

TAKING STOCK: COMBATING ANTI-SEMITISM IN THE OSCE REGION (PART I)

HEARING BEFORE THE COMMISSION ON SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE

ONE HUNDRED TENTH CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

JANUARY 29, 2008

Printed for the use of the
Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe

[CSCE 110-2-1]



Available via <http://www.csce.gov>

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

63-6351 PDF

WASHINGTON : 2011

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

COMMISSION ON SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH COMMISSIONERS

HOUSE

ALCEE L. HASTINGS, Florida,
Chairman
LOUISE McINTOSH SLAUGHTER,
New York
MIKE McINTYRE, North Carolina
HILDA L. SOLIS, California
G.K. BUTTERFIELD, North Carolina
CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH, New Jersey
ROBERT B. ADERHOLT, Alabama
JOSEPH R. PITTS, Pennsylvania
MIKE PENCE, Indiana

SENATE

BENJAMIN L. CARDIN, Maryland,
Co-Chairman
RUSSELL D. FEINGOLD, Wisconsin
CHRISTOPHER J. DODD, Connecticut
HILLARY RODHAM CLINTON, New York
JOHN F. KERRY, Massachusetts
SAM BROWNBACK, Kansas
GORDON SMITH, Oregon
SAXBY CHAMBLISS, Georgia
RICHARD BURR, North Carolina

EXECUTIVE BRANCH COMMISSIONERS

VACANT, Department of State
VACANT, Department of Defense
VACANT, Department of Commerce

TAKING STOCK: COMBATING ANTI-SEMITISM IN THE OSCE REGION (PART I)

JANUARY 29, 2008

COMMISSIONERS

	Page
Hon. Benjamin L. Cardin, Co-Chairman, Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe	1
Hon. Christopher H. Smith, Ranking Member, Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe	3

MEMBER

Hon. George V. Voinovich, Senator from the State of Ohio	6
--	---

WITNESSES

Gert Weisskirchen, Personal Representative of the Chairman-in-Office of the OSCE on Combating Anti-Semitism ...	8
Kathrin Meyer, Advisor on Anti-Semitism Issues, OSCE Office of Democratic Institutions and Human Rights	10

APPENDICES

Prepared statement of Hon. Alcee L. Hastings, Chairman, Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe	30
Prepared statement of Hon. Benjamin L. Cardin, Co-Chairman, Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe ..	32
Prepared statement of Hon. Christopher H. Smith, Ranking Member, Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe	34
Prepared statement of Gert Weisskirchen	36
Prepared statement of Kathrin Meyer	40

TAKING STOCK: COMBATING ANTI-SEMITISM IN THE OSCE REGION (PART I)

January 29, 2008

COMMISSION ON SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE
WASHINGTON, DC

[The hearing was held at 10 a.m. in room 419, Dirksen Senate Office Building, Washington, DC, Hon. Benjamin L. Cardin, Co-Chairman, Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe, presiding.]

Commissioners present: Hon. Benjamin L. Cardin, Co-Chairman, Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe and Hon. Christopher H. Smith, Ranking Member, Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe.

Member present: Hon. George V. Voinovich, Senator from the State of Ohio.

Witnesses present: Gert Weisskirchen, Personal Representative of the Chairman-in-Office of the OSCE on Combating Anti-Semitism and Kathrin Meyer, Advisor on Anti-Semitism Issues, OSCE Office of Democratic Institutions and Human Rights.

HON. BENJAMIN L. CARDIN, CO-CHAIRMAN, COMMISSION ON SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE

Mr. CARDIN. The Commission will come to order. And let me first thank our witnesses for being here and make a few announcements.

This is the first of a series of Commission hearings focused on reviewing efforts to monitor and combat anti-Semitic activities throughout the OSCE region.

A second hearing will take place on February the 7th at 2:30, and we hope you all will be able to join us.

I thank Commissioner Smith for joining us today. Commissioner Smith has been at the forefront of this issue since we've been debating how the OSCE should deal with the rise of anti-Semitism, particularly starting in the beginning of this century.

As many of you know, this week is a particularly important week. Twenty-six of the OSCE participating States recognize a day of remembrance on January the 27th.

On January 27th, 1945, the largest web of Nazi concentration and extermination camps, Auschwitz and Birkenau, were liberated. So I think it's particularly appropriate that we are holding this hearing during this week.

In the United States, our day of remembrance takes place in May, and it is an important moment for us to reflect on one of the darkest chapters in the history of mankind.

I also want to acknowledge that we've been joined by Senator Voinovich. Senator Voinovich has been one of the real leaders on the efforts to combat anti-Semitism within the OSCE and with his work here in the U.S. Senate.

Let me point out that Chairman Hastings, who was responsible for setting up these hearings, is not with us today because of the pressing business within his own State of Florida, and he asked me to apologize to our witnesses.

Chairman Hastings is, of course, the former President of the Parliamentary Assembly of the OSCE and at the forefront of making this issue a priority within the OSCE. He again offers his apologies for not being personally present today.

First, let me welcome Professor Gert Weisskirchen, a dear friend of ours, a person who we've worked with for many years, a distinguished member of the German Parliament, but now has the responsibility as the special representative of the OSCE in dealing with anti-Semitism within the OSCE region, and has done a fantastic job on this issue.

Let me just reminisce for a moment. It was the Berlin conference, Parliamentary Assembly, in 2002, in which Gert and Chris Smith really took on the leadership to say anti-Semitism should be looked at independent of the other forms of discrimination because of its rise in the OSCE region during this period.

With the help of Senator Voinovich, with the help of Chairman Hastings and others, the initiative started. It started with parliamentarians. It started within the Parliamentary Assembly. And it started in Berlin in 2002 with a sidebar meeting hosted by the German and United States delegations to look at developing a strategy to really promote the issue of dealing with anti-Semitism within the OSCE region.

As a result of that sidebar meeting, it was determined that it would be best to have a separate conference dealing with anti-Semitism. We took that to the ministerial meeting in December and got support in the ministerial meeting to set up these special conferences to deal with anti-Semitism.

First in Vienna and then in Berlin, these meetings took place, in Vienna in June '03 and Berlin in April '04, and we were privileged to be part of those delegations in which a blueprint was established for dealing with the growth of anti-Semitism, a very comprehensive blueprint that looked at us as parliamentarians with responsibility to show leadership and develop programs to combat anti-Semitism by first getting the facts, looking at the data, and trying to find out the episodes of anti-Semitism within our own communities.

Too many times, acts of vandalism were considered vandalism when we knew, in fact, they were—they were episodes of anti-Semitism.

And we needed to have the facts. We needed to have the data. And that was part of our effort, to make sure that we collected the information.

We thought education was very important to deal with particularly young people, so they understand the importance of the Holo-

caust in the recent history of mankind and to develop programs to make people sensitive to the problems of anti-Semitism.

I think these conferences were very, very successful. One of the results of the conference was to establish special representatives in the area not only of anti-Semitism; we later also set up special representatives in other areas of discrimination.

And we're very pleased that Gert Weisskirchen was selected as the special representative in the area of anti-Semitism.

It was also an empowerment of ODIHR, that ODIHR, the arm within the OSCE that deals with human rights issues, should be able and capable of getting the type of support to our states to deal with anti-Semitism, to be able to look at best practices, be able to offer technical assistance, be able to help the states deal with these issues.

Well, that's where we are. That's where we've come. But today, there are still troubling episodes. We see leaders within the OSCE make statements that are extremely troublesome. On the other hand, we do see leadership that stands up against this, and we see that we've made some progress.

So we very much look forward to this hearing to establish the record of what is happening within the OSCE region, including in North America, and whether we are, in fact, living up to the mandate that we started in 2002 of ridding the OSCE region—indeed, ridding the world—of the rise in and work toward the elimination of anti-Semitism.

So with that in mind, it's a real pleasure to have our witnesses here today and to continue these hearings to allow outside groups an opportunity to testify.

I thank you for making the effort to appear before the Commission. And once again, I want to thank my two colleagues that are here. Clearly, we would not have made this progress without the leadership of the United States and Germany.

And in the leadership of the United States, it was the parliamentarians led by our Chairman at that time, Chris Smith, that focused our government on the importance to make this a priority within the OSCE.

There are so many priorities that you could have, so many issues that you have to deal with, and I think it's to the credit of this Commission under the leadership of Chairman Smith that we were able to get the United States to make this a top priority within OSCE.

And to Senator Voinovich, who has been at the forefront of this fight on the floor of the United States and in quarters around the world, I offer again my congratulations to him for being able to get to where we are today.

So with that in mind, let me turn first, if I might, to Mr. Smith for any opening comments that he would like to make.

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

Mr. SMITH. Mr. Chairman, thank you so very much for your very kind remarks, and I just want to note for the record to make it very clear that the efforts have been absolutely bipartisan on this Commission.

We have joined arms in fighting and combating the scourge of anti-Semitism, and we're doing so, you and I and Senator Voinovich and Alcee Hastings and the rest of this Commission—Steny Hoyer—going back to the 1980s when all of us were so very much involved with the move to promote the freedom and the rescue of Soviet Jews.

We just celebrated the 40th anniversary of the Soviet Jewry movement earlier this month, and we remember that some 1.4 million Soviet Jews were rescued and, during the darkest days, almost 700,000, because of the linkage between Jackson-Vanick and the careful work that was done by Congress and by the executive branch and by friends in Europe to try to effectuate the release of Jews who were suffering, the refuseniks and so many others, in the Soviet Union.

I want to thank you again for this important hearing, to you and to Alcee Hastings. It's important that we continue to push this issue aggressively and painstakingly, and especially accurately, to ensure that the record clearly shows what progress has or has not been made.

And I especially want to thank and welcome our two distinguished witnesses, Gert Weisskirchen, who has been truly a leader in the OSCE region, and that would include the United States, in promoting respect, tolerance, and the embrace of our friends in the Jewish community.

If we don't speak out, if we don't speak out boldly and accurately, so many will find themselves the targets of anti-Semitic hate. And Gert has done an extraordinary job as personal rep.

He has really crisscrossed Europe on behalf of those in Judaism who have been attacked with such malicious hate and anger. And I want to personally thank him for his leadership. He has taken this issue and run with it and done an extraordinary job.

And so thank you, Gert, for your extraordinary work.

I remember, Mr. Chairman, in 2002 when several of us from the U.S. Congress, including my good friend and colleague, Mr. Cardin, then Congressman—now he's been moved up to Senator—when we noticed and were greatly alarmed by the spike of anti-Semitic violence sweeping through much of the OSCE region, particularly in Western Europe.

This Commission held a series of hearings to learn what the facts were, and they were, indeed, frightening. Then we worked together with Professor Weisskirchen and others in Europe to launch the OSCE into the fight against anti-Semitism.

For many of us on this Commission, 2002 was a turning point. We had had hearings before. I remember I chaired a hearing back in 1995 about the rising tide of anti-Semitic violence.

But much of it was privatized, particularly in the former Soviet Union, and there was not this wholesale move into this hate, which was being aided and abetted by the diaspora that was coming into Europe as well as by the right wing, the extreme right wing, the so-called skinheads, and by, regrettably, an acquiescence by many in the academic community who were demonizing Israel but, really, it was just a cover for anti-Semitic perspectives.

For many of us, like I said, that was a turning point. We began to notice that there were an increasing number of attacks on synagogues, Jewish cultural sites, cemeteries, and individuals.

It was an ugly reality that we knew wouldn't go away by ignoring it or by wishing it away. It was a chilling reminder that our societies still harbor a dangerous collection of bigots and racists who hate Jews. It had to be defeated.

In 2002, we gathered with our colleagues from other countries under the banner of the OSCE in Vienna and later in Berlin, Paris, Brussels, Cordova, and Bucharest to plan what practical steps we could take not just to mitigate this century-old dark obsession but to crush this pernicious form of hate.

In the first years after 2002, speaking out was the most important thing. When national leaders failed to denounce anti-Semitic violence and slurs, the void was not only demoralizing to the victims, but silence actually enabled the wrongdoing.

Silence by elected officials in particular conveyed approval, or at least acquiescence, and contributed to a climate of fear and a sense of vulnerability.

But the Vienna and Berlin conferences and those that followed were not just about words. We also worked on deeds as well, matching those words with deeds.

One of the most important deeds has been to commit the OSCE states to keep reliable records on hate crimes, including anti-Semitic crimes. A surgeon can't remove a cancer or prescribe a course of treatment without first documenting the nature, scope, and extent of the disease.

Nathan Sharansky on two occasions appeared before our Commission and admonished us to chronicle, to painstakingly put together, what is happening—don't misattribute a crime, the desecration of a Jewish cemetery or of a synagogue, to hooliganism or some other—call it what it is, but keep accurate records.

We had to fight what was going on, but we had to do it without hyperbole and with accuracy. To the extent countries have followed through on their commitment, they have been able to better craft strategies for combating anti-Semitism and to tailor police training to the kinds of hate crimes that most often occur.

Another important deed has been to promote Holocaust education and remembrance. It seems to me that only the most hardened bigot can study the horrors of the Holocaust and not cry out, "Never again."

It is now 6 years since the OSCE has put a special emphasis on the fight against anti-Semitism. The record in these 6 years among some of the countries is clearly mixed.

But we can't allow human rights fatigue and indifference to set in. Anti-Semitism remains what it has always been, a unique evil, a distinct form of intolerance, the oldest form of religious bigotry on earth and a malignant disease of the heart that has often led to murder.

I look forward to learning how the OSCE commitments to combat anti-Semitism have been implemented by our two very distinguished witnesses.

And we need, Mr. Chairman—and I think that's the reason for this hearing—need to redouble our efforts to fight the scourge.

And again, I also, like you, want to give thanks for the great work that Senator Voinovich has done over these years. He has been a great leader on issues relating to Judaism and to Jews, first in the Soviet Union and now, of course, everywhere where they are being maligned. So I want to thank him for his leadership as well.

Thanks, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CARDIN. Senator Voinovich?

HON. GEORGE V. VOINOVICH, SENATOR FROM THE STATE OF OHIO

Mr. VOINOVICH. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I, first of all, want to thank Alcee Hastings for working with you to have this hearing.

I think you've done an outstanding job of giving the chronology of all the years and the work that's gone into this.

And, Chris, thank you very much for your great leadership.

Without the two of you, we wouldn't be here today.

And it's interesting that I was appointed to the Helsinki Commission when I came into the Senate, and I'll never forget the hearing that you had, Chris, and it brought me back to a promise that I made to myself in 1982 when I visited the Diaspora Museum in Tel Aviv.

And I can recall leaving that museum, which chronicled what Christians had done to Jews over the centuries, and said to myself how badly I felt about it and that if this ever reoccurred that I would not remain silent, that I would—I'd try to think about the righteous gentiles that are honored at Yad Vashem, and just made up my mind after that hearing that I was going to do everything I could to work with you and others to see if we could make a difference.

And I think all of us should feel very, very good that we have made the progress we've made. The OSCE took this on as a major priority. It took us a while, didn't it, Gert and Kathy, to get the core budget of the OSCE to fund the Office of Democratic Institutions and Human Rights?

And I have read the report that's been prepared about all of the various countries, and I'm sure that this would never have occurred.

In the United States, we now have a special envoy at the State Department as a result of our global anti-Semitism bill back, I think, in 2004, and Gregg Rickman is—we'll be hearing from him, I think, one of these days about his report and what he's doing.

So I think that we've come together in an unusual way to deal with something that's a sickness, a sickness that has to be eradicated if we expect to have a world that we can all live in, and a peaceful world.

And so I thank both of you for your great leadership. You're on the ground where the rubber hits the road, and I'm very grateful to you. You've both done an outstanding job.

I understand you're going to be leaving, but I understand there's some good qualified candidates, and I hope that somehow you're able to share with them your passion for this job and have the motivation that they need to be successful.

But I think that we should feel good about where we are, but I think that we all know that this is something that we need to stay on top of constantly.

And I think, again, Mr. Chairman, that we ought to bring this up again to the State Department. We're going to have a new secretary of state one of these days.

I think we ought to make a point of making sure that this is on that person's high priority list, let the OSCE know that we're unrelenting and that we're not going to let this slide back, which is what happens usually when you have a problem. You kind of deal with it and then you let it kind of—you know, you don't give it the attention that it needs.

And also to underscore to the ministerial groups that they've got to put the money into this so that we can be successful and still deal with—Gert, you'll be talking, I'm sure, about your position. That's still uncertain about how that all works out.

And so I just want to say thank you, Mr. Chairman, for having this hearing, and I'm anxious to hear from our two witnesses today.

Mr. CARDIN. Thank you very much, Senator.

As I pointed out, Chairman Hastings not only took on a leadership role within our Commission to further the issue of the importance of separating anti-Semitism for particular treatment within the OSCE, but as President of the Parliamentary Assembly provided incredible leadership to advance this issue throughout the OSCE.

Without objection, his statement will be made part of the record.

We now turn to our two witnesses, and we thank both of you for being here. You really are experts in this area, and it's a real privilege to have both of you appear before the U.S. Congress.

Professor Weisskirchen, since 1976, has been a member of the German Parliament and a foreign policy spokesman for the Social Democratic Party of Germany since 1999.

In 1994, Professor Weisskirchen became a member of the Parliamentary Assembly of the OSCE and served as a spokesman of the Social Democratic members of the Parliamentary Assembly of the OSCE since 1997.

He has served as the OSCE chair-in-office personal representative on anti-Semitism since 2005.

And Dr. Kathrin Meyer. Since August 2004, Dr. Meyer has served as the advisor on anti-Semitism issues in the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe Office of Democratic Institutions and Human Rights, better known as ODIHR.

In addition to being responsible for all matters related to anti-Semitism and Holocaust education in the 56 OSCE participating States, Dr. Meyer has led efforts to develop related teaching, monitoring and reporting material.

While we regret that Dr. Meyer will be leaving the OSCE, and, as I understand it, this is her last formal act on behalf of the OSCE, we're glad that she will be continuing her efforts to combat anti-Semitism as the Executive Secretary of the Task Force for International Cooperation on Holocaust Education, Research and Remembrance, which counts many of the OSCE countries among its membership, including the United States.

And it's been one of our priorities to get a broader participation within OSCE within the organization that you shortly will be leading.

With that, we'll hear first from Professor Weisskirchen.

**GERT WEISSKIRCHEN, PERSONAL REPRESENTATIVE OF THE
CHAIRMAN-IN-OFFICE OF THE OSCE ON COMBATING ANTI-
SEMITISM**

Mr. WEISSKIRCHEN. Thank you so much, Mr. Chairman and both Mr. Voinovich, the Senator, and Member of the House, Mr. Smith, for inviting me. And I would like to give you kind of an overview what is going on in the OSCE space.

Despite the considerable efforts that have been undertaken in many participating States and the numerous conferences that have been held—you mentioned some of them—there have been recurrent manifestations of anti-Semitism in many countries of the OSCE region.

This includes countries whose governments and public institutions have had an excellent record in the fight against anti-Semitism.

Roughly 2 weeks ago in Berlin, the following event took place. There was a group of five Jewish pupils in front of their school, Jewish school, and there was a dog. And the commander of the dog hunted the dog to this group of these few pupils.

And then they were shouting, the commander and two others participating, shouting anti-Semitic, aggressive sentences to this small group. So that only shows that even in Berlin, in Germany, this has happened.

And if you look to other countries in the region, in the OSCE space, you will find out that there is, unfortunately, to be seen these kind of problems.

If you look to, say, Croatia, there is a rock singer named Thompson. He was lately in Canada and in Australia, and thousands of—more than 20,000 people were there listening to his music.

And he is performing music in a very ambivalent way—not only nationalistic, not only linked to Ustasha slogans, but in real terms it is a kind of neo-Nazism going on there.

So you will find out that there are several occasions to be seen. If you look to, say, Russia, then you will find out that there are numerous cases to be seen on the ground.

We had last Friday a hearing, a conference, in the German Bundestag that has been showing that Alla Gebba (ph), who is the founding woman of Holocaust education in Russia—he gave witness to what has been going on in this country, especially anti-Semitism there that is related to some sectors of the orthodox church.

So in this regard, we do see two types of anti-Semitism growing—on one hand, the old style cultural anti-Judaism anti-Semitism, on one hand, and on the other hand, in parallel you see in several sectors of younger people that kind of new anti-Semitism growing, which is linked to anti-Zionism. Especially in some immigrant younger populations we will find this.

In France, there is a survey that shows that especially in migrant communities, Muslim-oriented, you will find that kind of new type of anti-Semitism growing.

So that means, in short, that although we have had 47 commitments that the participating States were ready to accept in the different conferences, the picture is showing that anti-Semitism is up to now not being defeated.

And in this regard, I do think that we should try to find out in what way we as parliamentarians, as members of national parliaments, could act more efficiently together.

And I would like to show you one—in my experience, one of the best practices I ever have seen, that in Great Britain the parliament inaugurated an inquiry dealing with the fight against anti-Semitism, and they worked out a kind of recommendation in order to act more precisely and efficiently in Great Britain.

Roughly 50 recommendations were then being discussed by partisan manner, and from the different levels, from the state to the regions to the communities, they now are acting more precisely together in order to fight better against anti-Semitism.

This here, the Helsinki Commission, is one of the best models that parliamentarians could use. Then in March there will be a hearing organized by the German Bundestag in order to find out in what way we as parliamentarians could act much more better than before.

So in short, you will see that there are several problems we see not solved. That means that we have to strengthen our efforts.

And my suggestion would be that we in the next Parliamentary Assembly of the OSCE—at first in the winter session in Vienna within several weeks, and then next in the PA annual meeting we will have in Kazakhstan, we should focus again on this point and find out in what way we can reflect on what has been done in the different parliaments, asking what the governments had done, especially dealing with the implementation process of these 47 commitments.

I have written several letters to all of the governments. The response was ambivalent. Not all of the governments gave a clear-cut answer to my questions. So in this regard, this is one of the key elements to have that real clear-cut report on what has been done in order to implement the 47 commitments.

Mr. Chairman, I would be—it would be nice if you could give me the chance to reflect on one of the cases that I'm observing, that the transformation countries, the former Communist countries—they are now undergoing a real problem because of the fact that they are now trying to establish a kind of an ethical or philosophical foundation of their new self-understanding, consciousness.

And especially if you look to—I only would like to mention one case, what is going on in Hungary. And you will find out that there is a new narrative coming to the forefront, to the surface, and this narrative is linked to historical experiences.

And especially in Hungary, this is one of the cases that you can study. You can take others into account. You can look into the processes going on in Poland, where the last book of Mr. Gross, "Fear," has been debated now in a very hard way within the society.

So he is related in trying to bring to the consciousness of the people what Poland has been doing after the second world war in pogroms, in Kielce, in Jedwabne in '41, and later then in '46. So in these two countries there is a public debate going on.

And now I see that we as parliamentarians could be helpful in order to clarify this kind of new narrative coming to the forefront which is, in a way, linked to historical approaches and concepts.

You can see in these two cases that some help and some assistance could be delivered from the outside, and I do hope that we as parliamentarians can do better in order to debate our colleagues in these two parliaments.

Thank you so much.

Mr. CARDIN. Thank you very much.

Dr. Meyer?

**KATHRIN MEYER, ADVISOR ON ANTI-SEMITISM ISSUES, OSCE
OFFICE OF DEMOCRATIC INSTITUTIONS AND HUMAN RIGHTS**

Dr. MEYER. Mr. Chairman, committee members, ladies and gentlemen, I would like to thank you for the opportunity to present an overview of recent trends and manifestations of anti-Semitism in the OSCE region and the status of certain initiatives and commitments designed to combat anti-Semitism on behalf of the OSCE's Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights.

I will not go too much into detail regarding the history of the OSCE's involvement in the fight against anti-Semitism because Senator Cardin did that already in his opening statement.

Just referring to the Berlin declaration that came out of the Berlin conference, with this Berlin declaration the participating States recognized that anti-Semitism has new forms and expressions and that it poses a threat to democracy, the values of civilization and to the overall security in the OSCE region and beyond and therefore is an issue that a security organization has to deal with.

The OSCE participating States have also repeatedly declared that they condemn without reserve all manifestations of anti-Semitism and that international developments or political developments in Israel or elsewhere in the Middle East never justify anti-Semitism.

With a view to responding to and preventing anti-Semitism, a host of commitments were made in the area of data collection, legislation, and education. The commitments made in 2004 also led to the emergence of the ODIHR's Tolerance and Non-Discrimination Program and to my portfolio as advisor on anti-Semitism issues.

As an institution tasked to assist participating States with the implementation of commitments, the ODIHR and its Tolerance and Non-Discrimination Program are, inter alia, mandated to follow closely anti-Semitic incidents and to systematically collect and disseminate information throughout the OSCE area on best practices for preventing and responding to anti-Semitism.

In order to report on anti-Semitism in all its different forms, it is important for us to be able to identify it.

In cooperation with the European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights, the former EUMC and international experts, the ODIHR has applied the working definition of anti-Semitism that has been used since late 2004 for all activities regarding anti-Semi-

tism. This working definition was also cited in the Brussels declaration of the OSCE Parliamentary Assembly in July 2006.

The definition can be found in all our publications. It is the basis of our monitoring activities and our hate crime report that is available online but also in hard copy here today.

This report gives an overview of incidents and state responses to racist, xenophobic, anti-Semitic and other hate-motivated incidents in the OSCE region. The latest report covers the year 2006. The report for 2007 is currently being drafted.

Based on the available data, it can be said that the number of anti-Semitic incidents in the year 2006 increased dramatically in several countries—actually, in most countries.

One of the most worrisome trends we have identified with respect to 2006 and also for 2007 is that schools and students have become a prominent target and forum for manifestations of anti-Semitism.

In 2006, Jewish schools were under threat and/or attack in Austria, Canada, Denmark, France, Hungary, the Russian Federation, Ukraine, United Kingdom, and the United States.

To give you the most recent example of this trend—Gert Weisskirchen mentioned already—on January 17th, a group of Jewish students from the Jewish high school, Berlin, were verbally abused by a group of punks who also set their dogs on these Jewish students.

Analysis and investigations of these incidents show that the projection of anti-Israel sentiment onto Jewish communities throughout Europe was a widespread pattern in 2006 that also continued in 2007, and it found its expressions in both organized and spontaneous violence.

Holocaust denial also became an issue that arises increasingly, and also traditional anti-Semitic world views, stereotypes, and radical exclusionary nationalism have continued to motivate anti-Semitic incidents in the OSCE region.

The annual hate crime report stands at the center of monitoring activities. We draw on statistics and reports received from participating States, civil society, and the media.

Given the limited resources and the varieties of taskings received by the ODIHR's Tolerance and Non-Discrimination Program, this report can only be as good as the information we receive from participating States and civil society.

Looking at the way in which participating States have submitted information to the ODIHR in this area, the following can be summarized. Since 2004, 51 participating States responded to the note that was sent by the ODIHR.

Forty-nine participating States nominated national points of contact on hate crimes. And there are special envoys dealing with anti-Semitism issues and our relation with the Jewish community and Jewish organizations in six participating States now.

Thirty-five participating States provided feedback and additional information for the annual hate crime report for 2006. Five participating States informed the ODIHR that no hate crimes were reported in their country. Those countries were Albania, Azerbaijan, Cyprus, Monaco, and Turkey.

Apart from data collection and legislation, our focus is also on the preventative activities and education. With the Berlin declaration, the OSCE participating States committed to promoting remembrance and education about the tragedy of the Holocaust as well as educational programs to combat anti-Semitism.

Our subsequent projects and initiatives were based on an assessment of the situation as summarized in our publication "Education on the Holocaust and on Anti-Semitism in the OSCE Region."

With this study, a country-by-country overview, the ODIHR evaluated existing initiatives in the OSCE participating States and identified gaps and areas where educational efforts about the Holocaust and about anti-Semitism need to be strengthened.

In this publication, we identified the lack of training for teachers and/or lack of adequate teaching materials as one of the main problems in the region.

But it was also highlighted that contemporary anti-Semitism cannot be sufficiently addressed by Holocaust education. It should be acknowledged as an issue in itself.

Where Holocaust remembrance and education are still at the beginning or do not exist at all, the establishment of a Holocaust memorial day seems to be an excellent opportunity to start activities in this field and to raise awareness in societies.

The ODIHR seeks to assist participating States in this respect. We have developed two tools, one for governments and another for educators.

In close cooperation with the international task force for Holocaust education, remembrance and research, we have just published an online overview of good practices of commemorating the Holocaust on the level of the governments. This document was launched last Friday related to Holocaust remembrance day in many participating States, January 27th.

It provides a country-by-country overview of the official commemorative activities that take place in the OSCE participating States on Holocaust remembrance days. Thirty-six OSCE participating States provided us with information.

In close cooperation with Yad Vashem, we developed an online document that is also related to Holocaust memorial days. This is a guideline for educators that informs about educational good practices on Holocaust memorial days.

This document was launched in 2006 on Holocaust memorial day by the Belgium chairmanship and is available in 13 languages now. And the ODIHR records 400–800 downloads of this document in each language each month, so it's being very well used.

Also together with the Yad Vashem, we were happy to launch another document in December 2007. This is an easy-to-use tool, and it's aimed at teachers and other educators who feel the need to address issues pertaining to contemporary anti-Semitism, ranging from Holocaust denial to expressions of anti-Zionism and the use of anti-Semitic slurs in schools or school surroundings. It informs about different anti-Semitic stereotypes and makes suggestions on how to respond to them.

Those three documents provide educators and governmental officials with information and practical suggestions.

Another project goes one step further. Together with the Anne Frank House and experts from 10 participating States, we developed innovative and country-specific teaching materials on anti-Semitism.

The material consists of three major themes—the history of Jews and anti-Semitism in Europe until 1945, contemporary forms of anti-Semitism, and anti-Semitism as one of many forms of discrimination.

The materials have been adapted to the countries' historical and social background and are already being implemented in 5 out of the 7 pilot countries and under development for three more.

At the end of my statement, please allow me briefly to summarize our work for you. Since the establishment of the portfolio on anti-Semitism issues in the ODIHR's Tolerance and Non-Discrimination Program, there have been nine major events or conferences addressing the issue of anti-Semitism, three of which were tolerance implementation meetings.

We have published 11 books and documents in the area of tolerance and non-discrimination. Six of the publications plus our hate crime report deal with—six deal exclusively with anti-Semitism and Holocaust education, plus the two hate crime reports. Six of our overall publications have been translated into at least one other language.

Many participating States are involved in our educational, legislative, assistance, and capacity-building programs.

We look, of course, forward to continuing our cooperation, and close cooperation, with participating States, but we also have to mention that while at the beginning of the ODIHR's work on anti-Semitism and other forms of discrimination in late 2004 and 2005, there was strong political and financial support of our activities.

Unfortunately, this support has decreased in the last couple of years, especially in the terms of financial support. This is something that makes our work very difficult.

Please find more detailed information in my written statement and all publication mentioned have also been on display outside for your information. Thank you.

Mr. CARDIN. Well, again, let me thank both of you for your appearance here today and for your testimony.

Dr. Meyer, your information about 2006 being the year in which there was increased documentation of anti-Semitic activities is somewhat sobering. We knew that there was a real spike in 2000. We saw that clearly within the OSCE region. That really motivated us to have a direct program to deal with anti-Semitism.

We know today that perhaps some of that increase may well be we have better reporting. We're now getting better information. We can categorize more activities.

But we know there's trouble out there. We see the President of Belarus stereotype Jews. We see in Romania parliamentarians questioning Jewish heritage of nominees for Ambassadorships. And we see the boldness of some of the neo-Nazi activities, particularly in the Czech Republic, where during Kristallnacht they went into the Jewish quarter.

So we know that there are serious problems that are still out there and are capable of mushrooming and becoming even worse.

I guess my question to both of you is—you've given us some of the specific progress made in OSCE states, and you've given us some of the statistics on those states that have complied with the reporting requirements.

My question is are the participating States taking—realize the urgency of this issue? Are they giving it the type of attention that you would like to see? And I don't mind you naming states. If you wanted to do that, that's fine.

But I'm really interested in the overall acceptance within OSCE of the problem and willing to really tackle it by understanding the problem within their own state, seeking what are best practices, what is working in other states within the OSCE region, really trying to cooperate with your mission.

Or are they just complying with the letter of the requirements without really taking this as seriously as we would hope they would?

Dr. MEYER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. First of all, I think it's important to mention that when I mentioned that there's an increase in anti-Semitic incidents in the region, this is, of course, based on data that we receive from countries where we have reliable data, and we do not have reliable data for all countries, that's for sure.

I think if I say that our—if our findings say that the increase of 20 percent took place in France, compared to 2005 and 2006, this is a country that did data collection also before 2006, so this cannot be explained by better data collection.

So the countries that have a dramatic increase or show a dramatic increase according, also, again, to data available—I'm sure there was an increase in other countries as well not recorded—but France, United Kingdom, Belgium, Canada—those are countries with reliable data and also with governments that take responsibility and that take this issue very serious.

And that shows how serious it is. If we see an increase of 20 percent from 1 year to the other, that's dramatic. And I mean, you mentioned the increase of numbers in the year 2000. We are far, far higher than we were in the year 2000, and that was already a shock for all of us. That's one point.

The other point is that we could never come up with our hate crime report and our findings without the information we receive from civil society.

In some countries—unfortunately, the United States is one of the countries—we have excellent data, but our hate crime report has to be issued before the hate crime report of the FBI is issued, so we also rely for the United States on data that is provided to us by civil society.

And for some countries—you mentioned Belarus and also some others—there is no official data, or we get like one or two numbers from them, they'll say, "We had two anti-Semitic incidents." We cannot do anything with a letter that states there were two anti-Semitic incidents. So we rely on civil society.

I would say that some—that the OSCE region is, in a way, deeply divided when it comes to the issue of anti-Semitism. Many countries take it very seriously and take measures and support our work and try to increase their capacity for data collection.

Others do not, and also do not really see the need for that, particularly on anti-Semitism. I'm talking not for data collection, but the general trend to deal with these issues more than in a holistic approach which makes it somehow difficult to address anti-Semitism as an issue in and of itself. It sometimes does not make our job much easier.

Mr. CARDIN. If I could just interrupt there for one moment, our delegation will be in Vienna for the February winter meetings, and it's an opportunity for us to have bilateral meetings with other delegations.

I think it would be helpful for us if we had an assessment by state of those states that you believe should be doing more than they're doing, are not taking this in the manner in which they should. It would be useful for us to have that information.

I'm not interested in embarrassing states. I'm interested in getting action done. And we, I think, need to know an assessment of what states should be doing a more thorough job.

You mentioned Great Britain. You mentioned France. Both, of course, have large Jewish populations, both of which have significant problems of anti-Semitism. Both countries have been very forthcoming in trying to develop ways to deal with it. That's, obviously, what we're trying to do.

Great Britain has given us, I think, some practices that could perhaps be used in other OSCE states. That's important for us to get.

So we're not trying to pass judgment on the activities of a particular country. What we are trying to do is make sure they're taking these issues seriously and providing the leadership and are sharing the information, using good practices.

And I think unless we have the specific information per state, it's going to be difficult for our delegation to try to weigh in and be helpful.

Professor?

Mr. WEISSKIRCHEN. May I make a comment on France and Great Britain? You have pointed out that both governments and both parliaments are clear cut in their attitude toward fighting against anti-Semitism.

But on the other hand you see that in both countries anti-Semitism is growing, so if you look to the case of Great Britain, 40 percent say Jews are a legitimate target in the struggle for just order in the Middle East. That's a survey.

Then you picked up the case of France. You illustrated that. So the point is we should try and find out to have a better access and a better cooperation to these people acting on the ground in the civil society.

So this is key, I guess, that governments, parliaments, and civil society should work closely together in finding out the best practices in order to fight in a common approach against this evil.

Mr. CARDIN. I agree, and I guess my question to you is in Kiev we had a strategy and we passed a declaration. I was privileged to put that together and offer it on behalf of several parliamentarians.

Do we have a suggestion as to how the Parliamentary Assembly can be helpful in 2008 in advancing this issue?

Mr. WEISSKIRCHEN. Yes. My idea would be that we should pass on an amendment or a resolution that we should demand the governments to give more support to the civil society groups in financing, in encouraging them, in order to give them more opportunities to fight better. So this could be one of the elements, to be strengthened.

Mr. CARDIN. We'll look forward to working with you on that.

Let me ask about money since, Dr. Meyer, you brought that up.

And, Gert, you mention that frequently to us, the support, which is an important issue.

Senator Voinovich mentioned this also in his opening comments. It's been a struggle to have the transparency within the budgeting of the OSCE. I don't want to get into a large discussion about our concerns about how OSCE operates and how its budgets operate.

But I am concerned that we have the resources to support the work of the special representative and ODIHR in dealing with this very important subject. It requires resources.

And if those resources are somewhat at the whim and not predictable, it makes it difficult to have an ongoing dialogue and commitment and looking forward to progress on a yearly basis.

So I would appreciate your honest assessment to this commission as to where we are on OSCE's commitment through the budget process to the mission of combating anti-Semitism.

Dr. MEYER. Thank you. I would not comment on the whole budget here. The negotiations are under way, and the whole budget is an issue of itself for the OSCE.

When it comes to the ODIHR Tolerance and Non-Discrimination concrete projects, the tools we offer participating States in order, really, to combat on the ground such as our educational materials or as our police training, those are extra—this is funded from extra budgetary contributions.

And for this year—usually we get our first confirmations about money that we'll be getting in the beginning of the year during the HDM in Warsaw that is always in October. So for this year, 2008, we did not receive one single contribution, to the Tolerance and Non-Discrimination Program, nor did any of the participating States say there will be something coming later this year.

And some of our programs are more expensive than others. But just to give you an example, I received in 2005 a contribution from Germany of €12,000 to do something on anti-Semitism and Holocaust remembrance.

And with this money, we developed both guidelines, the guidelines on addressing anti-Semitism and the guidelines for educators on Holocaust memorial days that are available now in 13 languages, being distributed by the United Nations worldwide.

Both of these projects together, with €12,000, and there are millions of downloads out there already. So I think that we work pretty effectively with our extra budgetary contributions.

But if nothing comes in, not even such small-scale online documents can be produced. And I mean, it's not the case that we saw an overwhelming support for this project on anti-Semitism in the first place—mainly, Germany, the United States. Some money came from Austria. Very few states gave us money. But now really nothing is coming in anymore.

And one more point I would like to mention when it comes to the implementation and the support of implementation of existing programs, the teaching material on anti-Semitism that is specifically designed for the countries' needs and the background was, for example, developed also for Ukraine.

So Professor Weisskirchen and I traveled to Ukraine in 2006 and we got the confirmation that the ministry of education and the Skrubo (ph) Commission will take care of this material that was developed for free. There was money for teacher training and for printing. And we have never heard back since September of last year from the Skrubo (ph) Commission or of anyone at the ministry of education.

So the tools are there, specifically designed for countries. This material is useless for any other country. It has to be used in Ukraine. And we just cannot get it in the schools without a supporting letter or something. It's just a letter we would need.

And sometimes it's really—we get many nice statements when we travel there. At the moment, they have to get really concrete. Nothing follows up. So that's often makes our work very difficult.

Mr. CARDIN. I'll just make an observation that these extra budgetary contributions are an ongoing battle. And I really do believe the parliamentarians need to get more involved in the budgetary process within the OSCE.

There should be permanent funding within the OSCE for the mission. You shouldn't be dependent upon the generosity of a few states to move forward on these projects. These are important to the entire region and should be funded that way.

I thank the German Government and the U.S. Government, who have stepped forward to provide support for this mission. But quite frankly, it should be funded through the open, transparent process within the OSCE. And this is a continuing battle. I know it's not one that we're going to resolve here today.

But I do encourage you to look at ways—and Gert, I believe, looking more, I think, toward what you have done, because we have a close relationship, and Dr. Meyer's going to be moving on to a different role.

But I do think it's important that we have the information necessary so that as parliamentarians we can insist upon our governments in Vienna to take a different attitude on how these budgets are put together.

Congressman Smith?

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

Let me just ask a couple of questions. And again, thank you for your testimony and for the sets of documents you submitted for the record.

There was a government report by the Jewish Agency in Israel, which I'm sure you saw, on January 26th, and they talked about trends, that after the war between Israel and Lebanon, that there was a spike in anti-Semitic activity, but in many countries that spike has abated, although it's not gone away.

But they did talk about some worrying trends with regards to Britain, France, Ukraine, and also included in that worrying trend was Germany, Australia, United States, and Ukraine—oh, I mentioned Ukraine.

You know, in my own state just a couple of weeks ago, just north of my district there was a despicable act of anti-Semitism when some 500 tombstones in a Jewish cemetery were overturned.

It's not the first time, but certainly the magnitude of it just brought, I think, to everybody in my own home state again afresh that there are bigots out there who desecrate cemeteries.

So none of us are without blame. That is very actively being pursued by the police. It is being looked at for what it is, a hate crime. And my sense is that the perpetrators at some point will be brought to justice, because it is being actively looked at.

But this trend is something that I'm concerned about. You know, in our international religious freedom act, we have what we call countries of particular concern, so designated because when you look at their policies vis-a-vis religion, countries like China, like Saudi Arabia, are extreme violators of religious freedom.

And then a whole series of actions can be taken against those countries, more than a dozen, beginning with a demarche, but the real ones would be the economic sanctions that could be levied against those countries.

And I'm wondering, you know, not with the idea—obviously, the OSCE doesn't, you know, prescribe sanctions against countries, but there are countries of particular concern.

And if the United States happens to fall into that category, so be it. We need to speak truth to any power that is not doing its utmost to mitigate and hopefully end this terrible problem.

I'm also concerned about what's going on in Britain. I mean, one of the things that Sharansky has made very clear, and he did it so magnificently in his speech in Berlin—we all recall that speech when he talked about the three Ds. One of them is the demonization of Israel.

It seems to me that when things are getting worse vis-a-vis the Palestinian and Israeli negotiations, people feel they have a license to commit acts of barbarity against Jews in their home countries. It's a pretext, but we see it all the time, and it seems to be getting significantly worse.

I was in Jerusalem just a few weeks ago, and we had breakfast—Frank Wolf, Joe Pitts, and I—with Sharansky, and he made some very valid points about, you know, his concerns about what could happen—if you like what's happening in Gaza, well, do you want that to happen in the West Bank as well, where Hamas commits acts of violence with impunity?

And we all want the peace process to proceed and for there to be peace and reconciliation between the Palestinians and Jews, but false hope doesn't serve the interest of people who believe in peace and reconciliation.

And I am concerned, despite all the push, that we don't want a Gaza-fication of the West Bank. And I think that possibility is not well understood by many of our European friends, many in America, many in Canada, that Israel is between a rock and a hard place.

Its very security and survival is at risk. It's not hyperbole. It is absolutely true. So they need to proceed with extreme caution. But as they do that, there are people who then, you know, take it out

on them in terms of—and especially by proxy with the Jews in their own country.

Britain—I met with—and I’m sure other members of the Commission met with—John Mann when he made the rounds. I think he’s doing a great job. I read his report. It was an excellent report.

But as our own report shows, as the most recent report by the CST has pointed out, there has been a significant, significant rise of anti-Semitic hate in Britain, and it’s—in addition to desecration of holy sites and synagogues and cemeteries, there’s been a significant rise in actual violence against individual Jews.

And what was pointed out by the CST was that—and I find this very—it’s contained in our own U.S. report—that only one in 10 incidents that are reported to the police result in any proceedings against the perpetrator.

So we have a massive falloff, if that report is true, in prosecutions against perpetrators of crimes. And I’m wondering—I mean, the numbers are 31 percent increase from ’05 to ’06. And again, many of these are violent crimes, attacks against Jews simply because they are Jews, abusive behavior against young people at universities and colleges.

And I’m wondering if in your work, you know, you’ve noticed this particularly in Britain, but anywhere else, and especially this lack of law enforcement, which I find so disconcerting.

You know, even when the original report was made about what was going on in my—county just north of me, in Middlesex County, it was not attributed to anti-Semitic hate at first. You know, the police got it wrong at first, quickly changed it when there was an outcry from the community, which there had to be.

But when you don’t prosecute—1 in 10—that’s a terrible record. What’s your sense on that? What are you finding?

Mr. Weisskirchen?

Mr. WEISSKIRCHEN. I very much agree, Mr. Smith, what you now are describing. The point is that we do have this working definition on anti-Semitism, and this is clear cut. Especially if you look through the different “includings but are not limited to,” there are several enumerated points you can read out and find.

The point is that there should be created a kind of a real link between this working definition and the law enforcement authorities. So this has been lacking in my understanding.

And the inquiry is heading to this point, and asking for the ministry of interior to do more in creating bridges between the definition and the law enforcement instruments. So this is key, I guess.

And you have a lot of experience with other countries who are now trying to put this in place, and probably you could give some ideas how to act a bit more precisely on this point.

May I only highlight one point you have mentioned, Chris? That’s the issue of Israel and Palestine. All the time when there are crises to be seen—the latest was the Lebanon crisis—then these are then climbing up. The figures, you will find, then peaks in anti-Semitic accidents and manifestations.

So in this regard, I do hope very much that what the president yesterday said in his state of the union speech is come to in practice. It means that we will see a kind of a peace solution in the near east, and this is one of the key political methods we could use.

I do hope we'll be seeing in the next month that this comes forward.

Mr. SMITH. If I could, have you noticed any corresponding trend of Jewish attacks on Arabs or Muslims or Palestinians in any of these countries?

I mean, it seems to me it is one-sided exclusively. If things don't work out in the Middle East peace negotiations, the only one who pays a price are innocent Jews in other places.

And again, I hope I made myself clear. I think there should be, you know, the progress on the peace talks if and only if the real security issues are solved. Otherwise it could be an engraved invitation for even worse down the line for the state of Israel.

But you haven't seen any—I mean, why do you think it's so one-sided? I mean, the Jews give land for peace—promise for peace; they don't get the peace, they just give up the land—and you know, it's all one way, it seems.

And you know, I've gone to Ramallah. I've talked to the Palestinians. You know, I hope that, you know, the more moderate Palestinians who really believe in peace—because their voices are crowded out by Hamas, which believes in terrorism, and Europeans and Americans are in agreement on that.

But I'm very concerned about this, because this could drag on for many more years, and no solution found, and then again, pretext. This is our excuse—their excuse to go after Jewish people and hurt them.

Mr. WEISSKIRCHEN. Rightly so. There never was any incident, never any in my information—my information tells me that there never was any sign that Muslim communities were in any way harmed or in a way—in an aggressive demonstration or something like that has been endangered by Jewish people. Never.

Mr. CARDIN. Senator Voinovich?

Mr. VOINOVICH. I was thinking about the Berlin declaration, and one of the provisions of that provided that we declared unambiguously that international developments or political issues, including those in Israel, elsewhere in the Middle East, never justify anti-Semitism, which I thought was a very, very important thing that we were able to get into the declaration.

I've got statistics here from Canada where they have had an increase, compared in 2006 as to 2005. We know that incidents have jumped more than fourfold since 1997.

France increased more violent acts. Germany, same problem, not that you're not trying to do what you can about it, but the fact is it's there. Hungary, the same thing. Poland, which—you think that it's gotten worse. And you go on.

And I wonder to myself if we hadn't gotten started with this, where would we be today? And so I think that the challenge that the Helsinki Commission has here, and I think the OSCE, is how to figure out how we can go to the next level in terms of dealing with the challenge that we have.

And I think the—I'm an old manager, but the first thing that I think we need to deal with is the budget, and we've talked about that.

And I know that I dealt with de Gucht, the minister there from Belgium, and then I dealt with Dimitri Rupel during that period

of time where the OSCE budget was being controversial with the Russians.

As you know, they were going to pull back, and there was the negotiation going back and the question was whether or not we'd get money out of the core budget to support your work, Doctor.

And it seems to me that we really need to concentrate on that. Nobody could figure out when it was going to happen. It's a mystery about how this funding takes place.

And I think we need to pierce that veil and find out just exactly how that decisionmaking is made. So the next question then becomes all this extra money that's coming in.

From what you say, there's no extra money coming in this year. So a lot of the things that you're doing you're not going to be able to do. So two ways to deal with it—try to get the countries that have been giving the money to come to the table and provide the money or, in the alternative, try to get that money out of the budget of OSCE and then out of ODIHR. So that's part of it.

The next issue then becomes how do you get some of these countries to do a better job in terms of their reporting, in terms of their actions, in terms of their education and so forth.

And I have argued for a long time that too often what we do is we beat up on people, and I think it would be very wise if we could get the OSCE to talk about—at the meeting in Vienna, the parliamentary meeting, to maybe acknowledge and bring attention to countries that are doing an outstanding job, that are role models to accomplish what we want them to achieve, rather than just talk about the ones that aren't stepping to the table.

The other thing is that—and we're talking about our group. I don't know about the two of you, but I have got a few on the phone. I've written to the Ambassadors from countries that are not doing the job and brought to their attention things that have occurred and asked them to look into it and I'd like to hear from them about it—that is, that we can use our own auspices and our respective—and maybe that could be a little better coordinated with the Helsinki Commission, to kind of just let these folks know that are representing their countries that this is a big issue in the United States, and we'd like them to pay attention to it, so they get the word back to their countries.

So I think that where we're coming from now is we've got to figure out how do we get this to the next level, and we just don't let this thing slide back. And I'd be interested in any of your thoughts on how we can do a better job of making sure that this Berlin declaration becomes a reality.

Dr. Meyer?

Dr. MEYER. Thank you very much.

Mr. VOINOVICH. And I'd like to know, has the fact that you're now being funded out of the core budget meant any difference, or—

Dr. MEYER. Oh, yeah.

Mr. VOINOVICH [continuing]. Is it about this—go ahead. All right, go ahead.

Dr. MEYER. No. I mean, that makes a big difference. First of all, the position is independent from the generosity of states to second, because as I mentioned, I will be leaving the ODIHR soon, and I

was looking for possible successors, and I tried to approach people that I thought would be great in this job.

And I can tell you it would have been impossible to find a single person that would have applied to move to Warsaw on a secondment. It was difficult enough. But I was able to find some qualified candidates. Because of this, they know what they are getting into. They bring families to Warsaw.

If you apply for a job that you don't know next year whether your government at home still thinks this is important or not, or whether your government in general at all is able or willing to fund it—we have several countries that are never seconding to the ODIHR and others do it for a year or two and then they stop it.

So to have this position in the core budget is crucial to make it independent from the individual person who has this post but to have a continuous effort in this field.

And I would like to thank you again very much for your effort in making this happen, because otherwise we would now really be in trouble, I guess, when it comes to finding a successor.

Money is definitely a key issue, that's for sure. And I would like to maybe open another line here, and that is civil society. I did not mention that very detail in my statement, but it's in my written statement.

We do civil society outreach programs, civil society capacity-building programs, because in many countries we rely on civil society to provide us with data, because if we wait for the government to provide us with data and to have the mechanisms in place that they are able to provide us, we won't be able to do any reporting for a couple of years.

Mr. VOINOVICH. The civil society means like NGOs?

Dr. MEYER. NGOs, Jewish communities, mainly NGOs.

I think it is also important—and you mentioned the increasing numbers of anti-Semitic incidents and especially those that are connected to the Middle East conflict, or whether the Middle East conflict is being just used as an excuse for that.

This is something that we see as a very worrisome trend, because in those countries where we have really dramatically increasing numbers—you mentioned the U.K. Not last year, but the year before, Germany was one of those countries.

We do see the full support of the government in the fight against anti-Semitism. There are law enforcement trainings. There are prosecutors being trained.

For example, in the U.K. the Community Security Trust works very closely with Scotland Yard and with police trainings, and this is not a problem in that country.

And that is one of the examples where it's a pretty much top-down approach, and a top-down approach is always difficult. If the government—and we see that in Germany.

When it comes to Holocaust remembrance, to statements against anti-Semitism, the political leaders, whether it's in the parliament or the government, speak out against anti-Semitism. They fund the police. They fund activities.

But the country, the people, are not following. And that is where we see the problems, and that's why the support of civil society, of NGOs that do the work on the ground, is really crucial.

And to give you also one example from our home country, Germany, there was a tiny little NGO established after the firebombing on the synagogues in Turkey. Turkish young Berlin—people from Berlin, German citizens with a Turkish background, established an NGO to go into schools where we have a majority of students with a migrant background, with a Turkish-Arab background, to teach them about anti-Semitism, to overcome the prejudice.

And they do that with the same background, so they are very reliable. They do a good job. They were almost—this NGO ran out of funding because they rely on public funding. The German Government was not really aware of it.

So it was kind of quite—if we personally would not have known about this really fine initiative, it would be closed by now.

So there are initiatives all over. And as you know, the ODIHR also does—we have this public Web site and a data base where we try to have NGOs, little initiatives, Jewish communities, other communities to submit their good practices in order to share that.

We need money to support these NGOs. Sometimes it's just one, two people on the ground in some communities doing the work, running around, painting over the spray-painted swastikas, doing awareness-raising.

The politicians, parliamentarians, law enforcement, governments—that's one side of the story, and they're very, very important and crucial. But the people on the ground—if there's political leadership but the people do not follow, there's no education. There's no prevention work. We won't achieve anything.

So we need to stay very active in this field and support the communities and the NGOs in this field a lot. And for that, we definitely need money. And again, we do not talk big money. But we need money for that.

Mr. VOINOVICH. Well, it seems to me that it would be very important if we get an idea of what it is in terms of a budget that you think that you would need to get the job done, so we've got some kind of goal in terms of what we're trying to get them to support.

Dr. MEYER. Well, I did not come here with concrete numbers. I wasn't expecting this to become so concrete. But I will definitely provide you with an overview afterwards and you will get a detailed outline of our activities and projects. We will send that to you afterwards.

Mr. VOINOVICH. Would you consider it to be part of the core budget, or extra budgetary, or—

Dr. MEYER. For now, to keep the show running, we need it extra budgetary, because the core budget is being discussed right now. There's no way to add anything to the core budget at this point. So for the upcoming year it would be crucial to have extra budgetary contributions.

But in the long run, of course it would be good. It would be good to have a solid basis and also to do long-term planning, because if our financial planning is only from 1 year to the other, long-term projects or involvement are difficult to do.

Mr. VOINOVICH. Well, it might be good at the Vienna meeting to get a letter out to the folks that have, in the past—provide docu-

mentation of why you feel that that would be something very worthwhile, that it has been successful.

And at least in the process of doing that we would educate the countries involved as to its importance and perhaps get them as allies when we try to get some more money out of the core budget to do this.

Mr. WEISSKIRCHEN. If I may add, one additional structural problem we are facing—I mean, the personal representatives—we are based on an honorary basis. We are working as individuals.

We do not have any real, substantial structural support.

Mr. VOINOVICH. You and I talked about this a couple years ago, but why don't you explain to us where the money comes from to help you get your job done? And maybe you've got a couple of other counterparts, but how does that work, and where are we in regard to that?

Mr. WEISSKIRCHEN. Personally, I'm relying on the budget of the German Bundestag, so that's it. In several occasions—and if I'm going to put this forward to Vienna, then I get some, but small moneys. That was only one time 300 euros. That's what I got.

So I would like to see—and this is a problem all of us three are facing. We would need a kind of a structural fundement—not big, but in order to have resources, especially having someone assisting.

We do not have any assistants, personal assistants, by manpower or something. We have to do it from our own.

Mr. CARDIN. Well, you've partially answered my next question, and that is in a few weeks we're going to have the Chair-in-Office before our commission.

And if you were a Commissioner, what question would you ask the chair in order to try to advance the carrying out of the mission. And they've put this in context.

We've talked a little bit about budgeting, and I think the whole budgeting process at the OSCE needs much more reform. We've gotten some way, but we have to go much further.

And I think special representatives should have budget support. And I think ODIHR should be able to have in its core mission—be able to carry out the mission that's been given to you, which we all acknowledged at the time, at the time that we were putting more responsibility on ODIHR, that it would require substantial increases in the budgetary support. You've gotten some, but, in my view, not enough.

So I guess my question is with the Chair-in-Office here, is the mission clear enough as to what we need to do? Is there additional support that we need from the Chair-in-Office or from the OSCE in order to be more effective in reaching our goal?

Mr. WEISSKIRCHEN. Two things. First is we need the support of the Secretary, General Secretary, in order to deliver or to get a deliverance of the countries, members of the OSCE, to implement the commitments. That's No. 1.

And No. 2 is to give a really small financial and structural support for the personal representatives.

And three, to give ODIHR the chance to have a kind of a continuing structural financial support.

Mr. CARDIN. Dr. Meyer, do you want your last crack at the OSCE bureaucracy before you leave?

Dr. MEYER. No, thank you very much.

We had the chance together to visit the now-Chair-in-Office before they took over, and I think that we are very lucky this year with the chairmanship and we feel strong support through the chairmanship for tasks.

And I think the point that Professor Weisskirchen just raised—brings it pretty much to the point. This is what especially the personal representatives would need, but the ODIHR has strong support.

Mr. CARDIN. Let me ask one more question, and that deals with a problem that we find here in the United States, and we understand it's also true in Europe, and that is the breeding of anti-Semitic activities on college campuses.

And then with the age group slightly older than our college-age group, where the problem seems to be where there's a lot of breeding of activities that lead toward anti-Semitic activity.

My question to you is do you have a game plan for how we should best handle our colleges, knowing full well the sensitivity on academic freedom, but also knowing that it has caused significant challenges in regards to combating anti-Semitism?

We should start with the professor, that's correct.

Mr. WEISSKIRCHEN. Academic freedom is untouchable, no doubt. Second, that means that we have to engage—if there is any anti-Semitic mood, you can see on the ground in different campuses. You have to talk to the professors, to the lecturers on the spot, on the ground.

And in this regard, we do have, as parliamentarians, a good possibility, good access, because we are in the kind of relationship between our responsibility and theirs, so we have to open up debates with them in order to confront the issues.

One example: When I was in Great Britain last year there was this boycott issue emerging, then I went there to London, talked to people, especially to the unions, in order to try to convince them to stop this.

And I do think this could show and is being then helpful in order to confront the people on the ground with different arguments. And then fortunately, they stopped this.

So you have addressed the problem, talked to them openly, frankly, tell them what is your opinion toward this is, and then kind of deliberation shows that normally then they are going to stop this.

Mr. CARDIN. Dr. Meyer?

Dr. MEYER. Yeah, the anti-Semitism or the changing attitudes on campuses we see in the United States—we also see it in Germany and France, U.K.—are very worrisome. I see that as an indicator of the mainstreaming of anti-Semitism into society overall.

It's not that there's a special problem among students or the age group of younger people. The problem is the mainstreaming of anti-Zionist, anti-Semitic attitudes.

And this is something that is being spread in societies throughout the media and also, I would say, the connection between the left-wing groups, the more liberal groups, that propagate this form of anti-Semitism, because many years ago we only saw right-wing extremists or sometimes extremist Islamists with these kind of

statements, and since these—also, one thing that these groups, for example, have in common is Holocaust denial.

This is something the overall population does not want to deal with. If somebody denies the Holocaust and is an anti-Semite, this is something—those are not the people you want to be friends with or want to be seen with.

When, on the other hand, anti-globalization activists show up, they are for a better world. They do not have a supremacy ideology. They are for a better world. They try to protect the poor and so on. This is something that you more easily connect to.

And if this group also identifies the Jews as the main evil in the world, and Israel as the representative, and then again vice versa, making Jews the representative of Israel, that's where we see the main problem.

And that's why I think it's just—the campus issue is not an issue of itself. It's really just a sign of how mainstreamed anti-Semitism—anti-Zionist, anti-Semitism is in many societies.

And I think that an open dialogue also with the media, again, also not with interfering freedom of the media or freedom of academia, but to have this open dialogue, address these issues. And again, civil society has a crucial role.

And part, of course, in this case also public opinion leaders and those that shape the political discourse in a country, because I think it is important that—and if people have to speak out every day against something, they should do it, because this is what needs to be done these days, because the trends are really worrisome.

Mr. CARDIN. Thank you.

Congressman Smith?

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

Let me ask you what your take is on the Muslim Brotherhood of Britain in their ending their boycott of the National Holocaust Memorial Day in Britain, which I thought was a very positive sign on their part. Were you part of that?

And second, the Mediterranean partners—what has been your experience, Gert, for example, in dealing with the six partners—Israel, Algeria, Jordan, Egypt?

Have they been engaged on this? I would expect that Jerusalem is, but I'm wondering if the Egyptians and Jordanians, for example, have been helpful in this combating of anti-Semitism.

Mr. WEISSKIRCHEN. Picking up the last point first, there is to be seen kind of an ambivalent attitude. In general, they know that there is a problem, and they agree that we have to find common ground, especially Morocco.

But when there was this OSCE conference in Tel Aviv—it was in December, and you saw that only two representatives of Egypt and of Jordan showed up, and the others were not there.

So this is a first step, and there should be—this step should be followed by other concrete new steps. This is not a lost case, I would like to mention. But it shows that the beginning is not that easy for them because they know that they do have a real problem.

And this is, in my opinion, one of the reasons why we do have in the campuses this problem now new form of anti-Semitism re-

lated to Muslim communities and to the point that some of the intellectuals are thinking that Palestine should be freed.

They are not clear enough in their judgment and their perception that Palestine is not the victim but in some ways the aggressor toward Israel. They are not clear-cut in thinking this.

There is a kind of intermingling attitude toward who is the real victim. So in this regard, the different Maghreb states and from Morocco to Egypt, they are associative members of the OSCE, and we have to work out better steps in order to bring into these societies this debate.

Mr. SMITH. Just on that, if I could briefly, did the Egyptian and Jordanian representatives play a constructive role, in your opinion, or did they just observe?

Mr. WEISSKIRCHEN. Yes, they took part in the debate and made their point, and they were ready to accept other views. So in this regard, this was a first step. But it has to be followed by several more concrete steps, too.

Mr. SMITH. And the Muslim Council of Britain—your sense on that, because they have boycotted the national day for at least 6 years, and they have decided now to join it.

Mr. WEISSKIRCHEN. Yeah. That shows that if you are ready to have an open dialogue with people who are kind of reluctant or, in real terms, aggressive to have this Holocaust commemoration, if you are ready to talk to them openly and bring them into dialogue, then you do have a good chance to convince. And this has been happening there.

Mr. CARDIN. Senator Voinovich?

Mr. VOINOVICH. I'd like to get back to how do we improve the situation from where we are to move forward. And we have this envoy now at the State Department, Gregg Rickman. I know that the European Union has its own office to monitor hate crimes and intolerance.

I'd like to know, No. 1, has the fact that we've got this envoy now at the State Department been of any help to you in the work that you do? And how much communication do you have with the envoy? How much communication do you have with the European Union? That's one thing.

Second of all, on a larger scale in terms of our own budget in the United States, from what I understand, we're not doing our job in terms of our budget in terms of the OSCE. And if we're interested in public diplomacy and soft power, we ought to be clarifying just, you know, how much money we should be putting in.

I understand there's two or three accounts, and you didn't get—OSCE didn't get our money till the very end, so that they couldn't rely upon it in terms of budgetary. So on our own land, we've got to do a better job, I think, of highlighting how important it is that we make our commitment to the OSCE.

And the last one deals with what's going on now between the Palestinians and the Israelis. I think it's unique that 55 Sunni Arab nations have come out and made it clear that they recognize the state of Israel.

I've always felt that you're never going to get a two-state solution until you get the Arab nations to come forward and say, "Yes, Israel's there," because there's always been that feeling that a lot

of them just want to go back before '48, not '67. They want to go back before '48.

And I'd be interested in your opinion about how important it is that we move on this at this time. I think part of the motivation for them to be doing what they're doing is their fear of Iran, and they know that Iran is exploiting the Israeli-Palestinian issue, and that's what's fomenting Hezbollah, Hamas, and the rest of it.

And I'd be interested in your opinion as to how important it is that we move forward with as active an effort as we can to deal with this at this, I think, special opportunity that we have that—who knows?—may disappear.

Mr. WEISSKIRCHEN. First, the envoys, especially the envoy of the United States of America, is being helpful for us. But know that six or seven states—six—only have put this instrument in place, and all the others are missing.

So in this regard, this could be a good opportunity to bring about the message that all the others should follow suit. And this is a good instrument in order not only to have in mind what the others are doing—I mean, in shaming. This is one point.

But the other point is in order to look into your own society and your own country, what is going on in the United States of America or in Germany. So in this regard, they do have this twofold possibility. And in this regard, I admire the special envoys. They are doing a wonderful job. It should be strengthened by others, too.

No. 2, budget. It would be better that you should pick that up, because I'm not familiar with that kind of bureaucracy going on in the OSCE field. You know better than me.

The last point. I agree very much, Senator Voinovich, that this is behind their effort now to create a kind of new approach in the Arabic world toward Israel, because they fear that Iran is the winner of all the different problems now you see from Afghanistan to especially Iraq, to the Mediterranean basin.

So in this regard, they now are fearing that Iran is playing not only in rhetorics but later then in politics and in other military measures, is then playing a dangerous role.

So you are right, and I do hope that the efforts now been shown by President George W. Bush and by Prime Minister Olmert and President Abbas is now showing within the next month that there is a—a process has been started that leads to a kind of solution.

I don't know what will be in the end this year—I do hope so—what kind of solution we will see, but it will reconcile the problems there. And this, I guess, is another possibility for the United States of America to be active. And you know that we Europeans are following and supporting you.

Dr. MEYER. Regarding the special envoys, we are in very close contact. We are in very close contact and in close cooperation, actually, for the State Department with both Gregg Rickman and also Christian Kennedy, since our portfolio regarding anti-Semitism and Holocaust remembrance is divided among those two here at the State Department, and that was the case since—I mean, since I started my work for the OSCE, you had to buildup this entire program.

The State Department was always very, very supportive and helpful also when it came to negotiations in Vienna, and so they

were very, very helpful regarding the Tolerance and Non-Discrimination Program.

Regarding your second point, yes, I think it is—the ODIHR was tasked with—a lot of commitment from the states were kind of transferred into tasks in order to assist participating States to meet their commitments in the field of tolerance and non-discrimination, many of them regarding anti-Semitism, but many of them regarding all different forms of discrimination, anti-Semitism one of them.

And that, of course, needs a budget and to have that—as I said, have that kind of clear and solid would be very helpful for our work. For long-term projects and for long-term activities, I think this is crucial.

But also, you know how difficult agreements regarding the core budget are in Vienna these days, because it is not only about our concrete tools and projects. The budget negotiations are about a lot more issues than just the concrete work that will be done with that money.

And if we have the support of some of the participating States that really stand behind the ODIHR these days, that is definitely very much appreciated and will lead to the fact that we will be able to continue our work in this field, because at this point it's really at the—we are in a situation that, as I mentioned, for our law enforcement officer training program, we are completely out of money.

Some other projects are out of money also. The society capacity-building program has a curricula developed and there cannot be any seminars this year, so we're desperately waiting for some support in order to actually get the job done that we are tasked to be doing.

And we'd be very grateful for your support.

Mr. VOINOVICH. And you'd be willing to supply that information to us.

Dr. MEYER. Yes, I will send that to you in writing.

Mr. VOINOVICH. Thank you.

Mr. CARDIN. Well, let me again thank both of our witnesses for their presentations here. It's extremely helpful to us.

We all have a common objective here, and clearly it's sometimes frustrating when we see the bureaucracies of our own organizations put some roadblocks in our way. But that's part of the OSCE process, and we'll work our way through it.

But at the end of the day, we want to do everything we can to rid not only the OSCE region but to rid our world of anti-Semitism. It certainly is very, very troublesome to see that in so many countries there's a rise of anti-Semitism.

And we will continue to monitor this, and we'll look for a strategy to do everything we can to help. We will take advantage of our meetings in Vienna in February to advance these issues—and of course, leading up to the annual meeting in July.

Again, thank you both very much.

Our Commission will stand adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 11:49 a.m., the hearing was adjourned.]

APPENDICES

PREPARED STATEMENT OF HON. ALCEE L. HASTINGS, CHAIRMAN, COMMISSION ON SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE

Welcome. It is appropriate that we convene a hearing on combating anti-Semitism in January as many of the darkest chapters of the Shoah, the Holocaust, were written during this month—including Hitler's appointment as Chancellor in 1933, the banning of Jews from the German Labor Front trade union a year later, a ban on Jews in the teaching and other professions and sterilization orders of Afro-German youth followed in 1937, with the issuance of the order to speed up the forcible removal of Jews in 1939, and the fateful selection of Auschwitz as site for a new concentration camp in January of 1940.

The following year a leading Nazi newspaper proclaimed, "Now judgment has begun and it will reach its conclusion only when knowledge of the Jews has been erased from the earth." By January of 1943 over one million Jews had been slaughtered and orders were issued for the arrest and deportation of all Roma to extermination camps.

Other January events demonstrated a valiant effort to resist this evil, most notably the Warsaw Ghetto Uprising that same year. At last, the liberation of Auschwitz came on January 27, 1945, but only after two million men, women, and children had perished there.

Out of the depths of destruction, death, and despair European Jewry survived and once again thrives across a continent which has, for the most part, embraced democratic principles of governance and respect for the fundamental rights and freedoms enshrined in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights adopted 60 years ago in the wake of World War II.

But the events of the early part of this new century were a vivid reminder that vigilance and action are necessary to prevent the resurgence of anti-Semitism and related violence in Europe and beyond, including in our own country. The Helsinki Commission responded to the disturbing rise in anti-Semitic violence at home and abroad, mobilizing Commissioners and others in partnership with the NGO community, to translate common concerns into action. In this regard, I note the strong leadership provided by Co-Chairman Ben Cardin, Chris Smith, and Senator Voinovich.

The OSCE Parliamentary Assembly proved an important vehicle for rallying parliamentarians throughout the OSCE region and building political support for action by the participating States. Professor Weisskirchen, a man of tremendous passion and energy, has proved a key ally in this ongoing struggle.

I had the privilege of participating in the first OSCE conference focused exclusively on anti-Semitism, convened in Vienna in 2003, and have participated in those held in Berlin, Cordoba, and most recently in Bucharest. Given the gravity of the issue—I have pushed, and will continue to press to ensure that combating anti-Semitism in all its manifestations remains high on the agenda of

the OSCE and the Parliamentary Assembly, with the special value added that parliamentarians and other elected officials can and must bring to bear in the face of this evil.

As the title spells out, today we seek to take stock of our successes and ongoing challenges. I am pleased that we have both Professor Weisskirchen and Dr. Kathrin Meyer here to speak about the wide range of initiatives that have taken place within the OSCE following our extensive efforts. While we regret that Dr. Meyer will be leaving the OSCE, we are glad that she will be continuing her efforts to combat anti-Semitism as the Executive Secretary of the Task Force for International cooperation on Holocaust Education, Research and Remembrance, which counts many OSCE countries amongst its membership.

Thank you both for being here today, I am looking forward to your testimonies.

PREPARED STATEMENT OF HON. BENJAMIN L. CARDIN, CO-CHAIRMAN, COMMISSION ON SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE

Welcome to the first in a series of Commission hearings focused on reviewing efforts to monitor and combat anti-Semitism throughout the OSCE region. A second hearing will take place on February 7, at 2:30 pm. We hope that you will join us.

I would first like to extend a special welcome to my friend and former Commissioner Senator Voinovich, whose leadership has been instrumental in global efforts to combat anti-Semitism.

As many of you know, the largest of the web of Nazi concentration and extermination camps, Auschwitz-Birkenau, was liberated this week in 1945 on January 27. The horror found there exemplified the very worst of humanity and what can take place when unbridled hate is allowed to flourish.

For 26 OSCE participating States, January 27th has now been reserved as a day of remembrance. In the U.S., our own day of remembrance will take place in May. However, this week, we too, will honor the memory of those who perished during the Holocaust by reviewing where we are in the struggle to eradicate the prejudices, discrimination, and outright violence that has plagued Jews for centuries, and continues to this very day.

I would like to thank Chairman Hastings for continuing to place this issue at the forefront of the Commission's agenda and understand that commitments in Florida have prevented him from being here today. I would also like to extend a warm welcome to my friend and colleague in the OSCE Parliamentary Assembly, Professor Gert Weisskirchen. Not only have you been a staunch leader within the Parliamentary Assembly on these issues but also within the German Bundestag. Welcome.

Now we turn to a focus on the status of efforts to address the escalation of violence in Europe and North America that marked anti-Semitic activity at the beginning of this decade.

According to the State Department, manifestations of anti-Semitism increased significantly in Europe since 2000, including verbal and physical attacks against Jews resulting in serious injury and even death, and also vandalism, fire bombings of Jewish schools, and desecration of synagogues and cemeteries.

It is within this context that I, along with Chairman Hastings, Ranking Member Smith, Senator Voinovich and other members of this Commission began efforts within the U.S. Congress and the OSCE Parliamentary Assembly to address this violence. With OSCE Parliamentarians such as Gert Weisskirchen and Canadian Senator Jerry Grafstein, we were able to unanimously adopt a resolution specifically focused on combating anti-Semitism, at the Assembly's Berlin meeting in 2002.

Since that time, the OSCE Parliamentary Assembly has annually passed declarations addressing anti-Semitism and calling for concrete measures by all participating States and the OSCE. Most recently, I spearheaded efforts at the Assembly's 2007 Annual Session in Kyiv to focus on the implementation of these declarations, including requesting presentations from the three Personal Representatives at OSCE PA Annual Sessions and exploring the role

Mediterranean Partner countries can play in combating all forms of intolerance, including anti-Semitism.

These parliamentary declarations have often served as the blueprint for many efforts within the OSCE, including the Vienna and Berlin conferences, collection of hate crimes data, and development of educational tools to counter anti-Semitism and other forms of intolerance. Initiatives aimed at providing the political impetus for action, including the valuable work undertaken by our guests here today.

Now despite these best efforts, the stereotypes and hateful sentiments directed toward Jewish communities around the globe remain and have remained at record levels in many countries since the beginning of this decade, but not without some signs of progress.

While many of us may be familiar with the headlines the Belarusian President made last year for his use of Jewish stereotypes, some may be less familiar with the efforts of a Polish Mayor who denounced anti-Semitism and participated in the clean up effort of hundreds of Jewish graves that had been desecrated.

With Senators in Romania castigating an ambassadorial nominee for his "Jewish heritage," the words of the Hungarian parliamentarian Imre Mecs condemning the resurgent use of Holocaust-era symbols in his country may have also been missed.

Or, with neo-Nazis attempting to march through Prague's Jewish quarter on the anniversary of Kristallnacht, the echo of footsteps of the British Parliamentarian, John Mann through the halls of the U.S. Congress may not have seemed as loud. As Chairman of the British Parliamentary Committee Against Anti-Semitism, John Mann not only combats anti-Semitic activity in his own country, but has also traveled to speak with other Parliamentarians about how they might undertake similar initiatives in their own countries.

While I understand that Mr. Mann could not be here today due to commitments within his own government, the example of the UK's Inquiry exemplifies how political leaders in particular can use their positions to promote solidarity, tolerance and respect in their citizenry.

As the title spells out, today we seek to take stock of our successes and ongoing challenges. I am pleased that we have both Professor Weisskirchen and Dr. Kathrin Meyer here to speak about the wide range of initiatives that have taken place within the OSCE following our extensive efforts. While we regret that Dr. Meyer will be leaving the OSCE, we are glad that she will be continuing her efforts to combat anti-Semitism as the Executive Secretary of the Task Force for International cooperation on Holocaust Education, Research and Remembrance, which counts many OSCE countries amongst its membership.

Today I am eager to review how far we have come and how we should proceed in the future, noting what we have learned, as this is the only way we will successfully eradicate the negative sentiments and related violence directed towards Jewish and other communities.

Thank you.

**PREPARED STATEMENT OF HON. CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH,
RANKING MEMBER, COMMISSION ON SECURITY AND CO-
OPERATION IN EUROPE**

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and good morning to everyone. On behalf of the Helsinki Commission and the US Congress, I would like to add my own very warm welcome to Professor Weisskirchen and Doctor Meyer.

I remember when, in 2002, several of us from the US Congress—including my good friend Representative, now Senator, Cardin—noticed the spike of anti-Semitic violence sweeping through much of the OSCE region, particularly western Europe. This Commission held a hearing to learn what the facts were, and they were indeed frightening. Then we worked together with Professor Weisskirchen and others in Europe to launch the OSCE into the fight against anti-Semitism.

For many of us on this Commission, 2002 was a turning point. More than any other time since the dark days of World War II, Jewish communities throughout Europe and North America again were facing violent attacks against synagogues, Jewish cultural sites, cemeteries and individuals. It was an ugly reality that we knew wouldn't go away by ignoring it or by wishing it away. It was a chilling reminder that our societies still harbor a dangerous collection of bigots and racists who hate Jews. It had to be defeated.

In 2002 we gathered with our colleagues from other countries under the banner of the OSCE in Vienna, and later in Berlin, Paris, Brussels, Cordoba, and Bucharest, to plan what practical steps we could take not just to mitigate this centuries-old obsession, but to crush this pernicious form of hate.

In the first years after 2002, speaking out was the most important thing. When national leaders failed to denounce anti-Semitic violence and slurs, the void was not only demoralizing to the victims but silence actually enabled the wrongdoing. Silence by elected officials in particular conveyed approval—or at least acquiescence—and contributed to a climate of fear and a sense of vulnerability.

But the Vienna and Berlin Conferences and those that followed it were not just about words. We worked so that words would be matched—and even exceeded—by deeds.

One of the most important deeds has been to commit the OSCE states to keep reliable records on hate crimes, including anti-Semitic crimes. A surgeon can't remove a cancer or prescribe a course of treatment without documenting the nature, scope, and extent of the disease. We had to find out what was going on!

To the extent countries have followed through on this commitment, they are able to craft better strategies for combating anti-Semitism, and to tailor police training to the kinds of hate crimes that most often occur.

Another important deed has been to promote Holocaust education and remembrance. It seems to me that only the most hardened bigot can study the horrors of the Holocaust and not cry out: Never again!

It is now six years since the OSCE has put a special emphasis on the fight against anti-Semitism. The record in these six years is mixed. But we can't allow human rights fatigue and indifference

to set in. Anti-Semitism remains what it has always been, a unique evil, a distinct form of intolerance, the oldest form of religious bigotry, and a malignant disease of the heart that has often led to murder.

I look forward to learning how the OSCE commitments to combat anti-Semitism have been implemented by the Participating States, and where we need to redouble our efforts in the fight against the scourge of anti-Semitism.

I assure our witnesses that they can count on the support of the members of this Commission.

**PREPARED STATEMENT OF GERT WEISSKIRCHEN, PERSONAL
REPRESENTATIVE OF THE CHAIRMAN-IN-OFFICE OF THE
OSCE ON COMBATING ANTI-SEMITISM**

Since 2005 I have been appointed by the respective Chairman-in-Office to the position of Personal Representative on Combating Anti-Semitism. Now, in my third year of this mandate, it is time to take stock of the current situation, point to successes and positive trends, make critical assessments, and then look ahead to the future.

OSCE CONFERENCE IN BUCHAREST

The mandates of the Personal Representatives of the Chairman-in-Office were created as a consequence of OSCE anti-Semitism conferences held in Vienna, Berlin, Paris, Brussels, and Cordoba. A further OSCE conference was held in Bucharest from 7 to 8 June 2007: the High-Level Conference on Combating Discrimination and Promoting Mutual Respect and Understanding. It was preceded by a NGO meeting.

The Bucharest Declaration contains the following passage:

“Recognizing its unique and historic character, (the participating States) condemn anti-Semitism without reservation, whether expressed in a traditional manner or through new forms and manifestations. (They) Reiterate previous OSCE declarations that international developments or political issues, including in Israel or anywhere else, can never justify anti-Semitism.”

Prior to that the NGOs formulated nine recommendations and made reference in this context to the special role of education and parliaments. I strongly support all of these recommendations and in particular the appeal issued by the NGOs to take action against expressions of racial hatred and anti-Semitic discourse on the Internet. I have listed these recommendations for you at the end of this part.

As of June 2007 a total of 48 separate commitments had been made by OSCE participating States in reference to the fight against anti-Semitism. These commitments are necessary. There is a need now to strengthen the political will to implement these commitments in all OSCE countries. Many countries have been quite exemplary in this area. Unfortunately there are other countries whose efforts have not been sufficient.

CURRENT STATE OF AFFAIRS

Despite the considerable efforts that have been undertaken in many participating States and the numerous conferences that have been held, there have been recurrent manifestations of anti-Semitism in many countries of the OSCE region. This includes countries whose governments and public institutions have had an excellent record in the fight against anti-Semitism. In Germany, for instance, a rabbi from the Jewish congregation in Frankfurt was injured in a knife attack. In addition to egregious acts of violence like this one, there are often other, much more subtle forms of anti-Semitism that are a cause for concern. What is dangerous, for in-

stance, are attempts to make anti-Semitic attitudes predominant in public discourse.

One of my objectives is to create an awareness of different forms of anti-Semitic discourse. I can give two examples of this from my work.

In May 2007 the British University and College Union (UCU) called for an anti-Israeli boycott. Other unions followed this example with similar actions. I issued a press release immediately condemning this call for a boycott. I travelled to London in July to talk with the unions in a further attempt to raise public awareness of this matter.

There was a disquieting development in Croatia. The popular singer Marko Perkovic, alias "Thompson", started showing various symbols from the Ustasha era at concerts. During a country visit to Croatia in 2007 I was able to talk to a number of government representatives as well as representatives of the Jewish communities. The objective here was to reach a consensus with my Croatian interlocutors that nationalistic tendencies of any kind need to be nipped in the bud.

I wrote a letter to all the heads of government of the OSCE participating States in which I proposed that an inquiry similar to the British All-Party Parliamentary Inquiry be carried out. This was also recommended by the NGOs in Bucharest. I enclosed the Magenta Foundation report on the 1st International Conference on Academic Anti-Semitism and the ODIHR-FRA Working Definition of Anti-Semitism. In the meantime I have received answers from some of the governments. Most of them use the working definition of anti-Semitism that was jointly formulated by ODIHR and the Fundamental Rights Agency. Unfortunately, none of the reply letters has made any concrete statements to the effect that plans are being made to use an instrument similar to the All-Party Parliamentary Inquiry.

CiO PERSONAL REPRESENTATIVE MANDATES

The role of CiO Personal Representatives encompasses three areas:

1. They implement the decisions taken by the participating states at OSCE Conferences.
2. They draw attention to both progress and setbacks in the implementation process.
3. They encourage efforts by civil society groups and promote national and transnational cooperation between social, parliamentary and governmental actors.

It will hardly be possible to carry out these tasks in a satisfactory manner with the current mandate structure. The Personal Representative mandates need to be equipped with further instruments if they are to be able to do justice to these functions. At the moment there is a considerable gap between what would actually be required and what exists in reality and this gap needs to be closed.

It would be nice if there were more support from the OSCE participating States. This year only one country visit has been agreed thus far, i.e. to Croatia. Unfortunately there have been no further invitations from other countries. Contacts and meetings with NGOs

and representatives of the Jewish communities in the various countries is very important in terms of doing justice to the CiO Personal Representative mandates.

Prior to the appointment of the Personal Representatives the following six areas were declared to be in particular need of attention:

- 1) Data collection
- 2) Legislation
- 3) Law enforcement
- 4) Education
- 5) Media
- 6) Parliaments

Progress has been made over the past few years in most of these areas.

In November 2006 OSCE ODIHR held a Tolerance Implementation Meeting in Vienna on the subject of Data Collection. NGOs formulated various recommendations which I have listed in my written statement. I want to focus here on one of the most important recommendation the NGOs formulated:

We remind participating States of their commitment to provide hate crime statistics on a regular basis and to respond to violent manifestations of intolerance;

Various tools provided by OSCE ODIHR have proven to be very helpful. The OSCE ODIHR Law Enforcement Officer Programme has already been implemented in some countries and is in either the planning or preparatory stages in others. ODIHR is also working on a training programme for public prosecutors.

Teaching materials on the subject of anti-Semitism have been developed for a number of countries and are now in use there.

A code should be developed together with authors, journalists, and publicists that would constitute a voluntary moral and autonomous agreement to show tolerance and recognize the rights of minorities. A project of this kind has already been discussed with the OSCE Representative on Freedom of the Media.

The OSCE PA can be used as a laboratory for testing new legislative approaches. National parliaments should be encouraged to strengthen their ability to monitor the results of decisions in the OSCE. An instrument comparable to the All-Party Parliamentary Inquiry could be employed in other countries as well. It would be a good thing if OSCE PA national delegations were to promote an initiative of this kind in their parliaments. 74OUTLOOK

Many parliaments have been exemplary in their efforts to fight anti-Semitism and recognize the scale of the problem. Nonetheless, there has been growing acceptance of anti-Semitic statements and stereotypes in some countries, as was observed in the autumn of 2006.

As such, it is of crucial importance that civil society be included in the fight against anti-Semitism. We cannot afford to lose those who are in the middle of the political spectrum. It must be guaranteed that social initiatives and projects will receive the support they need to be able to do their work successfully. It is a task for the national parliaments to see to it that there is sufficient funding for civil society projects of this kind.

We need to work towards an exchange of information on promising methods of fighting anti-Semitism. We are currently able to

say that there are a number of particularly successful projects that could be implemented in other countries.

In Sweden, for instance, there is an exit programme for radical neo-Nazis. Over a period of many years case workers have succeeded in getting numerous individuals out of the right-wing extremist scene. No one is given up for lost.

In France official data on anti-Semitic violence and other manifestations of anti-Semitism is compared with data received from NGOs. Since NGOs do not use the same strict criteria for data collection, a more precise picture emerges as to the scale of anti-Semitic crimes.

The appointment of special envoys responsible for dealing with the subject of anti-Semitism and relations with Jewish communities results in the problem being seen more clearly on the part of executive government as well. There are special envoys of this kind in the United States, France, Poland, Spain and Germany.

The following countries stand out for their efforts to fight anti-Semitism through education by taking part in the ODIHR Anne Frank House Project and developing relevant teaching materials: Germany, Croatia, Denmark, Spain, Lithuania, the Netherlands, Poland, the Russian Federation, Slovakia, and Ukraine. I have actively supported this ODIHR programme from the outset and I am pleased by the success it has had in many countries.

As has already been mentioned, the CiO Personal Representative mandates need to be expanded so that they can be carried out in a satisfactory manner. The provision of physical and human resources would be helpful in making our work more effective.

I am certain that we will continue to have strong support for carrying on the fight against anti-Semitism.

**PREPARED STATEMENT OF KATHRIN MEYER, ADVISOR ON
ANTI-SEMITISM ISSUES, OSCE OFFICE OF DEMOCRATIC IN-
STITUTIONS AND HUMAN RIGHTS**

Mr. Chairman, Committee Members, Ladies and Gentlemen,

I would like to thank you for the opportunity to present an overview of recent trends in manifestations of anti-Semitism in the OSCE region and the status of certain initiatives and commitments designed to combat anti-Semitism on behalf of the OSCE's Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights.

1. BACKGROUND OF THE OSCE'S INVOLVEMENT IN COMBATING ANTI-SEMITISM

The OSCE reacted to the rise of anti-Semitism throughout the region with a meeting in Vienna in 2003, followed by a high-level conference in Berlin in 2004.

With the Berlin Conference on Anti-Semitism in 2004 and the PC Decision No. 607 on Combating Anti-Semitism of April 2004, participating States recognized that anti-Semitism has assumed new forms and expressions and that it poses a threat to democracy, the values of civilization and to the overall security in the OSCE region and beyond. Participating States have repeatedly declared that they condemn without reservation all manifestations of anti-Semitism and all attacks motivated by anti-Semitism. They also declared that international or political developments in Israel or elsewhere in the Middle East never justify anti-Semitism.

With a view to responding to and preventing anti-Semitism, a host of commitments was made in the area of data collection, legislation and education. The commitments made in 2004 also led to the establishment of the ODIHR's Tolerance and Non-Discrimination Programme and to the creation of the new position of the Adviser on Anti-Semitism Issues in the summer 2004.

2. THE ODIHR'S MANDATE

As an institution tasked to assist participating States with the implementation of commitments, the Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights (ODIHR) and its Tolerance and Non-Discrimination Programme are, inter alia, mandated to:

- Follow closely anti-Semitic incidents;
- Systematically collect and disseminate information (legislation, statistics) pertaining to anti-Semitic incidents and hate crimes;
- Systematically collect and disseminate information throughout the OSCE area on best practices for preventing and responding to anti-Semitism and, if requested, offer advice to participating States in their efforts to fight anti-Semitism;
- Support the ability of civil society and the development of partnerships to address racism, xenophobia and related intolerance, including anti-Semitism.
- Assist participating States upon their request in developing appropriate methodologies and capacities for collecting and maintaining reliable information and statistics about hate crimes and violent manifestations of intolerance and discrimination, with a view to helping them collect comparable data and statistics.

3. THE WORKING DEFINITION OF ANTI-SEMITISM

In order to report on anti-Semitism in all its different forms, it is important for participating States and the ODIHR to be able to identify it. In cooperation with the European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights (the former EUMC) and international experts, the ODIHR has applied a working definition of anti-Semitism that has been used since late 2004 for all activities regarding anti-Semitism. This working definition was also cited in the Brussels Declaration of the OSCE Parliamentary Assembly in July 2006.

The definition can be found in the ODIHR's publications. It is the basis of the ODIHR's monitoring activities and hate crime report, which is available online but also in hard copy here today.

The working definition is as follows: "Anti-Semitism is a certain perception of Jews, which may be expressed as hatred towards Jews. Rhetorical and physical manifestations of anti-Semitism are directed towards Jewish or non-Jewish individuals and/or their property, towards Jewish community institutions and religious facilities. In addition, such manifestations could also target the State of Israel, conceived as a Jewish collective.

Anti-Semitism frequently charges Jews with conspiring to harm humanity, and it is often used to blame Jews for "why things go wrong". It is expressed in speech, writing, visual forms and action, and employs sinister stereotypes and negative character traits.

Contemporary examples of anti-Semitism in public life, the media, schools, the workplace, and in the religious sphere could, taking into account the overall context, include, but are not limited to:

- Calling for, aiding, or justifying the killing or harming of Jews in the name of a radical ideology or an extremist view of religion;
- Making mendacious, dehumanizing, demonizing, or stereotypical allegations about Jews as such or the power of Jews as a collective—such as, especially but not exclusively, the myth about a world Jewish conspiracy or of Jews controlling the media, economy, government or other societal institutions;
- Accusing Jews as a people of being responsible for real or imagined wrongdoing committed by a single Jewish person or group, or even for acts committed by non-Jews;
- Denying the fact, scope, mechanisms (e.g., gas chambers) or intentionality of the genocide of the Jewish people at the hands of National Socialist Germany and its supporters and accomplices during World War II (the Holocaust);
- Accusing the Jews as a people, or Israel as a state, of inventing or exaggerating the Holocaust;
- Accusing Jewish citizens of being more loyal to Israel, or to the alleged priorities of Jews worldwide, than to the interests of their own nations.

Examples of the ways in which anti-Semitism manifests itself with regard to the State of Israel, taking into account the overall context, could include:

- Denying the Jewish people their right to self-determination, e.g., by claiming that the existence of a State of Israel is a racist endeavour;

- Applying double standards by requiring of it behaviour not expected or demanded of any other democratic nation;
- Using the symbols and images associated with classic anti-Semitism (e.g., claims of Jews killing Jesus or blood libel) to characterize Israel or Israelis;
- Drawing comparisons of contemporary Israeli policy to that of the Nazis;
- Holding Jews collectively responsible for actions of the State of Israel.

However, criticism of Israel similar to that levelled against any other country cannot be regarded as anti-Semitic.

Anti-Semitic acts are criminal when they are so defined by law (e.g., denial of the Holocaust or distribution of anti-Semitic materials in some countries). Criminal acts are anti-Semitic when the target of an attack, whether people or property—such as buildings, schools, places of worship, and cemeteries—is selected because it is, or is perceived to be, Jewish or linked to Jews. Anti-Semitic discrimination is the denial to Jews of opportunities or services available to others and is illegal in many countries.”

See for more information: <http://tandis.odhr.pl/index.php?p=ki-as,intro>

4. COLLECTING DATA AND REPORTING ON ANTI-SEMITISM IN THE OSCE REGION

Following its mandate, the ODIHR publishes an annual report on hate crimes in the OSCE region. This report gives an overview of incidents and state responses to racist, xenophobic, anti-Semitic and other hate-motivated incidents in the OSCE region. The latest report covers the year 2006. The report for 2007 is currently being drafted.

Based on the available data, it can be said that the number of anti-Semitic incidents in the year 2006, when compared with 2005, increased by 20 per cent in France and by 31 per cent in the United Kingdom. Belgium, Canada, and the United Kingdom recorded their highest number of anti-Semitic incidents since 2001, 1996 and 1984 respectively. The number of politically motivated acts with an anti-Semitic background declined by 1.3 per cent in Germany, while the number of anti-Semitic incidents decreased by 12 per cent in the United States.

The report also highlights particularly worrisome trends and incidents in the region. These incidents involved physical and verbal assaults, mainly against visibly identifiable Jews or Jewish institutions, and attacks against Jewish property, including the vandalism on Jewish cemeteries and synagogues. The most prominent cases were the attack in the Moscow synagogue in January, the shooting at the Jewish Community Centre in Seattle in July, the threat to the synagogue in Prague in September and the kidnapping, torturing and murder of Ilam Halimi in France in January 2006.

An important and worrisome trend we have identified with respect to 2006 is that schools and students have become a prominent target and forum for manifestations of anti-Semitism:

- In 2006, Jewish schools were under threat and/or attacked in Austria, Canada, Denmark, France, Hungary, Russian Federation, Ukraine, United Kingdom, and the United States of America.

- In addition to that, Jewish children were attacked either on their journeys to and from school or during the school day by schoolmates, as is reported from Belgium, Estonia, France, Germany, Russian Federation, United Kingdom, United States of America.

- Anti-Semitism has also become a problem in schools where there are no Jewish students. References to both anti-Jewish stereotypes and Holocaust imagery are used to defame and humiliate others or as a means of provocation. In October 2006, a group of teenagers in Paderborn, Germany, forced a classmate to walk around the schoolyard wearing a placard hanging from his neck that read: "I'm the biggest pig in town, only with Jews do I hang around".

- Another indicator is that "Jude" has become a very common and popular swear word among German youngsters, also being used extensively in sport, for example to slur the referee or other rival teams in sports, especially soccer.

See for more information: http://www.osce.org/odihr/item_11_26296.html

What stands behind these attacks?

- Analysis and investigation of these incidents has shown that the projection of anti-Israel sentiment onto Jewish communities throughout Europe was a widespread pattern in 2006. This trend clearly intensified during the Israel-Hezbollah war and found its expression in both organised and spontaneous violence. Jews have collectively been blamed for the policies of the Israeli Government. In this context, direct reference to the Third Reich was often made, with Holocaust imagery being used as a rhetorical device to threaten Jews or to equate them with the perpetrators of the Holocaust.

- Another development is the politicization of Holocaust denial and the fact that the Shoah has become a theme in anti-Semitism. In 2006, attacks against the memory of the Holocaust were both rhetorical and physical, with memorial sites being desecrated and demolished in various participating States.

- Apart from these rather recent trends, adherence to (elements of) the traditional anti-Semitic worldview, traditional stereotypes and radical exclusionary nationalism have continued to motivate anti-Semitic incidents in the OSCE region.

The annual hate crime report stands at the centre of the Tolerance and Non-Discrimination Programme's monitoring activities. The ODIHR draw on statistics and reports received from participating States, civil society and the media. However given the limited resources and vast number of taskings received by the ODIHR's Tolerance and Non-Discrimination Programme, the report can only be as good as the information submitted by participating States and civil society.

Looking at the way in which participating States have submitted information to the ODIHR in this area, the following can be summarised:

- Since 2004:

- 51 participating States responded to the Note Verbales sent by the ODIHR;

—46 participating States submitted information about legislation;

—40 participating States submitted information about statistics;

—38 participating States submitted information about practical initiatives;

—49 participating States nominated national points of contact on hate crimes: Albania, Andorra, Austria, Azerbaijan, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Holy See, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Kazakhstan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Malta, Moldova, Monaco, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Russian Federation, Serbia, Slovak Republic, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom, United States of America.

—There are special envoys dealing with anti-Semitism issues and/or relations with the Jewish community and Jewish organization in the following participating States: Belgium, France, Germany, Poland, Spain, United States of America.

- The following 35 participating States provided feedback and additional information for the Annual Hate Crime Report for 2006:

—Albania, Andorra, Austria, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Belgium, Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Holy See, Iceland, Italy, Kazakhstan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Malta, Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Russian Federation, Serbia, Slovak Republic, Slovenia, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, Ukraine, United States of America.

—5 participating States informed the ODIHR that no hate crimes were recorded in their country: Albania, Azerbaijan, Cyprus, Monaco and Turkey.

- In the Annual Report for 2006, the ODIHR was able to support its findings in the area of anti-Semitism with official and unofficial statistics for the following countries.

- Belgium (unofficial)
- Canada (unofficial)
- Czech Republic (official)
- France (official and unofficial)
- Germany (official)
- Italy (official)
- United Kingdom (unofficial)
- United States (unofficial). In some states, like the US, official data is collected, but the statistics are published after the release of the ODIHR report.

Other participating States provided information on individual cases or on the issue of anti-Semitism and Holocaust remembrance in general: Belgium, Lithuania, Russian Federation, Sweden, Ukraine.

In general, it can be said that the majority of the participating States provided hate-crime statistics without disaggregating the numbers according to the different bias categories. A significant number of states provided statistics in relation to racially moti-

vated incidents only. Other states provided information and statistics on incidents motivated by xenophobia, ethnicity, or national origin. The difference in classification of bias categories is wide-ranging across OSCE participating States.

A number of states provided information and statistics on hate crimes resulting from religious bias. A wide divergence was seen among states in relation to the classification of this category. Whereas some states provided statistics, specifically in reference to anti-Semitic offences, other states capture anti-Semitic crimes within the category of religious bias.

With respect to data collection, the ODIHR has recommended the need for participating States to:

- Enact legislation requiring the relevant national criminal justice authorities to record and report on incidents motivated by hate or bias at the local and national level;
- Strengthen existing methodologies for identifying and monitoring hate crimes and incidents and for the collection of data on the types of crime or incident, perpetrators and victims, as well as the legal or other follow-up to the crime, including prosecution and length of sentences;
- Strengthen their efforts to establish specific mechanisms for registering, recording, and publicly reporting on hate crimes, including official databases and annual reports;
- If they have not done so already, nominate National Contact Points to gather and send to the ODIHR updated and regular information on hate crime statistics and legislation and relevant national initiatives to combat hate crime.

5. ODIHR ACTIVITIES IN THE AREA OF PROMOTING HOLOCAUST REMEMBRANCE, EDUCATION ON THE HOLOCAUST AND ON ANTI-SEMITISM

Apart from data collection and legislation, another focus is on education.

With the Berlin Declaration, OSCE participating States committed to promote remembrance of and education about the tragedy of the Holocaust as well as educational programmes to combat anti-Semitism. The ODIHR first started activities in this field in 2004.

The ODIHR's subsequent projects and initiatives were based on an assessment of the situation as summarised in the publication: "Education on the Holocaust and on Anti-Semitism in the OSCE region: An Overview and Analysis of Educational Approaches". With this study, a country-by-country overview, the ODIHR evaluated existing initiatives in the OSCE participating States and identified gaps and areas where educational efforts about the Holocaust and about anti-Semitism need to be strengthened.

In this publication, we identify areas of concern and made recommendations.

Areas of concern:

- Lack of training for teachers and/or lack of adequate teaching materials;
- Time limitations within the curriculum;
- Inadequate training or educational strategies targeted at teaching about the Holocaust within multicultural learning environments;

—Difficulties in dealing with issues connected to the current political situation in the Middle East;

—The existence of prejudices and stereotypes among some educators;

—Disagreements over the rationale for teaching about the Holocaust and its relationship to other genocides.

Recommendations:

—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 in and of itself;

—Teacher trainings should be implemented in OSCE participating States and supported by the Governments;

—Sufficient teaching materials should be developed;

—Cooperation within the region and between educators and exchange of experience should be encouraged.

See for more information: http://www.osce.org/odihr/item_11_18712.html

Where Holocaust remembrance and education are still at the initial stages of development or do not exist at all, the establishment of a Holocaust Memorial Day seems to be an excellent opportunity to start activities in this field and to raise awareness.

- In many countries, a special day has been designated to that end—in some States, commemorations take place on two different days. In other countries, the victims of the Holocaust are included in a national commemoration day. Overall, commemorations take place in the 41 of the 56 participating States: Albania, Armenia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Kazakhstan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Monaco, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Romania, Russian Federation, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom, United States of America.

- The 27th of January (the day of the liberation of Auschwitz Birkenau concentration camp by the Red Army in 1945) is commemorated by civil society and/or governments in 26 participating States: Albania, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Ireland, Italy, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Monaco, Netherlands, Norway, Russian Federation, Serbia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, United Kingdom.

- 13 participating States commemorate the Holocaust on another day (e.g. Yom HaShoah): Austria, Bulgaria, Canada, France, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, Ukraine and the United States of America.

- 6 participating States include the victims of the Holocaust in their national commemorations: Armenia, Georgia, Kazakhstan, Netherlands, Slovenia, Uzbekistan.

The ODIHR seeks to assist participating States in this respect and has therefore developed two tools—one for governments and another one for educators.

In close cooperation with the Task Force for International Cooperation on Holocaust Education, Remembrance and Research (ITF), the ODIHR has just published an overview of good practices of commemorating the Holocaust on the level of the Government. The document is entitled: “Holocaust Memorial Days in the OSCE Region—An Overview of Good Practices”. It provides a country-by-country overview of the official commemorative activities that take place in OSCE participating States on Holocaust remembrance days.

- Responses were received from: 36 OSCE participating States: Andorra, Azerbaijan, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Holy See, Hungary, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Monaco, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Russian Federation, Serbia, Slovakia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, United Kingdom, United States of America.

See for more information: <http://www.osce.org/odihr>

the ODIHR developed an online document entitled: “Preparing Holocaust Memorial Days—Suggestions for Educators”. This is a compilation of good practices from various OSCE participating States.

- Available in 13 languages: English, Croatian, Dutch, French, German, Greek, Hungarian, Italian, Lithuanian, Polish, Russian, Serbian and Spanish.

- 7 participating States have translated the document into their languages: Belgium, Croatia, Greece, Hungary, Italy, Lithuania, and Switzerland.

- 4 participating States use the guidelines officially: Italy, Croatia, Greece, Hungary.

See for more information: <http://www.osce.org/odihr> or <http://tnd.odihr.pl/?p=edu>

Building on the excellent cooperation with Yad Vashem, the ODIHR was pleased to launch another document in December 2007: “Addressing anti-Semitism: Why and How? A Guide for Educators”. This easy-to-use tool is aimed at teachers and other educators who identified a need to address issues pertaining to contemporary anti-Semitism. The Guide provides educators with practical suggestions and background information on how to address issues ranging from Holocaust denial to expressions of anti-Zionism and the use of anti-Semitic symbols. It informs about different anti-Semitic stereotypes and makes suggestions on how to respond to them.

See for more information: http://www.osce.org/odihr/item_11_20672.html

After having identified a lack of teaching tools specifically dealing with the issue of anti-Semitism, we engaged in a cooperation project to develop such a tool for participating States that goes one step further than the guidelines mentioned earlier. Together with the Anne Frank House and experts from ten participating States, we developed innovative and country-specific “Teaching materials

on anti-Semitism". The material consists of three major themes: The history of Jews and Anti-Semitism in Europe until 1945, Contemporary forms of anti-Semitism, and Anti-Semitism as one of many forms of discrimination. The materials have been adapted to each country's historical and social background.

- 10 Countries participating in the project: Croatia, Denmark, Germany, Lithuania, Netherlands, Poland, Russian Federation, Slovakia, Spain, Ukraine.

- Implemented through teacher trainings in: Croatia, Denmark, Germany, Netherlands

- Implementation underway in: Poland, Lithuania, Ukraine.

- Adaptations underway in: Russian Federation, Slovakia, Spain.

See for more information: http://www.osce.org/odihr/item_11_23875.html

6. THE ODIHR'S CAPACITY-BUILDING INITIATIVES

Law Enforcement Officer Training Programme (LEOP)

The programme focuses on four main components: (1) Training for police officers on all aspects of hate crime: response, investigation, gathering intelligence, sharing information, and working with prosecutors; (2) developing strategies to combat hate crime that are based on proactive police leadership and community-based partnerships; (3) Developing an effective process for collecting and disseminating data on hate crime; and (4) Training prosecutors on how to use evidence to establish that a crime has been committed.

- Implementation completed in: Croatia, Hungary, Spain.

- Implementation underway in: Poland, Serbia, Ukraine.

- Countries who have expressed interest in implementing the LEOP: Bosnia and Herzegovina, Romania.

- An expert seminar was held in the Russian Federation.

- A regional network that supports the efforts to address hate crimes as a trans-border was established and consists of 13 States. It will provide training and technical assistance and support exchange of information

Currently, the ODIHR is following up on ways in which it can assist these countries to implement the Programme.

See for more information: http://www.osce.org/odihr/item_11_20673.html

Civil Society Capacity Building

A key priority of the ODIHR in the area of tolerance and non-discrimination is to provide civil society with tools for developing their capacity to prevent and to respond to violent manifestations of hate. The ODIHR's work here focuses on enhancing the capacity, skills and knowledge of civil society in areas such as monitoring, reporting, raising the awareness, providing assistance to victims, conducting advocacy work and building coalitions. We are currently in the process of finalizing a resource guide and implement a training programme for NGOs, followed by support to the design and implementation of small-scale projects.

The ODIHR also supports the development of existing civil society networks active throughout the OSCE region (for example:

UNITED for intercultural action, International Network Against Cyber Hate) and encourages the creation of coalitions on issues related to its mandate. Since 2006, the ODIHR has been facilitating an ongoing dialogue among civil society representatives and with participating States. Ahead of major OSCE conferences on tolerance issues, it organizes civil society preparatory meetings. These meetings allow for discussion and exchange of best practices, but also support the development and consolidation of common recommendations to participating States, OSCE institutions and civil society to be presented at the related conference.

See for more information: <http://www.osce.org/odihr/20062.html> and <http://tandis.odihr.pl/index.php?p=cs,intro>

7. OSCE EVENTS IN THE AREA OF COMBATING ANTI-SEMITISM

June 2003: OSCE Conference on Anti-Semitism, Vienna

Organized by the OSCE Chairmanship.

See for more information: <http://www.osce.org/item/9610.html>

April 2004: OSCE Conference on Anti-Semitism, Berlin

Hosted by the Government of Germany.

See for more information: <http://www.osce.org/item/9677.html>

June 2004: OSCE Meeting on the Relationship Between Racist, Xenophobic and Anti-Semitic Propaganda on the Internet and hate Crimes

Organized by the OSCE Chairmanship

See for more information: <http://www.osce.org/item/9691.html>

September 2004: OSCE Conference on Tolerance and the Fight Against Racism, Xenophobia and Discrimination

Organized by the OSCE Chairmanship

See for more information: <http://www.osce.org/item/9694.html>

June 2005: OSCE Conference on Anti-Semitism and Other Forms of Intolerance, Cordoba

Organized by the OSCE Chairmanship.

See for more information: <http://www.osce.org/item/9735.html>

JUNE 2006: OSCE TOLERANCE IMPLEMENTATION MEETING ON PROMOTING INTER-CULTURAL, INTER-RELIGIOUS AND INTER-ETHNIC UNDERSTANDING, ALMATY.

Organised by the ODIHR and the OSCE Chairmanship.

See for more information: http://www.osce.org/conferences/tolerance_2006.html and <http://tandis.odihr.pl/index.php?p=qu-ev,Almaty0606>

October 2006: Tolerance Implementation Meeting: "Education to Promote Mutual Respect and Understanding and to Teach about the Holocaust", Dubrovnik.

Organised by the ODIHR and the OSCE Chairmanship.

- 24 participating States registered for the Meeting
 - 18 participating States sent their OSCE delegations or other diplomats
 - 6 participating States sent experts: Austria, Bulgaria, Croatia, Slovakia, Spain, United States of America.
- See for more information: http://www.osce.org/conferences/tolerance2_2006.html and <http://tandis.odihr.pl/index.php?p=qu-ev,Dubrovnik1006>

November 2006: Tolerance Implementation Meeting: “Addressing the Hate Crimes Data Deficit”, Vienna.

Organised by the ODIHR and the OSCE Chairmanship.

- 36 participating States were represented at the Meeting.
 - 17 of the then 46 nominated National Points of Contact on Hate Crimes registered: Andorra, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bosnia Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Croatia, Czech Republic, Finland, France, Holy See, Kazakhstan, Norway, Netherlands, Poland, Spain, Sweden, United States of America.
- See for more information: <http://www.osce.org/item/21879.html> and <http://tandis.odihr.pl/index.php?p=qu-ev,Vienna1106>

June 2007: High-Level Conference on Combating Discrimination and Promoting Mutual Respect and Understanding, Bucharest.

Organised by the OSCE Chairmanship.

See for more information: http://www.osce.org/conferences/tnd_2007.html

8. LIST OF PUBLICATIONS

- ODIHR: Holocaust Memorial Days in the OSCE Region—An overview of good practices [2008], <http://www.osce.org/odihr/>
- ODIHR/Anne Frank House: “Teaching Materials on Anti-Semitism” [2007], <http://www.osce.org/item/23875.html> and <http://www.osce.org/item/20672.html>
- ODIHR/Yad Vashem: “Addressing Anti-Semitism: Why and How?—A Guide for Educators” [2007], http://www.osce.org/documents/odihr/2007/12/28962_en.pdf
- ODIHR/Yad Vashem: “Preparing Holocaust Memorial Days—Suggestions for Educators” [2006], available in Croatian, Dutch, English, French, German, Greek, Hungarian, Italian, Lithuanian, Polish, Russian, Serbian, Spanish, <http://www.osce.org/odihr/20104.html>
- ODIHR: Education on the Holocaust and on Anti-Semitism. An Overview and Analysis of Educational Approaches [2006], available in English and Russian, <http://www.osce.org/item/18712.html>
- ODIHR: Why Should We Teach About the Holocaust? [2005], available in Polish and English, <http://tandis.odihr.pl/index.php?p=edu,hol>
- ODIHR: Hate Crimes in the OSCE Region: Incidents and Responses, Annual Report for 2006 [2007], <http://www.osce.org/item/26296.html>
- ODIHR: Combating Hate Crimes in the OSCE Region: An Overview of Statistics, Legislation, and National Initiatives [2005],

available in English and Russian, <http://www.osce.org/item/16251.html>

- ODIHR: Toledo Guiding Principles on Teaching About Religions and Beliefs in Public Schools, prepared by the ODIHR Advisory Council of Experts on Freedom of Religion or Belief [2007], <http://www.osce.org/item/28314.html>

- ODIHR: Guidelines for Review of Legislation Pertaining to Religion or Belief [2004], available in English and Russian, <http://www.osce.org/item/13600.html>

- ODIHR: International Action against Racism, Xenophobia, Anti-Semitism and Intolerance in the OSCE Region, A comparative Study [2004], <http://www.osce.org/item/13601.html>

In addition to these publications, the ODIHR systematically collects and disseminates information on legislation, statistics, best practices in the area of tolerance and non-discrimination and has made this information available to the public through the Tolerance and Non-Discrimination Information System: <http://tandis.odihhr.pl/>

- This database offers access to
 - Information received from OSCE participation States, non-governmental organizations and other organizations;
 - Country pages providing access to country initiatives, legislation, national specialised bodies, statistics and other information;
 - Thematic pages with information related to different key issues;
 - International standards and instruments;
 - Information from inter-governmental organizations, including country reports and annual reports.

9. CONCLUDING REMARKS

At the end of my statement, please allow me to briefly summarize our work for you.

Since the establishment of the portfolio on anti-Semitism issues in the ODIHR's Tolerance and Non-Discrimination Programme

- there have been 9 major OSCE events or conferences on the issue of anti-Semitism, 3 of which were tolerance implementation meetings

- we have published 11 books and documents in the area of tolerance and non-discrimination

- 6 of these publications and our hate crime report focus on either Holocaust remembrance and/or anti-Semitism

- 6 of our overall publications have been translated into at least one other language.

- More than half of the participating States are involved in our educational, legislative assistance and capacity-building programmes.

We look forward to continuing and expanding this cooperation as we move towards implementing the Berlin Declaration.

Thank you very much for your attention.



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.