE’s Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights in Warsaw, Poland. This past January during the first commemoration of the international Day for Holocaust Remembrance, ODIHR and Yad Vashem released guidelines on Holocaust commemoration, specifically designed for educators. Kathrin played a key role in developing these guidelines, which are a hands-on asset for teachers as they work to ensure the lessons of the Holocaust are incul-

cated with our children. If we are to remember the Holocaust, our children must be taught its lessons at an early age. I am pleased that ODIHR has diligently committed itself to this issue.

Our second panel represents three organizations that are no strangers to the Helsinki Commission. Rabbi Andrew Baker of AJC will first share his thoughts on where the OSCE tolerance process is going and what needs to be done to maintain our positive momentum in combating anti-Semitism. Next, Stacy Burdett will speak about ADL's programs to combat hate crimes and educate law enforcement officials. Lastly, Liebe Geft, who is the Director of the Simon Wiesenthal Center Museum of Tolerance, will talk about how the Museum works with police to ensure they understand and appreciate the importance of tolerance.

My Holocaust education began when I was 14, when my father introduced me to a Holocaust survivor. While every child may not have the privilege of meeting a Holocaust survivor, education in the classroom and in the home, remains the next best hope of inculcating tolerance and respect.

While the battle is far from won against the forces of anti-Semitism and hate, the OSCE is pushing ahead. Today's announcement by the Belgian Chair-in-Office of the upcoming OSCE Tolerance Implementation Meeting on "Promoting Inter-cultural, Inter-religious and Inter-ethnic Understanding" in Kazakhstan on June 12-13 will be another opportunity for us to push ahead. In addition to important meetings like this, it is the tireless work of Paul and Kathrin in education and training that proves the OSCE is making a difference.

PREPARED STATEMENT OF PAUL GOLDENBERG, SPECIAL ADVISOR, OSCE OFFICE FOR DEMOCRATIC INSTITUTIONS AND HUMAN RIGHTS

Messr. Co-Chairmen, Committee Members, Ladies and Gentlemen,

It gives me great pleasure to speak to you today about issues of community safety and civil governance from the perspective of police and community relations and the advancement of human rights across the 55 nations of the OSCE. For all these issues . . . and many more . . . can be impacted by a single event, by a single hate crime. Communities within the OSCE region have turned from tranquil to chaotic in an instant. They are the events that have led to this pioneering program.

Hate crimes, or bias crimes as we have come to know them across the United States, are criminal offences committed against a target, either a person or a place, because of their actual or perceived connection with a group that may be defined by race, creed, color, nationality, sexual orientation, religion or other discriminatory grounds.

The heinous nature of a hate crime is the fact that they strike at our communities, not just a single person, place or institution, but rather whole sectors of our society can be isolated by a virtual wall of fear by just a single calculated act of violence when the victim is a community icon.

It is because of this broad impact that these types of crimes, these hate crimes, have such appeal to those who advance and promote the 'causes' of hatred.

While the commission of these crimes is reprehensible, the consequences are infinitely more far-reaching than other types of crimes, for these are the events that can divide communities, neighborhoods and States. These are the events that can create tension where none had existed, breed dissent where once there was harmony, incite distrust where once there was collaboration. In short, these are the crimes that threaten democracy and democratic institutions. These are crimes that impact upon governments, as well as it's people and communities.

When a hate crime occurs, victims—And the communities from which they come—have an expectation of governments' response. We recognize that citizens and communities seldom differentiate between the police action and government policy, which are one and the same in the eyes of the community.

An ineffective police response can be viewed as the inaction of a government that "doesn't care" about the victim or their community. Such attitudes and beliefs can be the catalyst for change or, more ominously, retribution, sometimes through violence and social upheaval.

The modest costs associated with the delivery of this program pale in comparison to the policing costs associated with just a single demonstration. Although social turmoil may start with a single event, it seldom ends that way. As we have recently seen, social unrest in one European nation has resulted in an estimated \$250 million dollars in damages and direct policing costs.

Many real or perceived hate crimes across the OSCE Region, which includes the United States and Canada along with much of Europe and parts of Asia, have been the flash points for recent as well as historical community unrest. Civil disturbances arising from such crimes, injustices and inequality of treatment have resulted in clashes with police, riots, and social uprisings that form violent challenges to legitimate, democratically-elected governments.

All of these have a significant costs, not only in the monies needed to equip police and support their responses to such actions, but also in the impact they have on community and State safety, on political stability, and on economic well-being and productivity of a nation. Like a unwanted wave, this economic impact of social upheaval can wash over such areas as tourism, foreign investment, manufacturing and service industries, washing away growth, opportunity and advantages that may be key components in a nation's economy.

The Office of Democratic Institutions and Human Rights of the OSCE has commissioned the development of a Law Enforcement Officer Program on Combating Hate Crime in the OSCE Region, which I have been honored to lead for these past eighteen months. It has been through the vision and commitment of the OSCE Director, Ambassador Christian Strohal and the tireless and unwavering efforts of Ms. Jo-Anne Bishop, head of the ODIHR's Tolerance and Non-Discrimination Program that this program has received the support and recognition that has allowed it to be such an international success. The political will and efforts of such notables as Canadian Senator Jerahmiel Grafstein have advanced this issue, while this Committee's Co-Chairman, Representative Chris Smith challenged all of us to turn concepts into reality, and to move beyond the rhetoric of theory to the develop of practices and the creation of tangible outcomes that could be seen, that would have an impact, and that would finally make a difference.

All these supporters have recognized the positive role that the police play in our communities, and the impact that the police have on positive social change. Although some consider that law enforcement has contributed to this problem, the ODIHR and this Commission have viewed the men and women of law enforcement as an integral part of the solution. They have also recognized both the need and the value of police-to-police professional training, the philosophy upon which this program is based; support for this fundamental concept has been universal.

This Law Enforcement program is one that touches upon many segments of the community, and the diverse components of the national police service within participating States.

The program team is comprised of subject matter experts in the field of hate crimes drawn from police services in the United States, the United Kingdom, France, Canada, Hungary and Spain.

This program has brought together these outstanding police professionals, who have joined together with some of the world's most talented and innovative human rights advocates. Together we have forged an unprecedented alliance which has led to the development of this training initiative. A program that is customized for each region, a program that gives a voice to minority communities within each State, and a program that grows and improves, with each new State, with each new agency and with each application.

This international implementation team has expertise in other areas as well, that contributes to the program's success, such as conflict resolution, community capacity-building, partnership development and community engagement.

This engagement begins in the consultation phase of the program, where impacted communities and their representatives in participating States are brought together to provide input on how they see police responding to hate crimes, what they need, and what they would like to see. The international implementation team has been successful in reaching out to groups that have been the victims of hate crimes, and groups who have

seen themselves on the fringes of society. We have asked them how they would like to be involved, how they can help law enforcement and society stem the tide of hatred and its deteriorating effects on their people and their communities. We have been successful in using this process to build strong partnerships between governments and their people, using law enforcement as the vehicle for greater collaboration and problem-solving on issues that affect people where and how they live in a free society.

It is a telling revelation that during our work, we have met with many prominent NGOs and human rights organizations that have never had a chance to sit down to engage with their own policing services. These are groups that have a strong need and a compelling desire to work with police. They offer a capacity to leverage police resources with those of the concerned communities, to the advantage and betterment of each, but had never had the opportunity to discuss such partnerships.

The consultation phase of the hate crimes program also engages the judiciary and legislators to determine their needs and to solidify their participation as partners in this program, as this is the area of greatest focus for the police. We ask,

“Do you have adequate laws to address hate crimes?”

“Are you supported by the courts in the prosecution of these offences?”

“What might be done to strengthen legislation, or to apply existing laws with greater effect?”

“How can prosecutors and the courts have more success in speaking to the issue of crime motivated by hate?”

Finally, we consult with the police services, including command officers, specialized unit commanders and front line officers. We seek input from all levels of the police organization and integrate their views, address their concerns and evaluate their recommendations for change. We believe that this has contributed to the success of the program and we envision continuing to advance this level of consultation.

Beyond consultation, the program includes a comprehensive training and capacity-building component for each participating police service. We believe that our training curriculum is the most comprehensive and expansive training available on this topic, and draws on the best practices of the participating States of the OSCE. Program participants include senior police training staff, who receive direct, hands-on training in recognizing and responding to hate crimes, and in helping communities and individuals recover from the effects hate crimes have on victims and victimized, targeted communities. Participants receive manuals, workbooks, training guides, films, sound files and animated crime scenes that we have developed for the program to help them deliver the training, and to train others to do so as well.

Finally, the program includes a follow-up evaluation to determine the impact of the hate crimes training across the participating State. We recognize the significant financial and logistical demand that this type of training puts upon the police service, and as such, the follow-on evaluation is designed to measure changes over a period of four to five years.

This program has been successfully delivered in two pilot States, Hungary and Spain. The training has been wholly embraced by the two countries, with both countries engaged in integrating the hate crimes curriculum into their national police training curricula.

The most poignant aspect of this program is the impact that it has on the various stakeholder groups. We have learned of the strong desire by community groups to become engaged with the police in preventing and responding to hate crimes. We have seen the

passion of impacted groups, Roma groups across Europe, Tartars in the Ukraine, Africans in Croatia and in all countries, people who work tirelessly at the protection of human rights for all people.

The experience has underscored our commitment to the concepts of community-based policing and the need for community engagement in problem solving. We believe that by forging new partnerships, and by helping police services in these countries reach out to their communities, we can help these organizations grow and develop in a way that not only supports democratic institutions and civil society, but in a way that encourages the growth of strong communities and reinforces democratic values.

Within the police communities, we have found a desire to learn, grow and change. We have found police command staff that are committed to participating with their communities, and we have found training staff that are both eager to learn and want to help.

Because the training touches on so many topics, new ideas are brought to each participating State, ranging from victim/witness advocacy to issues of compassion and community engagement through community councils.

To all our partners and program participants, we are bringing new ideas and innovative training concepts that apply the principles of adult learning and promote a high degree of critical thinking and active participation, recognizing different styles of learning. We exploit technology to the greatest advantage for the adult learner. Most of all, we maintain a focus on relevant training that delivers practical concepts, knowledge and skills in law enforcement, in social engagement and in building the capacity of communities to work with police and government to produce valuable and sustainable social change.

Through the Law Enforcement Officer Program on Combating Hate Crime in the OSCE Region, we have been able to help change police and community views towards one another, and towards the issue of hate crimes. We promote an organizational understanding of hate crimes in national police services. Our new ideas for training and for community support in police training build the capacity of police services to act as leaders in enabling positive community change, where once they may have been seen as repressive agents of government, protectors of tyranny. These changes takes time and commitment, and need the work of visionaries and “new thinkers” that can see a role for police that includes advocating for and supporting social change.

The work we have done this past year-and-a-half is growing well beyond a mere training course. The tools and best practices this program now employs include:

- Assessment of police organizational capacity to support victimized communities
- Assistance in planning and creating national police institutes for the prevention and investigation of hate crimes
- Community development actions that build and strengthen police- community partnerships
- Policies and practices that enrich police responses to hate crimes and their treatment of victims, witnesses and affected communities
- Supports to police, prosecutors and the judiciary to obtain higher rates of convictions and more significant sentences for offenders
- Formats for organizational planning and community engagement on a range of social issues where law enforcement and governments have a stake in the outcomes

—A template for collecting data on hate crimes occurrences and analyzing intra-national trends and the effectiveness of anti-hate programs

—Instruments for assessing the impact of police training and police-community partnerships on hate crime occurrences and the communities' perception of police concern and actions

—A curriculum for training police trainers to proliferate the program across nations

We are committed to continuing our efforts through the participating States of the OSCE that wish to engage in the program. We are currently working with the governments of Croatia and Ukraine, where consultation and training have already been undertaken. We will be working with Serbia and Montenegro later this year in developing their capacity to deal with hate crimes and to work with that nation to develop the region's first office to deal with hate crimes and its community impacts, through a National Office for the Prevention and Investigation of Hate Crimes.

This has been a tremendously fascinating and rewarding opportunity to work with so many countries, and with a team of such unparalleled expertise. It continues to be my honor to manage the delivery of this program to those countries that see the need. Just last week, I had the opportunity to meet with the 45 representatives from many prominent NGOs from across Europe and western Asia, and many asked, not if this program was feasible for their countries, but rather when could we get this program be "on the ground" in their community.

I hope that this Congress will see the merits of the approach and continue to support these groundbreaking efforts to support and sustain civil governance, to ensure the protection of vulnerable communities and to visibly grant assurances to citizenry of all social, demographic, religious and ethnic backgrounds that their safety and security issues are important to police, important to the State and deserving of the rapt attention of both.

Ladies and gentlemen, we are currently experiencing a period of tremendous conflict in our world, perhaps a time of unprecedented conflict, and not only within the OSCE region, but across the globe. Communities are in conflict, nations are in crisis, peoples of different creeds, races, beliefs, nationalities and religions are embroiled in conflicts resulting in social unrest, destruction and even death. Having seen the outcomes of intolerance, having seen its costs in money, human suffering and in lives, we are confident that humanity can see that the road to co-existence lies in education, in understanding and in taking action to protect and develop communities.

This program has the opportunity to place on the ground a model training and data collection system that is customized to meet the needs of each participating State, while maintaining a consistent central theme. When this training is delivered across an entire organization or State, the cost is only a few dollars per officer. However, to continue this, funding is critical, and we look towards all the participating States of the OSCE to invest in the growth and development of the region, invest in its human rights, to invest in its democratization, to invest in its future. While the program implementation has a modest cost, the program outcomes are priceless.

We are committed to working towards that goal through this program, by providing training to the governments' front line responders—the men and women who are tasked with being the first people at the scene of any crisis, the first people that communities turn to when crisis erupts, the first people we look to when we are struck by disaster and unrest. They are the police officers of OSCE States, and we believe that it is through

them, that we can effect social change, and it is with their effort and commitment that we may find a path to greater harmony in all of our communities.

I would like to thank David Harris and my Friends at the American Jewish Committee for their continued encouragement and support for this program and the values of fairness, equality and tolerance that it promotes.

Thank you for this opportunity to share our program's intent, effects and success.

PREPARED STATEMENT OF KATHRIN MEYER, ADVISER ON ANTI-SEMITISM ISSUES, OSCE OFFICE FOR DEMOCRATIC INSTITUTIONS AND HUMAN RIGHTS

Mr. Chairman, Committee Members, Ladies and Gentlemen,

I would like to thank you for the opportunity to speak to you today about our activities in the field of Education on the Holocaust and on Anti-Semitism on behalf of the OSCE's Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights.

It might not be clear on the first sight why the OSCE as the world's largest regional security organisation is involved in the field of Holocaust Remembrance and Education. Please allow me to give you a brief background to that question before I will present our activities regarding Holocaust Education.

The 55 participating States of the OSCE from Europe, Central Asia and North America reacted to the dramatic increase of racist, xenophobic and anti-Semitic acts throughout the region with several high level conferences and Ministerial Decisions on Tolerance and Non-Discrimination since 2002.

In these Declarations the Participating states acknowledged the need for a specific approach to improve: data collection, legislation, training and education.

The ODIHR's mandate in the field of Holocaust Remembrance is based on the Declaration that came out of the Berlin conference on Anti-Semitism in 2004. At this conference the participating States recognized that Anti-Semitism has assumed new forms and expressions and that Anti-Semitism poses a threat to democracy, the values of civilization and to the overall security in the OSCE region and beyond. The same occurs to other forms of intolerance and discrimination, recognized in other OSCE declarations.

With the Berlin Declaration the OSCE participating States committed themselves (inter alia) to promote educational programs to combat Anti-Semitism, to promote the remembrance of and education on the Holocaust and to promote respect for all ethnic and religious groups. The ODIHR was tasked to disseminate best practices and to assist the States to implement these commitments.

Recognizing that Anti-Semitism poses a threat to the overall security in the region compels us to identify all different forms of this phenomenon. While the Holocaust was based on anti-Semitism, we can see today that Holocaust Denial or the diminishing of the Holocaust is one form of Anti-Semitism that occurs more and more often and is used as a justification for anti-Semitic acts, discrimination and hate crimes. That is why these two fields are strongly connected for us and that is why my office is involved in the field of Holocaust Education.

In order to fulfil our mandate the ODIHR started the work in this field with an evaluation. We developed the study: Education on the Holocaust and on Anti-Semitism in the OSCE region: An Overview and Analysis of Educational Approaches This study that is available online, gives a general analytical overview of ongoing activities in the OSCE region on Holocaust Education and provides a country by country overview. It also analyses the need for specific educational programmes to address contemporary Anti-Semitism. We are currently developing a similar evaluation for the general field of Tolerance education for the OSCE region.

With the study the ODIHR evaluated existing initiatives in the OSCE States, we identified those that could be developed successfully elsewhere and identified good prac-

tices to support future efforts by OSCE states and civil society. But we also identified gaps and areas where teaching about Holocaust and anti-Semitism need to be strengthened.

The analysis showed that the Interest in the history of the Holocaust is growing in the region, that the Holocaust is a topic of history lessons but also in literature, languages, civic education, ethics and theology, as well as in extracurricular activities. So far 33 out of the 55 participating States commemorate Holocaust Memorial Days.

The following obstacles were identified:

- Lack of official directives specifically related to Holocaust education
- Lack of appropriate teaching material for Holocaust education but especially to address contemporary Anti-Semitism
- Lack of teacher trainings in many OSCE Countries

The study provides therefore comprehensive recommendations; let me highlight today just a few of them:

- Holocaust Education should be implemented in each participating State and needs to be strengthened in many
- Contemporary anti-Semitism cannot be sufficiently addressed by Holocaust education, it should be acknowledged as an issue of itself
- Teacher Trainings should be implemented in the OSCE States and supported by the governments
- Sufficient teaching materials should be developed
- There should be cooperation within the region between educators and an exchange of experience.

In order to follow our own recommendations we established close co-operation with key international organizations, such as the Task Force for International Cooperation on Holocaust Education, Remembrance and Research (ITF), Yad Vashem and the Anne Frank House Amsterdam. With those partners we developed joint assistance projects to support the implementation in participating States.

To follow our mandate to assist the implementation and to give very practical assistance to the States in the field of Holocaust Remembrance and combating Anti-Semitism but also in order to disseminate good practices, the ODIHR started to develop teaching tools on contemporary Anti-Semitism and on Holocaust Memorial days.

In cooperation with Anne Frank House in Amsterdam and experts from seven countries (the Netherlands, Croatia, Lithuania, Poland, Ukraine and Germany, recently Denmark joined the project), teaching materials on anti-Semitism in seven special country adaptations have been developed, based on historical and social background of each country. The material has been translated and is recently being tested in schools. This material is a novelty, not only because of the international cooperation on it but also because there is almost no teaching material that deals with anti-Semitism and is not focused on the Holocaust.

The “ready to use” material that will give detailed information, graphics and assignments for the students will come in three parts for the students and a special teacher’s guide. Part 1 is on the history of Anti-Semitism, part 2 on contemporary forms of Anti-Semitism and part 3 puts Anti-Semitism into perspective with other forms of discrimination. The material in seven different languages and versions will be ready for the next school year as PDF documents on our website.

This exciting and important educational program has been supported so far only by very few States financially. And if we would get support in the future, we would be able to provide printed copies of that material to teachers and students in countries where access to the internet and proper printers is difficult for teachers that are willing to use the material.

Based on the commitment to commemorate the victims of the Holocaust and the experience that Holocaust denial becomes more and more common in some regions, we developed suggestions for educators on Holocaust memorial days in close cooperation between the ODIHR and Yad Vashem. Funded only by Germany so far the ODIHR brought together experts from 12 countries (Austria, Sweden, the Netherlands, Croatia, Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, United Kingdom, Russian Federation, Ukraine, Germany and Israel) at Yad Vashem for an expert forum.

The document that came out of this cooperation has been circulated to you today for your information. These suggestions have been launched by the OSCE's Chair in Office the Belgian Minister of Foreign Affairs during the celebration on January 27th in Brussels. The ODIHR provided an English and a Russian version.

The Belgian government developed French and Flemish translations and in Italy, Croatia and Hungary the Ministries of Education provided translations into their own languages and made the guidelines available on their websites. And just one week ago the Polish Government informed us that they are working on a translation that will be available on their website end of May.

Our suggestions for educators highlight really amazing initiatives of schools, educators and communities on Holocaust memorial days from 12 countries so far. They are being well received. On the ODIHR's and Yad Vashem's website there were 400–800 downloads of the document in each language each month.

If we will receive more funding for this project, we want this document eventually to be distributed in printed copies that come with a CD of good practices and also consist of a second part "Why and how to address contemporary Anti-Semitism", according to our understanding, that both fields are strongly connected. The CD with many more initiatives from more countries and regions as well as the second part on Anti-Semitism are under development right now.

This practical tool will help educators that have not have the opportunity to attend teacher trainings and have not been involved in Holocaust education to understand how many different activities could be undertaken by remembering those millions of men, women and children who perished during the Holocaust. I hope that these examples from our suggestions for educators will not only serve as an inspiration for activities on Holocaust memorial days, but also as an encouragement to start remembrance of the Holocaust where it is not commemorated so far. I am convinced that the remembrance of the victims of the Holocaust has an important influence on young people and what they learn from that experience will make a difference in today's world.

We hope that all our practical teaching tools will help to engage more governments to incorporate Holocaust Education and educational tools to address contemporary forms of Anti-Semitism as well as other forms of discrimination into their national curricula. We hope more governments will not only send us initiatives from their countries, but also translate ODIHR'S guidelines, make them accessible to educators in their countries and fund the ODIHR's educational program. This will allow us to continue our work and

enable us to make the material that we developed so far available to educators all over the OSCE region.

My office is happy to cooperate with governments, and we are ready to give advice, share experience and assist in the implementation of Holocaust remembrance activities and teaching activities that aim to combat Anti-Semitism today.

Thank you very much for your attention!

PREPARED STATEMENT OF RABBI ANDREW BAKER, DIRECTOR OF INTERNATIONAL JEWISH AFFAIRS, AMERICAN JEWISH COMMITTEE

This is a critical point in the efforts to press the OSCE to embark on efforts to seriously combat anti-Semitism in Europe.

Three years ago the OSCE had not yet undertaken any measures to address the problem of anti-Semitism. It had only just agreed to hold a conference on the subject. This itself was a milestone, and it happened largely because of US pressure to do so. And that initiative, as people here well-know, came about thanks to the strong advocacy of the Helsinki Commission and its Congressional Members.

Looking back now, we must recognize that there has been remarkable progress. The Vienna Conference in 2003, followed by the Berlin Conference in 2004, brought governments together and secured commitments both for their own independent actions and for the work of the OSCE collectively. It resulted in the “Berlin Declaration” which was a dramatic expression of these commitments.

We should rightly take some satisfaction in what has been achieved.

A special unit on tolerance and non-discrimination has been established at ODIHR. It has on its staff an expert on anti-Semitism, Dr. Kathrin Meyer, who is ably engaged in the work that ODIHR has been tasked to do, which includes collecting reports from all member states and developing educational programs to address the problem.

At that first conference in Vienna, NY Mayor Rudy Giuliani spoke of the American experience in collecting data on hate crimes and the importance of a proper response by law enforcement to such crimes. The ODIHR has engaged Paul Goldenberg and his police colleagues to develop a program to “train trainers” in how to respond to hate crimes, which has already been taken to the police agencies of four OSCE countries, with others on the way. At a time when transatlantic relations are frayed, this is one contribution from the American side of the Atlantic—drawing on the work and experience of our various police departments—which is not only needed but welcomed on the other side.

The OSCE has also appointed a special representative for combating anti-Semitism. Serving as the Personal Representative of the Chair-in-Office, Bundestag Member Gert Weisskirchen is holding his own meetings with government officials and NGOs, helping to prod governments to do more and gathering advice and information from community groups on the extent and nature of the problem.

Three years ago, when we pressed the Europeans to take more seriously the problem of anti-Semitism, we were often told that we were exaggerating, that anti-Semitism was not so prevalent. It soon emerged that many government agencies themselves had no system for collecting data and many did not even have a definition of anti-Semitism. An EUMC report on anti-Semitism, then covering 15 countries, revealed that over half of their national monitors had no definition, and of those that did, no two were the same. Sadly, the truth became clear. Without a clear definition, monitors (where they did exist) were not recording anti-Semitic incidents. Not recording meant not counting; not counting meant not a problem. This is now changing. A working definition has been adopted by the EUMC. The same definition is now being used inside ODIHR in its hate crime police training program.

I dare say that each of these tangible advances is the direct result of the active support that comes from the members of this Commission, a product of the strong advocacy

from the US Congress, directed to the State Department's representatives, directed in bilateral meetings with the leaders of the OSCE and the ODIHR, and articulated in the OSCE Parliamentary Assembly meetings.

But right now, at this very moment, we are in danger of losing these gains.

For the police training program to continue there needs to be more financial support. For the work of ODIHR's special expert on anti-Semitism, there needs to be a financial commitment that will make the position part of that office's core budget. In fact, there needs to be a clear message of support for maintaining and strengthening its office on tolerance and non-discrimination, and this requires designated financial contributions from OSCE members including the United States.

We need to maintain the pressure in the political arena. The "historical memory" of OSCE ambassadors and even of our own State Department officials is rather short. We need to continue the necessary pressure to see that implementation of the commitments made by governments takes place. We need to insure that the call for another high level conference of the OSCE to address the problems of anti-Semitism and other forms of intolerance to take place in Romania in 2007 (as the US enunciated at the OSCE Ministerial Meeting in Ljubljana in December 2005) be formally adopted by the Permanent Council. We need to insure that the implementation meetings that were promised for this year also take place and provide the necessary focus on anti-Semitism.

In closing, the OSCE has become a very important arena to address the problem of anti-Semitism, which sadly has reemerged in this first decade of the Twenty-First century. Much as we might wish otherwise, it is not a brief recurrence. It is serious; it is systemic; it has assumed new forms and expressions; and it requires a continued and long-term strategy to successfully combat it. There are some within the OSCE who might prefer to view it as a topic that was given its due and suggest now it is time to move on to other matters. Instead, we must insist on the opposite. The goal now is to insure that the OSCE remain equipped and committed to dealing with the problem—this year, next year and in the years to come.

PREPARED STATEMENT OF STACY BURDETT, ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR OF GOVERNMENT AND NATIONAL AFFAIRS, ANTI-DEFAMATION LEAGUE

Since 1913, ADL has worked to expose and counter anti-Semitism, and all forms of bigotry. We are grateful to the Helsinki Commission for holding this briefing and for its diligent and ongoing efforts to keep this issue on the front burner in Washington and in the capitals of all the OSCE Participating States. We are honored that ADL has been part of this Commission's efforts against anti-Semitism in the OSCE region for many years.

CURRENT TRENDS AND DATA

While, in many of the countries where data on anti-Semitic incidents are available, last year saw a decline in varying degrees, the violence has continued at high levels.

Here in the US, the number of anti-Semitic the ADL documented a total of 1,757 anti-Semitic incidents in 2005, a 3 percent decline from 2004. But as was the case in other countries, recorded acts of anti-Semitism in 2004 were alarmingly high. In our own monitoring, 2004 was a nine year high. A link to this year's data and a graph showing data over the last 20 years can be viewed at: http://www.adl.org/PresRele/ASUS__12/audit_2005.htm.

The Tel Aviv University's Stephen Roth Institute, which publishes an annual survey of anti-Semitism worldwide, reported a drop in overall incidents worldwide of approximately 20 percent. The UK and Canada saw a slight decline with a more marked decline in incidents in France. According to the Community Security Trust (CST) in Britain, incidents declined from 532 in 2004 to 455 in 2005, but the CST noted the number was the second highest on record. The League for Human Rights of B'nai Brith Canada documented 829 anti-Semitic incidents reported to their anti-hate hot line and offices in 2005. A 3.3 percent decline from the record high of 857 documented in 2004. The French Ministry of Interior data showed a decrease from 974 incidents in 2004 to 504 incidents in 2005. The Representative Council of Jewish Institutions in France, known as CRIF, still emphasize that violence against Jews is still ten times what it was in the 1990s and remain very concerned.

Any decline in incidents is certainly encouraging, but it should be underlined that, compared with pre-2000 levels, they remain worryingly high. Moreover, data alone are only one indicator of the level of anti-Semitism in a society. Other trends and factors—particularly in Russia, where racist and anti-Semitic attacks have reached epidemic proportions, with seven racist murders recorded in April this year alone—paint a more bleak picture across the OSCE region. Here are just three examples:

—In Ukraine, beyond the increase in acts of violence and vandalism against Jews, there have been attempts to ban everything from Jewish organizations to Jewish holy texts. The Interregional Academy for Personnel Management (MAUP)—accredited by Ukraine's Ministry of Education, with more than 50,000 students enrolled, actively promotes anti-Semitism of the most vicious kind. Ukraine's President Viktor Yushchenko has issued an important statement against anti-Semitism, and, more recently, the Ministers of Foreign Affairs and Education and Science have criticized MAUP but we have yet to see government action to follow up.

—In January of this year, the Swedish Chancellor of Justice, Goran Lambertz, halted an investigation into Stockholm’s Grand Mosque, where tapes of despicable anti-Semitic sermons were on sale. He noted that the content of the sermons called Jews the “brothers of apes and pigs” and aspiring jihadis were urged to kill them. Yet Mr. Lambertz chose not to invoke Sweden’s anti-incitement laws. Instead, he said the calls to murder Jews “should be judged differently, and be considered allowed, because they are used by one side in a continuing profound conflict, where battle cries and invectives are part of everyday occurrences in the rhetoric that surround the Middle East conflict.” In other words, these anti-Semitic speeches and calls for violence against Jews are simply an outgrowth of the Palestinian Israeli conflict.

—In Poland, we are gravely concerned that Prime Minister Kazimierz Marcinkiewicz included in the ruling coalition government the Self-Defense Party and the League of Polish Families. Leaders of both parties have made statements suggesting sympathy for racist and anti-Semitic views. The leader of the Self-Defense party, Andrzej Lepper, has made statements supportive of the French neo-fascist leader Jean-Marie Le Pen and has spoken approvingly of the economic policies of the Nazis. In the recent past, leaders of the League of Polish Families have spoken of “Judeo-communist” plots and made other anti-Semitic statements. The party maintains close links with Radio Maryja, a conservative Polish Catholic radio station notorious for its anti-Semitic broadcasts.

PROGRAMMATIC RESPONSE

OSCE Ministerial Decisions and Declarations addressing anti-Semitism and intolerance at conferences in Berlin, and Brussels in 2004 and in Cordoba in 2005 have underlined a central message: “the primary responsibility for addressing acts of intolerance and discrimination rests with the Participating States” and highlights their central role in implementing programs in the area of law enforcement and education. Most recently in Ljubljana, last December, Ministers urged Participating States to implement their commitments with a strong focus on law enforcement training, public and education on the Holocaust and anti-Semitism, including and very importantly, contemporary forms of anti-Semitism.

Putting those important words and commitments into action across such a large region seems a daunting task and surveys and conferences conducted by OSCE have shown that Participating States have done far too little to implement them. But a strength of the OSCE conferences and programs has been their ability to showcase the impressive resources available to states, and to offer states assistance to expand them one nation at a time, one city at a time, one school at a time. You heard from the first panel about the array of excellent programs the OSCE’s Office of Democratic Institutions and Human Rights (ODIHR) has identified and helped develop for Participating States to put into practice. There is no shortage of other programs across this region or the experts to adapt and develop them for new countries.

What is lacking is the political will on the part of many states to take advantage of these initiatives. The commitments by Participating States are impressive. States have at their disposal the expertise and assistance of the ODIHR and a world of talented non-governmental experts. But the burden is on governments to open their doors to these programs and help expand their reach and impact.

Even the valuable programs of ODIHR, many of which rely on extra-budgetary contributions by states, have had the support of just a handful of governments. The US has been an important supporter and we hope you will ensure that the US continues to play its part. Members of the Helsinki Commission and all Members of Congress also can play a vital role in getting more states to step up to the plate.

I will highlight just a few initiatives in the area of education and law enforcement training that we have identified as useful in a number of OSCE Participating States that could readily be expanded and adapted to even more countries.

US GOVERNMENT TRAINING AND EDUCATION MODELS

A foundation of the OSCE commitments related to anti-Semitism and tolerance rests on legislation which provides the framework for, data collection and analysis, law enforcement training and victim assistance. The U.S. government has played a central role in funding program development in this area and promoting awareness of initiatives that work and a number of US models bear mentioning as promising practices that could be adopted by other Participating States.

There is growing awareness of the need to complement tough laws and vigorous enforcement—which can deter and redress violence motivated by bigotry—with education and training initiatives designed to reduce prejudice. The Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) developed and has circulated widely training materials on how to identify, report, and respond to hate crime. These resources are available online at: <http://www.fbi.gov/ucr/traingd99.pdf> and at: <http://www.fbi.gov/ucr/hatecrime.pdf>

In 1992, Congress approved several new hate crime and prejudice-reduction initiatives as part of the four-year Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act reauthorization. The Act included a requirement that each state's juvenile delinquency prevention plan include a component designed to combat hate crimes and a requirement that the Justice Department's Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) conduct a national assessment of youths who commit hate crimes, their motives, their victims, and the penalties received for the crimes.

In 1992, for the first time, Congress acted to incorporate anti-prejudice initiatives into the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), the principal Federal funding mechanism for the public schools. Title IV of the Act, Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities, also included a specific hate crimes prevention initiative—promoting curriculum development and training and development for teachers and administrators on the cause, effects, and resolutions of hate crimes or hate-based conflicts. The enactment of these Federal initiatives represented an important advance in efforts to institutionalize prejudice reduction as a component of violence prevention programming.

The Department's Office of Civil Rights, in association with the National Association of Attorneys General, has provided excellent counsel and programming for schools in a publication entitled, "Protecting Students from Harassment and Hate Crimes: A Guide for Schools." That publication is available online here: <http://www.ed.gov/offices/OCR/archives/Harassment/index.html>

MODEL RESOURCES

Even absent a well-crafted hate crimes law, Participating States could provide training and information or promulgate guidelines on how to report and how to respond to a hate crime. For example, the International Association of Chiefs of Police (IACP) has prepared very useful and accessible resources to help improve law enforcement preparation and response to hate violence. IACP held a Summit on hate crimes in June, 1999. The Summit report is available online here: http://www.theiacp.org/documents/index.cfm?fuseaction=document&document_id=160

In addition, funded by a grant from the Justice Department, the IACP prepared a guide to hate crimes for first responding police officers in the field. This guidebook is online here:

http://www.theiacp.org/documents/index.cfm?fuseaction=document&document_id=141

Here are additional examples of thoughtful hate crime victim assistance/community action guides: one from the Organization for Chinese Americans, another from Sikh Media Watch, others from the Los Angeles County District Attorney's Office.

<http://www.ocanatl.org/bin/html0s/02179.1.2152521134000014368>

http://www.sikhmediawatch.org/pubs/Know_What_To_Do.PDF

<http://da.co.la.ca.us/pdf/hatecrimes.pdf>

<http://lahumanrelations.org/publications/docs/2004HCR.pdf>. (This well-crafted and inclusive annual report is a model for how local jurisdictions can raise awareness about this problem.)

PROGRAMS OF THE ANTI-DEFAMATION LEAGUE

The League has been recognized as a leading resource on effective responses to violent bigotry, including our annual Audit of Anti-Semitic Incidents, and the design and delivery of anti-bias, anti-Semitism and Holocaust education programs. ADL has drafted model hate crime statutes for state legislatures, and serves as a principal resource for the FBI in developing training and outreach materials for the Hate Crime Statistics Act (HCSA), which requires the Justice Department to collect statistics on hate violence from law enforcement officials across the country.

ADL's law enforcement training is Peace Officer Standard Training certified and uses interactive technology with scenarios and case studies—some of which have already been adapted for use outside the US.

For example, in Austria: ADL and a team of over 50 of both civilian and law enforcement trainers work with the Austrian Ministry of Interior, to conduct anti-bias training for every professional and new recruit in the country. These trainings are compulsory and encompass anti-bias and hate crime training. In the last 5 years, this training has reached over 10 percent of Austria's law enforcement professionals. The Austrian Ministry of Education has also implemented our signature anti-bias program A Classroom of Difference™ in select schools across the country.

LAW ENFORCEMENT RESOURCES

—LEARN (Law Enforcement Agency Resource Network) Website www.adl.org/learn

In addition to a law enforcement bulletin distributed to over 10,000 law enforcement officers nationwide—ADL has a Website specifically designed for law enforcement to provide training and educational information for law enforcement personnel on extremist groups and individuals, terrorism, hate crimes, and other issues of interest to the law enforcement community.

—Hate Crimes Training

Building on ADL’s expertise in monitoring and exposing the activities of organized hate groups and in crafting legal and legislative responses to hate crime, ADL has developed a hate crimes training program for law enforcement professionals.

ADL training seminars offer instruction on the special nature of hate crime, the legal and constitutional framework in which federal and state hate crime statutes operate, and how to perform investigative and enforcement duties in a way that reassures the victims and helps alleviate community tensions and fear.

—Anti-Bias Training

The unique role of law enforcement officials in any community makes cross-cultural understanding imperative. In addition to the need to ensure officer-to-officer sensitivity, to accurately represent its constituents, law enforcement officials need understanding, respect, and a willingness to communicate with all segments of the population. If members of the community feel that their own concerns are not understood, their confidence in law enforcement personnel to meet these needs may be severely diminished. Unfortunately, this can adversely impact cooperation for reporting crimes and providing information vital to solving crimes. To assist law enforcement professionals in meeting these challenges, ADL has created a specialized training program. Designed by human relations specialists with extensive training experience, the program helps civilian and law enforcement personnel to examine stereotypes and confront prejudice and learn diversity skills that will directly affect their work. ADL professionals have delivered anti-bias workshops for the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI), the Drug Enforcement Agency (DEA), the Los Angeles County Sheriff’s Department, New York State Police, the Houston Police Department and many other local police departments across the United States.

—Training to Address Extremism

Building on ADL’s expertise in monitoring and exposing the activities of organized hate groups, ADL has developed an extremism training program for law enforcement professionals. Seminars about extremist ideologies and effective investigation, solving and prosecuting techniques have been conducted by ADL throughout the country. Imagine the value added when a police officer who sees a tattoo or marking at a crime scene—and is able to connect that to an extremist group, an ideology or a conspiracy theory. Tools like the ADL hate symbols database and printed pocket guide of these symbols and the ongoing relationship with experts in their communities can boost an officers effectiveness in dealing with anti-Semitism, extremism and hate crime.

Anti Bias Education in Schools—and New Online Training Institute

Experience has shown that hate is learned. And just as it is learned, so it can be un-learned. Successful programs are as varied as the target audiences and the countries in which they are offered. Our own programs, reaching approximately 15 countries today, range from anti-bias initiatives to teach, for example, even a toddler to appreciate physical differences—to equipping college students to face the collateral damage of hate rallies on

their campuses—to training teachers and student leaders to get involved in things like name-calling before they escalate.

Changing social and political dynamics force educators to continually take stock and refine their tools. Our experience has shown, and ODIHR's recent study on Education about the Holocaust and Anti-Semitism found this as well—educational programs must be relevant to students and must provide both students and teachers tools to cope with the current events.

The ADL has had positive experience with a number of its programs that are targeted toward cutting through the stereotypes and myths that operate in today's classroom and have demonstrated results and transferability to the pedagogical model and context of a number of OSCE Participating States.

The ADL A WORLD OF DIFFERENCE® Institute has trained approximately 420,000 teachers in the U.S., impacting over 37 million students, training them in how to confront their own biases as well as how to use specially designed curricular materials. The programs have been evaluated by independent researchers and institutions including Yale University, the University of Pennsylvania's Graduate School of Education and Teacher's College of Columbia University. This program has been adapted in eight OSCE Participating States, as well as to Argentina, Japan, states of the Former Soviet Union and Israel. The Institute's Peer Training program is currently in use across the US as well as in Austria, Belgium (in French and in Flemish), France, Germany, Greece, Italy, Luxembourg, The Netherlands, Portugal, Spain and The United Kingdom.

We have just previewed to the public this month an exciting initiative to take the A WORLD OF DIFFERENCE® training online in a first of its kind online web-based training program to reach into schools, homes, corporations, law enforcement agencies and elsewhere. Making Diversity Count, the inaugural training course, an interacting and engaging professional development online training program for secondary school educators will go live in January 2007.

A NEW GENERATION OF HOLOCAUST EDUCATION PROGRAMS

—Schools. *Echoes and Reflections* is a new multimedia curriculum on the Holocaust—is the result of a partnership, combining the national outreach network of the Anti-Defamation League (ADL), the unmatched visual history resources of the Shoah Foundation, and the historical expertise of Yad Vashem. The pedagogical experience of the three organizations produced the most comprehensive curriculum on the Holocaust available to date. This unprecedented, rich, primary-source-based program—with the visual testimonies of the Shoah Foundation, the staggering data of Yad Vashem and the expertise of ADL—significantly enhances and vastly enriches educational tools for learning about the Holocaust. *Echoes and Reflections* helps students make connections between the Holocaust and its context to their own personal lives. The use of survivor testimony video draws the students into a more personal relationship between them and the material.

—Law Enforcement. The Holocaust is also a meaningful education tool for law enforcement. Working with the US Holocaust Memorial Museum, ADL's Law Enforcement and Society: Lessons of the Holocaust program challenges law enforcement professionals to examine their partnership with the communities they serve. It uses the history of the Holocaust to explore issues of their role as protectors of individual rights, checks and balances, and to examine the personal responsibility of officers 60 years ago and today. Offi-

cers have said this examination of the Holocaust has helped them gain a deeper perspective on the critical role they play in society and a greater understanding of the values and code of ethics of their profession. This program has touched tens of thousands of federal, state and local law enforcement professionals. It is also a required part of the training for all new FBI agents.

—Interfaith Programming. In the US, ADL’s Bearing Witness Program for Catholic School Educators helps teachers examine anti-Semitism and the Holocaust as a starting point for addressing issues of diversity in contemporary society. Its goal is to successfully implement Holocaust education in religious schools. In order to do this effectively, teachers work to confront and to acknowledge the history of the Holocaust including the role of the Catholic Church and other religious institutions. This program is a collaborative effort between ADL, the Archdiocese, and the US Holocaust Memorial Museum. Initially offered only in Washington, DC, the program has now expanded and will be offered in five US cities this summer.

YOUTH HATE VIOLENCE PREVENTION

The Partners Against Hate initiative draws on the experience, networks, and resources of its three cooperating national organizations—the Anti-Defamation League (ADL), the Leadership Conference Education Fund (LCEF), and the Center for the Prevention of Hate Violence (Center). The Partners’ Web site, serves as a comprehensive clearinghouse of hate crime-related information, including resources developed through the grant, as well as other promising programs from across the country. In addition, the Web site includes access to the finest database of hate crime laws that form the basis of criminal enforcement in the states, and counteraction tools.

It is worth highlighting that so many of the programs we are discussing today are available at a relatively minimal cost. We heard today about excellent materials that can already be downloaded in different languages. They require only support for printing costs to put them in the hands of many more teachers and students. A number of the ADL programs are provided at minimal cost or no cost wherever possible—what we ask is for a government or ministry to open their doors and facilitate their implementation.

We look forward to working with Members of the Helsinki Commission and Members of Congress to help governments mobilize the courage to tap the most indispensable resource, the will to let these programs make a difference.

PREPARED STATEMENT OF LIEBE GEFT, DIRECTOR, SIMON WIESENTHAL CENTER'S MUSEUM OF TOLERANCE

As an accredited NGO at the UN, UNESCO, the OSCE and the Council of Europe, the Simon Wiesenthal Center (SWC) is vitally concerned with the challenges of Holocaust education and police hate crimes training in the context of globally resurgent anti-semitism. Last year, when American officials joined European leaders at Auschwitz-Birkenau to bow their heads in tribute to Hitler's victims at the sixtieth anniversary commemorations of the end of World War II, their concern extended to the growing threat to democratic societies posed by today's hate movements, including those that target Jewish individuals and institutions from one end of the continent to the other. For Simon Wiesenthal, the namesake of our organization, who died last September at age 96, the past was always portent if not prelude. He was gravely concerned about the current rise of ferocious anti-Semitism in Europe, and warned again and again that the most important abettor of future injustices and hate-motivated criminality is the silence of the apathetic or intimidated majority.

Last June, the Founder and Dean of the SWC, Rabbi Marvin Hier, was one of the US delegates to the Cordoba conference on Antisemitism and other Forms of Intolerance. In his remarks there, Rabbi Hier called for member states of the OSCE to establish museums/resource centers as focal points of education, especially to support law enforcement professional development and best practices. We are deeply committed to the efforts of the OSCE and eager to share our experience and knowledge in this area with governments and experts from the OSCE member states. Indeed, we have already begun to do so, both in the training of delegations from numerous European countries and by working with OSCE/ODIHR to map out future areas of cooperation including sharing of resources and expertise. Mark Weitzman, Director of the SWC Task Force Against Hate sits on ODIHR's Advisory Panel of Experts on Freedom of Religion or Belief, and has been a member of the U.S. delegation to the International Task Force (ITF) since its earliest stages. The SWC commends the energetic leadership of Ambassador Christian Strohal, and particularly the efforts of Dr. Kathrin Meyer and Paul Goldenberg, whose earlier testimony reflects their commitment and achievements, under sometimes difficult circumstances, in this area.

We are pleased to take this opportunity to recognize the efforts of the International Task Force on Holocaust Education, Research and Remembrance (ITF), now comprising 24 member countries. This unique enterprise—that brings together government and NGO participants in a cooperative effort to encourage Holocaust education, including open access to World War II era archives—has become the most important initiative in Holocaust education today. The commitment of democratic governments to the cause of Holocaust education underscores its importance. Here, we would like especially to acknowledge the support of the State Department, particularly the Office of Holocaust Issues headed by Ambassador Edward O'Donnell, and his staff, who have tirelessly pursued every opening and initiative to strengthen and support these efforts. Without this commitment, the Task Force would simply not be as successful.

It must also be said, however, that important areas still need to be strengthened. For example, it should be made clear that membership in the ITF for member states does not mean the end of educational efforts, and for member governments does not imply that the goal has been reached, nor that attention and commitment can be downscaled, nor that it is now the time to turn the light on other countries and away from their own. Member-

ship in the ITF must be viewed as a beginning, and a commitment to further intensify ongoing efforts. Anything short of that will only strengthen those who are actively trying to destroy Holocaust education, whether they come from the ranks of Islamist extremists or from the corps of extreme right-wing nationalists.

We are particularly concerned with how justifiable complaints over anti-Arab and anti-Muslim prejudice have been perverted and exploited to undermine support for educating new generations about Hitler's crimes. The Wiesenthal Center firmly believes that teaching about prejudice and punishing hate crimes are not zero-sum activities that benefit some minorities at the expense of others. Instead, our basic assumption is that learning about Europe's historic persecution culminating in the Holocaust of its archetypal minority, the Jews, can educate other minorities, including today's Muslim immigrant communities in Europe, about the dynamics of prejudice and discrimination against which they seek to empower themselves. The SWC's new documentary film, *Ever Again*, warns about extremists exploiting current European turmoil, particularly in Europe's growing Muslim community that is experiencing a veritable war for hearts and minds between moderates and the hate merchants who unfortunately have the loudest megaphones. To make matters worse, their pernicious influence is projected into cyberspace by a metastasizing network of thousands of Holocaust-denying web sites and chat rooms. The challenge of the Internet is the special focus of the Wiesenthal Center Task Force Against Hate initiative, which has just produced its eighth annual CD-ROM on Digital Terrorism and Hate. Antisemitism is the primary manifestation of the haters' diabolical purpose, and must continue to be tracked with specific focus—not lost in an amorphous holistic category with all forms of intolerance, as some OSCE members have suggested.

The monitoring of hate is the responsibility of both government and law enforcement. The Wiesenthal Center has extensive experience in law enforcement training through its educational arm, the Museum of Tolerance. The Museum's Tools for Tolerance® for Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice Professionals programs have served well over 75,000 officers and law enforcement personnel since the program's inception in 1996, constituting perhaps the largest training program of its kind in the nation. The success and recognition of these programs prompted the creation of the New York Tolerance Center, thereby creating powerful bicoastal learning environments for these innovative programs to bridge personal, local and global issues, and to challenge participants to redefine professional roles in an increasingly complex and changing world.

Tools for Tolerance® for Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice Professionals now offers ten distinct courses, broadening its reach in New York to the National Guard, Corrections and Probation Officers, and District Attorneys. This expands a national audience already established through the National Institutes Against Hate Crimes and Terrorism, an intense, 4-day program that has thus far brought together multidisciplinary teams of law enforcement and criminal justice professionals from 199 jurisdictions in 37 states across the U.S. to focus on critically analyzing the unique elements that differentiate hate crimes and terrorist threats from other acts of violence, and provide a structure for the creation of effective strategies for prevention and intervention. An independent evaluation of the program by the Institute for Law and Justice in Virginia in April, 2006 notes that the program "is widely heralded as one of the best trainings on hate crimes and terrorism funded by the Bureau of Justice Assistance, U.S. Department of Justice." The national reach of this training program is expanding significantly with continued Federal and State support, primarily in California and New York, as demand increases for

continuing programs that aim to further enhance law enforcement professionals' capacity to proactively prevent the spread of hate crimes in their communities; to identify and address potential terrorist threats; to provide tools for building community trust without compromising safety and security; and to address the unique challenges facing today's law enforcement leadership.

The Tools for Tolerance® program is the official Trainer of Trainers in California on the controversial topic of racial profiling, which remains a dominant issue for all law enforcement agencies. Staff and faculty also train trainers around the country, as well as deliver a core Perspectives on Profiling program at the Museum of Tolerance and the New York Tolerance Center. Close to 12,000 officers have already completed this course, which utilizes a unique training tool that confronts a number of complex issues surrounding the debate on racial profiling. Based on research from 36 police agencies around the country, the product, Perspectives on Profiling is a cutting edge training tool that moves officers into a new paradigm of thought on the subject of racial profiling. It is sensitive to the challenges that face law enforcement both in reality and in the management of public perception. The product is founded on a robust ethical perspective projected into real life situational choices.

Tools for Tolerance® has welcomed and customized programs for delegations from numerous countries. The German military has been sending groups to the Museum of Tolerance since 1999. The heads of the French National Police attended a special program, 'Crimes of Racism and Hate: Sharing Experiences, sharing Knowledge,' at the Museum of Tolerance in March 2003, and expressed interest in continued exchanges. The Tools for Tolerance program hosted a high ranking delegation of law enforcement and community leaders from Stavropol, Russia, in April, 2005. Sixteen heads of police and anti-terrorism, as well as educators, journalists and community representatives participated in a week-long Climate of Trust program in Los Angeles, and the Museum's project coordinator paid a reciprocal visit to Russia at the end of May. In late March, 2006, community leaders from Manchester, England, spent time with senior SWC and MOT staff exploring the possibility of promoting and possibly delivering the Tools for Tolerance® police training and other professional development programs from Manchester to the U.K. and Europe. In May, 2006, Canadian law enforcement command staff and officers are participating in Tools for Tolerance® programs. The New York Tolerance Center is also reaching the international community through the United Nations, and hosts visitors from the U.S. Department of State, including, most recently, a delegation of Muslim Imams and Russian Orthodox priests from the Urals.

In the experience of the SWC, Holocaust education—rather than being discarded or marginalized—can and must be integrated in the core of necessary, new educational paradigms. We welcome the opportunity to continue to work together with European law enforcement to make sure that Holocaust education continues to contribute to the future of human rights. Arguably, laws punishing Holocaust denial are still necessary in the former Nazi heartland to counter potent neo-Nazi movements. Yet the ultimate positive goal of Holocaust educators should be for all the nations of Europe and the rest of the world to embrace the 1998 Declaration of the Stockholm International Forum on the Holocaust and join the Task Force for International Cooperation on Holocaust Education, Remembrance, and Research (ITF). Prevention trumps punishment, and Holocaust education is a preventative to twenty-first century evils that we cannot afford to forgo.

RECLAIMING THE OSCE ANTI-SEMITISM TRACK

The World Jewish Congress American Section and the Simon Wiesenthal Center are pleased to offer recommendations for enhancing the U.S. strategy for combating anti-Semitism worldwide, beginning with the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) and moving to the bilateral and global dimensions. Although the United States must engage all international organizations on this issue, such as the United Nations and Organization of American States, these recommendations focus on the OSCE mechanisms because of the progress to date and the precedents which have been established through American initiative and follow-through during the past five years. Even as U.S. policy looks to utilize other international institutions, the OSCE still presents the best models and track record—and the best opportunities for real progress and for application elsewhere.

WITHIN OSCE

1. Resume the original U.S. push for high-level attention to the problems raised by resurgent anti-Semitism as well as Islamophobia and other forms of racism and xenophobia. The fact that most OSCE members have not fulfilled their Berlin commitments should not be accepted as justification for abandoning a high-level and distinct focus on combating anti-Semitism, or accepting assurances regarding the Western European “holistic” approach. On the contrary, maintaining the public spotlight on unique and distinct phenomena keeps governments on notice, which is precisely why some governments may seek to downgrade the visibility of this issue.

2. Funding for ODIHR coordination and for the personal representatives of the OSCE Chairman-in-Office should be continued and run through the general budget, rather than as an extraordinary allocation from one or more individual governments. Staff positions within ODIHR should be institutionalized permanently rather than depending on voluntary and time-limited seconding of personnel from member governments. It should also be emphasized that the prime objective of the personal representatives is to advocate within the OSCE system for full implementation of relevant documents such as the Berlin Declaration, rather than to analyze data, oversee programs, or process individual grievances.

3. Ensure that different but related phenomena—such as anti-Semitism and Islamophobia—remain distinct within the OSCE system, rather than grouped together as generic results of universalized racism and xenophobia. Each phenomenon has distinct and independent roots and must be addressed with a different mix of tools, even though many of the tools are the same or similar (e.g., data collection, tolerance education, inter-religious dialogue, public statements, media campaigns).

4. Ensure that, for each country covered, the State Department’s next Global Anti-Semitism Review reports public trends and incidents of anti-Semitism, official and societal responses within the country, and diplomatic support for international coordination in the fight against anti-Semitism.

BILATERALLY AND GLOBALLY

1. In line with the parameters of Helsinki, OSCE member states have a right to question each other regarding compliance with their commitments to the Helsinki process, and the 2004 Berlin Declaration should be no exception.

- What are the other 54 member states doing to fulfill their individual and collective commitments to data collection, education and training, legislation, and sharing of best practices on the ground and through the OSCE Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights (ODIHR)?

- What data can they report on incidents of anti-Semitism and xenophobia in their own countries, without relying on pre-existing reports by NGOs or third-party governments (i.e., U.S. reports on human rights, religious freedom, and anti-Semitism)?

- How do they reconcile their own data or level of compliance with the information already disseminated by others? At the same time, the U.S. Government should continue to make available its own public record, domestic statistics, and expertise.

2. Beyond the OSCE member states, all of which agreed by consensus to adopt the Berlin Declaration during the December 2004 Sofia Ministerial, all governments of the world can be encouraged to use the Declaration as a model for addressing anti-Semitism.

3. The Berlin standards can also be promoted by U.S. delegations to fora of the United Nations and the Organization of American States.

4. The Task Force for International Cooperation on Holocaust Education, Remembrance and Research, spearheaded by the United States, provides an additional channel for promoting public programs and educational projects without the need for consensus among 55 member states, as the OSCE normally requires. Connecting the lessons of the Holocaust to the fight against contemporary anti-Semitism is already integrated into the U.S. approach, and can be further supported through the Task Force.



This is an official publication of the **Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe**.



This publication is intended to document developments and trends in participating States of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE).



All Commission publications may be freely reproduced, in any form, with appropriate credit. The Commission encourages the widest possible dissemination of its publications.



<http://www.csce.gov>

The Commission's Web site provides access to the latest press releases and reports, as well as hearings and briefings. Using the Commission's electronic subscription service, readers are able to receive press releases, articles, and other materials by topic or countries of particular interest.

Please subscribe today.