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ANTI–SEMITISM:
A GROWING THREAT TO ALL FAITHS

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 27, 2013

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON AFRICA, GLOBAL HEALTH,
GLOBAL HUMAN RIGHTS, AND INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,
Washington, DC.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to notice, at 9 o'clock a.m., in
room 2172 Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Christopher H.
Smith (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Mr. SMITH. The committee will come to order, and good morning
to everyone. Thank you for being here bright and early. And I want
to welcome you to this, what I believe and we believe to be a very
important hearing on anti–Semitism and combating anti–Semitism,
with a particular emphasis on Europe.

At a congressional hearing that I chaired in 2002 on combating
anti–Semitism, Dr. Shimon Samuels of the Wiesenthal Center in
Paris testified and said, “The Holocaust for 30 years after the war
acted as a protective teflon against blatant anti-Semitic expression,
especially in Europe. That teflon,” he said, “has eroded, and what
was considered distasteful and politically incorrect is becoming sim-
ply an opinion. But,” he warned ominously, “cocktail chatter at fine
English dinners can end in Molotov cocktails against synagogues.”

In response to what appeared to be a sudden frightening spike
in anti-Semitism in several countries, including here in the United
States, we first proposed the idea for a conference on combating
anti-Semitism under the auspices of the Organization for Security
and Cooperation in Europe. Convinced we had an escalating crisis
on our hands, we teamed with several OSCE partners to push for
action and reform. Many of the people and the NGOs present in
this room played a leading part.

Rabbi Baker will remember so well how we worked on several
important initiatives including language and plans of action. These
efforts directly led to important OSCE conferences on combating
anti-Semitism. As I think many of you know, they occurred in
places like Vienna, Berlin, Cordoba, and Bucharest. In each of
those, participating states made solemn, tangible commitments to
put our words into action. In some countries progress has been
made, yet the scope and outcome of anti-Semitic acts has not
abated in others, and in some nations it has actually gotten worse.

That is why we are here today, to review, to recommit, and to
reenergize efforts to vanquish the highly disturbing resurgence of
anti-Semitism everywhere, including in Europe. Unparalleled since the dark days of the Second World War, Jewish communities on a global scale are facing verbal harassment and sometimes violent attacks against synagogues, Jewish cultural sites, cemeteries, and individuals. It is an ugly reality that won’t go away by ignoring it or by wishing it away. It must be defeated. Thus, we gather to enlighten, motivate, and share best practices on how not just to mitigate this centuries old obsession, but to crush this pernicious form of hate.

From our first panel of witnesses we are going to hear how anti-Semitism directly threatens not only Jews, but also Christians and Muslims and democracy and civil society. We are all in this together. When we fight anti-Semitism it is not only a matter of justice for Jewish fellow citizens, but also standing up for Christianity and for Islam and for the possibility of a decent living itself. We all have a direct stake in the fight against anti-Semitism.

This is tragically clear in the Middle East countries where the governments propagate anti-Semitism as an official or quasi-official ideology. These governments incite anti-Semitic hatred of Israel in order to distract the people from their own tyrannical rule and from their own abuse of human rights, denial of democracy, economic corruption and the like. Sadly, it works. We see this in governments as varied as those of Iran and Egypt, Pakistan and Syria and Saudi Arabia, and the list of course doesn’t end there. Tens of millions of people who live in these communities are in this sense suffering from anti-Semitism. Few of them are Jewish. Most are Muslims. Millions are Christian. It is true that to some degree or other, many of the people in these countries have bought into the evil of anti-Semitism, but many thankfully have not.

From our second panel we are also going to hear reports from a number of European Jewish leaders who will be able to tell us firsthand about anti-Semitism in their countries and the region, and how the governments are responding and whether these responses are effective and adequate. Sadly, in much of Europe the harassment of Jews including verbal and physical violence continues to increase, and a recent Anti-Defamation League study shows that anti-Semitic attitudes are widespread in Europe and getting worse in many countries.

One thing the witnesses will address is whether elected officials are fulfilling their responsibility to speak out publicly against any expression of anti-Semitic hate. When the national leaders fail to denounce anti-Semitic violence and slurs the void is not only de-moralizing to the victims, but silence actually enables the wrongdoing. Silence by elected officials in particular conveys approval or at least acquiescence and can contribute to a climate of fear and a profound sense of vulnerability.

Another point we have to consider is whether the countries are collecting reliable hate crime information. We can’t fight anti-Semitic crimes effectively unless we have reliable information on them. The most recent figures from the United States, for example, which are collected by the FBI, show that Jews, although they are only 2 percent of the United States’ population, they are the victims of 63 percent of religiously targeted hate crimes. An additional concern is the importance of Holocaust education. If we are to pro-
tect our children from the dark evil of anti-Semitism we must re-educate ourselves and systematically educate our children. While that starts in our homes, the classroom must be an incubator of tolerance and respect. It seems to me only the most hardened racist can remain unmoved by Holocaust education and remembrance. Only the most crass, evil, and prejudiced among us can study the horrors of the Holocaust and not cry out, never again.

Yet another concern is the rise of the new anti-Semitism, which tries to pass itself off as legitimate criticism of Israel, but which demonizes, delegitimizes, and applies double standards against Israel—former Soviet refusenik Natan Sharansky’s three “d”s. In any case, this form of anti-Semitism appears to be spreading among European social democratic and leftist parties as well as among Muslim immigrants from the Middle East, and I would like to hear the views of our distinguished witnesses on that as well.

I look forward to our witnesses’ statements, and I would ask that my full statement be made a part of the record. Without objection, that and all of my colleagues, their full statements will be made a part of the record. I would like to now yield to Mr. Cicilline.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Smith follows:]
Good morning and welcome to everyone joining us this morning. I particularly want to welcome representatives of a number of European countries. After the hearing, I look forward to meeting with them to hear their views on how the evil of anti-Semitism can be more successfully addressed.

At a Congressional hearing I chaired in 2002, Dr. Shimon Samuels of the Wiesenthal Center in Paris testified and said, “The Holocaust for 30 years after the war acted as a protective Teflon against blatant anti-Semitic expression (especially in Europe). That Teflon has eroded, and what was considered distasteful and politically incorrect is becoming simply an opinion. But,” he warned ominously, “cocktail chatter at fine English dinner table ends as Molotov cocktails against synagogues.”

In response to what appeared to be a sudden, frightening spike in anti-Semitism in several countries, including here in the United States, we first proposed the idea for a conference on combating anti-Semitism under the auspices of the organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE).

Convinced we had an escalating crisis on our hands, we teamed with several OSCE partners to push for action and reform. Many of the people and NGOs present in this room played leading roles.

These efforts directly led to important OSCE conferences on combating anti-Semitism in Vienna, Stutia, Cordoba, and Bucharest. In each of those, participating states have made solemn, tangible commitments to put our words into action. In some countries, progress has indeed been
made, yet the scope and outcome of anti-Semitic acts have not abated in others, and in some
nations it has actually gotten worse.

That is why we are here today, to review, re-commit, and re-energize efforts to vanquish
the highly disturbing resurgence of anti-Semitism everywhere, including in Europe.

Unparalleled since the dark ages of the Second World War, Jewish communities on a
global scale are facing verbal harassment, and sometimes violent attacks against synagogues,
Jewish cultural sites, cemeteries and individuals. It is an ugly reality that won't go away by
ignoring or wishing it away. It must be defeated.

Thus, we gather to enlighten, motivate, and share ideas on how not just to mitigate this
centuries-old obsession, but to crush this pernicious form of hate.

From our first panel of witnesses we are going to hear how anti-Semitism directly
threatens not only Jews but also Christians and Muslims, and democracy and civil society. When
we fight anti-Semitism it is not only a matter of justice for Jewish fellow-citizens, but also of
standing up for Christianity, and for Islam, and for the possibility of decent living itself. We all
have a direct stake in the fight against anti-Semitism.

This is tragically clear in the Middle-Eastern countries where the government propagates
anti-Semitism as an official or quasi official ideology. These governments incite anti-Semitic
hatred of Israel in order to distract the people from their own tyrannical rule, from their own
abuse of human rights, denial of democracy, economic corruption. Sadly, it works. We see this in
governments as varied as those of Iran and Egypt, Pakistan and Syria and Saudi Arabia, and the
list doesn't end there.

Tens of millions of people who live in these countries are in this sense suffering from
anti-Semitism. Few of them are Jewish - most are Muslim, millions are Christian. It's true that,
to some degree or other, many of the people in these countries have bought into the evil of anti-
Semitism, but many have not.

From our second panel, we are also going to hear reports from a number of European
Jewish leaders who will be able to tell us about anti-Semitism in their countries, how the
governments are responding, and whether these responses are effective. Sadly, in much of
Europe, the harassment of Jews, including verbal and physical violence, continues to increase,
and a recent Anti-Defamation League study shows that anti-Semitic attitudes are widespread in
Europe and getting worse in many countries.

One thing the witnesses will address is whether elected officials are fulfilling their
responsibility to speak out publicly against any expressions of anti-Semitic hate. When rational
leaders fail to denounce anti-Semitic violence and slurs, the void is not only demonstrative to the
victims but silence actually enables the wrongdoing. Silence by elected officials in particular
carries approval - or at least acquiescence - and can contribute to a climate of fear and a sense
of vulnerability.
In this respect, I want to recognize the leadership Hungarian Prime Minister Viktor Orbán has shown in the fight against anti-Semitism. Prime Minister Orbán has taken his government into the vanguard of those fighting anti-Semitism in Europe. He has declared a "zero tolerance policy" against anti-Semitism and seen that anti-Semitic incidents are promptly followed by high-level official condemnations, sometimes by him, sometimes by other officials. There is still far too much anti-Semitism in Hungary, and it is cultivated by the viciously racist Jobbik political party. But I am glad that the Hungarian government has responded vigorously, protecting its Jewish citizens by strengthening legislation and law-enforcement, education and Holocaust remembrance.

Another point we will have to consider is whether the countries are collecting reliable hate crime information. We can't fight anti-Semitic crimes effectively unless we have reliable information on them. The most recent figures from the U.S., for example, which are collected by the FBI, showed that Jews, less than 2% of the U.S. population, are the victims of 63% of religiously-targeted hate crimes.

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

Yet another concern is the rise of a "new" anti-Semitism, which tries to pass itself off as legitimate criticism of Israel – former Soviet "refusenik" Natan Sharansky's "3 Ds." In any case, this form of anti-Semitism appears to be spreading among European social-democratic and leftist parties, as well as among Muslim immigrants from the Middle East, and I'd like to hear your views about the most effective ways to expose it for what it is.

I look forward to hearing the witnesses' ideas as to what Congress and the U.S. government can do to help. We need to work together with you to light a fire under our government, under European governments, and intergovernmental organizations like the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE).

It will be helpful to hear your thoughts on the State Department's Office to Monitor and Combat Anti-Semitism, which was created by an amendment I offered in 2004. Also about the improving the excellent work Rabbi Andy Baker and the OSCE, where I and other members of the Helsinki Commission were successful in making the fight against anti-Semitism a priority – and I think the OSCE and other intergovernmental organizations need to be re-energized on this issue.

Finally, any thoughts on legislation are welcome, for example ideas that could be taken up in the Combating Anti-Semitism Act which I am preparing to re-introduce, or in the Interparliamentary Coalition for Combating Anti-Semitism, where I am a member of the Steering Committee. One possible initiative is for a day on which heads of state or government...
Mr. CICILLINE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thank you for holding today's hearing. And thank you also to our ranking member, Congresswoman Bass, for convening this important hearing, and thank you to our witnesses.

Fostering religious understanding and combating anti-Semitism is a critical and very important challenge. In the United States, the work we do internationally to protect the human rights of people of every faith is a reflection of our nation's values and founding principles. We are all of course familiar with the historical consequences of anti-Semitism especially when it is infused with a political dimension. The purpose of this hearing is absolutely essential. It is very important to discuss the impact anti-Semitism has on the global understanding and the rights of all people.

And so I want to just welcome the witnesses who are here today, to thank you for participating in this hearing on this very important topic. I look forward to hearing your diverse and global perspectives. I think we all recognize that the rise of anti-Semitism is deeply troubling, and considering what actions we can take to respond to this phenomenon, what public policies we can implement, what educational policies we can promote to help to eradicate anti-Semitism all over the world should be our focus. And I thank you to the extent you are going to contribute to that discussion, and I welcome you to the hearing today.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I yield back.

Mr. SMITH. Thank you, my friend. I would like to yield to Mr. Marino, former U.S. Attorney from Pennsylvania, and a member of this committee.

Mr. MARINO. I yield back. I have no opening statement.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. Bera?

Mr. BERA. Mr. Chairman, thank you for holding this hearing. As we are going to hear, anti-Semitism and hate crimes continue to plague our nation and the world. In 2011, over 1,080 cases were reported nationwide. Unfortunately, my community in Sacramento knows firsthand the dangers of this form of hatred. This weekend I had the privilege of visiting Congregation Beth Shalom, a synagogue in Carmichael, California, for Purim celebrations. There I witnessed a vibrant and joyful community celebrating their faith. However, just 14 years ago this community was victimized by anti-Semitic arsonists who burned three synagogues. Congregation Beth Shalom as well as B'hai Israel and Kenesset Israel Torah Center were victims of these senseless attacks.

Our community is all too aware of the threat that anti-Semitism poses to freedom in this country and around the world. These attacks in 1999 came as a shock. They served as a cruel reminder
that the desire to erase the Jewish people and their culture persists. At B’nai Israel, a community founded in 1849 and the oldest congregational-owned synagogue west of the Mississippi River, more than 5,000 books were destroyed. Ancient, irreplaceable judaica were lost in the fire, and a community of believers peacefully practicing their faith were deeply shaken.

An intern in my office attends Beth Shalom, the congregation that I visited this weekend. She was only 6 years old at the time of the attacks. Her parents struggled to explain why anyone would do something so awful to the good people they knew, friends, family, neighbors. Just days after the arson, a unity rally was held at the Sacramento Community Center. More than 5,000 people of all faiths came to support the synagogues. The congregation received hundreds of cards, donations, and a community pulling together. Signs that read “United We Stand” could be seen in windows throughout Sacramento. As we know in Sacramento firsthand, battling anti-Semitism is going to be an ongoing struggle.

Mr. Chairman, thank you again for convening this important hearing, and thank you to the witnesses for telling us how we are going to continue this battle. I yield back my time.

Mr. SMITH. Thank you very much. I would like to now yield to Mr. Meadows.

Mr. MEADOWS. I just want to thank each one of you for being here on this critical issue as we address it, and thank you, Mr. Chairman, for holding this hearing. As we look at this, one of the things that I hope each one of you can address is how so many times we publicly say that this is something that we can’t stand, but yet quietly we tolerate it. And so what we need to do is make sure that not only our rhetoric is matched by our actions, but what we need to do not only as a nation, but as a leader in the world to highlight this particular issue.

The other part of that is, is there has been much emphasis played on the economic role and how that exacerbates this problem. And while history shows that there certainly is an economic component to it, as we see the nation of Israel we have got a 10,000 square mile nation that has no oil, no gold, no iron, and yet it is surrounded by 5.2 million square miles of oil-rich country and they are seen as the aggressor, which is not actually the case.

And so even though there may be an economic component to it, what I would love to see from each one of you and would welcome hearing is how that we can address this and highlight the atrocities that are happening over and over, and what is the causal effect of that and how through an international body perhaps that we can put influence or pressure to bear to highlight this so that it doesn’t continue to be tolerated in our world. Thank you so much. I yield back, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SMITH. Thank you, Mr. Meadows. Mr. Weber?

Mr. WEBER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for holding the meeting, and I echo the same sentiments and remarks. I will be committed to eliminating anti-Semitism around the world. The United States stood tall once before, and I look forward to being part of standing tall once again. Thank you very much.

Mr. SMITH. Thank you, Mr. Weber, very much. It is now a privilege to introduce our first panel. But before I do that I do want to
acknowledge the presence of Annette Lantos, the wife, and very distinguished in her own right, but the wife of our former chairman, Tom Lantos, who we all deeply miss. And our first witness will be Katrina Lantos Swett who is Tom and Annette's daughter.

Dr. Katrina Lantos Swett is the chair of the United States Commission on International Religious Freedom, an independent U.S. Government commission that monitors the universal rights to freedom of religion, and belief, abroad. She established the Lantos Foundation for Human Rights and Justice in 2008, and serves as its president and chief executive officer, carrying on the unique and tremendous legacy of her father, the late Congressman Tom Lantos.

We will then hear from Eric Metaxas who is the author of the best-selling books including “Bonhoeffer” and “Amazing Grace: William Wilberforce”—who is a personal hero of mine—and the Heroic Campaign to End Slavery”, and more than than 30 other books. A very, very prolific and effective writer. He is currently the voice of BreakPoint, a radio commentary. He was the keynote speaker at the 2012 National Prayer Breakfast, and was awarded the Canterbury Medal in 2011 by the Becket Fund for Religious Freedom.

We will then hear from Zuhdi Jasser who is the founder and president of the American Islamic Forum for Democracy, and is the author of “A Battle for the Soul of Islam: An American Muslim Patriot's Fight to Save His Faith.” Dr. Jasser is a first-generation American Muslim whose parents fled the oppressive Ba’ath Regime in Syria. He earned his medical degree on a U.S. Navy scholarship and served 11 years in the U.S. Navy. Dr. Jasser currently serves on the U.S. Commission on International Religious Freedom.

We will then hear from John Garvey who is the president of the Catholic University of America. Mr. Garvey was the dean of Boston College Law School and the president of the Association of American Law Schools. He has practiced law and taught at Notre Dame, Michigan, and Kentucky. He is the author or co-author of numerous books including “Religion and the Constitution,” which won the Alpha Sigma Nu Jesuit book award; and he has won the Catholic Press Association award for another work that he authored.

Then we will hear from Elisa Massimino who has been the president and chief executive officer of Human Rights First, and no stranger to this subcommittee. She helped establish the Washington office in 1991, and served as the organization’s Washington director from 1997 to 2008. She has served as pro bono counsel in many human rights cases, testified before this committee and others more than a dozen times, and is published frequently. The Hill has repeatedly named her as one of the top 20 public advocates in the country.

A very distinguished list; I would like to now ask Dr. Lantos Swett if she would proceed.

**STATEMENT OF KATRINA LANTOS SWETT, PH.D., CHAIR, U.S. COMMISSION ON INTERNATIONAL RELIGIOUS FREEDOM**

Ms. LANTOS SWETT. Thank you very much. It is a great honor for me to be here today. It is a great honor to appear with this distinguished panel of witnesses. And of course, Mr. Chairman, we all
know that you are among the most valiant and courageous defenders of human rights in all their forms and for all people everywhere that our country has known, and so it is a particular pleasure for me to be here testifying before you. And lastly, I would be remiss if I didn’t acknowledge my father there gazing down upon me. Certainly my personal hero and someone who as the only survivor of the Holocaust ever to serve in this body, his presence is with us here today and I know he is incredibly grateful to know that these hearings are taking place.

I would like to ask, Mr. Chairman, that the full text of my remarks be entered in the record, because in the interest of time I probably won’t be able to deliver every word as written.

Mr. SMITH. Without objection, so ordered.

Ms. LANTOS SWETT. Thank you so much. In light of today’s hearing it is fitting to note that just a few days ago, last Sunday, Jews around the world celebrated the annual festival of Purim. As related in the biblical Book of Esther, Purim is the story of how the Jews of the Persian Empire, nearly 25 centuries ago, faced the danger of imminent extermination at the hands of Haman, the King’s prime minister. This ancient threat represents the first known plot to entirely destroy the Jewish people. Through a dramatic turn of events, and may I say through the courage and cleverness of beautiful Esther, the plot was thwarted and the Jewish people were delivered from destruction.

It is ironic indeed that in today’s Persia, which we now call Iran, its current leaders follow in Haman’s footsteps by expressing their own form of vicious anti-Semitism and their avowed determination to wipe Israel, the Jewish homeland, off the map. Top officials have denied the reality of the Nazi Holocaust, the most serious effort in history to obliterate the Jewish people. As the daughter of Holocaust survivors I can testify as to how surreal it is for a people to have to defend themselves in this day and age not only against hateful attitudes and behaviors, but also against those who try to dissuade others from believing that 6 million people were killed for the sole crime of being Jews.

Unfortunately, anti-Semitism remains a phenomenon that knows no national boundaries. I was recently confronted with the reality of this during an official USCIRF visit to Egypt. One of the most dramatic moments of that visit to Egypt was when I sat across at a very close distance from a high official in the Morsi government and personally confronted him on some of President Morsi’s recently unearthed statements in which he says that we must nurse our children and grandchildren on hatred of the Jews down to the last generation and in which he referred to Jews as the descendants of apes and pigs. I said to that minister, your President was calling on hatred of me down to the last generation. Your President was saying that I and my seven children are the descendants of apes and pigs. This is not the conduct of a civilized people. These are not the words of a civilized man. This is a stain upon the honor of Egypt. A stain upon the character of your nation, and it must stop.

I share that experience because I think in some sense it holds the key to the answer that we are all seeking today, how do we confront anti-Semitism? It is awkward. It is uncomfortable. It is
personal. It is direct. It is tense. We don’t shrug our shoulders, we don’t—to borrow a phrase from President Bush—sort of indulge in the bigotry, soft bigotry of low expectations and say, well, it is the Muslim world. We will shrug our shoulders and kind of just move on and get to the more serious discussions. We face it. We confront it. I am going to return to my written remarks here.

Anti-Semitism remains a phenomenon that as I say knows no national boundaries. Through vigilance and wakefulness we have tried to confront it in every corner and in every country and in every region of the world. And in Europe the enormity of the Holocaust compelled Europe’s peoples to begin the critical task of self-examination, confronting hateful action stemming from poisonous attitudes and beliefs which permeated Europe for nearly 17 centuries, helping to demonize the people and preparing the way for the unthinkable. This painful realization of how homegrown hatred sowed the seeds for genocide remains a significant force in Europe today. Yet now, nearly 70 years after the Holocaust, the fact remains that across Europe, from East to West, anti-Semitism lives and is gaining momentum.

I know that time is short and I don’t want to overstep my time, so instead of detailing, as I think some of my fellow witnesses will, the incredibly broad scope of examples of anti-Semitism across Europe, I would like to speak briefly about the perpetrators and the enablers of these very disturbing acts. The perpetrators of these acts across Europe and elsewhere largely are individuals or members of groups who are deeply hostile to democracy and pluralism. Some are neo-Nazis who express their admiration for Adolph Hitler. Others are racist skinhead groups active in many countries, and many are violent religious extremists who distort the religion of Islam to suit their own intolerant political aims. Compounding this problem are four critical factors.

First, while the number of Europeans participating in anti-Semitic acts is minuscule, nearly every recent survey on anti-Semitism in Europe shows that negative attitudes toward Jews among Europe’s population remains surprisingly widespread. Second, these surveys show that to an alarming degree at least some of this bias against Jews masquerades, as you said Mr. Chairman, as criticism of the State of Israel. While we know that no country is beyond reproach for its particular policies, when criticism takes the form of language that seeks to delegitimize, demonize and apply a double standard to that nation, then we have to insist on calling it what it is, anti-Semitism. We must unmask it.

I am reminded of how persistent this problem has been. Back in 1968, the non-Jewish writer Eric Hoffer put it well when he wrote, “Other nations when they are victorious dictate peace terms, but when Israel is victorious it must sue for peace.” He added, “Everyone expects the Jews to be the only Christians in this world.” Very penetrating comment, I think.

A third factor, European governments initially were slow to respond to the threat posed to Jews, and even now according to a number of Jewish community leaders and public officials, often at the local level leadership remains reluctant to identify publicly the ideological or religious identity or motivation of some of the per-
petrators of anti-Semitic acts. And this lackadaisical attitude has contributed to a climate of complacency vis-à-vis this issue.

Finally, as USCIRF has documented and articulated, a number of European governments along with certain political parties are complicating matters by supporting initiatives that single out certain Jewish religious practices for restriction. In at least four countries, Iceland, Norway, Sweden and Switzerland, kosher slaughter is flatly banned. Authorities and political forces in Norway and Germany have also tried to ban infant male circumcision. To be sure, the driving force behind such restrictions, which also affect Muslims, is not primarily anti-Semitism per se. It is more directly related to a tendency in some Western European countries to replace monolithic state religions with monolithic secular ideologies.

And we see that this aggressive secularism in some instances targets traditional Christianity and Islam as well. In both instances past and present, Judaism and other minority belief systems are left on the outside. Nonetheless, this drive to ban kosher slaughter and circumcision evokes tragic images of much darker days for Jews in Europe. At the very least, such efforts reveal a chilling indifference to the Jewish historical experience in Europe. The end result is that the atmosphere throughout Europe today is one in which Jewish communities feel insecure and threatened, and the general population seems dangerously complacent and even comfortable with widespread, open manifestations of anti-Semitism.

I know we are going to have the opportunity to discuss solutions and answers in our later discussion, so let me close, if I may, with one more paraphrase from Eric Hoffer, this former longshoreman and social philosopher. He wrote, and I am paraphrasing him here a bit, “I have a premonition that will not leave me. As it goes with the Jews so will it go with all of us. Should the Jews perish, the Holocaust will be upon us all.” Thank you very much.

[The prepared statement of Ms. Lantos Swett follows:]
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Introduction

I appreciate the opportunity to testify this morning about the growing challenge of anti-Semitism, particularly on the continent of Europe, and how the U.S. Commission on International Freedom, or USCIRF, views this serious problem.

Before I continue, let me acknowledge the crucial importance of this Committee and these hearings. It is through such hearings that Congress and the American people can better understand the disturbing phenomenon of anti-Semitism. It is a persistent, age-old hatred unto itself but also serves as a warning sign of malignant forces that pose other dangers to society and the cause of freedom, including but not limited to freedom of religion.

In light of today’s hearings, it is fitting to note that just three days ago, last Sunday, Jews around the world celebrated the annual festival of Purim. As related in the Biblical Book of Esther, Purim is the story of how the Jews of the Persian Empire nearly 25 centuries ago faced the danger of imminent extermination at the hands of Haman, the king’s prime minister. This ancient threat represents the first known plot to destroy the Jewish people. Through a dramatic turn of events, Haman’s plans were thwarted and the Jewish people were delivered from destruction.

It is indeed ironic that in today’s Persia, which we now call Iran, its current leaders follow in Haman’s footsteps by expressing their own form of anti-Semitism and their avowed determination to “wipe Israel off the map.” Top officials have denied the reality of the Nazi Holocaust, the most serious effort in history to obliterate the Jewish people. As the daughter of Holocaust survivors, I can testify how surreal it is for a people to have to defend themselves in this day and age not only against hateful attitudes and behavior, but also against those who try to dissuade others from believing that six million human beings died for the sole “crime” of being Jews.

Unfortunately, anti-Semitism remains a phenomenon that knows no national boundaries. I was recently confronted with this reality during an official USCIRF visit to Egypt. Recently unearthed 2010 comments by President Morsi that urged Egyptians to “nurse our children and grandchildren on hatred for Jews and Zionists” and another interview in which he referred to Jews as the descendants of “apes and pigs” underscore the depth to which Egyptian society is infused with these deplorable attitudes. When confronted on these comments, Egyptian officials with whom we met attempted to divert the discussion to attacks on the state of Israel.

These two examples serve to underscore how deep, abiding, and seemingly intractable anti-Semitism remains. Yet I believe that if people of good will come together and resist this evil wherever it arises, the simple vow, “never again,” can become a reality. In order to make this a reality we must heed the injunction of my late father, Congressman Tom Lantos who said: “The veneer of civilization is paper thin; we are its guardians and we can never rest.”

Through vigilance and wakefulness the good news is that in the decades following the Holocaust, Europe has made progress in the struggle against anti-Semitism. The enormity of the
Holocaust compelled Europe’s peoples to begin the critical task of self-examination, confronting hateful actions stemming from poisonous attitudes and beliefs which permeated Europe for nearly 17 centuries, helping to demonize a people and preparing the way for the unthinkable. This painful realization of how homegrown hatred sowed the seeds for genocide remains a significant force in Europe today.

**Eastern Europe**

Yet even today, nearly seventy years after the Holocaust, the fact remains that across Europe, from east to west, anti-Semitism lives.

In Russia, despite significant improvements from the Soviet era, skinhead groups have engaged in violence against Jews in the name of nationalism. I visited Russia on behalf of USCIRF just last year. We heard how high levels of xenophobia and intolerance, including anti-Semitism, often result in violent and sometimes lethal hate crimes. We have seen increased prosecutions in Moscow and no anti-Semitic rhetoric from the Russian government. However, the government has not addressed these issues consistently, especially regarding crimes against other ethnic and religious minorities.

In Belarus, the government has failed to identify or punish the vandals of Jewish memorials, cemeteries, and other property. Rather than moving decisively against such activities, government officials, including President Lukashenko, and the state media have encouraged future hatred through their own anti-Semitic utterances.

In Hungary, my parents’ native country, the leader of its third largest political party recently urged the government to create a list of Jews who pose “a national security threat.” This ominous suggestion evokes chilling memories of some of Hungary’s darkest days under Nazism, when hundreds of thousands of Jews were carefully identified and then killed or deported to their death. There is no place for such talk in civilized societies. I was pleased to see the strong response by the Hungarian government, Parliament and leading opposition party in condemning this statement.

**Western Europe**

In Western Europe, we saw disturbing signs of heightened anti-Semitism in streets, towns and cities in various countries beginning in our new century. It has taken a number of forms, often escalating from verbal abuse to physical attacks, and from desecrating Jewish synagogues and cemeteries to firebombing Jewish schools.

Since 2000, anti-Semitic graffiti increasingly has appeared across Europe’s great cities, from London to Paris, Berlin to Madrid, and Amsterdam to Rome. Over the past decade, synagogues were vandalized or set ablaze in France, Hungary, Sweden and Poland.

In some cities, physical attacks on Jews and Jewish property have led its Jewish residents to try to hide their ethnic and religious identity. In Malmo, Sweden, attacks have caused increasing
numbers of Jews to leave their homes. A generation ago, there were 2,000 Jews in Malvo; today there reportedly are fewer than 700.

While assaults continue to occur across the continent, they appear to be a particular problem in France. Last year was one of “unprecedented violence” against French Jews, according to a recent report by the security unit of France’s Jewish community. According to the report, there were 614 anti-Semitic incidences in France in 2012, compared to 389 in 2011.

Earlier this month, a woman was arrested in Toulouse, France after trying to stab a student at the Ohr HaTorah Jewish day school, the same school where four Jews were shot and killed in March 2012 by a French gunman of Algerian descent on a motorcycle.

Perpetrators and Enablers

The perpetrators of these acts largely are individuals or members of groups who are deeply hostile to democracy and pluralism. Some are neo-Nazis who express their admiration for Adolf Hitler. Others are racist skinhead groups active in many countries. Many are violent religious extremists who distort the religion of Islam to suit their own intolerant political aims.

Compounding the problem are four critical factors.

First, while the number of Europeans participating in anti-Semitic acts is miniscule, nearly every recent survey on anti-Semitism in Europe shows that negative attitudes towards Jews among Europe’s population remain surprisingly widespread.

Second, these surveys show that to an alarming degree, at least some of this bias against Jews masquerades as criticism of the state of Israel. While no country is beyond reproach for its particular policies, when criticism takes the form of language that seeks to delegitimize a nation, demonize its people, and insist on applying to that nation’s conduct standards to which no other state is held, then we must call it what it is: anti-Semitism. Highlighting this double standard back in 1968, a non-Jewish writer, Eric Hoffer, put it well when he said that “other nations when victorious … dictate peace terms but when Israel is victorious, it must sue for peace.” He added, “Everyone expects the Jews to be the only Christians in this world.”

Third, European governments initially were slow to respond to the threat posed to Jews and even now, according to a number of Jewish community leaders, public officials, often at the local level, remain reluctant to identify publicly the ideological or religious identity or motivation of some of the perpetrators.

Finally, as USCIRF has documented and articulated, a number of European governments along with certain political parties are complicating matters by supporting initiatives that single out certain Jewish religious practices for restriction. In at least four countries – Iceland, Norway, Sweden, and Switzerland – kosher slaughter is flatly banned. Authorities and political forces in Norway and Germany also have tried to ban infant male circumcision.
To be sure, the driving force behind such restrictions—which also affect Muslims—is not primarily anti-Semitism per se. It is more directly related to a tendency in some Western European countries to replace monolithic state religions with monolithic secular ideologies. In both instances, past and present, Judaism and other minority belief systems are left on the outside.

Nonetheless, the drive to ban kosher slaughter and circumcision evokes tragic images of much darker days for Jews in Europe. At the very least, such efforts reveal a chilling indifference to the Jewish historical experience in Europe.

The end result is that the atmosphere throughout Europe today is one in which Jewish communities feel insecure and threatened and the general population seems dangerously complacent and even comfortable with widespread, open manifestations of anti-Semitism.

**Solutions**

Clearly, anti-Semitism in contemporary Europe, while not nearly as virulent as in the past, has persisted, even in well-established democracies. It has led to religious freedom violations, ranging from governmental actions limiting religious practices to private actors perpetrating violent acts in Europe's cities against Jewish individuals and property.

Denouncing such hate is crucially important to show that “never again” will the forces of democracy and freedom turn their back on Jewish communities when they face the scourge of anti-Semitism. The Executive and Legislative branches of our government, along with USCIRF, can play an important role pressing other countries to condemn hatred of the Jewish people.

Speaking for USCIRF, I can confirm that our Commission continues to monitor, report and raise its voice against anti-Semitism. We have engaged the State Department on these issues, recommending increased U.S. government efforts to combat anti-Semitism in places we report on, such as Egypt, Iran, Russia, Turkey, Belarus, and Venezuela.

To address the challenge of anti-Semitism, we have urged the United States to pursue a range of actions. We have recommended that the U.S. government act bilaterally and in concert with others to denounce state-sponsored acts of anti-Semitism and Holocaust denial promotion campaigns wherever they occur. We also have recommended that the United States urge other governments to take all appropriate steps to prevent and punish acts of anti-Semitism, including condemning such acts, while vigorously protecting freedom of expression. We also have urged that these efforts should not just be reactive, condemning hateful rhetoric and actions after the fact, but also proactive, working to counteract anti-Semitic rhetoric and other organized anti-Semitic activities so they will not happen again. We met on several occasions with the U.S. State Department's Special Envoy to Monitor and Combat Anti-Semitism, Hannah Rosenthal, to learn more about how we can help support this vital agenda.

Over the past decade, the United States has helped combat European anti-Semitism through its support of initiatives through the Organization on Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE), resulting in groundbreaking work on this front. Many Members of Congress, including the Chair
of today’s hearing, were instrumental in helping establish the OSCE’s tolerance work. USCIRF, including its Commissioners and staff, also participated in these efforts.

Through these endeavors, the OSCE-participating states agreed to establish several mechanisms to address anti-Semitism, intolerance and related human rights issues. The landmark OSCE Conference on Anti-Semitism held in Berlin in April 2004, with its Berlin Declaration, was particularly significant. Again, many of the members here today, including the Chair, as well as USCIRF Commissioners, attended the Berlin conference. The OSCE has since convened more than ten high-level and expert conferences on these issues.

Further, the OSCE Chairman-in-Office in late 2004 appointed three Personal Representatives, with one of them tasked specifically to monitor anti-Semitism, and two others to monitor intolerance toward Muslims, Christians, and members of other religions. Rabbi Baker, who follows on the next panel, currently serves in this OSCE capacity to combat anti-Semitism. Rabbi Baker has been particularly active, visiting numerous OSCE countries and issuing reports that were posted on the OSCE website. USCIRF has recommended that the United States encourage other OSCE-participating states to issue invitations to the Personal Representative on anti-Semitism, as well as the other representatives, which would enable them to raise issues of concern directly with government officials, as well as hold direct meetings with NGOs and community and religious leaders.

The OSCE also has created an institution within its organization. A new Tolerance Program within the OSCE human rights office was established in 2004 to monitor and encourage compliance with OSCE commitments to combat xenophobia, anti-Semitism, and Islamophobia, as well as promote freedom of religion or belief.

Clearly, these efforts of the OSCE, Europe’s largest human rights body, are positive examples of Congressional leadership and initiative creating a coalition of the willing to condemn anti-Semitism.

Thanks to this leadership on Capitol Hill, along with the work of USCIRF and numerous NGOs, the world spotlight is being trained on acts of violence or discrimination. When such acts target members of a particular group because of who they are and what they believe, European governments are now being challenged as never before to view them as anti-Semitic acts, not mere hooliganism, requiring unequivocal responses.

Yet, despite this progress, the struggle against anti-Semitism in Europe continues. In addition to humanitarian concerns, there are at least two other reasons to focus our attention on how Europe and its people are treating its Jewish communities. First, in some of the same environments in which Jews face limits to freedom and threats to their well-being, so do members of other minorities. And second, some of the same violent forces which target Jews in Europe also oppose democracy and freedom for all.

Seen in this light, the fight against the ancient scourge of anti-Semitism is also a struggle for the basic values and principles of liberty against the forces of tyranny in every form. It is the fight to preserve the best of civilization and ensure the continued march of human progress. In that
fight, all of us must be engaged. The stakes are far too high not to take a firm and resolute stand for freedom and decency.

Thank you again for this opportunity to testify today.
Mr. Smith. Dr. Lantos Swett, thank you for that very powerful statement. But now I will ask Mr. Metaxas if he will proceed.

STATEMENT OF MR. ERIC METAXAS, AUTHOR AND COMMENTATOR

Mr. Metaxas. First of all, let me thank you all for the invitation to be here this morning. I grew up in America but my parents are immigrants from war-torn Europe, from Greece and Germany, respectively. They inculcated in me a great pride in their adopted country, so to testify here is for me a high privilege indeed.

This morning I testify as an American and as a Christian. What it is to be an American and what it is to be Christian can be tremendously misunderstood, so let me be clear here as I set out in stating that I believe that in the true sense both of these identities, American and Christian, are identities that are not tribalistic, but that bring with them a sense of obligation for others and a perspective that is by definition focused on others. For example, to be an American is not to be part of any ethnic group but to be part of something that transcends ethnicity. To be an American is to buy in to an idea that pluralism is good and that a multiplicity of peoples and ideologies and races and religions can coexist. This is at the heart of the American experiment. And to be an American is to buy in to the idea that not only can they coexist, but that in coexisting civilly they will add up to a sum far greater than their parts. To be a Christian is likewise to know that one is not part of an ethnic group but of a group that transcends and potentially includes all ethnic groups. So true Americans and true Christians can never be tribalists or racists. If we ever put one group above another group we are denying ourselves and the core beliefs that make us Americans or Christians.

I have written a biography of the great German pastor, Dietrich Bonhoeffer, who spoke up for the Jews when very few Germans were doing so, and we have to ask, why did he do that? Why did he risk his life, for example, to get seven Jews out of Germany and into neutral Switzerland so that their lives might be saved? Bonhoeffer stood up for the Jews for one reason, because he was a Christian, not a mere churchgoer, not a mere Gentile, but a Christian. Bonhoeffer famously once said that only he who speaks out for the Jews can sing Gregorian chants. In other words, anyone who claims to be Christian and does not do whatever he can to help the persecuted Jews has no right to claim to be a Christian. That person is only a hypocrite and a betrayer of the Christian faith.

But why? Is this merely an assertion by me and by Bonhoeffer? Well, no, because at the heart of the Christian faith is this idea that God blesses us so that we might bless others. He gives us whatever he gives us for others. Indeed, it is in Genesis that God states this in the context of making the first Jew, Abraham. He says he will bless Abraham so that Abraham can bless others. He will bless the Jews and he chooses the Jews. The Christian believes that God chose the Jews as his own people so that out of them he might bring himself to the whole world beyond the Jews. That he might out of the Jewish people raise up his Messiah. And so the
Jews are blessed to be a blessing, chosen out of all groups in the world to bless the whole world.

The Bible also says every human being is made in God's image and God loves us equally, so to serve God we must serve others. In fact, Bonhoeffer says that Jesus Christ is the Man for others. The self-giving “agape” love of Jesus is the love that gives at the expense of one’s self, knowing that whatever we do to bless others God will replenish. So to be a Christian is to love and serve others, specifically others different from us.

When Hitler began persecuting Jews in earnest in 1933, Bonhoeffer wrote an essay titled, “The Church and the Jewish Question,” declaring that it was the duty of German Christians to stand up for the Jews, indeed for any group being persecuted. But this is an American belief too, although I daresay you can guess where we got it from. America is not a democracy, but a republic. Majorities do not decide what is true. In America, minorities are protected when necessary because we believe what the Bible teaches, that some truths are transcendent and not subject to plebiscite, and one of those ideas is the dignity of every human being despite his beliefs or racial or ethnic makeup. We are inherently sacred because we are made in God’s image. So God commands every Christian to stand up for those being treated unjustly or persecuted in any way, and in America we have enshrined that into our very laws.

So today as a Christian and as an American I declare that anyone who sees things from a tribalist or racist perspective, and anti-Semitism is one especially prominent expression of this, then that person declares himself not to understand the Christian faith and not to be a Christian. The true Christian knows that his enemy is not the Jew, but his enemy is the enemy of the Jew.

One final point. Throughout history Gentiles, which is to say those who are not Jewish, have often been confused with Christians. Often they have themselves encouraged and participated in this confusion. But a mere Gentile is no Christian. All dedicated Nazis were Gentiles. None were Christians. To be a Christian is to know that you have, according to the New Testament, been grafted in to the Jewish faith. Your Messiah and your God, Jesus, is a Jew and all of his disciples are Jews. On Kristallnacht in 1938, Bonhoeffer for the first time made the very dramatic leap into seeing an attack on Jews as an attack on God Himself. So Christians who think of themselves as some tribal group in opposition to Jews are profoundly deluded.

To demonize any group based on what they believe or their ethnic makeup is to admit that one’s beliefs are not in the God of the Bible but in a counterfeit god who is, in fact, the ancient enemy of that God. Not to stand up to attacks against any group, especially Jews, is to deny the transcendent truths that we are all created in God’s image with certain inalienable rights. Bonhoeffer said that “Silence in the face of evil is itself evil. God will not hold us guiltless. Not to speak is to speak. Not to act is to act.” So to do nothing when anti-Semitism raises its head is to hasten the death of civil society for everyone.

Everyone who has the privilege to call himself a Christian or an American must stand against these things, and not just stand
against them but take action against them. We must recall the words of Bonhoeffer’s friend, Martin Niemoller, who wrote his famous poem.

“First they came for the Communists, and I didn’t speak out because I was not a Communist. Then they came for the socialists, and I didn’t speak out because I wasn’t a socialist. Then they came for the trade unionists, and I didn’t speak out because I wasn’t a trade unionist. And then they came for me, and there was no one left to speak for me.”

Niemoller himself did not speak up until it was too late, and his poem cautions us to speak out when any group is being persecuted. This is the right thing and the American thing and the Christian thing to do. God commands it.

Thank you.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Metaxas follows:]
First of all let me thank you all for the invitation to be here this morning. I grew up in this country. My parents are immigrants from Europe — from Greece and Germany respectively — and they inculcated in me a great pride in their adopted country, so to testify here is for me a high privilege indeed.

This morning I testify as an American and as a Christian. What it is to be an American and what it is to be a Christian can be tremendously misunderstood, so let me be clear here as I set out, in stating that I believe that in the true sense, both of these identities, American and Christian, are identities that are not tribalistic, but that bring with them a sense of obligation for others and a perspective that is by definition focused on others.

For example, to be an American is not to be part of any ethnic group, but to part of something that transcends ethnicity. To be an American is to buy into an idea that pluralism is good and that a multiplicity of peoples and ideologies and races and religions can co-exist. This is at the heart of the American experiment. And to be an American is to buy into the idea that not only can they co-exist, but that in co-existing civilly, they will add up to a sum greater than their parts.

(1)

And to be a Christian is likewise to know that one is not part of an ethnic group, but of a group that transcends and potentially includes all ethnic groups. So true Americans and true Christians can never be tribalists or racists. If we ever put one group above another group we are denying ourselves and the core beliefs that make us Americans or Christians.

I’ve written a biography of the great German pastor Dietrich Bonhoeffer who spoke up for the Jews when very few Germans were doing so. Why did he do that? Why did he risk his life to get seven Jews out of Germany and into neutral Switzerland so that their lives might be saved?

Bonhoeffer stood up for the Jews for one reason — because he was a Christian. Not a mere church-goer, nor a mere Gentile, but a Christian. Bonhoeffer famously once said that only he who speaks out for the Jews can sing Gregorian chants. In other words, anyone who claims to be a Christian and who does not do whatever he can to help the persecuted Jews has no right to claim to be a Christian. That person is only a hypocrite and a betrayer of the Christian faith. (2)

But why? Is this a mere assertion by me and by Bonhoeffer? No. At the heart of the Christian faith is the idea that God blesses us so that we might bless others. He gives us whatever he gives us for others.

Indeed, it’s in Genesis that God states this, in the context of making the first Jew, Abraham. He says he will bless Abraham SO THAT Abraham can bless others. He will bless the Jews and he CHOOSES the Jews. The Christian believes that God chose the Jews as his own people so that out of them he might bring Himself to the whole world beyond the Jews, so that he might out of the Jews people raise up His Messiah, who would bring Him — the God of the Jews — to the...
ends of the earth. So the Jews are blessed to be a blessing. They are chosen out of all groups in
the world, specifically to bless the whole world.

The Bible also says every human being is made in God's image and he loves us all equally, so to
serve God we must serve others. In fact, Dietrich Bonhoeffer says that Jesus Christ is "the man
for others." The self-giving "agape" love of Jesus is the love that gives at the expense of one's
self, knowing that whatever we do to bless others God will replenish. To be a Christian is to
love and serve others. (3)

When Hitler began persecuting Jews in 1933, Bonhoeffer wrote an essay titled "The Church and
the Jewish Question" declaring that it was the duty of German Christians to stand up for the
Jews, indeed for any group that is in any way being persecuted.

But this is an American belief, too, although I daresay you can guess where we got it from.
America is not a democracy, but a republic. Majorities don't decide what is true. In America,
minorities are protected when necessary, because we believe what the Bible teaches, that some
truths are transcendent and not subject to plebiscite, and one of those ideas is the dignity of every
human being, despite his beliefs or racial or ethnic makeup. We are inherently sacred because
we are made in God's image. So God commands every Christian to stand up for those being
treated unjustly or persecuted in anyway. And in America we have enshrined that into our laws.

So today as a Christian and an American I declare that anyone who sees things from a tribalist or
racist perspective -- as anti-Semitism is one especially prominent expression -- then that person
declares himself not to understand the Christian faith and not to be a Christian. The true
Christian knows that his enemy is not the Jew, but his enemy is the enemy of the Jew. (4)

One final point. Throughout history Gentiles -- which is to say those who are not Jewish -- have
often been confused with Christians. Often they have themselves encouraged and participated in
this confusion. But a mere Gentile is no Christian. All dedicated Nazis were Gentiles. None
were Christians. To be a Christian is to know that you have -- according to the New Testament -
been "grafted in" to the Jewish faith. Your Messiah and your God, Jesus, is a Jew and all of his
disciples are Jews. Your faith is distinctly Jewish. In our estimation it is the final bloom of that
plant whose roots go back to Abraham and Moses and David and all the prophets.

On Kristallnacht in 1938, one of the worst expressions of anti-Semitism in the history of the
world, Bonhoeffer for the first time made the very dramatic leap into seeing an attack on Jews as
an attack on God himself. So Christians who think of themselves as some tribal group in
opposition to Jews are profoundly deluded and must be called out as such. To demonize any
group based on what they believe or their ethnic makeup is to admit that one's own beliefs are
not in the God of the Bible but in a counterfeit God who is in fact the ancient enemy of that God.

Not to stand up to attacks against any group, especially Jews, is to deny the transcendent truth
that we are all created in God's image with certain inalienable rights. Bonhoeffer said that
"Silence in the face of evil is itself evil. God will not hold us guiltless. Not to speak is to speak.
Not to act is to act."
To do nothing when anti-Semitism raises its head is to hasten the death of civil society.

Everyone who has the privilege to call himself a Christian or an American must stand against these things and not just stand against them but take action against them.

We must recall the words of Bonhoeffer's friend, Martin Niemöller, who wrote his famous poem...

First they came for the communists,
and I didn't speak out because I wasn't a communist.
Then they came for the socialists,
and I didn't speak out because I wasn't a socialist.
Then they came for the trade unionists,
and I didn't speak out because I wasn't a trade unionist.
Then they came for me,
and there was no one left to speak for me.

Niemöller did not speak up until it was too late. And his poem cautions us to speak out when any group is being persecuted. This is the right thing and the Christian thing to do. God commands it.
Mr. SMITH. Thank you for that very powerful statement as well, and for providing us a refresher course on the model of Bonhoeffer, which we all need to emulate. Thank you so very much.

Dr. Jasser?

STATEMENT OF ZUHDI JASSER, M.D., PRESIDENT, AMERICAN ISLAMIC FORUM FOR DEMOCRACY

Dr. JASSER. Thank you, Chairman Smith and Ranking Member Bass, distinguished members of the committee for seeking my testimony. I must first thank the committee for taking the time to focus on this very important issue of anti-Semitism and its important role as a canary in the coal mine, if you will, for the threat against all people, all faiths, and liberty. Our organization, the American Islamic Forum for Democracy, is dedicated as a Muslim organization in the mission to the advancement of liberty through the separation of mosque and state. My comments are abridged and I submit the full comments to the record.

Anti-Semitism is not just another symptom from a radical fringe of Islamist groups. It runs much deeper. This body has been fearless in exposing anti-Semitism in Europe and the West. It is time to do the same with the role in which Islamism or political Islam plays upon anti-Semitism around the world, as it also impacts the West. Islamists have utilized the viral spread of anti-Semitic imagery and demonization of Jews as a tool among Muslim majority communities and nations against a common enemy they fabricate. Beneath Islamist hatred of Jews lies a more global supremacism that treats all minorities, whether Shia, Ahmadiyya, Ismailis, or dissenting Sunnis, like myself, from within the faith and other minorities outside, the same, simply as tools to be inhumanly exploited.

Anti-Semitism runs rampant on the fertile soil of Islamism. What is our challenge before us here today? We can help the non-Islamist reformers change that soil or we can sit back and watch the Islamists—in Egypt, the Brotherhood; in Tunisia, al-Nahda; in Saudi Arabia, the Wahhabis; in Iran, the Khomeinists; or Pakistan, the Deobandis—fertilize and till the hate-filled soil into a greater threat. Make no mistake. The departure of Arab fascist dictators and Arab Awakening was a necessary step forward in a long journey toward democracy, and there is still many more of them to go. But societies with rampant anti-Semitism, conspiracy theories, and hate of Western democracies cannot succeed and will always fail.

Already the Muslim Brotherhood now in power is buckling down on free speech and blasphemy worse than they were under Mubarak. But please understand though, while Islamism is popular, upwards of 30–40 percent at times, it is not a majority movement. But what I am sure you know is that the hate of anti-Semitism is sadly more popular and is a majority sentiment. Islamists invoke common cause with secularism, the hatred of Jews and the West, and are able to dodge national introspection and build shallow coalitions on that hate.

Let us look at the numbers. A Pew poll in 2006 stated that the anti-Jewish sentiment is endemic in the Muslim world. In Lebanon, all Muslims and 99 percent of Christians say they have an unfavorable view of Jews. Ninety-nine percent of Jordanians, large
majorities of Moroccans, Indonesians, Pakistanis, and six-in-ten Turks also view Jews unfavorably. Egyptian TV has long aired the hateful forgery of their protocols, and Al Jazeera, the most watched Muslim media in the world, has countless sermons and programs vilifying Jews and Israel. And Al Jazeera media group just purchased for $0.5 billion, access into American living rooms.

With vast global connections in Arabic social and traditional media, Muslim populations in Europe and the United States are impacted by Islamist propaganda. The Pew showed in 2006 that Muslims in Europe hold a far more unfavorable opinions of Jews than the general population. In Britain, 47 percent of Muslims held unfavorable views compared to 7 percent of the general public. In France, 28 percent of Muslim versus 13 percent of the general public. In Germany, 44 percent of Muslims versus 22 percent of the general public. We have been absent in the defense of liberty in these populations that haunts us over there and right here in the West.

As hate leads population shifts will follow. From nearly 1 million Jews in the Arab region around 1950, there are 20,000 left. Over 2 million Christians have recently left the Middle East. Anti-Semitism is obviously the gateway drug that takes societies away from diverse liberal democracies and moves them closer to homogeneous, oppressive autocracies which abuse minorities. If we sit here and tolerate any less from Muslim communities than we do for ourselves in respect to anti-Semitism and the principles embodied in the universal declaration of human rights, we are participating not only in a form of a denial but, I believe, in subtle bigotry.

The reality is that Muslim imams, scholars, and activists with the courage to publicly take on anti-Semitism of the Islamists are far too few. They have neither the platforms, the attention, nor the backing which petro-funded Islamist think tanks and linked movements do around the world. Last January an Arabic al-Qaeda jihadi forum attacked me as an enemy of Islam, and actually in its attack said that I am part of the devil that is known for its Zionism. This is all too common and it is how they marginalize their antagonists and avoid substantive debate, use anti-Semitism to attack other Muslims.

Sheikh Qaradawi, who is known throughout the world as one of the preeminent Sunni leaders, globally in his program on Al Jazeera to over 60 million followers, said the last punishment was carried out by Hitler. This was the divine punishment for them, in reference to the Jews. Allah willing, the next time will be at the hand of the believers. Qaradawi returned to Egypt as Khomeini returned to Iran after the Egyptian revolution.

Lastly, the Saudis spent tens of billions of dollars throughout the world to pump Wahhabism or petro-Islam, a particularly virulent and militant version of supremacist Islamism. An endless list of terror groups use their ideology from al-Qaeda, Hamas, Lashkar-e-Taiba to many in their madrassahs and mosques that are influenced by Wahhabi materials. A ninth grade Saudi textbook described Jews as “the apes of people of the Sabbath, the Jews; and the swine are infidels of the communion of Jesus and Christians.” And remember, even if they do remove parts of the textbooks with
this, you cannot reform by deletion or white-out, it needs deep self critique and wholesale abandonment of Islamism for liberty.

I leave you last with solutions to consider. Number one, we must engage and take sides in the battle of ideas against Islamism by reviving our public diplomacy and support of universal human rights whether it is popular in their societies or not. We need to systemically expose, name and shame the anti-Semitism behaviors and ideas promulgated by Islamist movements including all forms of hatred against Jews, conspiracies, and anti-Americanism. Anti-Semitic ideas are not isolated incidents to be simply condemned and dismissed. We should expose their root cause, foremost of which amongst Muslims is Islamism.

And we must work to provide platforms for courageous reform based civil society organizations which work against anti-Semitism, and this is what I talk about in my book, “A Battle for the Soul of Islam.” And we must conversely disengage proudly from Islamist groups. We must end the climate of political correctness and subtle bigotry which gives Muslims a pass on accountability for hate-filled ideas.

We must not be seen as advocating liberty only at home and turning a blind eye to anti-Semitism from our so-called allies. And we must confront Islamist groups and leaders in Europe with what Prime Minister David Cameron called “muscular liberalism.” And as my colleagues have already stated, hyper-secularists in Europe attack the faithful of all faiths. Islamists thrive under the deception that Muslims have no other option than to lean toward Islamism.

Thank you.

[The prepared statement of Dr. Jasser follows:]
TESTIMONY OF
M. ZUHDI JASSER, M.D.
PRESIDENT, AMERICAN ISLAMIC FORUM FOR DEMOCRACY
February 27, 2013

U.S. House of Representatives, Committee on Foreign Affairs, Subcommittee on Africa, Global Health, Global Human Rights, and International Organizations

“Anti-Semitism: A Growing Threat to All Faiths”

Thank you Chairman Christopher Smith and Ranking Member Karen Bass, and distinguished members of the committee, for seeking my testimony. I must first express my gratitude to the committee for taking the time to focus on the issue of anti-Semitism and its important role as a “canary in the coal mine,” if you will, for the threat against all people and all faiths.

My name is Dr. M. Zuhdi Jasser and I am the president and founder of the American Islamic Forum for Democracy. Our organization’s mission is the advancement of our Constitution’s principles of freedom and liberty through the separation of mosque and state. As a Muslim organization we are particularly focused upon the need to generate a consensus of reform against the ideas of political Islam and the Islamic state vis-à-vis the promotion of the ideas of liberty and pluralism.

On behalf of our organization I have written and testified repeatedly in these halls about the threat of Islamist extremism and the need for our society to identify, understand, dissect, counter and then defend against the ideology that threatens us. Different from many “politically correct” approaches to this issue I have not found the nebulous and generic concept of “violent extremism” particularly helpful in developing targeted solutions against this domestic and global threat. Programs that only counter violence address the means of those who threaten us while wholly ignoring the ideology or the enemy which their movements seek. The common ideological thread which runs through the security threat that comes from Islamist extremism is the inherent supremacism of Islamism or political Islam. Thus, violent extremism is but one threatening symptom or manifestation that comes out of the Islamist ideology that threatens western democracies and citizenry under its sway.

The Link between Anti-Semitism and Islamism

Anti-Semitism should not be viewed as just another “radical” symptom that arises from the supremacist mentality of Islamism. It is far more than that. If we can develop the understanding and national conviction to directly confront the anti-Semitism of global Islamist movements, we will therein hold the key to unraveling the very fabric and platform through which Islamist leaders spread their ideas. The Helsinki Commission and the members of your committee have a rich history of being fearless in seeking to shed the anti-septic of the light of day upon anti-Semitism in Europe and the West wherever it exists in order to preserve the essence of our democracies and prevent us from abandoning the central premise of the equality of all under God, blind to faith or no faith. The need to do the same with anti-Semitism that arises and metastasizes from the propaganda of Islamist movements around the world has never been greater than it is today.

The link between Islamism and anti-Semitism is rather simple. It is self-evident that supremacists from within a particular faith community will create and exploit hatred towards another faith community in order to collectively rally their own followers against a common enemy. Islamists utilize anti-Semitic imagery, profiling and demonization of Jews as a tool for their own ascension into power among Muslim majority communities and nations, or in Arabic, the “Ummah.” Islamists often exploit both the Muslim Ummah and the Jewish minority in order to create a groupthink against the “other.” The demonization of Jews by...
Islamists is a key signal to all of us not only because of its imminent threat to all Jews across the world from Islamists who may become violent or oppressive, but also because beneath that hatred lies a more global sliprnicism that treats all minorities from within the faith and outside the same as obstacles to their own ascension. These theo-fascists use the demonization of minorities as populist tools to rally populations to their fascism.

Understanding this inextricable link between the demonization of Jews or anti-Semitism and the advancement of Islamist movements is essential to how our nation approaches finding the keys that will unlock and unravel the threat of Islamism domestically and abroad.

While addressing "violent extremism" has given many a pass in dealing with the faith-based component of the societal and political threat of Islamism, the spread of anti-Semitism by Islamists does not. It is the Jewish faith group that is being attacked and demonized and I, as a devout American Muslim, have dedicated my life to countering the Islamist demagogues and their ideas from within our faith community that target Jews. Those ideas could never be targeted without acknowledging the role of political Islam and the Islamic state ascendance in creating a fertile soil for anti-Semitism. It is in defense of our Constitution, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and in my own enlightened self-interest as a Muslim that I sit before you and pray that you join us in understanding the need to develop a national strategy against Islamism in order to begin to eliminate anti-Semitism across the globe.

The Arab Awakening: Islamism rushes to fill the vacuum, anti-Semitism led the way

Europe and the West are being directly impacted by the events of the last two years during the Arab Awakening. With the tumult in Libya, Egypt, Tunisia, Yemen, Bahrain and Syria, the ascent of Islamist movements has not brought a real spring but rather the empowerment of new autocrats who wield Islamism. Thought to many, the Islamist movements are simply dictators on theocratic steroids. With vast global connections in Arabic social and traditional media, Muslim populations in Europe and the United States are being impacted by a great deal of the propaganda coming out of these regions now with unleashed Islamist movements.

The new-found avenues of public discourse (Facebook, Twitter and YouTube) and attempts at media freedom are long overdue for the region which has been crushed by generations of unforgiving dictatorship. However, whether they are truly moving towards more transparent societies with actual checks and balances of a genuinely free media remains to be seen. The reality on the ground is that media and thought has been dominated for quite some time by extraordinarily wealthy Islamist media arms like, Al Jazeera Media Group (funded by the Emir and government of Qatar), the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia (and its royal family) and the Iranian government (Khomeinists) to name just a few of the wealthy benefactors of Islamist movements. In fact, recent reports are that in Egypt, for example, while the revolution was driven by greater grass roots social media freedoms, the Muslim Brotherhood now in power is buckling down on free speech in ways that are even worse than they were under Mubarak. Arrests for blasphemy and criticism of the President are dwarfing what they were in the previous years. Heba Morayef of Human Rights Watch in Egypt stated, "The repression used to be more limited and strategic, now, the scary thing is that it’s all over the place."

To many of us, the anti-Semitism of the Muslim Brotherhood’s Islamist ideology was long a harbinger of what to expect if Islamists ever came to power. Their anti-freedom, neo-theocratic methods are part and parcel of the same supremacist ideology. Interestingly, Islamist groups in the West, those created in the late 20th century as Muslim Brotherhood legacy groups have not demonstrably utilized the opportunity of the Arab Awakening to push forth reforms against neo-theocratic institutions and ideologies. Instead, they are...
being told by European and American Islamist demagogues like Tariq Ramadan to “learn from the Egyptians” about how to fight back against their own governments. Ramadan, the grandson of Hassan Al-Banna founder of the Muslim Brotherhood, told thousands at the annual Receiving the Islamic Spirit conference in Toronto December 2012 that they should take a lesson from Egypt, “and be courageous enough to say “no” when there are injustices done to the Muslims in the jails, innocent people suspected of being connected to so called terrorist organizations.” Thus, contrary to genuine anti-Islamist Muslim reformers in Muslim communities, Islamists and their sympathizers in the West obsessively focus upon blaming the West, or “the other”, for the “Muslim condition” and constantly pit Muslim communities in the West against “non-Muslim” governments. This is a natural sequel to the history of indoctrination with the divisive mantra of anti-Semitism and its conspiracy laden philosophies.

Yet, sadly virtually nothing is said to Muslim audiences in the West by Muslim leaders especially of Islamist legacy groups about the central need to combat the institutional ideas of anti-Semitism. Some have even featured anti-Semitic speakers at their national conventions.

The challenge before the world could not be clearer — into the abyss left by ruthless dictators is a widening front in the battle for the soul of Islam: Will Muslim majority societies and Muslim leaders around the world heed the call of the Arab spring for the rights of the individual? Will they defend the rights of the minority over the collective, over the tribe, over the clerical oligarchs? Or will they just trade one autocracy for another? And will the U.S. and the West stand on the principles we were founded upon?

New ideas to the region like individual liberty and the separation of mosque and state are not turned on like a light switch. They are nurtured in a soil that has been tilled for critical thinking. Middle Eastern soil today is far from that. What we see today is more of the past battles between the evils of secular Arab fascism and theocratic fascism. In the information war between them, the liberals and secular democrats have been absent. Meanwhile, the fascists lie in wait for openings like a controversial film or cartoons that exploit the imagined threat or conspiracy of American imperialism in order to legitimize their own ascendency. That is the demagogic role that anti-Semitism takes on too easily in the vacuum of the departure of secular Arab fascists. We have for too long left untended the war of ideas for liberty and individual rights within Muslim majority nations and communities, especially those now undergoing upheavals screaming for help of liberals. We have refused to take sides within the theo-political debates going on inside the Muslim communities at the expense of so many minority victims of Islamists — like the Jewish community, in the face of rampant and endemic anti-Semitism. This is to our own peril.

The importance of the role of anti-Semitism here cannot be overstated. Both in Tunisia and in Egypt the Islamist parties received only a plurality of the vote in the first balloting, but due to fractionalization and division, the secularists and non-Islamists were never able to rally around any unifying idea that could have marginalized the Islamists. In fact, anti-Semitism was long a tool utilized by Islamists in order to invoke common sympathy from secular nationalists, who also developed a hatred for Jews, in order to avoid national introspection.

Follow the numbers: first anti-Semitism then Islamists’ fascism

Even though in Egypt, the Islamists carried only 25 percent support as opposed to the population and the more extreme salafists carried 15-20 percent, Pew revealed that “Anti-Jewish sentiment” is endemic in the Muslim world. In Lebanon, for example, all Muslims and 99% of Christians say they have a very unfavorable view of Jews. Similarly, 97% of Jordanians have a very unfavorable view of Jews. Large majorities of Moroccans,

---

Footnotes:
Indonesians, Pakistanis and six-in-ten Turks also view Jews unfavorably. As many of these nations now find themselves sliding from secular fascism to Islamist fascism or theo-political fascism, one has to plainly see how the anti-Semitism long fueled for generations by Arab dictators like Hosni Mubarak, Zine El Abidine Ben Ali, Saddam Hussein, Bashar Assad or King Abdullah bin Abdulaziz was a harbinger of the type of violent and hate-filled societies they were sowing.

These secular fascists effectively used national media to propagate anti-Semitism in an "us versus them" mentality. They also effectively demonized Zionism in order to lift up pan-Arabism as a tool to keep the masses from questioning their authority. Their media propaganda machines made this happen. Under Mubarak, Egypt annually played the vindictively anti-Semitic and czarist Russian forgery, Protocols of the Elder of Zion. State Media regularly denied the Holocaust while at the same time irrationally labeling Zionism as a new Nazism. Conversely, in April 2001, the government sponsored newspaper Al-Akhbar published a paragraph extolling praise on Hitler for the Holocaust and complaining that it did not go far enough: "Thanks to Hitler, of blessed memory, who on behalf of the Palestinians, avenged in advance, against the most vile criminals on the face of the earth. Although we do have a complaint against him for his revenge on them was not enough."

That propaganda and threat continues today in state run media throughout the Middle East including the Al Jazeera media group which has recently purchased the potential access to over 40 million American homes through the its acquisition of Current TV for $500 million. Recent reports are that many journalists have been leaving Al Jazeera due to a deep seated, pro-Islamist bias from the Qatari ownership.

The hate created by the secular fascists has also tellingly fueled a mass exodus of the Jewish people that began in 1948 at Israel’s founding when there were over 800,000 Jews living in Arab lands. Today, it is believed that there are less than 20,000 remaining. That exodus has carried over to the Christian community where it is believed over two million Christians have fled the Middle Eastern Arab community in the last 20 years. This vacuum of religious diversity only feeds the Islamists supremacist mentality.

Defeat anti-Semitism and we can break the nexus between the secularists of all faiths and the Islamists which will then weaken the Islamists considerably while more importantly advancing the principles of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and those who support it.

It is no secret that the Organization of Islamic Cooperation (OIC) which consists of the 56 Muslim majority nations has instead signed the Cairo Declaration of Human Rights of 1991 which enshrines legal provisions against blasphemy and apostasy among other Islamist ideas incompatible with the UDHR. In fact, in the December 2010 Pew Global Attitudes Project Report, 84 percent of Egyptians polled felt that the death penalty was appropriate for apostates who leave Islam. Again, in a society where half that number support Islamist movements, this points to how endemic the ideas are which sow hate against those of other faiths like Judaism. Anti-Semitism is the obvious "gateway drug" or bridge that we must expose between the various elements of societies that move away from democracy and toward more authoritarian societies and that are doomed to oppress all minorities from within and outside various faiths.
Running side-by-side with anti-Semitism are multiple conspiracy theories along hate of the West. After the global furor over an anti-Islam film posted by an American citizen, the grand sheik of Al-Azhar, Ahmed al-Tayyeb, condemned the West last September 2012, summarily telling Egyptians in reference to the film that “the West throughout history has not treated Islam with respect, but showed hostility [against it], and chosen the path of conflict, rather than understanding.” The Islamist narrative is that the defense of liberty is a license to denigrate Muslims and Islam. Along with this narrative comes the anti-Semitic narrative of conspiracies into which the influence of the United States is interwoven and maligned.

Moral relativism and “the bigotry of low expectations”

Our motherlands face a number of hurdles before they even begin to enter modernity. But to patronize their societies with a different set of human standards than those embodied in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights is a moral relativism that insults every Muslim and citizen otherwise in those nations. It also expects lots of Muslims living in the West who remain silent against the obvious intimations of anti-Semitism that beset so much of the Arabic and Muslim dominated media. Tough love is the highest form of respect. Demanding the minimum standard of nonviolence is just not enough. Moral relativism is exactly what the newly elected theocrats of the Muslim Brotherhood and their mentors at Al-Azhar want in order to widen rather than close the divide between the ideas of liberty and Islamism.

We still have no strategy to engage real allies of liberty within many of these emerging societies: the silent majority of liberals on the ground in the Middle East. We must signal clearly to them that when it comes to democracy, there is no compromise on the defense of freedom of speech and that defense is inescapably wedded to the first freedom — freedom of religion. When the liberals and reformers of Egypt and Tunisia see as silent against the Muslim Brotherhood’s anti-Semitism, is it any wonder that opinion polls of the U.S. remain so low regardless of who’s in the White House?

As the old guards rush to fill the power vacuum, the voices of the Arab spring standing up to the tyrants need to know the free world is on their side. The defense of free speech and religious liberty is not a war against faith, but a war against the oligarchs, the despots and the theocrats who would usurp their freedom. Any assumption otherwise is a bigotry our nation fought against, not for. There is one ideological litmus test shared by the secular autocrats and the Islamists, and it is anti-Semitism.

Origins of Islamist anti-Semitism

The intellectual origins or underpinnings of Islamist anti-Semitism is certainly multi-factorial and will not be solved in this testimony. However while our Islamic tradition certainly has as Martin Kramer has described “some sources on which Islamic anti-Semitism now feeds” it is not the only source. In fact, if Islamist anti-Semitism is wholly confronted by modern anti-Islamist Islamic reformers, I believe it can be marginalized and ultimately defeated ending a force which can ultimately have sway upon a quarter of the world’s population. The current reality, however, is sadly, that the imams, scholars, or activists with the courage to publicly take on the anti-Semitism of Islamist leaders are too few. And when they arise have neither the platforms, attention, nor the backing which petro-funded Islamist linked movements do around the world.

Often the militant element of the Islamists will attack them joined by a collective silence from most fellow Islamists putting all other Muslim liberals on notice that a similar fate may await them. In fact it is no secret that last January on an Arabic Al Qaeda jihadi forum, our pro-American, pro-Muslim, pro-liberty anti-
Islamicist work was attacked. The post by the Al-Fida forum against me cited Qur'an references that "Allah takes revenge on the enemies of Islam" and then linked that to an admonition that the Syrian opposition "must allow other devilish elements to remain amongst them even if they have excellent personal contacts and a deep knowledge of the intricacies of American politics—and all the more so if this devil is known for his Zionism." I can tell you from personal experience in a life dedicated to reform against Islamism that common among Islamist thought of all stripes is the utilization of hatred of Jews to marginalize their antagonists from within and thus avoid substantive debate about their own theological authenticity within Islam.

Some Muslim scholars and activists desiring greater attention who have had the courage to expose anti-Semitism within our faith community include a number of quite faithful and devout Muslim leaders. Former President of Indonesia, A H.E. Kyai Haji Abdurrahman Wahid along with the U.S. based organization LibforAll hosted a conference in Bali, Indonesia "denouncing Holocaust Denial" in cooperation with the Simon Wiesenthal Center for Tolerance in 2007. Wahid also edited the important, The Illusion of the Islamic State: How an Alliance of Moderates Launched a Successful Jihad Against Radicalization and Terrorism in the World's Largest Muslim-Majority Country. Canadian Tarek Fatah, founder of the Muslim Canadian Congress recently authored a must read on this issue: The Jew is not My Enemy: Unveiling the Myths that Fuel Muslim anti-Semitism. Abdullahi Na'im of Emory University gives a robust defense of how Muslims should prefer a secular state from the Islamist one in Islam and the Secular State. Many of us have since recently formed a broad and diverse coalition of non-Islamist Muslim reformers in North America called the American Islamic Leadership Coalition (AILC), which is beginning to provide one platform for diverse Muslims speaking out against Islamist anti-Semitism.

The exploitation of Israel among Islamists is also virtually a litmus test for anti-Semitism. Kramer continues:

"Islamists see Israel as a symptom of a larger conspiracy against them either western or Jewish or a sinister combination of the two. Many Islamists today do not look at Israel or its policies as their irritant. They look beyond, either to America, symbol today of the power of the West or to the Jews, dispersed throughout the West where they exercise a malign influence. These are deemed to be the real forces driving history." Kramer highlights in 1994 that Rashid al-Ghannushi, who now happens to be the Tunisian Islamist leader of the ruling, Al-Nahda party stated that "a Jewish-American plan encompassing the entire region, which would cleanse it of all resistance and open it to Jewish hegemony from Marrakesh to Kazakhstan. Apparent is the use of conspiracy theories by Islamist demagogues to portray a false narrative and fiction against Israel and thus by association all Jews. These conspiracy theories then spread like wildfire and are exploited by fellow global Islamist movements in all stripes in order to broaden the conspiracy against all Muslims and provide more excuses for the failures of Muslim majority nations.

When the OFC met in Malaysia, Prime Minister Mahathir told the crowd, "The Europeans killed 6 million Jews out of 12 million, but today they are the ones defending the world by proxy. They get others to fight and die for them." Reports were that the crowd responded with a "resounding ovation". This fits in line with the opinion polls from Pew for those nations.

16 Na'im, Abdullahi, Islam and the Secular State.
17 http://www.amicusa.org/aboutus/ (Website of the American Islamic Leadership Coalition).
18 The salience of Islamic antisemitism: it's not just about Israel, but reflects more on the nature of Islam. Institute of Jewish Affairs Reports, No 2, October 1995.
Kramer concludes,

"If these themes seem distressingly familiar it is quite likely because they are borrowings from the canon of Western religions and racial anti-Semitism. The anti-Semitism we see today in the Islamic world owes a crucial debt to the anti-Semitism of the West."

We forget that many Islamist leaders received their education in the West only to return and piggy-back it upon their own theo-political anti-Semitism of Islamism. The philosophical father of the Muslim Brotherhood, Sayyid Qutb spent two years (1948-50) in the United States before going back to lead the founding of the Islamist movement in Egypt with his book Milestones, a short treatise which described the West as the land of Jahilliyah (ignorance) and evil. This treatise established the Milestones for establishment of the Islamic state in order to prevent descent of society into the evil of "secularism" he saw in the West. Certainly anti-Semitism found in Europe reinforced many of the Islamist constructs he developed for political Islam. Islamism depends upon conspiracy in order to explain the weakness of the Muslim condition and the need for Muslim collectivism and Islamic statehood and ultimately neo-caliphism.

The Power of the Pulpit: Qaradawi and the Islamist Imams

Sheikh Yusuf al-Qaradawi is arguably the most influential cleric in the world of Sunni Islam. He had escaped General Abdel Nasser’s Egypt to Qatar in 1961 from where he has since authored over 120 books, influenced a number of highly trafficked Islamist websites, and most notably hosts a weekly program on Al Jazeera Arabic titled “Shariah and Life” viewed by an estimated 60 million people globally. His sermons and public statements are a treasure trove of conspiracy theories and anti-Semitic diatribes. On his program on January 28, 2009, he stated "the last punishment was carried out by Hitler...this was divine punishment. Allah willing, the next time will be at the hands of the believers." After that aired, Al Jazeera actually refused to apologize to John Whittingdale, chairman of the House of Commons Media Select Committee in Britain claiming free speech. Imam Qaradawi has similarly justified suicide bombing against Israelis including women and children and also against Americans.

The importance of Qaradawi with regards to Islamist anti-Semitism cannot be overstated. Despite being prohibited from travel to France, the United Kingdom and the United States, Qaradawi who lives in Qatar has long been President of the European Council for Fatwa and Research (ECFR). ECFR is notoriously known for being a Muslim Brotherhood legal arm in the West, giving hundreds of anti-Western separatist fatwas (legal opinions) targeted at western Muslims. At one reading, a Wall Street Journal reporter noted that “the Protocols of the Elders of Zion a notorious anti-Semitic forgery from Czarist Russia was used to evidence the threat of a Jewish plot against European Muslims.” Qaradawi’s ubiquitous global tentacles and ideology underscores the nexus here between so many leading Islamist thinkers and European anti-Semitism. While in Qatar from his perch as the spiritual guide of global Islamism, he ran the ECFR.

Qaradawi recently returned to Egypt after more than a 30 year absence to lead a crowd of over two hundred thousand. Barry Rubin declared in the Jerusalem Post that “Egypt gets its Khomeini.” Yet, surprisingly the case against Qaradawi’s hate-filled anti-Semitic speech is not so clear for many. Shadi Hamid of the Brookings Institute who attended Qaradawi’s return to Tahrir Square stated at the time,

“Qaradawi is very much in the mainstream of Egyptian society. he’s in the religious mainstream, he’s not offering something that’s particularly distinctive or radical in the context of Egypt...He’s an...”

---

The threat that Qaradawi and his Islamist sympathizers pose to humanity is manifold. Making the case against the threat of his Islamism is clearest when one confronts his flagrant anti-Semitism and demonization of Jews. While the arguments against his political Islamism ideas may be nuanced in the setting of a so-called "Islamic democracy," he advocates those when it suits him as an Islamist and populist. But to ignore his anti-Semitism as so many around the world do for so-called reformers who are neo-Islamists is to do so at the peril of world Jewry and the security of all minorities and our liberal democracies. One of the most revealing tests is to note the silence of many western Muslim leaders confronted with the anti-Semitism of the likes of Qaradawi or Prime Minister Mahatir.

Looking purely through a lens filtered for anti-Semitism, one cannot help but connect the dots from Qaradawi’s anti-Semitism to an inevitable neo-dictatorism that is now ascending in the Middle East under the rise of Islamism. Eventually, Egyptians will have to come to terms with how cleric’s with toxic positions on Jews and Americans swim in the same pool with those who have similarly hateful positions against the Shia community (described as deviants), the Ahmadiyya (described as apostates), or the Baha’i (described as infidels) and so many other vulnerable minorities who will undoubtedly suffer, and are suffering, at the hands of Islamists when they are in power.

The Simon Wiesenthal Center recently listed the Muslim Brotherhood and the Iranian regime as the worst offenders of anti-Semitic rhetoric across the planet. We ignore the telltale signs of hate against Jews and what that portends for other minorities at the peril of all genuine democracies. One need look no further than Iran to see that an Islamist revolution while using the democratic engine of electoral politics will never herald real democracy until minorities have equal rights and anti-Semitism is defeated at its core from within the Islamic consciousness and against the ideology of political Islam.

The impact of Wahhabism and its educational and religious materials

According to former CIA director R. James Woolsey, the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia has spent nearly $90 billion spreading their ideology around the globe since the 1970s. He describes the Saudi-sponsoring of the dissemination of the extremist Wahhabi strain of Islam as “the soil in which Al Qaeda and its sister terror organizations are flourishing.” According to scholars such as Gilles Kepel, Wahhabism gained considerable influence in the Islamic world following a tripling in the price of oil in the mid-1970s. The Saudi government began to spend tens of billions of dollars throughout the Islamic world to promote Wahhabism, which was sometimes referred to as “petro-Islam.” This version of Islam was a particular virulent and militant version of supremacist Islamism or Wahhabism.

For example, Lashkar e-Taiba (LeT), which means Army of God, a militant Pakistani Islamist group responsible for a number of terror attacks in Southeast Asia. Their leadership is tightly affiliated with the organizations which have a strictly Wahhabi orientation and at times have been close to Saudi Arabia but became distant after 9/11 due to their closeness to Osama bin Laden and their criticism that the Kingdom was “not an ideal Islamic society with Western troops stationed therein.” They describe Hindus and Jews as the main “enemies of Islam, and Israel and India as enemies of Pakistan.” LeT’s Amir, Professor Saeed, opposes Western democracy and stated:

---

"Democracy is among the menaces we inherited from an alien government. It is part of the system we are fighting against. Many of our brothers feel that they can establish an Islamic society by working within the system. They are mistaken. It is not possible to work within a democracy and establish an Islamic system. You just dirty your hands by dealing with it. If God gives us a chance, we will try to bring in the pure concept of an Islamic Caliphate."

The hate-filled Wahhabi ideology too often leads also to violence and terror against target communities like the Jewish community targeted by their anti-Semitism. For example, the series of deadly 2008 Mumbai attacks killing 164 and wounding 308 over the Thanksgiving weekend included the Nariman Jewish Community Center known as the Mumbai Chabad House, were determined to be committed by members of Lashkar E-Toba. Other examples of Islamist inspired anti-Semitism leading to terror against Jews are sadly too numerous to list here.

The translations and interpretation of Qur'an and Hadith (sayings of the Prophet Mohammed), for example distributed officially by the Saudi government are rife with anti-Semitic narratives which often are not even part of the original Arabic text. This is also often revealed in their educational materials on the Islamic religion. For example over the most recited opening prayer of the Qur'an repeated over 17 times a day by most Muslims around the world, the Saudi government sanctioned and distributed only one printed English version around the world translated with an insertion that intentionally sowed anti-Semitism. Darussalam Publishers in Riyadh printed a part of that scripture as, "Not the way of those who have earned your anger (such as the Jews), nor those who went astray (such as the Christians)." These parenthetical additions are editorial additions, which with only eight words distributed among millions upon millions of Muslims, have an immeasurable impact in fostering anti-Semitism and anti-Christian sentiments across the globe.

The U.S. Commission on International Religious Freedom (USCIRF) on which I serve, has long been at the forefront of following the hatred disseminated in educational textbooks that originate in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia. A ninth grade textbook, for example, published by the Ministry of Education in Saudi Arabia states that, "the Jews and Christians are enemies of the believers and they cannot approve of Muslims." An eighth grade text states, "the apes are the people of the Sabbath, the Jews; and the swine are infidels of the communion of Jesus and Christians." As Nina Shea, a former USCIRF commissioner notes, "the kingdom is not just any country with problematic textbooks. As the controlling authority of the two holiest shrines in Islam, Saudi Arabia is able to disseminate its religious materials among the millions making the hajj to Mecca each year. Such teachings can, in this context, make a great impression. In addition, Saudi textbooks are also posted on the Saudi Education Ministry's website and are being distributed by a vast Islamic infrastructure established with Saudi oil wealth to Muslim communities throughout the world. In his book The Looming Tower, Lawrence Wright asserts that while Saudis constitute only 1 percent of the world's Muslims, they pay "90 percent of the expenses of the entire faith, overspending other traditions of Islam."

Shea adds that despite four years of pressure from the U.S. while the Saudis promulgated an advertising campaign on American soil that they had cleaned up their textbooks: the reality was that they had not.

---
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American publishing leaders have also, to their credit, recently joined together to shed light on this important issue stating that “hate speech is the precursor to genocide, first you get to hate, and then you kill.”

Ultimately, the Saudis may actually remove various obviously anti-Semitic and anti-Western commentaries in their texts but the supremacism of Islamism is an ideology that can only be cleansed of anti-Semitism through deep reform for liberty and pluralism rather than through the use of “white-out” and deletion.

Solutions

As we better understand the link between anti-Semitism and Islamist movements and its supporters, the next step is to implement long-lasting solutions. These solutions will not only provide Europe and the West a bulwark against the infiltration of anti-Semitic ideas from Islamist movements in the Middle East, North Africa and Southeast Asia but it will also serve to better secure us against the threat of militant Islamism. For where anti-Semitism thrives so too does the eventual threat against other faith minorities and the very foundations of democracy:

- We must engage in the battle of ideas by reviving our public diplomacy in support of the principles that founded this country.
- We need to systematically expose (name and shame) with the anti-ptic of the light of day anti-Semitic behaviors and ideas promulgated across the Middle East and North Africa by Islamist movements.
- That exposure needs to address anti-Semitic speech and ideas not as isolated incidents that should be simply condemned, but rather to insist upon an open analysis of the root causes and reforms necessary to prevent it from recurring. This requires an abandonment of the denial that anti-Semitism is so endemic in Muslim majority nations which Pew has demonstrated in its Global Attitudes Project.
- We must work with and directly engage civil society organizations which are courageous enough to take on reform work against the anti-Semitism of Islamist groups, and we must actively and unapologetically disengage from Islamist groups who advocate anti-Semitic ideologies.
- We need to provide platforms to Muslim leaders in MENA and the West willing to take on and counter Islamist demagogues like Qaradawi and so many others who spew anti-Semitic vitriol.
- We need to continue the public pressure upon governments like Saudi Arabia and Pakistan which have facilitated and funded the distribution of textbooks about Muslims, Jews, Christians, and all people of faith which indoctrinates hate at a young age due to the virulent strain of Islam being promulgated.
- We can no longer tolerate a climate of political correctness which gives Muslims a pass on accountability for ideas, religious or political, which are obviously anti-Semitic. To do so, is to allow our government to promote a subtle bigotry of low expectations for both Western Muslims and emerging citizens of nations in the Arab Awakening. The grass roots in populations of nations across the Middle East and North Africa must not see us as advocating for liberty only at home in the U.S. while working with their oppressors and turning a blind eye to anti-Semitism from our “allies” in MENA.
- We must confront Islamist groups and leaders in Europe with what Prime Minister David Cameron referred to as “muscular liberalism”. As hyper-secularists in Europe attack the faithful of all faiths including Judaism and Christianity, Islamists are thriving amidst the climate of growing anti-Semitism and anti-religious fervor.
- We must address anti-Semitism at all its levels from the demonization of Jews all the way to the subtle references to Jews in the collective and amongst western conspiracy theories.
Mr. SMITH. Dr. Jasser, thank you very much for that very important contribution, and for reminding this committee, and I think the country, and I hope the press and everyone else. In the way you not only presented your testimony, I do hope everybody will read your entire testimony and see that Muslims are speaking out. You are one of the most bravest doing so, but speaking out in a way that really defends all people—Jews, Christians, Muslims themselves—but to do so in a way that really calls us to action, and the executive as well as the congressional branch. Thank you so much, Dr. Jasser.

Mr. Garvey?

STATEMENT OF MR. JOHN GARVEY, PRESIDENT, THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA

Mr. GARVEY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Anti-Semitism is so obviously wrong that I feel almost sheepish making arguments against it, but here we are. So I want to elaborate on three points which I hope you will not find unnecessarily self-evident. First, anti-Semitism is intrinsically wrong. It violates human dignity because it denies the right to religious freedom. The Catholic Church calls this our first, most cherished liberty. James Madison argued that the right is unalienable because what is here a right toward men is a duty toward our Creator. The Catholic Church actively seeks its protection regardless of the faith in question. This is why the American bishops lent their strong support to the International Religious Freedom Act in 1998.

Anti-Semitism also violates human dignity by denying the right of equality. Here is what the Second Vatican Council said, “The Church reproves, as foreign to the mind of Christ, any discrimination against men or harassment of them because of their race, color, condition of life, or religion.” Allow me to add a further refinement. The Catholic Church is especially concerned about anti-Semitism because we are one family in the Abrahamic tradition. Catholics call fellow Christians their brothers and sisters in faith. Pope Benedict describes the Jews as “our fathers in faith.” We share with them the Hebrew scriptures, and our traditions of prayer are rooted in that book. Together we worship the God of Abraham.

Anti-Semitism is an attack on our family. This familial outlook has led our last two popes to make powerful gestures of solidarity with the Jewish people. Pope John Paul II used a powerful image to condemn the legacy of anti-Semitism when he said during his historic homily at Brzezinka that the concentration camp is the “Golgotha of the modern world.”

Second, anti-Semitism is not just wrong for Jews; it puts other faiths at risk. This is so, first of all, because the arguments that support anti-Semitism may be deployed with equal force against other faiths. The descriptions used to disparage Jewish communities 100 years ago—that they were clannish, insular, didn't fit in, brought their outsider status on themselves—may be used against Muslims in France today. Their offense, it will be said, is not that they are Muslims. It is that they speak a foreign tongue, dress in inappropriate ways, dispute the principle of laïcité, favor the prospering of foreign states over France.
The patterns of violence that have historically characterized anti-Semitism are unfortunately familiar to Christians today. Anti-Christian sentiment in some parts of the world, like anti-Semitism, is rooted in a dislike of religious belief. It manifests itself in similar ways. Pope Benedict XVI described it in an address to the diplomatic corps last year:

“In many countries, Christians are deprived of fundamental rights; in other countries they endure violent attacks against their churches and their homes. At times they are forced to leave the countries they have helped to build because of persistent tensions and policies which frequently relegate them to being second-class spectators of national life.”

Here is a second cause of harm to other faiths. Anti-Semitism can make the world a more hostile place for other religions through a strategy of divide and conquer. Anti-Semitism does not attack belief itself. It focuses its attention on a particular group of believers. When they are intimidated into silence, the strength of the cohort of believers is reduced to that degree. Here is how James Madison saw the danger. “It is proper,” he said, “to take alarm at the first experiment on our liberties. Who does not see that the same authority which can establish Christianity, in exclusion of all other religions, may establish with the same ease any particular sect of Christians, in exclusion of all other sects?”

Third, like other cancers, anti-Semitism spreads its poison to all parts of the body politic. A society that tolerates anti-Semitism cannot maintain a healthy democracy. First, as a matter of historical fact, the western commitment to political liberty grew out of our acceptance of religious toleration. John Neville Figgis, the student of Lord Acton, famously said that “political liberty is the residuary legatee of ecclesiastical animosities.” Our success in living with religious differences gave us a lesson in tolerating political differences, and a hope that we could surmount them. If we are passive in the face of anti-Semitism we risk running our constitutional evolution in reverse.

Second, as the late Ronald Dworkin was fond of pointing out, democracy rests on a commitment to equality. Anti-Semitism, like racism, denies this. We saw this in our own treatment of African Americans. The original Constitution treated slaves as less than fully human. Dred Scott held that slaves were not citizens. A society that tolerates anti-Semitism behaves in a similar way and is not worthy to be recognized as a democracy.

Third, such a society can make no claim to be a liberal democracy. The defining characteristic of a liberal democracy is its commitment to liberty. Our own Supreme Court has held that the fundamental concept of liberty comprises an absolute freedom to adhere to such religious organization or a form of worship as the individual may choose. To persecute a people for their religious belief and form of worship is to deny the most fundamental commitment of a liberal democracy.

Thank you very much for giving me this opportunity to offer a few thoughts on an issue of such concern to us.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Garvey follows:]
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Mr. Chairman, members of the Committee, thank you for inviting me to speak today on this important subject. It is a matter of appropriate concern for the Congress and the House Committee on Foreign Affairs. Anti-Semitism is so obviously wrong that I feel almost sheepish making arguments against it. But here we are. So I want to elaborate on three points, which I hope you will not find unnecessarily self-evident. First, anti-Semitism is intrinsically wrong. Second, anti-Semitism is not just wrong for Jews. It is, as the title of today’s hearing suggests, a threat to all faiths. Third, anti-Semitism is not just a threat to religion. It undermines the fundamental premises of a liberal democracy.

I. Anti-Semitism is intrinsically wrong. It violates human dignity because it denies the right to religious freedom. The Catholic Church calls this “our first, most cherished liberty.” It allows us to fulfill our most fundamental duty – to live in accordance with God’s commandments. James Madison argued that the right is unalienable “because what is here a right towards men, is a duty towards the Creator.” The Catholic Church actively seeks its protection regardless of the faith in question. That is why the American bishops lent their strong support to the International Religious Freedom Act in 1998. The Act states that “[f]rom its birth to this day, the United States has prized this legacy of religious freedom and honored this heritage by standing for religious freedom and offering refuge to those suffering religious persecution.”

Anti-Semitism also violates human dignity by denying the right of equality. Here is what the Second Vatican Council said: “the Church reproves, as foreign to the mind of Christ, any discrimination against men or harassment of them because of their race, color, condition of life, or religion.” The Council went on to say:
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We cannot truly call on God, the Father of all, if we refuse to treat in a brotherly way any man, created as he is in the image of God. Man’s relation to God the Father and his relation to men, his brothers, are so linked together that Scripture says: “He who does not love does not know God” (1 John 4:8).

Allow me to add a further refinement. The Catholic Church is especially concerned about anti-Semitism because we are one family in the Abrahamic tradition. Catholics call fellow Christians their brothers and sisters in faith. Pope Benedict XVI describes the Jews as “our fathers in faith.” We share with them the Hebrew scriptures, and our traditions of prayer are rooted in that book. Together we worship the God of Abraham. Anti-Semitism is an attack on our family.

The Second Vatican Council expresses this relationship as one of mindfulness of the shared elements of our tradition: “the Church, mindful of the patrimony she shares with the Jews and moved not by political reasons but by the Gospel’s spiritual love, decries hatred, persecutions, displays of anti-Semitism, directed against Jews at any time and by anyone.”

It is a familial outlook that has led our last two popes to make profound gestures of solidarity with the Jewish people. Pope John Paul II used a powerful image to condemn the legacy of anti-Semitism when he said during his historic homily at Brzezinka that the concentration camp is the “Golgotha of the modern world.”

II. Anti-Semitism is not just wrong for Jews. A society that tolerates anti-Semitism puts other faiths at risk.

This is so, first of all, because the rhetoric and arguments that support anti-Semitism may be deployed with equal force against other faiths. The descriptions used to disparage Jewish communities a hundred years ago – that they were clannish, insular, didn’t fit in, brought their outsider status on themselves – may be used against Muslims in France today. Their offense, it will be said, is not that they are Muslims. It is that they speak a foreign tongue, dress in inappropriate ways, dispute the principle of laïcité, favor the prospering of foreign states over France. The principles that justify treating one religion with suspicion or derision can be used against others when the tide turns against them.

We detect a similar pattern in the arguments for suppressing certain religious practices. The Jewish ritual of circumcision was criticized in Germany (and San Francisco) as a violation of individual rights and an outdated and harmful religious practice. The debate has something in common with the arguments for requiring Catholic institutions to cover prescription contraceptives, early stage abortifacients, and sterilizations in their health care plans. To do otherwise, it is said, discriminates against women, violates reproductive rights, and rests on old-fashioned notions of sexual orthodoxy.

Lisa Palmieri-Billig, New Book Shows Pope’s Commitment to Jews and Israel, The Jerusalem Post (Nov. 28, 2010).
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The patterns of violence that have historically characterized virulent anti-Semitism are unfortunately familiar today to Catholics as well. Anti-Christian sentiment in some parts of the world, like anti-Semitism, is rooted in a dislike of religious belief. It manifests itself in similar, often violent, ways. Pope Benedict XVI described it in an address to the Diplomatic Corps last year:

In many countries, Christians are deprived of fundamental rights . . . ; in other countries they endure violent attacks against their churches and their homes. At times they are forced to leave the countries they have helped to build because of persistent tensions and policies which frequently relegate them to being second-class spectators of national life.

These attacks are a reminder that violence against one religion often prefigures attacks on another. Religious persecutions mimic one another.

Here is a second cause of harm to other faiths: anti-Semitism can make the world a more hostile place for other religions through a strategy of divide and conquer. Anti-Semitism does not attack belief itself. It focuses its attention on a particular group of believers. When they are intimidated into silence, the strength of the cohort of believers is reduced to that degree. Next might come Jehovah’s Witnesses or Mormons, Zoroastrians or Sikhs. Here again is how James Madison saw the danger:

It is proper to take alarm at the first experiment on our liberties. . . . Who does not see that the same authority which can establish Christianity, in exclusion of all other Religions, may establish with the same ease any particular sect of Christians, in exclusion of all other Sects?

The Catholic Church has both a duty and a powerful incentive to defend our Jewish friends against the forces of anti-Semitism in our world. Their troubles are ours, and we are both righteous and prudent to do our utmost to help them.

III. Like other cancers, Anti-Semitism spreads its poison to all parts of the body politic. A society that tolerates anti-Semitism cannot maintain a healthy democracy. This is so for three reasons.

First, as a matter of historical fact, the western commitment to political liberty grew out of our acceptance of religious toleration. John Neville Figgis, the British political philosopher and student of Lord Acton, famously said that “[p]olitical liberty is the residuary legatee of ecclesiastical animosities.” Our success in living with religious differences gave us a lesson in tolerating political differences, and hope that we could surmount them.

If we are passive in the face of anti-Semitism we risk running our constitutional evolution in reverse. Persecution of religious minorities whets the appetite for persecuting political opponents. And it inures us to claims of injustice.

Second, as the late Ronald Dworkin was fond of arguing, democracy rests on a commitment to equality, and democratic equality means that every citizen is entitled
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to equal concern and respect.\textsuperscript{12} Anti-Semitism, like racism, denies the most fundamental commitment of a democratic society – the right to treatment as an equal. Americans have seen this phenomenon play out in our own treatment of African Americans. The original Constitution (in the three-fifths compromise) treated slaves as less than fully human.\textsuperscript{13} \textit{Dred Scott v. Sanford}\textsuperscript{14} held that slaves were not citizens. It took a Civil War and an amendment to the Constitution to resolve that “all persons born . . . in the United States . . . are citizens,” and that “[n]o State shall . . . deny to any person . . . the equal protection of the laws.”\textsuperscript{15} A society that tolerates anti-Semitism denies these principles, and is not worthy to be recognized as a democracy.

Third, a society that tolerates anti-Semitism can make no claim to be a liberal democracy. The defining characteristic of a liberal democracy is its commitment to liberty – a right often guaranteed by constitutional assurances, the separation of powers, competitive elections, and the rule of law. It is hard to imagine a regime of ordered liberty that does not protect the free exercise of religion. Our own Supreme Court has held that “[t]he fundamental concept of liberty” comprises an absolute “freedom to adhere to such religious organization or form of worship as the individual may choose.”\textsuperscript{16} To persecute a people for their religious belief and form of worship is to deny the most fundamental commitment of a liberal democracy.

Thank you very much for giving me the opportunity to offer a few thoughts on an issue that is of such concern to so many of us.

\textsuperscript{12} Taking Rights Seriously 180 (1977).
\textsuperscript{13} U.S. Const. art. I, § 2.
\textsuperscript{14} Dred Scott v. Sanford, 60 U.S. 393 (1857).
\textsuperscript{15} U.S. Const. amend. XIV, § 1.
Mr. SMITH. Thank you very much for your testimony. You pro-
foundly state how anti-Semitism is intrinsically wrong, and as a
Catholic your point that anti-Semitism is an attack on our family
as well certainly rings true. And I think that and believe that goes
for all faiths. But thank you for your extraordinary testimony.

Ms. Massimino?

STATEMENT OF MS. ELISA MASSIMINO, PRESIDENT AND
CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER, HUMAN RIGHTS FIRST

Ms. MASSIMINO. Thank you so much, Mr. Chairman. I appreciate
the opportunity to be here today to share Human Rights First's
findings and recommendations on this important issue and to dis-
cuss how to further our common goal of combating intolerance and
advancing human rights. We are deeply grateful to you, Mr. Chair-
man, for your leadership and to the subcommittee for its important
role in keeping human rights front and center in the Congress.

Anti-Semitism is not a Jewish issue and it is not a religious
issue. It is a human rights issue and we all have to confront it. The
failure of governments to punish those who commit violence tar-
geting Jews and Jewish communities and to condemn and counter-
act virulent anti-Semitic hate speech creates an environment that
endangers not only Jews, but the rights and security of adherents
of other religious faiths and members of other minority groups. A
healthy civil society cannot flourish in the face of unchecked ha-
tred. Indeed, we see time and again that hate does not exist in neat
compartments, but it metastasizes, creating an enabling environ-
ment for violence that affects immigrants, members of religious
and sexual minorities, Roma, and many, many others.

For more than a decade, Human Rights First has been working
to monitor and combat anti-Semitic violence and to press for
stronger government action. Although anti-Semitism is a global
problem, my testimony today will focus on anti-Semitic violence in
Europe and the former Soviet Union where the translation of senti-
ment against Israel or the policy of its governments into anti-Jew-
ish antipathy has generated new and unique anti-Semitic violence
that has fluctuated in relation to events in the Middle East. At the
same time, age-old manifestations of anti-Semitism persist and are
often deeply intertwined with the prejudices that fuel hatred
against other minorities.

Anti-Semitism remains at the core of organized racial suprema-
cist groups in Western Europe and of broad nationalist movements
in Eastern and Central Europe that target immigrants, Roma,
LGBT persons, and religious minorities among others. It is thus
important that individuals and leaders from faith and other com-
munities come together to condemn anti-Semitism and other forms
of intolerance. And this hearing is an important opportunity for us
to reflect on the interrelationship of these threats and the impor-
tance of solidarity in confronting them.

Anti-Semitic violence as well as other forms of hate crimes
should not be seen simply as the problems of individual victims or
their communities. They must be seen and responded to for what
they are, serious violations of human rights. These threats of fun-
damental rights must be challenged not just by the victims or com-
munities of targeted individuals, but by all those who seek to advance universal rights and freedoms.

I would like to make four key points today. First, anti-Semitism is a unique and potent form of racism and religious intolerance, and the extent of the violence motivated by anti-Jewish animus throughout the OCSE region remains at disturbingly high levels. Second, with few notable exceptions, government responses to this rising tide of violence have been wholly inadequate.

Third, the failure to confront anti-Semitic hatred corrodes the rights and security of all people. Along with anti-Semitic violence, the targeting of individuals because of their race, religion, national origin, sexual orientation, or other factors has been on the rise in recent years in many countries across the globe. Strategies for combating anti-Semitic violence through a human rights framework are effective and they are necessary for stemming the tide of hate-fueled violence against others as well. And finally, U.S. leadership is essential in confronting anti-Semitism. My written testimony concluded with recommendations for strengthening U.S. leadership in this area.

The level of anti-Semitic violence in Europe and North America today is disturbingly high. Synagogues, Jewish homes and Jewish-owned businesses have been targeted in arson attacks and subjected to widespread vandalism, and students and teachers in Jewish schools and ordinary people have been harassed, beaten, stabbed, or shot simply because they were Jewish. Anti-Semitism is devastating not only to individual victims, but it terrorizes entire communities making participation in public life fully and free from fear, impossible.

In one of the most horrifying such incidents last March, a 23-year-old man of Algerian descent carried out a series of terrorist attacks targeting Jewish civilians and French soldiers. In total, seven people were killed including a rabbi and his two young children. Violent crime is anti-Semitism’s sharp edge but it often occurs in the context of virulent hate speech. In some countries, political and religious leaders are the ones spewing this hate, attacking Jews through stereotypes and scapegoating. In addition, Jews as people are often vilified in the context of attacks on Israel. While criticism of Israeli Government policies or the policies of any government is legitimate discourse, it crosses the line when it disparages or demonizes Jews as a people. When hate speech involves direct and immediate threats of violence, governments must hold perpetrators criminally accountable.

But it is important that we approach these challenges in a thoughtful way. Confronting hate speech must not impinge on free expression. There are ample cases as you know, Mr. Chairman, particularly in countries like Russia where the rule of law is weak, in which hate speech statutes are misused to prosecute dissenting voices and civil society activists, even those who are speaking out against hatred and working to advance tolerance. Instead, hate speech must be countered by clear public statements from a cross section of political and civil society leaders to condemn prejudice and hatred and to affirm the dignity and rights of all.

Consistent condemnation of hate speech is still sorely lacking across Europe and in many other parts of the world. It is vital that
political leaders speak out promptly and unequivocally to condemn hate speech. Similarly, it is crucial that the voices condemning hate speech are raised not only from those in targeted communities. Creating a multi-faceted chorus of counter-speech is a key to marginalizing the voices of anti-Semitism and diminishing the impact on the targeted community. The United States has a long history of this approach in lieu of hate speech laws to address hateful views and political discourse. U.S. Embassy officials should speak more frequently in this way and urge influential political leaders in the countries in question to do the same. When political leaders from across party lines condemn anti-Semitism and other forms of intolerance it sends an important message to the victim communities and to others who would speak so.

I want to summarize my recommendations quickly. The full text of them are in my written testimony. First, in order to strengthen U.S. leadership in this area, the U.S. should elevate the importance of religious freedom in its U.S. foreign policy by developing a national security strategy that promotes international religious freedom, combats anti-Semitic and related violence, and confronts hate speech while protecting free expression. Second, the U.S. should establish an interagency mechanism to deploy strategically the resources and programs from across the U.S. Government to combat hate crime globally.

Third, making combating anti-Semitism an important component of bilateral engagement through an interagency effort. That means not just the State Department, but every agency of the U.S. Government needs to raise this in its bilateral relations with other countries. Fourth, maintaining the international leadership of the United States in multilateral forums like the OSCE is critically important, and thanks to your leadership, Mr. Chairman, we are doing just that.

In conclusion, the failure to confront anti-Semitic hatred corrodes the right and security of all people, and that is why this hearing, framed as you have framed it, is so important. Thank you again, Mr. Chairman, for your leadership and your persistence in seeking to eradicate anti-Semitism.
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Introduction

Chairman Smith, Ranking Member Bass, and Members of the Subcommittee, thank you for convening this hearing to examine the growing threat of antisemitism. I appreciate the opportunity to be here today to share Human Rights First’s findings and recommendations on this important matter and to discuss ways that we can work together with you to advance human rights protections. We are grateful to you, Mr. Chairman, for your leadership on combating antisemitism and to the Subcommittee for the important role it plays in keeping key human rights issues front and center in the Congress. We look forward to continuing to work with you and to assist in these efforts.

Mr. Chairman, as you well know, antisemitism is a human rights issue. The failure of governments to confront it – to punish those who commit violence targeting Jews and Jewish communities and to condemn and counteract virulent antisemitic hate speech – creates an environment that endangers not only Jews but the rights and security of adherents of other religious faiths and members of other minority groups. A healthy civil society simply cannot flourish in the face of unchecked hatred. Indeed, we see time and again that hate does not exist in neat compartments, but creates an enabling environment where violence can occur targeting immigrants, members of religious minorities, Roma, people of African or Asian origin and LGBTI persons.

Human Rights First has been working since 2002 to both monitor and combat antisemitic violence and press for stronger government action. Our advocacy has been based on documentation in regular reports of the problem and recommendations for action. Additionally, since 2009 we have partnered with the Anti-Defamation League in producing annual reports on the implementation by the 57 participating States of the

Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) of their commitments to combat antisemitic and other hate crimes.

Although antisemitism is a global problem, my testimony today will focus on antisemitic violence in Europe and the former Soviet Union. The translation of sentiment against Israel or the policies of its government into anti-Jewish antipathy has for more than a decade generated new and unique patterns of antisemitic violence in Europe that have fluctuated in relation to events in the Middle East. At the same time, age-old manifestations of antisemitism persist and are often deeply intertwined with the prejudices that fuel hatred against people because of their religion, ethnicity, sexual orientation and other characteristics.

Antisemitism remains at the core of organized racial supremacist groups in Western Europe and of broad nationalist movements in eastern and Central Europe that target Roma, immigrants, LGBT persons, and religious minorities among others. In a telling example, Moscow’s Darchei Shalom synagogue was firebombed in 2011 in retaliation for the high-profile sentencing of key members of a skinhead gang responsible for dozens of terrorist acts and hate crime murders, mostly on non-Slavs living and working in Moscow. The supporters of the jailed murderers chose to attack a synagogue to send a sharp message to the authorities and the Russian public: that antisemitism remains at the core of the multilayered orb of prejudices that fuel racist and xenophobic violence.

It is thus important that individuals and leaders from faith and other communities come together to condemn antisemitism and other forms of hate violence and intolerance. This hearing is an important effort to reflect on the common threats facing multiple communities.

At the same time, Human Rights First has long maintained that antisemitic violence, as well as other forms of hate crime, should not be seen simply as the problems of individual victims or their communities. Hate crime must be viewed and responded to as a serious violation of human rights. Governments have an obligation to confront these abuses, and there is much more they can be doing. These threats to fundamental rights must be challenged, not just by victims’ groups or those who represent communities of targeted individuals, but by all of us who seek to advance universal rights and freedoms. Although some progress has been made in the last decade to draw greater attention to the issue—to a large extent in response to efforts led by the United States—high levels of antisemitic violence and related forms of hate crime persist, and the political will to reverse that trend remains sorely lacking in much of the OSCE region.

I would like to make four key points today.

- Antisemitism is a unique and potent form of racism and religious intolerance and the extent of violence motivated by anti-Jewish animus throughout much of the OSCE region remains at disturbingly high levels since the early 2000’s.
- With a few notable exceptions, governments have not responded adequately to this rising tide of violence, and there is an urgent need to adopt comprehensive strategies to combat it.
• The failure to confront antisemitic hatred corrodes the rights and security of all persons. Along with antisemitic violence, the targeting of individuals because of their race, religion, national origin, sexual orientation, and other similar factors, has been on the rise in recent years in many countries. Strategies for combating antisemitic violence through a human rights framework are effective and necessary to confront these scourges as well.

• The United States must continue to play a catalytic role to confront antisemitism globally, and we conclude with several recommendations for U.S. policy.

ANTISEMITIC VIOLENCE TODAY

The level of antisemitic violence in Europe and North America remains at disturbingly high levels, following a significant increase beginning in 2000 and peaking in many countries in 2009. Although the number of incidents in the last decade has fluctuated from year-to-year and from country-to-country, monitoring has shown that synagogues, Jewish homes, and Jewish-owned businesses have been targeted in arson attacks and subjected to widespread vandalism, and students and employees in Jewish schools and ordinary people have been harassed, beaten, stabbed, or shot because they were Jewish. Antisemitism—like other forms of racism and religious intolerance—is an obstacle to participation in public life fully and free of fear.

In the “newer” form of antisemitism, Jews around the world have increasingly been targeted for violence and vilification as if collectively responsible for wrongs attributed to the state of Israel. This new antisemitism combines the ancient roots and forms of antisemitism with new political elements, and may be partly responsible for both ongoing high levels of antisemitic violence and periodic surges in hate crime attacks. In the past, “trigger events” in the Middle East have been followed by sharp increases in attacks on Jewish institutions and on ordinary Jews living in Europe and North America. In 2009, for example, the conflict in Gaza was followed by a wave of attacks against Jews in Europe.

The link to the policies in the Middle East is, however, only part of today’s antisemitism. Contemporary antisemitism is multi-faceted and deeply rooted. It should not be viewed solely as a transitory side-effect of the conflict in the Middle East. Antisemitic incitement and violence predate the Middle East conflict and continue to be based in large part on centuries-old hatred and prejudice. The branding of Jews as scapegoats for both ancient and modern ills remains a powerful underlying factor in the antisemitic hatred and violence that continues to manifest itself today. This age-old antisemitic hatred is continuing to provoke violence across the OSCE region.

Among representative incidents of antisemitic violence are the following:

A Jewish cemetery near Wroclaw, Poland, and a Holocaust memorial site outside Kazan, Russia, were defaced in anti-Semitic attacks in February 2013. Unknown perpetrators spray-painted antisemitic slogans on a cemetery in Kalisz, and the vandals in Russia smashed a memorial and a menorah inaugurated for the 2011 international festival of Jewish culture in Ulyanovsk.
On October 5, 2012, the president of a Jewish congregation in the South Pest district of Budapest, Hungary, was attacked by two young men who kicked the victim in the stomach and made verbal threats. The victim did not require medical treatment for the injuries. Police arrested the two alleged attackers, one of whom was convicted of the crime and sentenced to two years in prison.

On September 28, 2012, an explosive device was detonated at a Jewish communal building in the early morning hours in Malmo, Sweden. No one was injured, but damage was caused to the building. A series of antisemitic attacks in Malmo, including acts of vandalism and firebombings, prompted a demonstration of support of the Jewish community by local residents.

On September 28, 2012, an arson attack took place at a Jewish boys’ school in Stamford Hill, UK. In July, a Jewish man was beaten by four unknown perpetrators in the same Jewish Orthodox neighborhood.

On September 28, 2012, unknown assailants beat a 25-year-old Jewish man in Kyiv, Ukraine. The victim was wearing a kippah after attending a Pesakh celebration at the Brodsky synagogue earlier that evening. He was hospitalized and remained in critical condition for several days.

On February 23, 2011, three youths verbally harassed and punched a rabbi at the Lausanne Synagogue in Switzerland. The attack took place as the victim was leaving the synagogue.

The U.S. State Department’s 2011 Religious Freedom report cites cases of personal violence, vandalism, and desecration in 20 countries in Europe.

Beyond the cases that make the headlines, the data that is available from the few government and NGO monitors also corroborates the steady levels of violence in recent years. Some telling statistics from the past few years:

- **Canada**: B’nai Brith’s League for Human Rights found a “negligible decrease” of 0.7 percent in antisemitic activity in the country in 2011. A total of 1,297 incidents were reported, including 916 cases of harassment, 362 involved vandalism, and 19 cases of violence.

- **France**: Antisemitic violence in France rose sharply in the first years of the decade, reaching a peak in 2004. By 2008, the number of incidents had stabilized, although at levels some 10 times higher than those recorded in 1999. The National Consultative Commission on Human Rights in France reported 389 antisemitic actions and threats in 2011, a decline from 466 in 2010 and 815 in 2009. Early reports from 2012 suggest another sharp increase. Although the annual CNCDH report has yet to be released, the Representative Council of Jewish Institutions in France reported on a 58 percent increase in acts of antisemitic violence in 2012 over 2011.

- **Germany**: The number of politically motivated crimes with an antisemitic motive recorded by the German police has decreased from 1,691 in 2001 to 1,239 in 2011 (29 cases in 2011 involved violence). The peak of incidents was recorded in 2006 (1,809).
• **Russia**: Jews have been among the victims of a sharp rise in hate crime committed by neo-Nazis, but a significant reduction in violence followed the peak of murders recorded in 2009. In 2011, the SOVA Center for Information and Analysis reported one assault and 13 cases of damage to property, and one case of arson motivated by antisemitism.

• **Sweden**: The police recorded a sharp increase in antisemitic crimes in 2008-2009 (250 in 2009), after which the figure stabilized (194 incidents in 2011, 161 in 2010). According to the police, most of these incidents are crimes against the person.

• **Ukraine**: Attacks on synagogues, memorial, and Jewish institutions continue to occur, although the number of personal assaults remains low, with no more than 3 attacks recorded in one year since 2008. The reductions come following a period from 2006-2008 in which antisemitic attacks were a part of a sharp rise in overall hate crime incidents.

• **United Kingdom**: Data presented by the Community Security Trust identified 2009 as the worst year on record for antisemitic incidents, while marking a significant decrease in 2010. 640 antisemitic incidents were recorded by CST in 2012, a slight increase from the 608 antisemitic incidents recorded in 2011. Official data cite 438 incidents for 2011, a slight decrease from 488 in 2010, although a significant decline from the 703 cases recorded in 2009.

  - In the **United States**, antisemitic hate crimes are still the majority of all recorded antireligious incidents (62 percent of 1,318 in 2009).

In addition to the importance of responding to antisemitic attacks through a hate crime framework, the security of Jewish individuals and institutions must also be viewed in the context of combating domestic and global terrorism, as demonstrated by two high-profile terrorist attacks in 2012:

• In March 2012, a series of three terrorist attacks targeting Jewish civilians and French soldiers in the French cities of Montauban and Toulouse was carried out by Merah, a 23-year-old man of Algerian descent. In total, seven people were killed, and five others were injured, including four Jews who were murdered at the Ozar Hatorah Jewish school in Toulouse, including a Rabbi and his two children, aged six and three. The perpetrator was shot and killed by the police after a long siege, and the French government alleged that Merah had trained with al Qaeda in Pakistan's Waziristan region, bordering Afghanistan, and also spent time in Afghanistan.

• At least seven people were killed and some 30 others were injured on July 18, 2012, in a terrorist attack on a bus carrying Israeli tourists in Burgas, some 400 kilometers east of the Bulgarian capital of Sofia. In February 2013, the Bulgarian government reported the results of an official investigation, indicating that Hezbollah’s so-called military wing was responsible for the planning and carrying out the attack. The Bulgarian minister of the interior said that there was reliable, well-founded information linking at least two of the three Burgas attackers to Hezbollah.
ANTISEMITIC HATE SPEECH

Violent crime is antisemitism’s sharp edge, but these crimes often occur in the context of virulent hate speech. In some countries, established political and religious leaders engage in persistent antisemitic discourse, attacking Jews through stereotypes, slanders, and scapegoating. In addition, Jews as a people are vilified in the context of attacks on Israel or Israeli policies. While criticism of Israeli government—or any government’s—policies is certainly legitimate, criticism of Israel or the Zionist movement crosses the line to become antisemitism when it disparages or demonizes Jews as a people.

The presence of representatives of political parties in local and national government that openly espouse racist and antisemitic views and policies is a disturbing dimension of antisemitism’s continuing presence and a formidable obstacle in the path of efforts to confront it. Political parties that espouse antisemitic among other racist, xenophobic and homophobic views have come to power through elections in several countries in recent years.

- Members of Hungary’s Movement for a Better Hungary (Jobbik), a radical nationalist political party, are often denounced for neo-fascist, racist, antisemitic, anti-Roma, and homophobic pronouncements. Jobbik won 47 (12 percent) seats in the 2010 Parliamentarian elections, building on the success of their 2009 campaign for the European Parliament seats, in which Jobbik members won 3 seats.
- The All-Ukrainian Union Svoboda won its first seats in the Verkhovna Rada in 2012, taking 10 percent of the popular vote that gave the party 38 mandates in the 450-member parliament. The far-right Union is commonly accused of racist and antisemitic positions.
- Greece’s right-wing People’s Association—Golden Dawn – rejects the neo-Nazi and fascist labeling, though its representatives use Nazi symbols, have praised German Nazi leaders in the past, and have engaged in deeply xenophobic rhetoric in an environment in which immigrants in Greece have been the overwhelming victims of a sharp rise in hate crime attacks that have gone largely unpunished. Golden Dawn members hold 18 seats (7 percent) in the Greek Parliament.

When hate speech involves direct and immediate threats of violence to particular individuals or institutions, governments must hold perpetrators responsible under criminal law. But government leaders should also recognize the limits of criminal law to address what is often more a political and social problem, rather than a legal one. There are ample cases, particularly in countries like the Russian Federation where rule of law is poorly developed, in which hate speech statutes are misused to prosecute dissenting voices and civil society activists, including those who are speaking out against hatred and working to advance tolerance.

As noted above, all too often public officials and religious and other community leaders are the ones responsible for statements advocating or inciting anti-Jewish hatred, which can create an enabling environment for violence. It is important to approach this challenge in a thoughtful manner; confronting hate speech must not impinge on free expression. Such hate speech needs to be countered by clear public statements from a cross-section of political and civil society leaders, to condemn prejudice and hatred and
to affirm the dignity and rights of all. These voices are needed to confront the growing wave of populist parties—such as Jobbik, Svoboda, and Golden Dawn—developing constituencies across Europe.

Recently, in Hungary, Marton Gyongyosi of Jobbik stated that it was time to determine “how many people of Jewish origin there are here, especially in the Hungarian parliament and the Hungarian government, who represent a certain national security risk.” The comments outraged much of the Hungarian population and led to a rally, organized by Jewish and civic groups. More than 10,000 people attended the protest outside the parliament building. The rally was led by politicians from both the government and opposition parties. Parliamentary faction leader of the governing Fidesz party Antal Rogan addressed the crowd. “I came because in this situation I cannot stay quiet,” Rogan said. “Hungary defends its citizens.” The American ambassador also attended the rally. The U.S. embassy said in a statement that “the recurrence of antisemitic and other racist statements in the Hungarian parliament demonstrates the need to further empower voices of tolerance and peaceful coexistence in Hungary.”

Sadly, this example is rare. Effective and consistent strategies for marginalizing these voices of intolerance are still sorely lacking across Europe and in many other parts of the world. Counterspeech at the political level and from a broader base of the social and religious and civil society groups than just the individual targeted communities is a key strategy for marginalizing those who voice antisemitic sentiments and for diminishing the impact of such hateful speech on the target community.

The United States has a long history of using counterspeech—rather than hate speech laws—to address hateful views in political discourse. It could play a role globally by encouraging embassy officials to more frequently speak out publicly and to encourage influential political leaders in the country in question to do the same. When political leaders from across party lines speak out against anti-Semitism and related forms of intolerance, it sends an important signal to communities. This is a practice that is sorely needed, but one that is lacking in many countries. The United States, with leadership from key members of Congress, can set an important example of the effectiveness of this important strategy to combat hatred, while respecting freedom of expression.

GOVERNMENT RESPONSES TO ANTISEMITIC VIOLENCE: THE DATA DEFICIT

Violent hate crime is always harmful to society but is particularly destructive when there is either no response or an inadequate response by State institutions. Governments are obliged under national legislation and international human rights law to protect individuals—citizens and noncitizens, regardless of their legal status—from discrimination by addressing antisemitic and other forms of hate crime. Too often, though, the reality is that there is inadequate justice in these cases. An expectation of impunity can contribute to an escalation of such attacks.

Since 2009, Human Rights First worked with the Anti-Defamation League to produce an annual review of the OSCE Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights’ (ODIHR) hate crime report. Our joint analysis points to the inadequate response to
antisemitic and other violence by most OSCE participating States, and we also advance recommendations for what States can do to improve both their record on hate crimes as well as the reporting process that allows governments and nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) to track progress.

Human Rights First has advocated a comprehensive program of action for governments to combat antisemitic and other forms of bias-motivated violence (see Human Rights First’s attached Ten-Point Plan). Monitoring and public reporting has been at the heart of those recommendations.

An effective government response to violent hate crimes is difficult, if not impossible, without a clear picture of the extent of the problem. Without adequate monitoring, it is difficult to identify accurately emerging trends or hate crime hotspots, develop strategies for prevention and protection, and determine which groups are most frequently the victims of violent hate crimes. Understanding the profile of perpetrators of violent hate crime is also important, yet assumptions and generalizations—for example with regard to the incidence of antisemitic attacks committed by Muslims—can be damaging if not based on scrupulously collected data. Without public reporting on the criminal justice response to hate crimes, it is difficult to ensure that adequate legal tools and resources are in place to investigate and prosecute such crimes. This reporting on actions taken is also essential to reassure the public that effective efforts are being made to provide protection from violence.

In our first report on the problem, in 2002, we pointed to a “data deficit” on antisemitic offenses, with most governments failing even to monitor and report upon these crimes. Ten years later, the findings of the OSCE’s Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights (ODIHR) latest annual report—“Hate Crimes in the OSCE Region” Report for 2011—point to the lack of progress of most States to fulfill commitments to combat antisemitic and other hate crimes. Human Rights First’s analysis of systems of monitoring reveals a serious data collection deficit, with only 17 of the 57 participating States of the OSCE fulfilling their basic commitments to monitor hate crimes. The others collect and publish either nothing at all or extremely limited information on the incidence of antisemitic or other hate crimes. According to OSCE/ODIHR’s latest Hate Crime Report, although 21 countries claim to collect data on antisemitic offenses, only 5 States actually submit data to ODIHR (Germany, Ireland, Italy, Sweden, and the United Kingdom).

THE SHARED BURDEN OF UNCHECKED ANTISEMITISM AND RELATED INTOLERANCE

A shared problem requires a shared solution. Hate crime laws and government policies to confront all forms of bias-motivated violence offer equal protection. Advocacy to advance a broad hate crime framework offers a unique chance for communities to join forces.

The situation in Ukraine offers a good example of the effectiveness of joint responses to manifestations of intolerance that affect multiple groups, including religious communities. Beginning in 2005, NGOs in Ukraine began documenting a dramatic rise in
violent hate crimes against a range of visible minorities, including Jews, with a six-fold increase in documented cases between 2006 and 2008. Civil society groups responded by forming the “Diversity Initiative”—a coalition of dozens of entities, including domestic and international NGOs and agencies—that was launched to coordinate efforts to raise awareness of the problem, provide assistance to victims, and advocate a more robust government response. After 2008, following pressure from domestic and international actors, the authorities in Ukraine publicly signaled that racist violence was unacceptable, formed an interministerial commission to combat xenophobia, and began to address hate crimes in a more systematic way. The number of recorded hate crime attacks decreased markedly in 2009 and 2010.

Our global monitoring shows that no religious community is immune to harassment, vandalism, and personal attacks motivated by prejudice and hatred. We are often reminded by these commonalities through the disturbing examples in which vigilante militias patrol Jewish and Roma neighborhoods, or skinhead gangs roam the streets looking to attack Jews, Muslim immigrants, and homosexuals. While the government has a responsibility to ensure that all such cases are investigated and prosecuted, civil society groups have a leading role in driving the public conscience according to our shared values in ensuring the fundamental human rights of all people.

Hate crime violence affects a variety of individuals and communities around the world: refugees and migrants, persons of all faiths, ethnic minorities, lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBT) persons, and many others. Beyond antisemitism, there are multiple biases that fuel the hate crimes that occur across the globe, among them:

- **Racist and xenophobic violence** have been on the rise in many places, particularly in the face of the global economic downturn. Sometimes these crimes are triggered by racist sentiments; in other religious differences or economic factors spark crimes of intolerance. The common thread is that the targets of xenophobic violence are usually marginalized communities that are often viewed as foreign, while the perpetrators of such violence often escape with relative impunity. Refugees, asylum seekers, and migrants are among the principal targets of racially and religiously motivated violence as they are often easily distinguished by their appearance, language, religion and customs. Often times, groups and individuals that target foreigners espouse antisemitism as well as hatred of Muslims, LGBTI individuals, and Roma.

- **Attacks motivated by religious hatred** continue, creating an atmosphere of fear and anxiety and obstructing individual rights to freedom of religion and belief. Religious communities can be subject to acts of vandalism and other serious property damage, such as the December 2012 arson attack on three churches in Amstetten, Austria, or the 2011 destruction of graves at the Muslim cemetery of Pospós, Greece. Individuals associated with religious groups have also been targeted for violence.

- **Roma and Sinti** face violent hate crimes and a myriad of other forms of public and private discrimination throughout Europe. A pattern of violence is directed at causing immediate harm to Roma and physically eradicating their presence in towns and communities in Europe. Racist violence against Roma remains gravely
underreported. Roma routinely suffer racist assaults in city streets and other public places as they travel to and from homes, workplaces, and markets.

- Continuing violence based on sexual orientation and gender identity bias, though still largely unseen, is an intimidating day-to-day reality for LGBT individuals, as well as others who do not conform to stereotypes of gender identity or simply advocate for LGBT rights. Gay pride parades and events in a number of countries have resulted in hateful diatribes from political leaders, inadequate police protection, and acts of harassment and violence against the participants. LGBT individuals are particularly vulnerable in countries where same-sex relations are criminalized. Consensual same-sex relations are criminalized in two OSCE countries (Uzbekistan and Turkmenistan) and in 78 globally.

THE UNITED STATES IS A GLOBAL LEADER IN COMBATING ANTISEMITISM AND OTHER HATE CRIME

The United States has been a leader in recognizing and documenting the global problem of antisemitic and other hate crime and placing it on the international human rights agenda. In order to continue this global leadership role, the United States must continue to look to the situation here at home, where antisemitic and other hate crime remain a serious problem. A strong response at home makes the U.S. credible when it advocates for responses from governments around the world to similar problems. The rising tide of violent hate crime across the globe makes U.S. global leadership on this issue important. Human Rights First welcomed the enactment of the 2009 Matthew Shepard and James Byrd, Jr. Hate Crime Prevention Act, which was championed by American LGBTI, Jewish, and civil and human rights organizations. The law has given renewed tools and vigor to the efforts to combat antisemitic and other bias-motivated violence in this country. The newly adopted legislation and its active implementation reaffirms the U.S. government’s commitment to developing a comprehensive response to domestic hate crime and offers an opportunity for the United States to demonstrate leadership in both bilateral and multilateral efforts to combat the scourge of hate crime globally.

The United States has long been engaged constructively in international efforts to confront antisemitism. The Global Antisemitism Review Act’s establishment of a Special Envoy to Monitor and Combat Antisemitism is an important position through which to strengthen U.S. advocacy of policies to address the problem around the world. We commend the work of Hannah Rosenthal, the Special Envoy until October 2012. She was an energetic and outspoken voice, traveling to numerous countries to raise U.S. concerns about and condemn antisemitism. She was actively involved in training foreign service officers. Ms. Rosenthal and the Special Representative to Muslim Communities, Farah Pandith, demonstrated the interconnectedness of their issues at a high-level conference on combating intolerance in Astana, Kazakhstan in 2010. At the meeting, Rosenthal presented the U.S. delegation’s official intervention on combating anti-Muslim intolerance, while Pandith delivered the intervention on combating antisemitism. In 2010, Rosenthal also spearheaded and led a visit of several Imams to Auschwitz to bear witness to the horrors of the past and to build partnerships in combating antisemitism and intolerance against Muslims.
The United States, with the active leadership of Chairmen Chris Smith and Ben Cardin, as well as other members of the Commission for Security and Cooperation in Europe, has played a leading role in establishing and supporting the OSCE Personal Representative on Combating Antisemitism in the OSCE region. One of the individuals testifying in the second panel of this hearing—Andrew Baker—currently holds that mandate. We have welcomed his commitment and the opportunity to work closely with him. Many aspects of the OSCE’s work on this issue are models for other international structures, and the U.S. contributed substantial efforts to creating and sustaining that model.

There is, however, much more work to be done by the Administration and the Congress to confront the growing threats of antisemitism in Europe and elsewhere. Human Rights First recommends that the U.S. government:

1. **Elevate the importance of religious freedom in U.S. foreign policy** by developing a national security strategy that promotes international religious freedom, combats antisemitic and related violence and confronts hate speech while protecting freedom of expression. To this end:

   - Secretary of State John Kerry should articulate early in his tenure his strategy to leverage U.S. leadership to combat antisemitic and other violent hate crime around the globe.
   - The Administration should immediately fill the position of Special Envoy to Monitor and Combat Antisemitism. The Special Envoy should have a deep commitment to and experience in identifying and combating antisemitism. The Envoy should have a track record of success in coalition building with diverse communities and in interfaith engagement.
   - Through reporting and public diplomacy, the Special Envoy should work to advance efforts to confront antisemitism as an integral part of the State Department’s focus on human rights, rule of law, and democracy around the world.
   - The Special Envoy should lead efforts to institutionalize training of State Department personnel on identifying and responding to different manifestations of antisemitism, including increasing the instruction on antisemitism and related issues in the basic training of foreign service officers.
   - The Special Envoy should conduct regular country visits, alone as well as part of larger delegations, including with Members of Congress, to raise concerns directly with political, religious, and civil leaders in country.
   - Congress should continue to conduct periodic hearings and otherwise invite the Special Envoy and other representatives of the State Department to outline the Administration’s strategy and report on progress in combating antisemitism.
   - Members of Congress should use the opportunity of their participation in interparliamentary institutions and in international travel to engage their parliamentary counterparts and representatives of foreign governments in combating antisemitism. Members of Congress have a particular role to play in pressing their counterparts to speak out publicly and regularly to
marginalize those voices that foster antisemitism and other forms of intolerance.

2. Establish an interagency mechanism to deploy strategically the resources and programs from across the different U.S. government agencies to combat hate crime globally. To this end:
   - The Administration should create an Interagency Policy Committee (IPC) or other interagency mechanism, to facilitate systematic and regular information-sharing and collaboration among the Department of State, Department of Justice, and related agencies that are equipped to take action to combat antisemitic and other bias-motivated violence globally.
   - The Department of Justice should expand international efforts of its International Criminal Investigative Training Assistance Program (ICITAP) and Office of Overseas Prosecutorial Development, Assistance and Training (OPDAT) programming to include hate crime-tailored training initiatives for foreign law enforcement and criminal justice personnel and civil society.
   - The State Department should include in its International Law Enforcement Academies specific training courses on combating all forms of hate crime.

3. Make combating antisemitism an important component of Bilateral Engagement through an interagency effort to:
   - Raise incidents and patterns of hate crime violence with representatives of foreign governments and encourage vigorous responses. Share concrete recommendations, such as those articulated in Human Rights First’s Ten-Point plan for combating hate crime, and offer support to implement them. Remind government leaders of their commitments through the OSCE and elsewhere to combat hate crime.
   - Maintain strong and inclusive Department of State monitoring and public reporting on antisemitic, racist and xenophobic, anti-Muslim, homophobic, anti-Roma, and other bias-motivated violence.
   - Offer appropriate technical assistance and other forms of cooperation, including training of police and prosecutors to investigate, record, report, and prosecute violent hate crimes, and organize international visitors programs to the U.S. for representatives of law enforcement, victims’ communities and legal advocates.
   - Support civil society groups working to combat bias-motivated violence, by facilitating access to existing U.S. funding programs and by directing Embassy and Department of State representatives to meet with such civil society groups and members of affected communities on a regular basis.

4. Maintain the international leadership of the United States in multilateral forums, particularly the OSCE.

Congress should support the State Department to demonstrate international leadership by:
   - Providing political and financial support to the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) to increase practical work on xenophobic, racist, and other hate crime.
• Elevating the issue of antisemitism by supporting the efforts of the Personal Representative on Combating Antisemitism’s to convene in 2013 a meeting on enhancing the security of Jewish institutions.

• Strengthening the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) and its Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights (ODIHR) to:
  o press member states to comply with OSCE commitments on tolerance and nondiscrimination, in particular with the 2009 Decision on Combating Hate Crime;
  o maintain strong support for the organization’s hate crime technical assistance programs; and
  o support an active role for the Justice Department’s Civil Rights Division as the designated Hate Crime Point of Contact for the OSCE.

CONCLUSION

The failure to confront antisemitic hatred corrodes the rights and security of all persons. Along with antisemitic violence, the targeting of individuals because of their race, religion, national origin, sexual orientation, and other similar factors, is on the rise in many countries. Strategies for combating antisemitic violence through a human rights framework are effective and necessary to confront all forms of hate crime violence, the solutions to which have much in common. The United States must continue to play a catalytic role in confronting antisemitic violence, and in doing so address all forms of global hate crime.
Ten-Point Plan for Combating Hate Crimes

1. Acknowledge and condemn violent hate crimes whenever they occur. Senior government leaders should send immediate, strong, public, and consistent messages that violent crimes which appear to be motivated by prejudice and intolerance will be investigated thoroughly and prosecuted to the full extent of the law.

2. Enact laws that expressly address hate crimes. Recognizing the particular harm caused by violent hate crimes, governments should enact laws that establish specific offenses or provide enhanced penalties for violent crimes committed because of the victim’s race, religion, ethnicity, sexual orientation, gender, gender identity, mental and physical disabilities, or other similar status.

3. Strengthen enforcement and prosecute offenders. Governments should ensure that those responsible for hate crimes are held accountable under the law, that the enforcement of hate crime laws is a priority for the criminal justice system, and that the record of their enforcement is well documented and publicized.

4. Provide adequate instructions and resources to law enforcement bodies. Governments should ensure that police and investigators—as the first responders in cases of violent crime—are specifically instructed and have the necessary procedures, resources and training to identify, investigate and register bias motives before the courts, and that prosecutors have been trained to bring evidence of bias motivations and apply the legal measures required to prosecute hate crimes.

5. Undertake parliamentary, interagency or other special inquiries into the problem of hate crimes. Such public, official inquiries should encourage public debate, investigate ways to better respond to hate crimes, and seek creative ways to address the roots of intolerance and discrimination through education and other means.

6. Monitor and report on hate crimes. Governments should maintain official systems of monitoring and public reporting to provide accurate data for informed policy decisions to combat violent hate crimes. Such systems should include anonymous and disaggregated information on bias motivations and/or victim groups, and should monitor incidents and offenses, as well as prosecutions. Governments should consider establishing third party complaint procedures to encourage greater reporting of hate crimes and conducting periodic hate crime victimization surveys to monitor underreporting by victims and under recording by police.

7. Create and strengthen antidiscrimination bodies. Official antidiscrimination and human rights bodies should have the authority to address hate crimes through monitoring, reporting, and assistance to victims.

8. Reach out to community groups. Governments should conduct outreach and education efforts to communities and civil society groups to reduce fear and assist victims, advance police-community relations, encourage improved reporting of hate crimes to the police and improve the quality of data collection by law enforcement bodies.

9. Speak out against official intolerance and bigotry. Freedom of speech allows considerable latitude for offensive and hateful speech, but public figures should be held to a higher standard. Members of parliament and local government leaders should be held politically accountable for bigoted words that encourage discrimination and violence and create a climate of fear for minorities.
10. **Encourage international cooperation on hate crimes.** Governments should support and strengthen the mandates of intergovernmental organizations that are addressing discrimination—like the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe, the European Commission against Racism and Intolerance, and the Fundamental Rights Agency—including by encouraging such organizations to raise the capacity of and train police, prosecutors, and judges, as well as other official bodies and civil society groups to combat violent hate crimes. Governments should also provide a detailed accounting on the incidence and nature of hate crimes to these bodies in accordance with relevant commitments.
Confronting Hatred While Respecting Freedom of Expression

Rather than create new international norms restricting freedom of expression, Human Rights First recommends the following steps that governments, political leaders and public officials should take to:

- Combat bias-motivated violence and other forms of public and private discrimination;
- Condemn and counteract speech that incites violence against or promotes acts that curtail the enjoyment of rights by particular individuals and groups on account of their religion, race, national origin, etc.;
- Reduce fear among targeted individuals and communities and diffuse community tensions;
- Promote communication among affected communities, law enforcement, political leadership and civil society; and
- Advance intercultural and interreligious understanding.

These recommendations are based on the work that Human Rights First has done for the past several years to combat racist, antisemitic, xenophobic, anti-Muslim, homophobic and related violence, primarily in North America, Europe and the former Soviet Union.

Guidelines to Confront Hatred

1. Speak Out Against Hatred
   A. Political leaders, government and other officials serving in public office should:
   - Pledge to refrain from using rhetoric that incites violence or promotes acts that curtail the enjoyment of rights by others.
   - Speak out publicly and consistently to condemn such speech when it occurs; build political consensus—reaching out across political party lines—to encourage speaking out.
   
   B. Governments should:
   - Establish guidelines and best practices for public officials at all levels to prevent statements that incite violence or promote acts that would curtail the enjoyment of rights by others.

2. Counteract the Impact of Hatred
   A. Governments and all officials serving in public office should:
   - Provide adequate security to individuals, communities and religious or other institutions that face threats of violence.
   - Establish specialized bodies or empower the appropriate existing bodies to diffuse community tensions as well as foster collaborative approaches and improve lines of communication between local government, local law enforcement, civil society groups, and community leaders to ensure effective responses to violence and hateful public discourse.
   - Train civil servants—particularly those that engage routinely with the public—on promoting respect for the rights of others, dealing with incidents of hate-motivated violence and combating negative stereotypes of, and discrimination against, individuals and groups.
Enact laws prohibiting both public and private discrimination that are in line with international standards and ensure proper oversight and public accountability of their enforcement.

Build public trust in government institutions by ensuring accountability for human rights violations by everyone including government officials—such as racial profiling and police abuse of victims of bias-motivated violence.

Ensure adherence to international treaty commitments guaranteeing freedom of expression, freedom of association and assembly, freedom of religion and belief and other human rights.

B. All officials serving in public office should:

Use every opportunity to affirm common bonds of humanity and to guarantee equal protection under the law without discrimination for all individuals—citizens and noncitizens—in their jurisdiction. Leaders should take advantage of their positions to promote interreligious and intercultural understanding as well as policies and practices of nondiscrimination.

3. Combat Violent Hate Crime

Governments are required to fulfill their international legal obligations to combat discrimination. When discrimination is manifested in hate crimes, States must transform the principles of nondiscrimination and equal protection into practical action.

A. Governments should:

**Acknowledge and condemn violent hate crimes whenever they occur.** Senior government leaders should send immediate, strong, public, and consistent messages that violent hate crimes will be investigated thoroughly and prosecuted to the full extent of the law.

**Strengthen enforcement and prosecute offenders.** Governments should ensure that those responsible for hate crimes are held accountable under the law, that the prosecution of hate crimes against anyone regardless of their legal status in the country is a priority for the criminal justice system.

**Monitor and report on violent hate crimes.** Governments should maintain official systems of monitoring and public reporting to provide accurate data for informed policy decisions to combat violent hate crimes, including against refugees and asylum seekers.

**Reach out to community groups.** Governments should conduct outreach and education efforts to communities and civil society groups to reduce fear and assist victims, advance police-community relations, encourage improved reporting of hate crimes to the police and improve the quality of data collection by law enforcement bodies.

5. Strengthen the Capacity of Intergovernmental Bodies

A. Governments should:

Comply with international norms and cooperate with international human rights bodies and mechanisms that regularly review States’ fulfillment of human rights commitments—including treaty bodies, the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights, and the special procedures of the Human Rights Council concerning freedom of expression, religion and belief, and combating racism.
Support and strengthen the mandates of regional intergovernmental organizations and mechanisms that are addressing discrimination, such as the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE), the Council of Europe, the Organization of American States and others.

Encourage the active participation of civil society groups and representatives of targeted communities in relevant international bodies and mechanisms.
Mr. SMITH. Thank you so much, Ms. Massimino.

Let me just begin the questioning and then yield to my distinguished colleagues.

Dr. Jasser, you talked about this tendency to give Muslims a pass. There are number of Muslim leaders, as you and I know so well, Dr. Ceric, the former Grand Mufti of Bosnia who has spoken out repeatedly as have others. But I find, and you may find this as well, they get almost no traction in the popular media and absolutely no coverage in the Middle East. You pointed out the role that—how did you put it—anti-Semitism is long a tool utilized by Islamists in order to invoke common sympathy from secular nationalists who also developed a hatred of Jews in order to avoid national introspection? To what extent is that understood in the Muslim world? And if you could speak to the role, and others might want to speak to it as well, that hate TV plays.

We had Natan Sharansky testify at one of my hearings years ago, and he brought a clip of a soap opera, so-called, that ran throughout the Middle East that showed a blood libel, a little boy, Christopher, having his throat slit, to be put into the matzah, an absolute libel against Jews, and he said, people believe this. And I am wondering, how can such a lie be embraced by so many people? Where is the corresponding pushback? But if you could speak to that.

Dr. JASSER. Thank you. Thank you, Chairman Smith. I can't tell you how important all these questions are. I will start with the last one which is hate TV and the media. It is no mistake that these ideas are getting traction. It is because of the billions of dollars put behind it. Al Jazeera has a huge following. Egyptian TV, Iranian Press TV, all of these propaganda arms are bolstered with billions of dollars and simply spread a lot of these ideas. And eventually even though the people may distrust and hate their governments and dictatorships, it is going to gain traction in their mindset because that was all they see. And that is why the Arab Awakening has been a good thing in order to begin to have diversity in the media and in the mindsets.

And the other thing is that we have been missing in action as far as promoting ideas and engaging in their media. When we put money into Iraq and the media there that we had, Hora TV, it doesn't get any ratings. They are not going to watch American TV. What we need to do is give platforms to Muslim organizations, Muslim reformers as you mentioned from Bosnia, and we have a coalition of reformers called the American Islamic Leadership Coalition that includes Canadian and American reformers that right now is almost 30 different members of organizations that have been working to expose anti-Semitism. It includes people like Tarek Fatah that has recently written a book on Islamist anti-Semitism. So I think it is important.

These platforms do not come easily. They have had a huge head start because of the funding, and that funding has had a core ideology. The secularists of these dictatorships have in many ways co-opted this anti-Semitism as a bridge to build these coalitions. The people really have been taken by it because there is no infrastructure of education, economic well-being, free markets, in order to counter this. And until the secularists who are a majority, I be-
lieve, find some unifying idea, they are going to continue to be fractionated, and the Islamists who are only a plurality are going to continue to win elections as they have in Egypt and Tunisia until the secularists can come together in a unifying idea such as liberty. In the meantime, they have only been unified by generations of hate.

Mubarak, who was supposedly our ally, showed the protocols. Assad, in Syria, and his father instilled hate. They instill hate in their population even though they are secular against faith communities because it works to monopolize the masses and control their mindset via anti-Semitism as the tool to do that. And I can't tell you enough how much it is important for us to develop public-private partnerships of reform based organizations, and I think anti-Semitism work against it will be a tool to begin to get into taking sides within the house of Islam. As long as we don't take sides the Islamists are going to win because they are the strong horse.

Mr. SMITH. Let me ask you, Dr. Lantos Swett, what you in your testimony quoted Egyptian President Morsi as urging the teaching of hatred of Jews to the country's children. Why is it that so many governments, and that would include our own, mistakingly look at the Muslim Brotherhood as somehow being moderate when it has such a profoundly anti-Semitic foundation to it?

Ms. LANTOS SWETT. Well, I think this relates to an ongoing challenge that those of us who advocate passionately on behalf of human rights face, and that is the ever-present spectre of realpolitik. I think that we have historically viewed the Muslim Brotherhood as a very dangerous organization with values and principles and platforms utterly inimical to our American values and democracy. But as my colleague Zuhdi Jasser just said, because the Muslim Brotherhood specifically in Egypt was the strong horse after the fall of Mubarak, we found ourselves walking down that road of finding reasons to excuse and explain away very, very disturbing elements of their platform.

And I think that is the situation that we find ourselves in. I think it is also sadly a reality that Morsi is probably now relatively speaking moderate as against some of the really extreme Salafis who are part of his coalition and are playing a very, very significant role in Egypt today. So I think we are drawn down that road, and history shows again and again and again that human rights, when they are marginalized, when they are put in a neat, tidy, little box in the corner, is something that we simply address rhetorically every now and then and then conveniently kind of stash them in that diplomatic corner labeled irrelevant and unimportant. It comes back to bite us in a very hard way when it comes to the rubber meets the road reality of American politics.

My colleague, Elisa Massimino, down at the end of the table, spoke about the need for the United States to develop a national security policy based around the priority and importance of religious freedom. Anybody with eyes to see can understand that many of the gravest threats facing our nation today from a national security and a terrorism, anti-terrorism perspective are coming from societies where religious freedom is constrained, where you don't have robust protections that lead to tolerance, democracy, pluralism, all the virtues that we are here advancing. So it is a very
dangerous and short-sighted game to ignore the long term strength that comes to a society when we base our policies on standing firmly and strongly for our most profound values. Because those profound values of pluralism, tolerance, democracy, equality, and freedom have built the strong nation that we enjoy today. And it is by pursuing and strengthening those policies abroad that we can build strong allies and strong partners.

Mr. SMITH. The chair’s time is expired. Mr. Cicilline?

Mr. CICILLINE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you to the witnesses for a really compelling and powerful testimony. I am certain that if everyone in the world had the opportunity to just hear the testimony of these five witnesses it would mark significant progress in our efforts to eradicate anti-Semitism. So thank you. And particularly thank you because I think the particular power of non-Jewish voices in this work is significant, and you all represent very important organizations and institutions and religious traditions that I think need to play a very important leadership role in helping to eradicate anti-Semitism all over the world.

And I am struggling to think of what we can do as a Congress. It seems to me as President Garvey said, this seems so obvious that it is difficult to imagine we need to have a hearing on it. But I think it is really actually a very valuable exercise and I thank the chairman for convening this, because I think the more we raise attention to the reality of anti-Semitism, sort of acknowledging that this is a worldwide and serious problem, I think, is the first and most important step. And then bringing attention to it and having universal condemnation of it.

But I want to just focus for my few minutes on the education component, because it seems to me the condemnation and the continuing to be sure that people understand the reality of anti-Semitism by collecting data and tracking it and all that part is certainly something that everyone should accept as important. But what I want to try to understand is what we might be able to do to help deal with ways to educate the next generation of people in our world about the dangers of anti-Semitism and how it is not simply a Jewish problem but a problem for humanity and a problem for human dignity and religious freedom all over the world.

We have in my district something called the Holocaust Education and Resource Center of Rhode Island whose mission it is to reduce prejudice and the injustice of bigotry against all minorities by teaching the current generation about the Holocaust and using the Holocaust as a way to really teach important values of human dignity and religious freedom. And I just would like each of the witnesses to sort of comment on what can we do as Members of Congress that will most effectively respond to this very serious rise to anti-Semitism all over the world?

I mean as Dr. Lantos Swett mentioned—and it is a great honor to welcome you to the committee—as a new Member of Congress, your father was a huge hero to me, and a great inspiration to so many people—but as you mentioned in your testimony, this effort to eradicate the Jews began 25 centuries ago and unfortunately, of course, was evidenced by very horrific actionable events throughout history that operationalized that effort to eradicate Jews from the murder of 6 million Jews to individual instances of anti-Semitism.
So I would just like to ask each of the witnesses to suggest to us something we can do that will help in this really important effort, and again, thank you for your testimonies. Maybe start with Dr. Lantos Swett.

Ms. LANTOS SWETT. Well, it is a wonderful question and it is one that I don't have a simple answer to. But I look with some optimism at where we in this country and to some extent globally have come as a society and as a world on many long and persistent evils that beset us.

I went with my family this past weekend to Gettysburg. I had never actually been there before and it was a really profound experience. I recommend it to anybody who has not gone. I could not help but be struck by the fact that less than 150 years after that terrible, terrible battle, which was sort of the turning of a war to try and erase a terrible stain on our nation's history and our character and our claim to be a decent people, that we did as a society and as a country move to the point where the first African American was elected President of the United States. And it is no longer permissible in polite society for that sort of racism to be expressed. I encounter it very rarely. I know it is not eradicated, but it has been to an overwhelming extent eliminated.

More recently I look back on my youth, let alone my childhood, and certain just calm and easy expressions of bigotry and really cruelty toward gay and lesbian members of our society, it was just okay. It was just kind of considered normative, if you will. I think we are moving to the point where that also is being eliminated, and yet this strange, toxic pathology of anti-Semitism persists and has a sort of a pass. I see it and hear it on college campuses. I teach at Tufts University. And I see and hear of it in a variety of venues. And so I don't know why, as we see society generally progressing, this one form of evil gets something of a pass.

I was incredibly moved by Mr. Metaxas' brilliant exposition of how impermissible, insupportable this attitude is from the Christian lens and perspective, but I don't think we have cracked that nut. Certainly, Holocaust education is part of it, but at some level this goes very deep. We have to confront the evil within. What is it within societies that permit this to somehow be given a pass where other prejudices and other forms of racism and intolerance are not?

Mr. SMITH. Mr. Marino?

Mr. MARINO. Thank you, Chairman. This question, I think, I am going to direct to Mr. Metaxas. Am I pronouncing your name correctly?

Mr. METAXAS. No one knows the actual pronunciation so that is just as good as any.

Mr. MARINO. Okay, so how about if we go with Mr. M? Thank you, sir. Thank you all for being here. A very specific question. I would like you to elaborate on it if you could, and if there is time, anyone else who wants to jump in, please do.

I had the opportunity to visit Israel last year, spent a couple of sessions in a group meeting with Prime Minister Netanyahu and other officials. But equally important, meeting with the citizens of the people of the Israel and actually being there when there were attacks coming from Palestine. Hearing the explosions, hearing the
sirens go off, and being told that they teach their children that they have about 15 seconds once they hear that siren go off to get to some location to try and get protection.

So how does one negotiate when Prime Minister Netanyahu has said to the Palestinians, I will talk with you anytime, anywhere, let us get started, but the so-called leaders of Palestine stand in front of the cameras and make statements such as, we may talk with you once we go back to what we want which are pre-1967 borders, and at that time we may stop attacking, we may sit down and negotiate? So what is the alternative there when you have—I am using this word loosely—leaders in Palestine with that kind of talk and that kind of arrogant attitude?

Mr. METAXAS. Well, if you are asking me how to negotiate with recalcitrant Palestinians, I don't know. I will tell you I think really the issue here, because we talk about realpolitik, we talk about what can we do. For me it is an issue, and I touched on this in my remarks, of foundational principles. Can we discuss, dare we any more in the climate in which we live, which is so infected with the political correctness, dare we assert the idea that some ideas are right and some ideas are wrong, and on what basis do we do that?

In this country we have not historically been shy about that. We have asserted ideas. The founding fathers bequeathed to us this idea of ordered liberty, and I think we are at this point in history as Americans largely ignorant of what that even is, and we have enjoyed its blessings so much that we have become complacent and don't appreciate the fragility of this flower, of what the American experiment and ordered liberty is. I bring this up because I think at the heart of that is religious freedom and freedom of conscience. And if Americans themselves don't understand what this is, what this extraordinarily fragile and infinitely valuable gift is that we have been given, if we cannot articulate what that is how do we expect the rest of the world to do that? How do we expect the rest of the world to articulate what religious liberty is, what religious freedom is, why someone should be able to say something even though I don't agree with it?

If we are not teaching that—and it gets back to education—if we are not teaching that in our schools, and for about 40 years in my memory we have not been teaching that anymore, because I am not sure that we believe it or that the cultural elites or the people who are in academia are comfortable with it or themselves believe it, so we have allowed ourselves to drift, to take this for granted and to think somehow that things will be okay. This fragile flower of religious liberty and the ordered freedoms bequeathed to us by the founders requires tending. If it is not tended by Americans it will die. And I don't see any other place on the surface of the globe where these wonderful ideas are just going to bubble up. Frankly, what bubbles up, traditionally, is tribalism, violence, sectarian violence. This is normal for what happens on the surface of the globe.

So if we in America aren't vigilant about explaining and educating and ourselves understanding what it is that we have if, in fact, it is worth having and worth fighting for—if we don't understand it and require our children to understand it, America will evaporate. We are a nation of ideas, and if we don't have a citi-
zenry that appreciates what it is that requires us to respect those with whom we disagree and to fight for those with whom we disagree, if we don’t understand that all is lost. And so I would say to you here, this is at the heart of the problem, that we used to lead the world in this. We used to understand this. We certainly had leaders who understood this. We hardly do anymore, and it will lead to grave problems. And it is now obviously leading to grave problems.

Mr. MARINO. Thank you. I yield back.

Mr. SMITH. Thank you. Ranking Member Bass?

Ms. BASS. Let me take the opportunity to thank the witnesses that are here today, and apologize to you to say that one of the things that is so challenging about life here in the Capitol is when you are supposed to be in three places at the same time. And so unfortunately I am not able to stay, but I definitely wanted to associate myself with the comments that you were just making when you talk about how vigilant we need to stay in our country, because in so many instances in history we have moved forward only to go backward.

And we have certainly seen a rise of hate in this country like we haven’t seen in many years just in terms of the number of hate groups that have sprung up, incidences that are happening all over the country. So the topic today, I think, is very appropriate and I appreciate you taking the time to come out. The community I represent in Los Angeles has a large Jewish community and, in fact, the Museum of Tolerance is in my district and has definitely been a shining light for the City of Los Angeles in terms of making sure that we always stay vigilant on these issues.

I did want to ask a question about the newly created Atrocities Prevention Board. And I wanted to know—as a matter of fact I was there when the President announced that. I think it was 1 year ago or maybe it was even 2. But I wanted to know if you would comment on that, and this is directed to anybody on the panel, and how you think that might be leveraged to address anti-Semitism.

Ms. MASSIMINO. Thank you so much, Congresswoman. Human Rights First has worked extensively to help create the Atrocities Prevention Board and we continue to work there to press for a strategy that can address a broad range of tools for atrocities prevention. And of course a number of us on this panel have talked about the relationship between hate speech and the enabling environment that that creates and the perpetration of violence based on hate. We have seen that in our own society and we certainly see it across the globe. The Holocaust Museum had an excellent exhibit several years ago on the relationship between anti-Semitic propaganda and the road toward the Holocaust. And I think the United States can play the most constructive role perhaps than any other country in the world in navigating what to do about the relationship between hate speech and violence, because we have a strong commitment to free expression, but we also know that hate speech has to be confronted by political leaders.

And I wanted to respond to this question of Mr. Cicilline about what Congress can do. And on this issue in particular, I think, through your relationships with your counterparts in other countries particularly in the countries of the OSCE but across the globe,
I would urge all of you in your individual capacities to call out the lack of counter-speech by political leaders and in the face of anti-Semitism, and as well in the context of the OSCE of which we are a member and Mr. Chairman has played such a leadership role there.

Ignorance and hate are a very lethal combination and education is hugely important. Education of youth, but also we need to understand a problem before we can solve it and there is a terrible data deficit about anti-Semitic hate violence. There are 21 states now in the OSCE who have committed to producing this data, collecting this data. Only five states are reporting on it in all of the OSCE, and we need to be a leader in changing that.

Also I think Congress can be asking Secretary Kerry and the administration more broadly, what is the strategy for combating anti-Semitism? We view this as a national security issue, we think the administration should too. You all created the position of the Special Envoy on anti-Semitism. You should press to get an appointment there, somebody with the stature and credibility for cross-community outreach who can really help lead that strategy.

And also on education, I think it is not enough just to look to the education of our own youth through the Museum of Tolerance or the Holocaust Museum, but we also—and this is something that Congress needs to take the lead on—need to look at the role of the Saudis in propagating hate through textbooks. These hearings are important, but it is a drop in the bucket when you think about the young people who are being educated using textbooks that demonize Jews. We are facing a generational problem and Congress should be inquiring about that.

And lastly, I hope you will use the appropriations authority to support civil society groups who are working on the front lines in all of these countries to try to combat intolerance and anti-Semitism and hate crime. Thanks.

Ms. Bass. Thank you very much.

Mr. Smith. Thank you. Mr. Meadows?

Mr. Meadows. I thank each one of you for highlighting this important and critical topic. As we look at it, who will be the next Bonhoeffers? Who will be the next Wilberforces? And I am looking at a panel that perhaps history will show that because of your efforts we will see you in that light. I just want to say thank you. I am jotting down a few notes as we have gone forward in terms of action items and I think, Dr. Jasser, you said name and shame to use your quoted words there as we look at that. And Dr. Lantos Swett, yesterday I know you were talking about the human rights violations that are not just with this particular issue but against women and children with Muslim Brotherhood as in your testimony yesterday.

So my question to each one of you, if you could give us two action points of what we can do to highlight this and keep it in the forefront of everybody’s mind. Because what we do is we create organizations. We create titles. We have international organizations that are for human rights, and yet they are hollow in terms of what they actually protect and stand up for. And so identifying those that are real versus not real, I would love two action points from each one of you in my time remaining. Dr. Swett?
Ms. LANTOS SWETT. Well, something very specific and timely, I know that President Obama is getting ready to take his first trip to Israel since he became President, where the context, the platform, the forum in which one speaks out against these evils is often more important than the words that you say, because we could fill up this room from floor to ceiling with brilliant expositions on the evils of anti-Semitism but in a relatively obscure setting.

I think it would be wonderful if all 435 members of the United States Congress were to call the White House in the next few days and say, we would like to have President Obama speak out in the biggest platform that he is going to have on this trip, which will get a lot of attention in Europe and the Middle East, about this issue. Context, platform, how big is that pulpit from which these critical things that as Dr. Garvey said, we all know, it is self-evident, and yet it is not spoken where it is heard. It has become sort of background and wallpaper. So that is kind of a very specific, concrete thing that in the runup to this very high profile visit which will be under the spotlight, huge pressure on the President to call out this sort of appalling, endemic saturation of anti-Semitism in the Muslim world that Dr. Jasser spoke about so powerfully.

Mr. MEADOWS. In very clear terms, is what you say.

Ms. LANTOS SWETT. In clear terms, and no moral equivalence. None of this on the one hand and on the other hand. Because the minute we sort of take this evil and kind of put it again on the wallpaper, well, we have got this unfortunate thing and we have got that unfortunate thing, and don't let me forget to mention this third unfortunate thing, you pretty much have robbed it of all of its power and all of its impact. So I think that would be one very concrete thing that I would suggest.

Mr. MEADOWS. Okay.

Ms. LANTOS SWETT. And I just want to say, because I know we are getting not far adrift, but one of the things that is so troubling is the resurgence of this evil in Europe.

Mr. MEADOWS. Right.

Ms. LANTOS SWETT. And I do hope we will have a chance to address that because it is very frightening to see it coming back there.

Mr. MEADOWS. And maybe some of the rest of you can address that. Dr. Jasser, go ahead.

Dr. JASSER. Yes, the two things I would say is, actually one main point is we need to create a national consensus. And I would say as obvious as anti-Semitism is, don't abandon this issue, because it is the issue that leads us to the conclusion as a nation that Islamism is the problem, is the root cause. That political Islam cannot be put in a wrap and made to look nice. It is a theocratic, theopolitical movement that we need to start looking upon the way we did communism.

When Mr. Marino was talking about Israel, Hamas is the Muslim Brotherhood. It was an outshoot of it and that is what you get when the Brotherhood comes to power is this——

Mr. MEADOWS. And is it true they don't even recognize the existence or Israel's right to exist, is that correct?

Dr. JASSER. Exactly. And this is what happens when one faith group based on a political movement gets into control, other coun-
tries that have a secular basis that believe in liberal democracy will be looked upon as evil and will not be looked upon as their allies. So based on that national consensus, two things I would ask you to do. Demand that our Secretary of State, our White House, disengage from Islamist movements in Europe and America and in the Middle East, and then engage with Muslim movements that are pro-liberty, anti-Islamist, and are looking to build platforms. Those two things. Disengage Islamists like the Brotherhood, and engage with anti-Islamists.

Ms. LANTOS SWETT. And I just want to jump in on one thing, because I think it is a point that needs to be made that pertains very much to what Zuhdi has talked about. And that is that much of the resurgence in Europe is coming from the radical elements of the Muslim community in Europe. So some of the re-infection, if you will, of this hatred and targeting of the Jews does trace its roots to precisely the movements that Dr. Jasser is referring to. So there is a link there. It is not just the Arab world.

Dr. JASSER. And European Muslims are watching Al Jazeera and Middle Eastern media.

Mr. MEADOWS. I see my time is expired. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. METAXAS. I apologize for having to walk out, but just to say that I do think it is a lack of will and resolve in the West that exists today that did not exist let us say 30 years ago, to call things what they are. That I would say is a misunderstanding of what liberty is, a misunderstanding of what freedom of expression is that would allow people to take advantage, ultimately, of our openness. That is what is clearly happening much more in Europe than it is happening here.

We know that it is happening in Great Britain. You may be familiar with the work of Baroness Caroline Cox over there. People are loath to see this. Somehow they are looking away from it. If we in America cannot reassert our foundational principles about what is right and what is wrong and stand against those who would bully us, who would take advantage of our openness, which is precisely what is happening that is allowing these things, then there is nothing to discuss. It really is up to us and we must decide whether we are willing to do that. Up until now, recently, we have absolutely not been willing to do that.

Mr. GARVEY. Can I just add one legal point to follow up on what Mr. Metaxas was saying? The First Amendment, as you know, provides more protection than we might wish for hateful speech, and I want to say two things about that which we need to keep in mind in these discussions. One is this: The fact that the First Amendment protects speech does not mean that it is not loathesome and shouldn’t be condemned. Second, we have said since the 1920s, since Justice Holmes and Justice Brandeis first began speaking about this issue, that the remedy for hateful speech is more speech. And that is the one thing that all the members of the panel today and Mr. Meadows seem to have agreed on as something the government should do. The culture that we create by speaking out about anti-Semitism is, in some ways, the most important step that we need to take.
Ms. MASSIMINO. Can I add just one thing to that? You asked for a couple of action items from each of us, and I would say reiterating this point that something all of you can do. We cannot let any instance of anti-Semitic hate speech go unchallenged, and that is a big job, sadly. But we all have to take that up. We have to create a climate of intolerance for intolerance, and we need to call on members of civil society who fall down on that front, political leaders who fall down on that front. And then on the deterrent side we have to empower law enforcement where there is hate violence. We do a good job in this country, thanks to the Matthew Shepard Act and other, to prosecute hate crime. Other countries are not as well developed and we can help them through our law enforcement training and funding.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. Weber?

Mr. WEBER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. A couple of questions. First of all for, I guess, Dr. Lantos Swett. I didn't catch the name of the gentleman, the high-ranking official that you had that discussion with.

Ms. LANTOS SWETT. I can give it you. I don't have it off the top of my head. He was a deputy minister. And if I could finish that story briefly. After I confronted him, and of course the answer was basically, attack Israel, attack Israel. But I tried to pivot and I said, what if your President, Mr. Morsi, tomorrow were to stand up in a major platform and say, enough. This is a shame. This is a stain on our character. No more. I will not do it and we will not tolerate it among leadership in our Government and it needs to end. I said, well, the next day he would be lauded from every capital for standing up, courageously speaking out, trying to change in a high-profile way this infection within the body politic of the Muslim world and that this would be a very positive thing. In sharing that conversation the following day with a group of reformers in Egypt, they gave a very, very disheartening and disturbing response. They said yes, but the day after the day after he said that he would be assassinated by his own people, which was sobering to say the least.

Mr. WEBER. Okay. My colleague here, Mr. Meadows, was asking for action items and I think—is it Massimino? Is that how we are saying that?

Ms. MASSIMINO. Yes.

Mr. WEBER. I think you made the comment that the Saudis have been basically promulgating anti-Semitism through their education literature. Do I remember that right?

Ms. MASSIMINO. That is right.

Mr. WEBER. So are you actively engaged in getting NGOs to go into countries and to combat this at the very lowest levels including preschool care, kindergarten, if you will, and up? Are you actively engaged in trying to employ the help of those people, the churches? I don’t know what all kinds of organizations would be in those countries. You are coming to us and you are saying you need our help, and rightfully so. And I want to be, count me as being part of that help. But are you doing more than that? Are you going into the countries? Are you talking to people, to NGOs, to churches, to synagogues?
Part of American’s history was that when King George was really doing a number on us back in Colonial days, the preachers and the churches stood up and spoke out. And, I think we need that kind of ground swell and that kind of support from ordinary citizens. Are you going after that kind of support?

Ms. MASSIMINO. Well, it is a very good point. I think that behind it, I think, is this idea that change has to come from within these societies and at the ground level. And, in fact, we have talked to a lot of people in countries where this kind of education has taken hold. And there are many, many who are dissatisfied with that but have few alternatives. It is a massive societal problem and one that I think the U.S. Government could do a lot to address with funding of the local groups who want to make a difference.

There is a limit, I think, to what organizations like mine that sit in New York and Washington can do on the ground there, but I can tell you that there are a number of people—this is not something that needs to be imposed from outside. There are plenty of people on the ground in these countries, they are fearful but they need support. They are not getting support in their own countries. And many of the countries, this is a circle of repression that you, Mr. Chairman, know so well with governments who try to cut off funding for those progressive groups who are trying to make a difference and they need to seek funding from outside. So that is something that the United States can be doing, is supporting the various civil society groups, religious groups, education groups and others who are trying to promote a more objective and invest in the long term education of their children.

Mr. WEBER. Okay, let me put you all on the spot. If the Saudis are indeed engaged in that practice, and I have no need to doubt that you are correct, would you all—I am going to put on my energy hat for a minute. I think that if America becomes energy independent and we don’t export dollars to the Saudis in exchange for energy, then it actually helps us on two fronts, would you agree? And would you help spread the word that America needs to be energy independent? I am going to proselytize you all from that end. Can I get an amen?

All right. I see that my time is expired, Mr. Chairman, thank you very much.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. Weber, thank you very much.
I want to thank our very distinguished panel. You have provided incredible insights and suggestions and I hope that many members read this record. It will be widely disseminated. And thank you so very, very much for your testimonies.

I would like to now welcome our second panel to the witness table beginning with Dr. Tamas Fellegi who began his career teaching law and government in Hungary. He went on to become a research fellow at Harvard and earned a Ph.D in the United States. After teaching, he worked in the private sector before joining the Hungarian Government to serve as Minister of National Development, and then to lead Hungary’s financial negotiations with the International Monetary Fund and European Commission.

We will then hear from Mr. Willy Silberstein who has served as the chairman of the Swedish Committee Against anti-Semitism since 2009 where he works to counter anti-Semitism through edu-
cation. He has also worked as a journalist, editor, and commentator for newspapers, magazines, and television channels in Sweden, and as a foreign correspondent in Belgium. He now runs his own company that focuses on the media.

We will then hear from Rabbi Andrew Baker who is the director of International Jewish Affairs for the American Jewish Committee, and the personal representative of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe Chair-in-Office on Combating anti-Semitism, and has been reappointed in each year since 2009 to that extremely strategic and important position. Rabbi Baker has served as president of the Washington Board of Rabbis, president of the Interfaith Conference of Washington, and I know I have worked very closely with him over these many years in combating anti-Semitism, and thank him again publicly for his extraordinary work.

We will then hear from Rabbi David Meyer who is a rabbi based in Brussels, Belgium, and professor of Rabbinic Literature and Contemporary Jewish Thought at the Gregorian Pontifical University in Rome as well as the University of Leuven. He is also a regular visiting professor in universities in Peru and in China teaching Judaism. He is also involved with projects in Rwanda working with Tutsi survivors of the genocide of 1994. Rabbi Meyer has now published six books on theological and rabbinic issues.

We will then hear from Rabbi Yaakov Bleich who is originally from Brooklyn, New York, but who moved to Kiev, Ukraine in 1989, where he was named Chief Rabbi of Kiev in Ukraine shortly thereafter and served in that post ever since. He has been instrumental in founding many organizations in the Jewish community in Ukraine. Rabbi Bleich has worked to advance interreligious and interethnic relations in Ukraine and around the world.

And finally we will hear from Mr. Andrew Surlevitch who is the anti-Defamation League’s Director of European Affairs. He engages with European Jewish communities to monitor, react to anti-Semitism, and analyzes European governments’ relations with Israel and policies on the Middle East peace process. He previously worked at the Conference of Presidents of Major American Jewish Organizations, and served as executive director of UN Watch in Switzerland. I thank you for being here and for your testimony.

Dr. Fellegi?

STATEMENT OF TAMÁS FELLEGI, PH.D., MANAGING PARTNER, EUROATLANTIC SOLUTIONS (FORMER MINISTER OF NATIONAL DEVELOPMENT, GOVERNMENT OF HUNGARY)

Mr. Fellegi. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. It is an honor for me to testify for and about Hungary. It is the country where I was born, and where as a Jew and as a descendant of Holocaust survivors I feel at home. Preparing for this public hearing I spoke to executives of Jewish organizations, religious leaders, university professors, government people, and opposition figures. However, what follows here represents my ideas and my evaluation of the current situation. Mr. Chairman, I have submitted a written testimony, and I would like that to be included in the record of the hearings.
I would like to anchor my brief opening statements on three main tenets. First, the rise of anti-Semitism has complex reasons, but at its core the current phenomenon is an expression of frustration with Hungary’s imperfect democratic transition. Second, only Jobbik, a party with a 10-percent base among the national population is an openly anti-Semitic party. There is a clear line of demarcation between Jobbik and the center-right government and all other mainstream political parties in Hungary. Third, despite the presence of Jobbik and anti-Semitic rhetoric, Jewish life including religious life has been witnessing a renaissance in Hungary that is welcomed by all mainstream parties.

Let me put all this into historic perspective. Prejudice against Jews both open and latent has always been present in Europe. But it is important to distinguish between deep-seated prejudice against Jews and the use of anti-Semitism for political manipulation. Following the era of Admiral Horthy, which was marked by a Nazi-style, anti-Jewish legislation and ultimately by the Hungarian Holocaust, the issue of anti-Semitism was swept under the rug during the almost 45 years of Communist rule. The democratic changes of 1989–1990, including freedom of speech and of the press allowed for suppressed frustrations and debates about our troubled past to come to the surface. They also enabled ever-present latent anti-Semitism to become manifest. Several openly anti-Semitic political and civic organizations were formed, but they never—let me emphasize this point—never ended up in government.

The most recent example is the xenophobic party, Jobbik, which started out as a radical anti-establishment movement. In 2010, after 8 years of socialist-liberal government which brought Hungary to the brink of economic collapse, Jobbik managed to get around 15 percent of the popular vote to become the third largest party in the Hungarian Parliament. It also cultivated an aggressive paramilitary arm which was banned by the present government but keeps reinventing itself. It has become a fact of life that Jobbik politicians taking advantage of freedom of speech have the openly racist views on Web sites and in print magazines and even in the Hungarian Parliament.

A negative consequence of this has been the decline of public sensitivity toward racism. What is also there, however, is that Jewish life in Hungary started to blossom from day one of the advent of democracy. Hungary has one of the largest Jewish populations in Europe, with some estimates going as high as 120,000. It supports extremely popular summer camps, schools, synagogues, and the Summer Festival that attracts Jews from all over Europe. There are courses in Hebrew offered by language schools and there are a number of new Jewish weeklies and periodicals. All historic Jewish groups are acknowledged and registered as established religions. Along with growing anti-Semitism these facts should not be ignored.

Let me briefly list the milestones that democratic Hungary has carried out since the collapse of communism in an effort to reconcile with the Jewish community. The establishment of the Hungarian Jewish Heritage Fund. The Kaddish was recited in Parliament in a memorial for victims of the Shoah. A national Holocaust Memorial Day is compulsory in all public schools on April
16th, commemorating the anniversary of the start of deportations in 1944. Teaching Holocaust history was made mandatory in schools from fifth to twelfth graders. The Holocaust Memorial and Documentation Center and the House of Terror Memorial Museum were established.

Holocaust survivors restitution claims have been settled. Pension payments to Holocaust survivors were doubled. 2012 was designated Raoul Wallenberg Memorial Year. A Holocaust Memorial Committee chaired by the head of the Prime Minister's office has been set up to commemorate the 70th anniversary of the Hungarian Holocaust next year. Hungary repeatedly requested the U.S. authorities to shut down the openly anti-Semitic, Nazi-style Hungarian language Web site called kuruc.info which operates in the United States. Paramilitary groups inciting hatred were banned and the criminal code was tightened regarding uniformed crime. Parliamentary House Rules were amended to allow the Speaker of the House to fine or expel MPs if they use hateful language. Finally, the first court verdict that convicted a Holocaust denier was handed down. The court sent the offender to visit either the Holocaust Museum, Yad Vashem or Auswitz, and write a report about the trip.

I earlier referred to the fact that anti-Semitism and racism in general have been on the rise, which tells us that Hungary must do much more in this field. Having said this, let me conclude by a probably surprising closing statement. In terms of government actions to foster Jewish life and combat anti-Semitism in Hungary, all of the milestones I listed a minute ago, with the exception of the Jewish Heritage Fund, put in place during the first and second administrations of Prime Minister Viktor Orban.

Thank you very much for your attention. I am ready for your comments and questions.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Fellegi follows:]
Testimony of Tamás Fellegi

Before the U.S. House of Representatives Committee on Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Africa, Global Health, Global Human Rights, and International Organizations

Hearing on “Anti-Semitism: A Growing Threat to All Faiths”
February 27, 2013

Chairman Smith, Distinguished Members of the Hearing Committee,
Ladies and Gentlemen:

It is a real honor for me to be invited to testify for and about Hungary. A country, where I was born and where as a Jew I feel at home. I cannot stress enough the importance of this hearing, which comes at a time when Hungary is going through major changes internally.

Preparing for this public hearing, I spoke to several prominent figures of Hungarian public life, including executives of Jewish organizations, religious leaders, intellectuals, university professors, government people and opposition figures, including the prime minister and the president of the Hungarian Socialist Party. However, what follows here represents my ideas and my evaluation of the current situation.

I would like to anchor my brief opening on three main tenets:

First, anti-Semitism has been on the rise in Hungary. This fact has complex reasons but at its core, the current phenomenon is an expression of frustration with Hungary’s imperfect democratic transition, and especially with the deep political, moral and economic crisis dominating Hungary since 2006.

Second, only Jobbik, a party with a ten percent base among the national population, is an openly anti-Semitic party. There is a clear line of demarcation between Jobbik, and the center-right government and all other mainstream political parties.

Third, despite all this, Jewish life, including religious life, has been enjoying a renaissance in Hungary that is welcome and encouraged by all mainstream parties.

Let me put these points into a historical perspective. Similarly to most of Europe, prejudice against Jews has always been present in Hungary, both open and latent. However, it is important to distinguish between deep-seated prejudices and anti-Semitic manifestations, and the use of anti-Semitism for political manipulation or to gain political advantages.
In Hungary, Jews lived, ever since the 13th century, under circumstances that were unparalleled in Medieval and early modern continental Europe. By the 19th century, the Hungarian Jewish community became one of the most numerous, successful, integrated and assimilated minorities in Europe, in all aspects of life: education, business, culture, and the arts. But this favorable and welcoming atmosphere changed for the worse following World War I. While Europe's Jews found refuge in Hungary fleeing from Nazism, the political elite, lead by Regent Miklos Horthy – who is still one of the most debated public figures of Hungary – eventually bowed to the pressure of Nazi Germany. Between 1920 and 1945, he oversaw the introduction of anti-Jewish legislation, and Hungary's involvement in the Second World War on the side of Nazi Germany. The Hungarian Holocaust, which happened with the active participation of the Hungarian political establishment, became a tragedy of our entire nation.

During the almost 45 years of Communist rule, any realistic chance to honestly face the legacy of the pre-war era and the Second World War was denied by the one-party rule. Anti-Semitism, however, was tangible in the infighting of the Communist elite. In society in general, anti-Jewish sentiments took the appearance of an anti-Israeli stance, especially after the 1967 Middle East war, when the open manifestation of anti-Semitism by the European Left was disguised as criticism of Israeli policies. Undoubtedly, we still carry on this legacy in Hungary and elsewhere in Europe.

The democratic changes of 1989-1990, the freedom of speech and of the media allowed open discussion about our twentieth century history and its legacy. Previously suppressed frustrations and open debates we never had before about our troubled past came to the surface. Thus, the same democratization itself made ever-present latent anti-Semitism manifest.

Several openly anti-Semitic political and civic organizations have surfaced, but they have never – and let me emphasize this point – never ended up in government. Here, I have to mention the establishment of the openly anti-Semitic and anti-Roma party, Jobbik, which started out as a radical anti-establishment movement, revolting against the post-communist political elite, and has picked up its racist and anti-Semitic edge as a tool of political marketing, only to be immediately engulfed by it.

Today, the essence of Jobbik is a gut reaction against the status quo. It is a radical statement made against the EU, against the entire 'post-Communist' political establishment, against the unrealized economic security of the democratic transition, dressed up in racism. It is a catch-all party, giving everyone a little bit of something to hate and someone to blame.

After eight years of socialist-liberal government, which brought Hungary to the brink of economic collapse and essentially let the rural population of Hungary become a prey of
local gangs, Jobbik managed to get around 15 percent of the popular vote in 2010 to become the third largest party in Parliament. It has also cultivated an aggressive paramilitary arm, which was banned by the present government but keeps reinventing itself. Constitutionally-protected freedom of speech enables Jobbik to voice its openly racist views on websites and print magazines and even in the Hungarian Parliament. I personally believe that the most negative consequence of this has been the decline of public sensitivity to racism. Whether people dismiss the ideas of Jobbik or not – it is still there.

What is also there, however, is a rebirth of Jewish culture. Jewish life in Hungary started to blossom from day one of democracy. Thousands of families started to speak about their history, both as individuals and as a people. The Lubavich Community has a strong presence. An extremely popular summer camp for Jewish children in Szarvas brings together Jewish children from all across Hungary; there is a high school to complement the Rabbinic Seminary, which, by the way, happened to be the only functioning one in any Communist country. A new synagogue will be built in Csepel for the first time in 80 years. The Main Synagogue in Dohány utca, which was for a long time the second largest synagogue in the world, has become a touristic and cultural hub. Budapest's formerly abandoned Jewish district is now the most lively part of downtown Pest. The Lauder Yavne School is one of the best educational institutions in the nation, and Hungary just opened the International Israeli Cultural Institute. The annual Jewish Summer Festival brings thousands from all across Europe; there are courses in Hebrew offered by language schools and there is a number of Jewish weeklies and periodicals which did not exist before. All historic Jewish groups are acknowledged and registered as religious institutions entitled to receive state support for the cultural contributions they make. These facts about the state of Jewish life in Hungary cannot be ignored.

In our newly born democracy, both anti-Semitism and pro-Jewish sentiments have become openly political. Political parties and civil organizations very quickly recognized how anti-Semitism could be used to gain political support and sympathy at home and abroad. Anti-Semitism has become a political card to be used.

Patterns of voting behavior and public opinion polls clearly indicate that, when it comes to anti-Semitism, there is a substantial overlap between the electorate of the Left and that of the far-right Jobbik Party. Does this mean that the political Left is racist or the center-right is devoid of prejudices? The answer to both questions is no. One should not really argue that certain writings by journalists associated with the center-right, such as the infamous commentaries of Zsolt Bayer, cannot be deemed as racist. It is also a fact that there are people associated with the center-right political community who support the rehabilitation of the historic period of Admiral Horthy. I am personally against his rehabilitation, and that applies to a wide range of political and literary figures of that era.
Let me briefly list the milestones that democratic Hungary has done as a nation since the collapse of Communism to reconcile with the Jewish community:

- Establishment of the Hungarian Jewish Heritage Fund
- The Kaddish was cited in Parliament to commemorate the victims of the Shoah;
- Designating April 16th as a national Holocaust Memorial Day compulsory in all public schools to commemorate the anniversary of the start of deportations in 1944;
- Teaching of Holocaust history was made mandatory in schools for 5th-12th graders;
- The Holocaust Memorial and Documentation Center and the House of Terror Memorial Museum have been established;
- Restitution claims of Holocaust survivors have been settled;
- Establishment and financial support of the Tom Lantos Institute in Hungary in association with the Lantos Foundation on Human Rights;
- Doubling the pension payments of Holocaust survivors;
- 2012 was proclaimed as Raoul Wallenberg Memorial Year
- A Holocaust memorial committee chaired by the head of the Prime Minister’s Office has been set up to commemorate the 70th anniversary of the Hungarian Holocaust in 2014;
- Each section of the bank of the Danube bears the name of people who saved lives making these unsung heroes household names for Hungarians and visitors alike;
- A ground-breaking, historic data exchange agreement has been signed with Yad Vashem to open Hungarian archives so that the history of the Shoah can be more thoroughly studied and the victims accurately named, accounted for and remembered;
- Hungary repeatedly requested the US authorities to shut down the openly anti-Semitic, Nazi-style Hungarian language website called kuruc.info which operates in the United States;
- Paramilitary groups inciting hatred were banned and the criminal code was tightened regarding uniformed crime;
- The House Rules of the Parliament were tightened and now the Speaker can fine or exclude MPs from the floor if they use hateful language;
- In a first, the courts convicted a Holocaust denier. In the sentence, offender was ordered to visit either the Holocaust Museum, Yad Vashem or Auswitz, and write a report about what he learnt from that trip.

Is it a respectable list? Yes, it is. Has the Hungarian political and cultural elite done enough to counter racism in Hungary? No, not by a long shot. Is it true that occasionally the government side was slow and ineffective in its statements and actions? Yes, unfortunately it is true.

I earlier referred to the fact that anti-Semitism and racism in general have been on the rise, which tells us that both official Hungary and civil society must do much more in this field. Having said this, let me conclude by a probably surprising closing statement: in terms of government actions to foster Jewish life and to combat anti-Semitism in Hungary, all of the
milestones I cited a minute ago, I mean: all of them, with the one exception of the Jewish Heritage Fund, have been introduced by either the first or the second administrations of Prime Minister Viktor Orban. Actions speak for themselves.

Thank you very much for your attention. I am ready for your comments and questions.
Mr. SMITH. Mr. Fellegi, thank you very much for your testimony. I would now like to ask Mr. Silberstein, if you could proceed.

STATEMENT OF MR. WILLY SILBERSTEIN, CHAIRMAN, SWEDISH COMMITTEE AGAINST ANTI-SEMITISM

Mr. SILBERSTEIN. Let me start by telling you about Shneer Kesselman. Shneer Kesselman is a rabbi in the Swedish city of Malmo, a city which I am sorry to say is infamous for its anti-Semitism. When Shneer Kesselman, sometimes when he goes out with his children he is being threatened. People throw cans after him. They curse him and say things I do not wish to repeat here. And what differs Shneer Kesselman from other Swedish citizens who are Jewish in Malmo is that people can see that he is Jewish because he wears orthodox clothes. And this means that had it been possible to identify other people in my Malmo or elsewhere as Jews, they would have had the same problems.

We have seen that a number of Jewish families in Malmo have left the city. They moved to Stockholm, the capital of Sweden, some of have also moved to Israel. Who would have thought some decades ago that Jewish families in Sweden would feel ashamed to live in a city with so much anti-Semitism, and move? I don't think anyone would have guessed that. So who is behind this anti-Semitism mainly in Malmo? Of course there are several groups. We have extremists to the left, we have extremists on the right side, and we have also people who are not really that much into politics but who do have prejudice against the Jews.

And then we must also admit that there are people who have moved to Sweden from the Middle East, Muslims who take with them the conflict from the Middle East to Sweden, and they make Swedish citizens who are Jewish responsible for what another country, Israel, does. Needless to say, that is totally unacceptable. And let me at the same time be clear, I believe a large portion of the Muslims in Malmo and elsewhere in Sweden are not anti-Semitic, but still there are too many who are.

At the same time we have seen positive counter-reactions. An organization called Young Muslims Against anti-Semitism has been formed and is active. In Malmo, you may have heard about that, we had so-called kipa-marches. People have gone out to the streets, some of us with a kipa on our head, and we have protested against anti-Semitism in Malmo. And to my great pride, I would like to add that many of those who march with us were non-Jews.

We know more or less for a fact that anti-Semitism is on the rise in Sweden. Polls have been made that confirm that. We get more people who, for instance, agree with statements like, the Jews are too influential in the world. One out of three say there is too much talk of the Holocaust in the world, and one out six say Jews are greedy. That happens among high school students in Sweden today. And as been said here before, I would like to say the same thing. Fighting anti-Semitism in the long run is also working against racism that can hit anywhere. A society that accepts hatred against Jews will surely pick other groups be it Muslims, Christians, homosexuals, and other groups. It may start with the Jews. It will surely not end with the Jews.
And let me end on a personal note. My mother was liberated by American soldiers in a concentration camp in 1945. She would have been impressed if she could have seen this which is going on in this room right now. She would have been proud, but she would not have been surprised. So therefore, thank you so much for bringing your spotlight to a rise in anti-Semitism in a continent that has endured so much hatred already. And I would like to see a manifestation like this on high political level with European politicians. We must show that we have learned our lesson. Silence is never again an option. Thank you very much.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Silberstein follows:]
Statement of Willy Silberstein
The Swedish Committee against Antisemitism
Anti-Semitism, A Growing Threat to All Faiths
Subcommittee on Africa, Global Health, Global Human Rights, and International Organizations
February 27, 2013

Let me start by telling you about Shneer Kesselman. He is a Rabí, born in the US.

He is working in the Swedish city of Malmö, which is rather infamous for its anti-Semitism in recent years.

What differs him from other Jews of Malmö is that people can see that he is Jewish. He wears traditional clothes.

For some years now he has been systematically harassed. People spit at him, throw cans after him, threaten him and call him things like bloody Jew.

He represents a high proportion of the total hate-crimes in Malmö. This is of course scaring in itself. A Jew cannot walk in a Swedish city without being scared.

But this also means that if people could identify other Jews as Jews they would also risk harassment. In Sweden in the year of 2013.

Let me add that many Jews have left Malmö, simply because they are afraid and ashamed to live in a city which treats its Jews like this. Some have moved to the capital of Sweden, Stockholm, a few have also moved to Israel.

One big group that is active against Jews in Malmö – and other parts of Sweden – are Moslem immigrants. They cannot differ the conflict in the Middle East from Swedes who are Jews.

Just recently Swedish public television showed an interview with a Jewish woman who had been threatened to death by Moslems. And interviews with Moslem immigrants confirmed their hatred towards Jews.

Let me at the same time be clear. A large portion of the Moslem immigrants in Sweden are not anti-semitic.

We have also seen very positive counter-reactions. An organization called Young Moslems against antisemitism has been formed and is active in educating young Moslems.

In Malmö, my committee against anti-Semitism has been very active and we have taken part in so called kipá-marches, where people, Jews and non-Jews, have manifested their support for the Jews of Malmö.

This has been very successful and has received a lot of attention also internationally.
The Swedish committee against anti-Semitism will also, with the help of funds from the government, hold seminars for teachers on anti-Semitism and Islamophobia.

We know that anti-Semitism is on the rise, polls confirm that more people now than a few years ago say yes to statements like: The Jews are too influential in the world.

1 of 3 say there is too much talk of the Holocaust in the world.
1 of 6 say Jews are greedy.

Let me add that working against anti-Semitism is in the long run working against racism that can hit anywhere.

A society that accepts hatred against Jews will surely pick another group, be it Moslems or Christians or others.
A fight against anti-Semitism is therefore a fight for the right for all minorities.
It may start with the Jews but it will surely not end with that.

Let me end on a personal note. My mother was liberated by American soldiers in a concentration camp in 1945. She would have been impressed if she could have seen this. She would have been proud – but not surprised.

So therefore, thank you so much for bringing your spotlight to a rise in anti-Semitism in a continent that has endured so much hatred already.

This shows that we at least have learnt a lesson, silence is no option.
Mr. Smith, Thank you so much, Mr. Silberstein, and thank you for traveling here, coming such a long way.
Rabbi Baker, welcome.

STATEMENT OF RABBI ANDREW BAKER, PERSONAL REPRESENTATIVE ON COMBATING ANTI-SEMITISM, OFFICE OF THE CHAIRPERSON-IN-OFFICE, ORGANIZATION FOR SECURITY AND CO-OPERATION IN EUROPE

Rabbi Baker. Mr. Chairman, thank you, and of course thank you for everything you have done in this critical area. I would like to lay out what I think are really the major themes suggesting the problems that are faced, that are being addressed here in this hearing today. The first goes to the basic issue of community security. Only a week ago, the security service of the Jewish community in France issued its annual report and it described 2012 as a year of unprecedented violence against Jews. Physical attacks nearly doubled over the previous year, and that increase was more than eight times higher than all other racist and xenophobic acts in the same period. You will recall that those acts included the murder of four at a Jewish school in Toulouse, an event that drew international attention.

But that report reveals that following this attack there was, in fact, a spike in incidents. Rather than generating awareness and sympathy, there were instead support and identification with that anti-Semitic murderer. Now France may stand out with the number of attacks. With the largest Jewish community in Europe it surely offers the largest number of potential targets. But that community is not alone in the need to address an increasing security threat. Other western European Jewish communities face similar challenges.

Physical attacks directed toward persons and property are a part of daily life, so the need to protect synagogues and community centers with secure entryways. Experts indicate now they need to be prepared as well for the possibility of international terror attacks. It is a formidable challenge, especially for small communities with limited budgets. It spans the continents as, in fact, I witnessed during my OSCE travels. The 1,000 Jews of Oslo, Norway, and the 1,000 Jews who live in Melilla, a Spanish enclave in North Africa, may appear to have very little in common. But both communities are spending an inordinate share of their budget simply to keep their members safe.

Governments have a basic obligation to provide for the security of their citizens and they also affirm a bedrock commitment to the free exercise of religion. And yet these security needs and the financial burdens that many communities now face seriously call these principles into question. So it is that these quite elemental challenges of a decidedly practical nature ultimately pose an existential threat to the future of Jewish life in Europe. The sources of these attacks are generally well known. Right wing, neo-Nazi groups have long been a focus of concern, and we need to remain vigilant about that. But the recent increases that are documented in France and elsewhere in Western Europe largely come from parts of the Arab and Muslim communities.
Knowing the source of these attacks is necessary in order to devise ways to prevent them, through law enforcement in the short term and through education in the longer term. Yet some governments willfully do not want to know and they have limited their monitoring tools so that they will not be confronted with these facts. That may be a reflection of political correctness or a fear that such data are likely to increase anti-Muslim sentiments, but either way they contribute to the problem.

Anti-Semitism in public discourse is something you know well, Mr. Chairman. You participated in 2011 in the OSCE conference in Prague that addressed this issue. The fact is that popular attitudes about Jews may not derive from firsthand knowledge. Jewish populations are often quite small in these countries. So they more frequently come from inherited prejudices or what people see and hear in the media. That media coverage often features highly critical descriptions of the State of Israel, and at times as some have already indicated, that criticism crosses over into anti-Semitism. When Israel is demonized, when its legitimacy as a Jewish state is questioned, when its actions are compared to the deeds of the Nazis, this is not mere criticism.

Aspects of this problem were referenced in that seminal OSCE Berlin Declaration adopted in 2004. It was described in more detail a year later in the working definition of anti-Semitism promulgated by the EUMC, now the EU Fundamental Rights Agency. That working definition also warns against holding local Jewish communities responsible for the actions of the State of Israel. But that regularly happens. Jews and Israel are conflated, and the incidents in the Middle East and the Israeli-Palestinian conflict trigger attacks on Jewish targets in Europe. European Jews have their own views about Israel, and they may vary widely. But only they are being told that they must publicly condemn the Jewish State as the price for support or for civic inclusiveness.

Last year a government funded Norwegian study found that 38 percent of the population agreed that Israel’s treatment of the Palestinians was akin to the policies of the Nazis. It was a sobering statistic even for political leaders who are openly pro-Palestinian in their views.

Extremist political parties. The growth of right wing, populist parties in some European countries is a new cause for alarm. The severe economic problems and the inability of mainstream political parties to cope have opened a door to extremist views. Parties such as Jobbik in Hungary, Svoboda in Ukraine, Golden Dawn in Greece have found success following a path already trod by established movements such as the National Front in France, the Freedom Party in Austria. Xenophobic appeals vie for primacy with equally hateful anti-Semitic messages. And as a result of election successes these words are no longer confined to street corner rallies. They now echo in the halls of Parliaments.

Jobbik leaders demand a listing of Hungarian Jews. Golden Dawn party attacks the very idea of Holocaust education. The Svoboda Party features anti-Jewish rhetoric in the halls of Parliament defending the use of the word “kike.” The danger may not be in the support that these parties have. They are relatively confined to 10–15 percent of the population. But they already exert a
gravitational pull from even mainstream parties. They are nervous about those potential voters or they are seeking those votes themselves.

Finally, a fourth area to be identified has been the limits being placed on basic Jewish ritual practice. We have witnessed the efforts in various European countries to restrict or to ban the practice of ritual circumcision and kosher slaughter. Proponents of these efforts may not necessarily be anti-Semitic, they may be self-described animal rights advocates or protectors of children. Political support, in fact, is broader. It may draw particularly on anti-Muslim sentiments, since a ban on these practices affects Muslim communities as well. But the reality is that legislation came close to being passed in the Netherlands. A regional court in Germany issued a ruling prohibiting circumcision causing the government to come forward with new legislation.

The fact is that some countries have maintained bans on ritual slaughter that pre-date any animal rights activism. They were intended to be anti-Semitic in nature, to keep Jews out. Country by country Jewish communities in postwar Europe worked out their own understanding of what was needed. They quietly negotiated with their respective governments. In some cases exceptions were granted or conditions were voluntarily accepted. Rarely did these issues rise as topics of public debate. But that has now changed for several reasons. Western European societies have become increasingly secular, and as a result there is less respect for religious practice generally. It is particularly evident when addressing these practices that are considered archaic or even barbaric, such as shechita and brit milah. A large and growing Muslim population in Europe means that they are more prevalent and thus more likely to require a legal framework, an official regulation in which to operate. As a result, the ad hoc approach that served the needs of mostly small Jewish communities is now beginning to unravel, and public discussions and blog postings easily turn to anti-Semitic expressions.

With all of the difficulties that have been enumerated above, we should not lose sight of the fact that if there is a ban on these age old precepts of Judaism, it would also threaten the very future of Jewish life. Let me conclude here, and I have appended to my written testimony a number of my OSCE reports. And thank you again, Mr. Chairman.

[The prepared statement of Rabbi Baker follows:]
Let me lay out here in this testimony what I believe are the main concerns that define the problem of anti-Semitism in Europe today recognizing that they may vary from country to country.

Jewish Community Security

Only a week ago the Jewish Community Security Service of France (SPCJ) issued its annual report, which described 2012 as, “a year of unprecedented violence against Jews in France.” Physical attacks nearly doubled over the previous year. That increase in anti-Semitic acts was more than eight times higher than all other racist and xenophobic acts in the same period. You will recall that those acts included the murder of four at a Jewish school in Toulouse, an event that drew international attention. But the SPCJ report reveals that following this there was a spike in incidents. Rather than generating awareness and sympathy, there was instead support and identification with the anti-Semitic murderer.

France may stand out with its significant number of violent acts, and with the largest Jewish community in Europe it offers the largest number of potential targets. But the French Jewish community is not alone with the need to address an increasing security threat. Other Western European Jewish communities face similar challenges. Physical attacks and threats directed toward persons and property are now a part of daily life. Synagogues, schools and community centers have been refitted with secure entryways and sidewalk barriers. Experts say they need to be prepared not only for home grown violence but also the possibility of international terror attacks. This is a formidable challenge especially for small communities with limited budgets, and it spans the continent as I witnessed in my OSCE travels. The 1000 Jews of Oslo, Norway and the 1000 Jews who live in Melilla, a Spanish enclave on the North African coast may have little in common, but both communities are spending an inordinate share of their budgets to keep their members safe.

Governments have a basic obligation to provide for the security of their citizens. They also affirm a bedrock commitment to the free exercise of religion. And yet the security needs and the financial burdens that many Jewish communities now face seriously call these principles into question. So it is that these quite elemental challenges of a decidedly practical nature ultimately pose an existential threat to the future of Jewish life in Europe.
The sources of these anti-Semitic incidents are generally known. Right wing, neo-Nazi groups have long been a focus of concern, and they remain a steady source of the problem. But the recent increases that are documented in France and elsewhere in Western Europe largely come from parts of the Arab and Muslim communities. Knowing the source of attacks is necessary in order to devise ways to prevent them—through law enforcement in the short term and education over time. Yet some governments willfully do not want to know, and they have limited their monitoring tools so that they will not be confronted with the facts. This may be a reflection of political correctness or a fear that such data are likely to increase anti-Muslim sentiments. Either way they contribute to the problem.

To be sure there are also examples of good practices which include close cooperation with law enforcement and government funding for security enhancements. But we need to find ways to get more countries to follow suit. This will be one of the primary goals of an OSCE/ODIHR conference on Jewish community security that we anticipate will take place in early April.

Anti-Semitism in Public Discourse

In 2011 the OSCE convened a conference on anti-Semitism in public discourse. It noted that popular attitudes about Jews may not derive from firsthand knowledge, especially as the Jewish population is often quite small. Instead they are more frequently informed by inherited prejudices and media coverage. That media coverage often features highly critical depictions of the State of Israel. And at times that criticism crosses over into anti-Semitism. When Israel is demonized, when its legitimacy as a Jewish state is questioned, when its actions are compared to those of the Nazis this is not mere criticism.

This aspect of the problem was referenced in the seminal OSCE Berlin Declaration adopted in 2004, and it was described and defined in more detail a year later in the Working Definition of anti-Semitism promulgated by the EUMC, now the EU Fundamental Rights Agency. That working definition also warns against holding local Jewish communities responsible for the actions of the State of Israel. But that regularly happens. Jews and Israel are conflated, and incidents in the Middle East and the Israeli-Palestinian conflict trigger attacks on Jewish targets in Europe. European Jews have their own views about Israel, and they may vary widely. But only they are being told that they must publicly condemn the Jewish State as the price for support and civic inclusiveness.

Last year a government funded Norwegian study found that 38 percent of the population agreed that Israel’s treatment of the Palestinians was akin to the policies of the Nazis. It was a sobering statistic even for political leaders who are openly pro-Palestinian in their views. Israel’s Hasbarah challenges are formidable, and they should be carefully separated from the problem of anti-Semitism. But for Norway’s small Jewish community—a third of whom were murdered in the Holocaust—such distinctions have little meaning.
Extremist Political Parties

The growth of right wing, populist parties in some European countries is a new cause for alarm. The severe economic problems and inability of mainstream political parties to cope with them have opened a door to extremist views. New parties such as Jobbik in Hungary, Svoboda in Ukraine and Golden Dawn in Greece have found success following a path already trod by more established movements such as National Front in France and the Freedom Party in Austria. Their success draws from anti-foreigner, anti-immigrant and anti-Roma prejudice.

But these xenophobic appeals vie for primacy with equally hateful anti-Semitic messages. As a result of election successes these words are no longer confined to street corner rallies; they also echo in the halls of Parliaments. Jobbik leaders demand a public listing of Hungarian Jews whom they accuse of undermining national identity. The Golden Dawn party now attacks Holocaust education in Greek schools and calls for the reversal of the Parliamentary decision that established an official commemoration day. Local rallies of the Svoboda Party often featured anti-Jewish rhetoric. Now that they sit in Parliament they defiantly defend the use of the word “kike” in their speeches.

The danger may not be that these parties will come to power; after all their support for now is in the 10-15 percent range. But they already exert an influence beyond their numbers, as there is a discernible gravitational pull to the right. FIDESZ leaders periodically condemn anti-Semitism, but they also play to the Jobbik voters with more artfully worded attacks or with those attacks being spoken by trusted friends who stand just outside the door. In Ukraine Jewish community leaders report that now when they press local officials to investigate anti-Semitic incidents they’re given a new reason for hesitation: Svoboda party members will denounce them if they are too active in taking up these concerns. The thuggish behavior of Golden Dawn party members openly attacking immigrant merchants on the streets of Athens has been caught on camera. But that behavior extends to the halls of Parliament as well. Greek MPs visiting Washington in November (as part of an election observer team) confided that when they speak out they and their families are physically threatened by Golden Dawn MPs. The problem they said is that there is just not enough security to protect them all. Perhaps as economic conditions improve support for these movements will diminish. But this is a poor prescription for addressing what is undeniably an acute problem.

Limiting Jewish Ritual Practices

We have also witnessed efforts in various European countries to restrict or ban the practice of ritual circumcision and kosher slaughter. The proponents of these efforts are not necessarily anti-Semitic. In fact they are self-described animal rights advocates or defenders of children. Political support is broader, and as these ritual practices are also a part of Islam that support may likely reflect an anti-Muslim bias as well. Legislation banning ritual slaughter came close to passage in the Netherlands, and a regional court decree in Germany prohibiting circumcision left the Government scurrying to draft legislation upholding the practice. Several countries have long-standing legislation that bans kosher slaughter outright. Adopted long before there were
any animal rights activists, these laws were anti-Semitic by design, intended to limit the number of Jews who would otherwise consider moving there.

Country by country Jewish communities in the postwar years worked out their own understanding of what was needed and quietly negotiated arrangements with their respective governments. In some cases exceptions were granted or some conditions were voluntarily accepted. Rarely did these issues figure as topics of public debate. That has now changed for several reasons. Western European society has become increasingly secular, and as a result there is less respect for religious practice generally. It is particularly evident when addressing those practices that are considered archaic and even “barbaric” as shechita and brit milah are viewed. A large and growing Muslim population in Europe also means that they are more prevalent and thus more likely to require a legal framework and official regulations in which to operate. As a result the ad hoc approach that served the needs of mostly small Jewish communities is now beginning to unravel. And public discussions and blog postings easily turn to anti-Semitic expressions. With all of the difficulties that have been enumerated above, we should not lose sight of the fact that if a ban on these age old precepts of Judaism were to be imposed it would also threaten the future of Jewish life.

I append to this testimony copies or excerpts from my OSCE country reports prepared in 2012, which describe these problems in more detail and also offer specific recommendations for action.

Country Visit: Hungary
Report of the Personal Representative of the OSCE Chair-in-Office on Combating Anti-Semitism
Rabbi Andrew Baker
March 21-23, 2012

The FIDESZ led government of Hungary has been criticized by the Venice Commission and others for imposing new laws and constitutional changes that will have a significant impact on social and political life—among them a media law, changes in the appointment of judges and a religion law that sharply reduces the number of officially sanctioned churches. Inside the country government officials speak of these steps as a necessary “consolidation” of laws and regulations while opposition voices decry what they believe is a “democracy deficit” in the country. My visit to Budapest came shortly after National Day events which included a fiery speech by Prime Minister Viktor Orban widely understood as an attack on Brussels and the EU establishment.

The state of the Jewish community in Hungary and questions about anti-Semitism in society should be examined separately from this broader discussion, but of course they cannot be entirely divided. Hungarian Jewry, numbering 80,000-100,000, represents the largest Jewish community in Central Europe. They are deeply-rooted, largely assimilated and well-integrated into Hungarian social life. They have naturally gravitated to politically left-leaning parties and are understandably troubled by appeals to Hungarian nationalism even when voiced by center-right politicians. Six hundred thousand Hungarian Jews were murdered in the Holocaust, and
that trauma still hovers over the present-day community which is virtually entirely a community of survivors and their offspring. Like other former Communist states, Hungary has only recently confronted its own Holocaust-era past, and this process of self-examination remains incomplete.

The emergence of the Jobbik Party—an unabashed, right wing force that espouses a strong anti-Roma and anti-Semitic agenda—has unnerved many people in Hungary and abroad. The periodic gatherings of its affiliated, militia-like Hungarian Guard dressed in uniforms modeled after the wartime, fascist Arrow Cross, are at the very least a provocative symbol especially to those Jews who lived through the Holocaust in Hungary. When the Hungarian Guard masses in towns and villages with significant Roma populations they pose a threat to physical security and safety. Few people in Hungary believe that the party will be able to increase its level of support much beyond its current level of 20 percent, and they note that a considerable number of Jobbik voters are only looking for a way to express their dissatisfaction with the political establishment and a deteriorating economic situation. Nevertheless, Jobbik’s presence means extremist, xenophobic and anti-Semitic rhetoric is now a regular feature of Parliamentary debate.

Hungarian Jews largely agree that FIDESZ leaders are very careful in their own public remarks and do not accuse them of espousing anti-Semitism. There are some who see in the general attacks on certain European and economic interests coded references to attacks on Jews, although this is surely open to debate. However, there is general agreement that in the outer circles of the party or among traditional party supporters in the media more explicit anti-Semitic appeals are present, and they believe that the FIDESZ leadership turns a blind eye to this. With a worsening economic climate and the prospect that FIDESZ will need to ratchet up its populist appeals in the next election, Hungarian Jews—not a terribly optimistic people in the best of times—are quite understandably on edge.

Assessing the Climate of Anti-Semitism:

By coincidence the Anti-Defamation League released a survey on attitudes toward Jews in ten European countries at the same time as my visit to Budapest. Based on telephone interviews conducted in each country, ADL determined that the level of anti-Semitism was highest in Hungary. Although a prominent Jewish researcher in Hungary criticized the survey’s methodology and questioned its findings, his own research work shows the problem increasing in recent years. No doubt the presence of the Jobbik Party in the Parliament is a contributing factor; for the first time in post-Communist Hungary one can hear overt anti-Semitic language from the mouths of MPs. While the worst of this rhetoric has been condemned by MPs from other parties, they have yet to figure out how to prevent its continuation. Also during my brief stay in Budapest anti-Semitic posters appeared on some city kiosks. Professionally produced, they depicted a paramilitary man in an Arrow Cross-like uniform dangling a crude caricature of a Jew from his fingers with words below reading, “Join the Fight.”(A photo of this poster appears at the end of this report.)

Such unvarnished anti-Semitic manifestations may be largely relegated to the extreme—but not insignificant—right. However, there are those who see in the populist and frequently anti-European and anti-business rhetoric of mainstream politicians veiled references to Jews. As one moves outward from this core of national, political leaders to columnists and writers associated with them or to regional and local politicians, the anti-Semitic references are more evident.
Internet web sites frequently host anti-Semitic postings, and Jewish leaders point out that even major newspapers are lax in removing such writings from their own on-line publications. When they protested to the Mayor of Budapest on the appointment as director of the city-sponsored theater of the late István Csurka—more noted in recent years for his anti-Semitic political agenda than as a dramatist—they were told that the city deserved at least one "Hungarian" theater. At the same time, physical attacks are rare, and security precautions taken at Jewish institutions in Budapest are less stringent than those in most Western European capitals.

Development of a National Curriculum:
At the present time the Ministry of National Resources is developing a national curriculum for use in all Hungarian schools. It provides an important opportunity to address the general lack of information on Jews and Jewish life in the country and its history. According to those familiar with the current teaching materials, Jews "appear" on three occasions—in the time of Jesus to account for the birth of Christianity, in the Nazi era as victims of the Holocaust, and in modern times as part of the Israeli-Arab conflict. Nothing is presented of the long history of the Jewish presence in Hungary and its contribution to Hungarian culture. This limited, two-dimensional picture of Jews is likely to perpetuate old stereotypes and prejudices, especially in regions where few if any Jews live today. This serious omission should be corrected. A consortium of Hungarian Jewish organizations has prepared a detailed analysis of the national curriculum and offered its recommendations; they should be given serious consideration. Minister Ráthelyi cited the educational programs of Centropa which offer a more detailed picture of Jewish life in Hungary before and after the Holocaust, and more support should be given to this effort. ODIHR has developed secondary school teaching materials in cooperation with the Hungarian Holocaust Memorial Center and the NGO Zachor Foundation designed to combat anti-Semitism through education, and the Ministry is encouraged to facilitate their dissemination and use in Hungarian schools.

The Hungarian Jewish Community:
As noted above, the Jewish population in Hungary is the largest in Central Europe. While the adoption of a new religion law severely reduced the number of officially recognized and supported church groups—and as a result engendered considerable criticism abroad—it actually extended designation to two new Jewish congregations. (Until now the government had accorded recognition only to the Jewish Federation of Hungary.) However, many were surprised that the Reform synagogue movement was not included in the legislation. Foreign Minister János Martonyi conceded that this was a mistake which should be corrected when the law is next amended.

A larger but related question—and not necessarily the full responsibility of government—is predicated on the fact that Hungarian Jews are a largely assimilated community with relatively few identifying through synagogue affiliation. Many more are likely to express their Jewishness through social, cultural and educational activities, but these institutions receive only limited if any financial support.

Holocaust Remembrance and Education:
The Holocaust Memorial Center in Budapest contains a permanent exhibit detailing the story of the Holocaust in Hungary, research facilities and a moving memorial to the 600,000 Hungarian victims. In principle, it is an invaluable resource for training teachers and instructing students.
However, some critics say its remote location and the lack of any mandated Holocaust education in the schools leave it underutilized. With the change in government in 2010, there were charges that the new authorities sought to change the content of the permanent exhibition so as to downplay Hungarian culpability in the Holocaust. In fact the subject was raised in my meeting with Andras Levente Gal, Commissioner for Good Governance in the Ministry of Public Administration and Justice and the official primarily responsible for dealing with Holocaust-related issues. Mr. Gal defended his criticism of the exhibition saying it was time, “to go beyond well-established Communist history.” In the meantime the controversy has partially abated and for the time being the exhibition remains unchanged.

The Museum was officially opened during the previous term of Prime Minister Orban, whose government also established an official Holocaust commemoration day. Despite the singular presence of this center in Southeastern Europe there are also critics who contrast it unfavorably to the larger, more centrally located and more frequently visited House of Terror Museum which focuses primarily on the crimes of Communism.

The Hungarian government has created a special commemorative committee to mark 2012 as the centennial anniversary of Raoul Wallenberg. The committee has organized events inside Hungary and abroad to highlight the Swedish diplomat’s rescue of Jews in Hungary during the war. Certainly Raoul Wallenberg is a rare example of what a committed individual could do even in those darkest days, and Hungary should be commended for raising awareness of his efforts.

Professor Szabolcs Szita, Director of the Holocaust Memorial Center, also indicated that they intend to focus more on the prewar experience of Jews and Hungarians living together. By way of example, he cited an exhibit which just opened that described day-to-day Jewish life in those times prepared by Centropa.

Hungary’s new constitution declares that the country lost its self-determination with the Nazi occupation in March 1944 and only regained it in 1989. There are some who see in this language—especially when taken together with calls for changing the narrative of the museum exhibition—an effort to distance Hungary from taking responsibility for the worst crimes of the Holocaust. Although the mass deportations were ordered by the Nazi occupiers they were largely implemented and carried out by Hungarian civil and police authorities. It would be unfortunate while other European countries such as France and Austria have belatedly confronted their own complicity in Holocaust-era crimes if Hungary would march in the opposite direction. In this regard it is worth making special note of Foreign Minister Martonyi’s words in his January 2012 speech marking the opening of the Wallenberg Centennial Commemoration: “It is especially painful for me as minister of Foreign Affairs of Hungary to say this: during the Holocaust the Hungarian State was weighed on the scales and found wanting. It could not protect its citizens, what’s more—even if under foreign occupation—it assisted in their extermination.”

Combating Hate Crimes:
Peter Polt, the Prosecutor General, explained that the concept of a hate crime is not defined under Hungarian law. In cases of violence directed at specific ethnic communities authorities have no difficulty in categorizing them as hate crimes. But it is far more difficult when examining hate speech, especially as the constitution offers a wide protection of freedom of
opinion and speech, and the line is not clearly defined. As a result there have been very few cases of prosecuting hate speech—24 in 2009, 16 in 2010 and 16 in 2011.

Data collection is also a problem. Not only is it not the practice of police to note the ethnic or religious identity of a victim, but according to the prosecutor data protection laws forbid it. The only exception is where the victims themselves ask that it be noted.

In my 2009 visit the Hungarian Guard was a new and disturbing presence and drew considerable attention. This paramilitary organization with connections to the Jobbik Party continue to parade in central Budapest and in other towns and cities in uniforms modeled on those of the wartime, fascist Arrow Cross. In an effort to prevent their activities laws were passed that banned the display of certain symbols, the wearing of certain uniforms and even marching in formation. And yet, despite this legislation, they continue virtually unabated. By their own admission, officials in the Ministry of Interior said the laws simply do not work. By making small changes to their uniforms or to the way they assemble or to the symbols they display, they manage to avoid prosecution. In fact, Deputy State Secretary Dr. Krisztina Berta explained that they frequently come to their demonstrations with legal counsel. These attorneys will explain to the police who are present why these guardsmen are not in violation of the law, and are thus left unhindered. Police and authorities are equally frustrated by this.

Addressing Concerns of the Roma Minority:

By all accounts anti-Roma attitudes in Hungary are dramatically high. They play a significant role in fueling support for the right wing Jobbik Party and surely are a contributing factor in the physical attacks that have occurred on Roma villages and encampments. Although the Roma in Hungary are quite different from Hungarian Jews, the two groups are often dual targets by xenophobic extremists in what is a largely homogenous society. A national social inclusion strategy has been drafted by the government which includes job training, economic development and the training of local community leaders.

Recommendations:

1. The Ministry of National Resources should accept the recommendations offered by Hungarian Jewish organizations in the development of the national curriculum. (See appendix.) Education officials should support and facilitate the use of materials prepared by ODIHR and the Zachor Foundation and by Centropa in Hungarian schools. Greater use should be made of the Holocaust Memorial Center as an educational tool by encouraging more comprehensive visits by student groups and teachers.

2. The presence of the Jobbik Party in the national Parliament and in local and regional councils has brought overt anti-Semitic (and racist and xenophobic) rhetoric to a new level in Hungarian society. It is thus incumbent on all mainstream political leadership and especially those of the ruling FIDESZ Party to counter this. Wherever possible and permitted under the law this hate speech should be prosecuted. Senior government leaders should swiftly and loudly condemn such anti-Semitic outbursts. They should avoid any unnecessary contact or seemingly friendly relations with Jobbik members which might thereby accord the party de facto respectability.
3. The OSCE Prague Conference on Anti-Semitism in Public Discourse (March 2011) warned of the dangers of anti-Semitic rhetoric and note the corrosive effect they posed to the security of Jewish communities. Hungarian political leaders should continue to be careful in their own speech and to admonish their allies and supporters when such language presents itself.

4. Despite sincere interest on the part of Hungarian authorities, efforts to curtail the presence of the (newly renamed) Hungarian Guard have not succeeded. New methods should be explored and undertaken. Perhaps with the assistance of ODIHR or other governments new legislative language could be found and adopted that would prove more effective in day-to-day use. Police should be encouraged to act more aggressively (albeit within the law) and in greater numbers so as to minimize the impact of the group’s gatherings.

5. It is well-established that comprehensive methods of the monitoring and data collection of hate crimes serve multiple, positive purposes. By identifying victims and perpetrators and the locations of these crimes, police, prosecutors and public officials are better able to deal with them at all stages of the justice process and to take effective countermeasures going forward. Other countries with strong data protection laws have nevertheless been able to carry out this work, and guidance should be sought from ODIHR and/or other governments.

6. Hate crime data collection starts with proper reporting by the police. As reported to ODIHR, no hate crimes were recorded by the police in 2010 whereas 15 were recorded in 2009. The Hungarian authorities should accept ODIHR’s offer to deliver training for law enforcement in the framework of its TAHCLE program.

Appendices:
Poster appearing on Budapest kiosks (as reported in Nepszava, March 23 2012):
A report and recommendation on the proposed national curriculum was prepared by a consortium of 14 Jewish congregations and NGOs (identified below) and shared with the Ministry of National Resources.
(The full report can be accessed here: http://www.jmpoint.hu/nat.)

Az eloterjesztő szervezetek:
Magyarországi Autonóm Ortodox Hitkőzség, Balázs Gábor elközjáró
Egyéneit Magyarországi Izraelita Hitkőzség, Köves Sámuel vezető rabbói
Budapesti Zsidó Hitkőzség Frankel Leó utcai Zsinagóga Körzet, Verő Tamás törôrabbói
BZSH Béét Salom zsináigóra Radnót Zoltán rabbói és Heisler András a MAZSIHISZ korábbi elnöke
Szim Salom Progresszív Zsidó Hitkőzség
Magyarországi Cionista Szövetség, Dr. Kádár Judit elnöki
Magyar Zsidó Kulturális Egyesület, Kirschner Péter elnöki
B'nai Brith Budapesti Szervezete, Vadász Magda elnöki
Magyar Zsidó Önkéntes Közalapítvány, Szabo György mb. elnöki
Lauder Javne Zsidó Közösségi Iskola
Bét Menachem Oktatási Körpont, Betteva Oberlander igazgató
HAVER Alapítvány, Kuratórium
JMPoint a Zsidó Küszößégért Közhasznú Alapítvány, Körtfi Csaba igazgató
Sálint Néz, Frisz Zsuzsa igazgató
(csatlakozás sorrend)

Meetings:
Representatives of civil society

- Ms Andrea Szönyi, Regional Consultant in Hungary of the USC Shoah Foundation Institute, Chairperson of the Board of Trustees - Zachor Foundation for Social Remembrance
- Ms Mónika Kovács, Vice-Dean for International and Scientific Affairs of the Faculty of Education and Psychology - Eötvös Loránd University
- Mr László Csósz, Historian - Holocaust Memorial Center
- Mr András Kovács, Sociologist, Professor at the Nationalism Studies and Jewish Studies Program at the Central European University
- Mr László Várkonyi, President and CEO of the International Centre for Democratic Transition
- Mr Máté Fischer, Operations Officer of the Tom Lantos Institute
- Ms Nora Kunitz, Programme Director of the Tom Lantos Institute
- Mr Imre Szebik, M.D. Master of Bioethics, Institute of Behavioral Sciences
- Rabbi Slomó Köves, Chief Rabbi of the Unified Hungarian Jewish Congregation (EMIH)
Mr Andras Megyeri, Unified Hungarian Jewish Congregation (EMIH)
- Mr Gábor Szántó, Chief Editor of “Szombat” The Hungarian Jewish monthly
- Mr Janos Gado, Editor “Szombat” The Hungarian Jewish monthly
- Prof. Szabolcs Szita, Executive Director of Holocaust Memorial Centre
- Dr. Janos Botos, Deputy Director of Holocaust Memorial Centre
- Mr Péter Feidmájár, President of the Federation of Hungarian Jewish Communities (MAZSIHISZ)

Ministry of National Resources
- Mr Miklós Réthelyi, Minister for National Resources
- Ms Ágota Schmidt, Chief of Cabinet of the Minister
- Ms Mária Ladó, Head of International Department
- Ms Bettina Török

Ministry of Foreign Affairs
- Mr János Martonyi, Minister for Foreign Affairs
- Mr Gergely Pröhle, Deputy State Secretary for EU Bilateral Relations
- Mr Zsolt Németh, Deputy Minister for State for Foreign Affairs
- Ms Andrea Komaromy, Deputy Head of Delegation, Head of Department for Cultural Diplomacy
- Mr Mihaly Dudas, OSCE Desk Officer
- Ms Anna Miklos, Third Secretary, Cabinet of the Minister

Parliament
- Mr János Főnagy, MP (KDNP), member of the Economic and Information Technology Parliamentary Committee
- Mr László Kovács, MP (MSZP), member of the Parliamentary Committee on Foreign Affairs (former Minister for Foreign Affairs)
- Mr András Schiffer, MP (LMP), member of the Constitutional, Judicial and Standing Orders Parliamentary Committee
- Mr Károly Túzes, Head of Secretariat for Security and Defense Policy of the Foreign Affairs Office of the Parliament

Office of Prosecutor General
- Mr Péter Polt, Prosecutor General
- Ms Eszter Mária Köpf, Head of Department of International and European Affairs
- Ms Katalin Gáspár, Adviser of the Department of Supervision of Investigations and Preparing of Charges
- Mr Krisztian Eperjes

Ministry of Interior
- Dr Krisztina Berta, Deputy State Secretary
- Mr István Erdős, Head of International Department
This visit served as a follow up to a visit in June 2009. At that time the release of several opinion surveys showing a high level of prejudice against Jews together with a spike in anti-Semitic incidents occurring during and after the war in Gaza focused significant attention to the problem of anti-Semitism in Spain. Since that time there have been genuine efforts to address it.

The timing of this visit enabled me to attend the Jewish community’s Yom Hashoa commemoration in King Juan Carlos I Park in the outskirts of Madrid. The ceremony took place at the Holocaust memorial in the park, a moving and modern sculptural installation that was erected in 2005. Although the audience was relatively few in number and came largely from the Jewish community, it was an impressive event featuring the mayor of Madrid. It reflects a growing interest and attention to Holocaust remembrance, which is officially commemorated by the government on January 27.

Surveying anti-Jewish Attitudes

Attitude surveys in Spain continue to describe a rather significant degree of anti-Jewish sentiment among the general population—which has ranged in recent years from 30 to 50 percent. Because of the very small number of Jews in Spain (estimated at no more than 40,000) and the fact that the Jewish community was only formally recognized in 1978, there has been considerable speculation as to the reason for these highly negative numbers. Since these attitudes cannot be based on a firsthand knowledge of individual Jews, some have speculated that the source lies in the generally strong anti-Israel depictions in the Spanish media. This was certainly an argument heard frequently at the time of my 2009 visit, which occurred only a few months after the war in Gaza. However, the Spanish Jewish scholar Alejandro Baer maintains that the basis for these anti-Jewish views can be traced to the
Expulsion from Spain in the 15th Century and the nationalist identity politics that remain a strong legacy of the Franco regime. According to Professor Baer, Spain is essentially a case of "anti-Semitism without Jews" and thus these attitudes are not based on any objective considerations but rather on "imaginary or abstract Jews."

This is certainly more than an academic debate, for if we are to devise appropriate strategies to combat these anti-Jewish views we shall need to know their source.

In an opinion poll released only weeks before this visit, the ADL found that anti-Jewish sentiments in Spain were held by over 50 percent of the population, putting them among the highest of the ten European countries surveyed. A more detailed survey conducted two years ago by Casa Sefarad-Israel concluded that a third of the population harbored prejudice against Jews—a lower number but still cause for concern.

Whatever the actual figure, there seems to be a general consensus on the part of Jewish community leaders, interested observers and government officials that there are now positive and concerted efforts to address this anti-Semitism. In particular the Jewish community leaders believe they have a sincere partner in the current government which can build on some of the initiatives undertaken by the previous one. In this regard the community leadership did not hide its annoyance with those who have been using the recent survey results to castigate the Spanish government, fearing that they may retard the cooperative work inside Spain. In any case there appears to be a distinct change from 2009. At that time there were still many in Spain who disputed the presence of anti-Semitism. Today this is no longer questioned, and instead the discussion is focused on what can be done about it.

**Jewish Community Views**

The Jewish community recognizes that its small numbers and low profile may be a contributing factor to the negative sentiments, since it inevitably falls to others to define them. They identify anti-Israel views related to the Middle East conflict, traditional Christian prejudice toward Jews and the unhelpful role of the media as the sources for these views. In recent years the Jewish Federation has undertaken efforts to monitor media coverage and now prepares an annual report. Selected cartoons and opinion pieces offer evidence of anti-Semitic depictions particularly with reference to the State of Israel. Community leaders have taken up the issue with some newspaper editors and there has been some discussion of establishing—with media cooperation—an outside, independent monitoring body. Jewish leaders are divided on this approach, with some fearing that doing so would limit its own freedom to criticize.

Spain had in place Holocaust denial legislation that resulted in two well-publicized convictions after years-long litigation, but in 2009 the law was overturned by the high court and effectively eliminated. Both the Jewish community and government officials expressed their dismay at the "legal vacuum" that has ensued. They would like to see a new law adopted that will allow for some prosecution. The Ministry of Justice has asked the Jewish community for its analysis and suggestions, but it is unclear how much more time will pass before any new legislation is proposed.

The community recognizes the importance of getting Spanish schools to include material in curricula that portrays the history of Jews and Judaism including the Holocaust. They note that the difficulties are compounded because of a decentralized educational system that grants autonomy to the regions. At the very least they would like to see strong guidelines issued by the national government in Madrid.
Jewish leaders expressed their belief that they have a “cooperative partner” in the current government that shares its concerns and wants to work with them. Because of this they note that while some attitude surveys carried out and publicized by outside organizations may have served to focus renewed attention on the problem of anti-Semitism in Spain they are not necessarily helpful. They would like to see prior coordination with their community leadership and a greater awareness of the Jewish community’s own activities in this area.

The Jewish community maintains contact with Muslim religious leaders in Spain, but there is no cooperative activity.

As in other European countries, the Spanish Jewish Community has special concerns about maintaining the security of its synagogues, schools and other institutions. It maintains regular communications with the Director General of Police but must spend 15 percent of its total budget on security needs. A focus of special concern is the Jewish community of Melilla, which has a relatively large Jewish population of 1,000 on territory surrounded by Morocco.

**Ministry of Foreign Affairs**

Spain has appointed an Ambassador at Large for relations with the Jewish community and international Jewish organizations. He and his colleagues share a similar analysis to that of the Jewish community in describing the contributing factors to anti-Semitism in Spain. They describe a number of specific initiatives that they have encouraged or implemented. These include the adoption of an official Holocaust commemoration day which was observed in 2012 in the Senate and in most regional parliaments; public participation in Jewish holiday events such as lighting a Chanukah menorah in Madrid, Barcelona and Malaga; organizing study trips to Israel for members of Spanish think tanks; and promoting a visit by the leader of the Spanish Church to Auschwitz, to Israel and to the main synagogue in Madrid.

The Ambassador at Large who heads the Spanish delegation to the Task Force for International Cooperation on Holocaust Education, Remembrance and Research (ITF) also coordinates a working group in Spain that is tasked with transmitting the lessons of the Holocaust to educators, journalists, jurists, and religious leaders throughout the country.

**Police and Interior Ministry**

In 2009 we were informed of a newly-established special prosecutor in Barcelona with a mandate to focus on hate crimes. He has now established himself and receives positive reviews for his work. However, the need remains to make this a nation-wide and comprehensive approach.

Data collection on hate crimes—particularly with disaggregating data on anti-Semitism—can be improved. We were informed of 60 cases of anti-Semitism—the majority of which are believed to be Internet related—but no official data are collected.

Spain was an early participant in police training efforts pioneered by ODIHR. Now that the police training program has been revamped and reactivated by ODIHR, there is hope that they might renew that relationship.
Officials report no increase in social unrest as a result of the worsening economic crisis in Spain and despite frequent public demonstrations. However, they say they are prepared should the need arise. While the budgets of other government ministries have been slashed, theirs remains nearly unchanged.

Ministry of Justice

The 1992 law which formally reestablished the Jewish community in Spain provided the legal framework for relations between the government and the community. This enables the community to receive grants for specific projects channeled through the Pluralism and Coexistence Foundation amounting to €1 million over the last three years. In such fashion the community is placed on an equal level with, for example, the Evangelical Church. Ministry officials reported that they have held discussions with the Jewish community regarding security needs, but there was no clear answer when asked about the availability of financial support.

Ministry experts were quite candid in describing a widespread lack of knowledge in Spain about religions other than Catholicism. They have developed guides intended for internal use by other ministries and by municipalities to help them in dealing with Jews and with other minority religious communities.

Officials also acknowledged that there is a "feeling of impunity" when it comes to Holocaust denial and even some aspects of anti-Semitism as a result of the high court decision to overturn the previous Holocaust denial law. However, they believe this is largely a "technical issue" that can be corrected with new legislation that could be sent to Parliament in the coming months.

Education Ministry

The Ministry maintains that Holocaust education is an important tool in combating anti-Semitism and it is identified in eight different subject areas of school curricula. At the request of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs it is now preparing a report on how Judaism and Jewish history are also taught.

Significant credit is given to the role of Casa Sefarad-Israel as a vehicle to teach both children and adults about Jewish culture. It has directly sponsored public Jewish holiday events and book fairs and supported the activities of other organizations with these aims. Casa Sefarad-Israel also assumes responsibility for training Holocaust education teachers, and our visit included a discussion with several dozen teachers from the Madrid area. They are an impressive and inspiring group, and they have taken their own initiative to expand programs and identify new student populations. These range from primary school classes in religious education to university students in the faculty of medicine.

Unfortunately in the current financial crisis the budget of Casa Sefarad-Israel has been significantly cut and this has also affected what it can do in the area of Holocaust education.

Melilla visit

At the suggestion of Spain's Ambassador to the OSCE we included a visit to the Spanish territory of Melilla in our visit. An enclave of 70,000 people in North Africa, Melilla once boasted a Jewish community of 10,000. Even today, with 1,000 Jews it is a relatively sizeable community compared with the rest of Spain.
During our brief stay we had an opportunity to meet with the leaders of Melilla’s Jewish, Catholic, Muslim and Hindu communities, and there is obviously an easy and genuine spirit of friendship and cooperation among them. Asked how this came to be, they all described the experience of growing up together and sharing holidays and celebrations with each other.

The oldest buildings in Melilla, part of the original fortifications, have been converted into museums which showcase the diverse cultural history of the enclave, and a presentation of Jewish history and Judaism is a significant component.

Much has been made of Spain’s history as a center for Jewish, Christian and Muslim civilization. But Melilla is a moving and positive symbol—if not very well known—of present-day tolerance and interreligious cooperation. It surely deserves more attention and recognition.

Recommendations

1. Resolve remaining barriers to the adoption of appropriate, revised Holocaust denial legislation.
2. Bolster support for Holocaust education teachers, including national endorsement of their efforts.
3. Continue in the development and implementation of educational materials that address the history of Jews and Judaism in Spain and combat anti-Semitism, including those prepared by ODIHR and Casa Sefarad-Israel.
4. As accurate and comprehensive information is important to understanding the extent of the problem, more should be done by authorities to collect data on hate crimes including anti-Semitism.
5. The Jewish Federation should be assisted in its efforts—including assistance from ODIHR—to monitor and report on anti-Semitism in Spain.
6. Encourage cooperative efforts by the government and the Jewish community and support the work of Casa Sefarad-Israel in fostering a positive picture of Jews and Judaism in Spain.
7. Reengage with ODIHR in its training for police and prosecutors on combating hate crimes.

Meetings included the following participants:

Representatives of civil society and non-governmental organizations

- Mr. David Hatchwell, President of the Madrid Jewish Community
- Mr. Issac Querub, President of the FCIE
- Ms. Carolina Aisen, Executive Secretary of the FCIE, and Coordinator of the Anti-Semitism Observatory
- Mr. Esteban Ibarra, Expert on Intolerance issues, “Movimiento contra la Intolerancia” (Movement against Intolerance)
- Mr. Antonio Domingo, Fundación Violeta Friedman
- Mr. Jorge Trías, lawyer, defended Violeta Friedman in the Léon Degrelle trial
- Mr. Ricardo Ruiz de la Serna, lawyer from the Anti-Semitism Observatory civic network
- Ms. Mayte Rodríguez, Centro de Estudios Judeo-Cristianos (Centre of Jewish-Christian Studies)
- Mr. Pedro Tarquis, Speaker, Consejo Evangélico de Madrid (Madrid Evangelic Council)
- Mr. Miguel Palacios, Minister, Iglesia Evangélica de Filadelfia
- Ms. Concha Díaz, Amical Mauthausen
Ministry of Foreign Affairs
- Mr. Juan González-Barba, Director General for the Maghreb, the Mediterranean and Africa
- Mr. Juan Manuel Cabrera, Ambassador at Large for Human Rights
- Mr. Álvaro Albacete, Ambassador at Large for Relations with the Jewish Community and Jewish Organizations
- Ms. Cristina Fraile, Under-Director General of the Human Rights Office
- Mr. Juan Armando Andrada-Vanderwilde, Head of the Council of Europe and OSCE Division
- Mr. Martín Remón Miranzo, Council of Europe and OSCE Division

Ministry of Justice
- Mr. Ángel Llorente, Director General on International Legal Cooperation and Relations with Religions
- Mr. José María Contreras, Under-Director General of Relations with Religions

Ministry of Interior
- Mr. Carlos Abella, Director General of International Relations and of Alien Status
- Mr. Antonio Arrabal Villalobos, Under-Director General for International Police Cooperation

Ministry of Education
- Mr. Carlos María Rodríguez Amunátegui, Under-Director General of Academic Planning
- Ms. Ángeles Muñoz, Under-Director General of External Education Promotion
- Ms. Yolanda Zarate, Technical Counsellor
- Mr. Antonio López Soto, Under-Director General of International Cooperation
- Mr. Ángel Santamaría, Technical Counsellor
- Mr. Juan López Martínez, Inspector Central De Educación

Centro Sefarad-Israel
- Mr. Florentino Portero, Director General
- Mr. Miguel de Lucas, Secretary General
- Ms. Hena Bar, Director of the Holocaust and anti-Semitism Department
- Ms. Yesica Sanromán, Coordinator IFF
- Ms. Esther Bendahan, Director for Cultural affairs
- Ms. Sonia Sánchez, Director for Educational affairs
- Mr. Fernando Martínez-Vara de Rey, Coordinator of Culture and Tribune

Melilla Regional Government
- Mr. Miguel Marín, First Deputy President of the Regional Government
- Ms. Sini Chocón, La consejera de Cultura

Interfaith Committee of Melilla “Mesa Interconfesional de Melilla”
- Episcopal Vicar D. Red Roberto Aguado, Highest religious authority of the Catholic Christians of the city of Melilla
- Mr. Abderrahman Benyahya, Spokesman of the Muslim Association in Melilla
- Mr. Jaime Canovas Azancot, President of the Jewish Community of Melilla
- Mr. Ramesh Ramchand, President of the Community Nanwani Hindu Melilla
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Ambassador Adil Akhmetov, Rabbi Andrew Baker and Judge Catherine McGuinness

Norway
June 11-15, 2012

Norway is an exemplary state that both espouses a commitment to human rights and equality and seeks to implement these goals in practice. Long a homogenous and cohesive society, it has in recent decades opened its borders to growing numbers of immigrants and asylum seekers. The country’s oil wealth has shielded it from some of the economic constraints—and accompanying social woes—that beset other European countries, but that does not make it immune to the social and political turmoil that comes with managing cultural and ethnic diversity.

Our visit coincided with the trial of Anders Breivik, the confessed mass murderer of 77 individuals including 69 young people at a political summer camp in July 2011. The physical and emotional scars of that terrorist act were quite visible in the still unrepaired government buildings that were bombed and in both formal and informal discussions with our Norwegian interlocutors. As one official put it, Breivik was a “lone wolf” but he acted “in a context.” Norwegian society appears to be wrestling with how to manage a public discussion of its multi-cultural evolution and allow more space for airing these critical views, now aware that forcing it underground means that some of the most extreme examples such as Breivik go undetected. At the same time there is concern that doing so might also raise the level of public prejudice.

Until now the largely positive climate of tolerance and more respectful debate (even on the part of right wing political parties) has had a mitigating effect on the country’s minorities. Even though they confront tangible problems of prejudice and discrimination, they still speak admiringly of Norwegian society.

Muslim Community

While Norwegian census figures do not note religion, estimates can be drawn from data identifying residents who come from majority-Muslim countries. This suggests a Muslim population of about 95,000. Of this about 70,000 are represented by the Islamic Council of Norway. Leaders of the Council speak positively about their freedom to practice their religion and organize themselves. They are directly engaged in dialogue with other religious and civic groups and are in regular communication with government ministries and political parties.
However, they also report numerous examples of discrimination primarily in the areas of employment and housing. They believe that having a foreign (Muslim-sounding) name puts them at a disadvantage when seeking a job. (One government survey proved this to be so.) As a way to promote diversity in hiring, government agencies are obligated to interview minority candidates, but the Council representatives believe it more frequently means “checking a box” rather than giving serious consideration to these job seekers. Local laws and informal practice, they say, result in concentrating Muslims in certain neighborhoods. By way of example, they point to restrictions of some municipalities on the building of mosques or limiting them to certain geographic districts. Legal restrictions on ritual slaughter—a problem for Jews as well as Muslims—is also a subject of concern for the Islamic Council. However, they are optimistic that they will find a solution.

**Jewish Community**

At the start of the Second World War there were 2100 Jews living in Norway. Following the German occupation and with the support of the puppet government of Vidkun Quisling, 775 Jews were deported to concentration camps where all but a handful were murdered. The remaining Jews survived by fleeing to neighboring (neutral) Sweden or finding refuge in other countries. Today’s Jewish community of approximately 2000 concentrated in Oslo and Trondheim are mostly their descendants. In 1995 Norway was forced to confront its inadequate treatment of Jewish material and moral claims for losses during the Holocaust and established a commission to examine the situation and make recommendations. The commission itself was split and issued two reports. The minority report, chaired by a representative of the Jewish community, took into account the special nature of Nazi seizures and postwar bureaucratic negligence and also called for an official apology. In 1997, after public debate the government chose to accept and implement the minority report. Some of those funds were used in the establishment of the Center for the Study of the Holocaust and Religious Minorities, which is housed in the onetime Oslo residence of Vidkun Quisling.

Shortly before our visit to Oslo the Center for the Study of the Holocaust and Religious Minorities issued the results of a national attitude survey designed to measure the level of anti-Semitism in Norway, and this was already generating discussion. Two findings in particular were drawing special note: According to the Center’s researchers 12.5% of Norwegians harbor significant, anti-Jewish prejudice. This is a disturbing finding considering the small number of Jews in Norway, their successful integration into society and the general level of tolerance in the country.

A second question found that 38% of Norwegians believe that Israeli treatment of Palestinians was analogous to Nazi actions against Jews. Although Norwegian political leaders have been quite critical of Israel in their discussions of the Middle East conflict, they claim to be taken aback by this. It surely reflects a lack of knowledge about the Holocaust, but its implications go further. Anti-Israel animus can also become a form of anti-Semitism, and the EU Fundamental Rights Agency has cited describing Israelis as Nazis to be one such example. Norway’s small Jewish community must directly face the results of a larger society harboring strongly negative views of Israel that are frequently folded into their view of Jews.

That said, Jewish community leaders describe a generally positive picture of day to day to life, marked by good relations with government authorities and effective dialogues with other religious and ethnic communities. Still, there are concerns that need to be addressed.

The community conducted a survey of its own young people in Oslo and found that Jewish students faced a disturbingly high level of harassment in the public schools. Of particular concern was the seeming indifference of teachers and school officials and a reluctance to intervene. This has led to the development of an action plan (not yet implemented) by the Ministry of Education to combat anti-Semitism in the schools.

Since 1929, Norwegian law has forbidden the practice of ritual (kosher) slaughter, the legacy of an anti-Semitic era. Because of the small size of the community this may be viewed today as more of a symbolic
than a real burden. However, Jewish leaders point out that the law already includes exceptions for the hunting practices of Norway's indigenous Sami people. Whatever its implications for Norway's Jews, the continued ban on kosher slaughter is surely a stain on the country's reputation for tolerance and inclusion.

As with other Jewish communities in Europe, security is a very real concern. In 2006 a dozen high caliber rifle shots were fired on the synagogue and community center in Oslo, and police determined that the perpetrator had conducted prior surveillance of the site. While the government has paid for some physical enhancements of the building, ongoing security remains the sole burden of the Jewish community, a significant financial obligation for such a small population.

Roma

The Roma and Traveler population in Norway is estimated to be small (about 10,000) and divided between transient and settled communities. They appear to encounter better treatment in Norway than in some other European countries, but still believe the government can do more in recognizing their special needs. One Roma leader argued that their social conditioning means normal employment paths may not work for them. Until recently there was a special government office that served as the main point of contact between state authorities and Roma. However, this is now closed and Roma are instead directed to municipal authorities. This is particularly problematic for Roma travelers who may leave Norway for extended periods. Schooling for Roma children may include books in the Roma language and teachers who focus on Roma culture, but this is not always the case. Many students will leave school at an early age, and providing the necessary schooling for children in transient communities has particular challenges.

Religious Groups and the Council for Religious and Life Stance Communities

The Council was originally established in 1996 as a vehicle for discussing the development of a curriculum on religion for the public schools. This itself reflected a change in education policy, which until then included only religious (Norwegian Lutheran) instruction. Education officials determined that students were largely ignorant about other religions. Today the Council is the central vehicle to bring together official representatives of major religious groups, including Jewish, Catholic, Baha'i, Muslim, Lutheran, and Protestant Free Churches, along with several humanist organizations. Council participants pointed out that education about religious diversity is important in more than theoretical ways, as Norwegian society itself has come to reflect that same diversity.

Another sign of change—and topic for discussion—was the recent constitutional amendment that eliminated the designation of the Norwegian Lutheran Church as the country's official religion. This was to be understood, we were told, as recognition of religious pluralism in Norway, and it may also result in some additional state support for other religious groups. Some participants noted that it would not have occurred had not Lutheran Church leaders also agreed. Presumably the law gives them greater freedom. By way of example, it was pointed out to us that no longer will the Norwegian king serve as the head of the Church with the authority to appoint its bishops.

Council participants expressed their belief that it was becoming increasingly more socially acceptable to be openly religious in Norwegian society.

By all accounts the interreligious Council with the active participation of the Muslim community played a significant role in defusing the tensions that arose with the publication of the "Mohammed cartoons" which first appeared in neighboring Denmark. Government officials also echoed this view.

Center for the Studies of Holocaust and Religious Minorities

The Center was created in 2005 and is housed in the former residence of Vidkun Quisling, the Prime Minister of the wartime Nazi puppet state. It is located in a leafy suburb of Oslo close by other attractions such as the Viking Museum. The Center includes in its basement floor a museum with a permanent exhibition on the Holocaust in Norway. The work of the Center focuses on research and
education; about 5,000 students visit the Center yearly. Much attention is placed on engaging the
student visitors (primarily 8th and 9th graders) and avoiding rote learning.
Several years earlier a Norwegian broadcast report revealed that teachers of the Holocaust were
reluctant to discuss the subject with their Muslim students. The Center was engaged to help develop
ways to work with teachers and address this problem as part of broader efforts to combat
anti-Semitism. They are gearing up to work on a pilot project with five schools where student prejudice will
be measured before and after the implementation of new teaching techniques.
The Center had also recently released the results of an extensive attitude survey with 1500 respondents.
As noted, it revealed that 12.5% of the population harbored strong, anti-Jewish prejudices. Center
researchers reported that those with anti-Jewish views are also likely to harbor negative views of other
minorities. The survey also reflected the fact that the Norwegian public is more critical of Israel and
largely "pro-Palestinian." Much attention focused on the finding that 38% believe that Israeli treatment
of the Palestinians is similar to the actions of the Nazis. They noted that people in this category were
also more likely to share traditional anti-Semitic views of Jews. Among the Center’s recommendations
are educational programs that not only deal with Jewish history and the Holocaust but also address
anti-Semitism as a special phenomenon with its own history.

Foreign Ministry
Norway’s oil wealth places it in an enviable position when compared with other European states.
However, its economic success means that it is fully dependent on immigration. Officials believe that
they have had a more “mature” public debate on multiculturalism than have their neighbors, and they
note that Norway’s conservative opposition party is more “responsible” on this issue than similar parties
in other countries. In part for this reason, the Breivik murders have had an even more powerful impact
on Norwegian society and leads to questions about how it is managing this social transition.

Ministry of Children, Equality and Social Inclusion
Although the country’s largest minority groups are Swedes and Poles for whom acculturation issues are
not dramatic, there are also significant minorities from Pakistan, Iraq, Turkey, Vietnam and the Balkans.
A strong focus is placed on integrating minorities in the labor market and society. To this end the
government provides asylum seekers with stipends while they attend two year obligatory culture and
language classes. Free language classes are also offered to most immigrants. Free kindergarten is also
provided as a means to help encourage women to join the work force. The Ministry has established a
goal of seeing women occupying 40 percent of public sector jobs and is keen on seeking immigrant
women to fill some of these positions.
There are established mandates for government ministries to promote social inclusion, which include
obligations to interview minority candidates and to report regularly on the results. A white paper on the
integration of minorities will soon be published which will contain proposals relating to integration and
combating discrimination.
Roma are classified as a national minority although their most visible presence appears to be begging in
the streets of Oslo. Ministry officials note the absence of Roma children among these beggars, a
common occurrence in other countries. They maintain that because of Norway’s “zero tolerance”
toward children not being in school, these Roma travelers do not bring their children with them.
Within the Ministry representatives of the Department of Integration and Diversity highlighted several
developments. These included the change in status of the Norwegian Lutheran Church as no longer the
official State religion, a national action plan soon to be adopted that will offer 66 measures to combat
discrimination, and a Justice Ministry action plan on extremism and the importance of measuring hate
crimes. These representatives also highlighted the recent survey that found 12.5% of the public harbor
negative attitudes toward Jews—a surprising figure, they said, considering the strong economy.

Ministry of Education
There is a strong tradition in Norway of all students attending the same (public) schools, which provides the opportunity to promote shared values, including human rights, respect for diversity and citizenship. Early education is considered especially important for integrating immigrant children into Norwegian society. About 35% of Norwegian students will attend universities, while the remainder is channeled into practical studies. A much higher percentage of second generation immigrants will attend universities than those of a first generation. There are relatively few Roma children in the education system, and those of settled Roma tend to leave school at a relatively early age (around 12). Very few reach higher levels. A new plan is being implemented to educate Roma parents and children together, but no results can yet be reported. Media reports in 2010 on the harassment of Jewish students in the schools led the Minister to establish a working group to propose an action plan which calls for a three year pilot project. Due to technical delays it is only now being announced. More details about this were shared with us by the Holocaust Study Center, which has been involved in formulating the project.

Department of Sami and Minority Affairs
There are five official national minorities: Roma, Romany/Tater, Kvens, Forest Finns, and Jews. Annual funding of about 6 million Norwegian Kroner is provided by the state to organizations representing these groups. An additional 25-30 million Kroner is available for special projects. [Although Muslims are recognized as a minority in Norway, classification as an official national minority requires settlement in Norway for 100 years or more.]

The Sami, numbering about 100,000, are classified as an indigenous people. There has been a resurgence in the use of the Sami language in recent years, which is viewed positively after efforts in the 1950s and 1960s at forced assimilation. Surveys show that the Sami face a significant degree of prejudice in Norway, although the national minority groups facing the most prejudice are Roma and Jews. Addressing the problems with Roma has been particularly difficult. In 2008 the Minister stated that government policies regarding Roma had “failed totally.” Limited education, disorganization and lack of trust contribute to the challenge.

Department officials note that Norway is a young state whose independence was established only in 1905. As a result in the search for a Norwegian identity, they said, it was a hard time for national minorities. Policies began to change in the postwar years, and Norway has issued a number of formal apologies for the mistreatment of them.

Office of Equality and Anti-Discrimination Ombudsman
The office was established in 2006 with responsibility to monitor compliance with anti-discrimination legislation adopted in the same year and with UN CERD commitments. It is the point of contact for public complaints about discrimination. It is hoped that it will serve to increase equality in society and promote ethnic diversity in the public and private sectors.

The Ombudsman has no authority to impose remedies or penalties. It can and does issue recommendations, and it can also wield some power by “naming and shaming” violators. In 2011 the office received 350 complaints. Discrimination based on disability accounted for 57% of those complaints. Only 20 were cases of religious discrimination; one-third of which involved Muslims. At the same time the office conducted a test on hiring practices of employers and determined that applicants with a Pakistani name were 25% less likely to be offered a job. The office indicated that it would classify complaints by Muslim women who encountered discrimination because they wear the hijab as a gender issue and not a religious one. Because many private resolutions worked out with complainants are kept secret the Ombudsman’s Office has no way of knowing how many of the 350 complaints have been positively resolved.
Still, the office can assist those who cannot afford to hire legal representation. Since it is a new agency, they hope their visibility and reach will increase over time. Officials also expressed some frustration, indicating that the laws are good but enforcement is an issue. They suggested that the police do not pay enough attention to discrimination and hate crime cases and believe that there are more cases than those registered.

**National Police Directorate**

When the doubts expressed in the Ombudsman Office were shared with representatives of the Police Directorate they were naturally defensive. At first they argued that hate crimes in Norway are low because crime in general is low. However, the most recent annual statistics available (2009) reported only 240 hate crimes (21 on religion, 183 on race and 33 on sexual orientation) a number dramatically lower than neighboring Sweden for example. Further discussion pointed to the need for a new and more reliable hate crime registration system.

Exact data on minority representation in the police force is not available, but officials estimate it to be only about 2.2%. A campaign is underway to recruit more minorities focusing on 18-26 year olds. Police training on diversity is not focused on hate crime reporting but rather on addressing underlying personal prejudices they may hold and the need for professionalism in their work.

The police maintain a special section to monitor hate on the Internet. Officials noted a significant degree of anti-Jewish hate speech at the time of the 2009 war in Gaza, which they say came as a revelation.

**Recommendations**

1. The Police Directorate needs to complete and implement its plan for more comprehensive monitoring and reporting of hate crime incidents. Police officers should receive the proper training on how to recognize and respond to hate crimes. In these areas ODIHR's Department on Tolerance and Non-Discrimination can offer assistance.

2. The Foreign Ministry should promote a civil discussion of the Middle East conflict and admonish those who in the course of debate would demonize the State of Israel.

3. The Government should bolster support for the Islamic Council and for the Religious Council dialogue as important civil society contributors to combating discrimination and promoting tolerance.

4. The Government and Parliament should ensure that Muslim communities face no barrier in providing for halal meat. As an important symbolic gesture it should repeal the 1929 ban on kosher slaughter.

5. Consideration should be given to provide additional financial support to the Jewish community to meet its security needs, as was done recently in neighboring Sweden.

6. The Holocaust Center and Ministry of Education experts might benefit from ODIHR's experience. ODIHR is ready to convene a regional roundtable to share information and exchange good practices on the development and implementation of teaching materials.

**APPENDIX:**

**List of participants in meetings with the Personal Representatives**

**Meetings with civil society representatives**

- Gunnar Gulbrandsen, Head of one of the Roma organizations in Norway
- Gunnar Stalsett, Moderator of the European Council of Religious Leaders, Bishop Emeritus of Oslo, Church of Norway
- Senaid Kobilica, President of the Council;
Faruk Terzic, Chairman, Imam Committee;
Shazia Mushtaq, IRN representative at STL.
Guri Hjeltnes, Director of the Center for Studies of Holocaust and Religious Minorities;
Peder Nustad, teaching assistant, Center for Studies of Holocaust and Religious Minorities;
Vibeke Moe, Center for Studies of Holocaust and Religious Minorities;
Mr Kjell Magne Bondevik, President of Oslo Center.
Tore Torstad, Executive Director of Oslo Center;
Einar Esteensnes, Senior Advisor of Oslo Center;
Anna Hushagen, Special Advisor of Oslo Center;
Ervin Kohn, President and Chairman of the Board of the Jewish Community in Oslo.

Meeting with the Council for Religious and Life Stance Communities
Britt Strandli Thoresen, the Baha’i Community of Norway;
Ingrid Rosendorf Joys, the Catholic Church in Norway;
Dag Nygård, Christian Council of Norway;
Camilla Aschjem, the Church of Norway;
Anne Sender, the Jewish Communities in Norway;
Lars-Petter Helgestad, the Council for Religious and Life Stance Communities;
Lise Tambø, the Council for Religious and Life Stance Communities.
Shazia Mushtaq, IRN representative at STL.

Ministry of Children, Equality and Social Inclusion
Inga Marthe Thorkildsen, Minister;
Anne Folkvord, Deputy Director General, Department of Integration and Diversity;
Thea Bull Skarstein, Deputy Director General, Department of Family Affairs and Equality;
Tewasen Teshome, Senior Advisor.

Ministry of Foreign Affairs
Torgeir Larsen, State Secretary;
Halvor Sætre, Deputy Director General, Section for Human Rights and Democracy;
Rune Resaland, Deputy Director General, Section for Security Policy and the High North;
Stein Iversen, Assistant Director General, Section for Russia, Eurasia and Regional Cooperation;
Geir Lølkkken, Assistant Director General in the Section for Human Rights and Democracy;
Birgit A. Kleven, Senior Adviser, Section for Russia, Eurasia and Regional Cooperation;
Monika P. Thowsen, Senior Adviser, Section for Human Rights and Democracy.

Ministry of Government Administration, Reform and Church Affairs, Department of Sami and Minority Affairs
Raimo Valle, State Secretary for Sami and Minority Affairs;
Bjørn Olav Megard, Director General, Department of Sami and Minority Affairs;
Magnus Forberg Andersen, Adviser, Department of Sami and Minority Affairs.

Ministry of Education and Research, Department for Education and Training
Eli Telhaug, Deputy Secretary General;
Karl Brustad, Deputy Director General;
Jørgen Haavardsholm, Senior Adviser.
November 20, 2012

Mr. Erik Ullenhag
Minister for Integration
Stockholm, Sweden

Dear Mr. Minister,

I am grateful for the opportunity to meet with you in Stockholm on November 12, and for the assistance that was provided me by your government for other meetings during my brief visit. By way of this letter, I would like to acknowledge the positive steps that have already been taken, review some of the salient points that emerged during our discussions and propose some recommendations going forward.

1. As I had pointed out in my 2010 report, the Jewish community in Sweden must assume an outsized security burden unlike any other religious or ethnic community, absorbing some 25 per cent of its overall budget. All governments bear the primary responsibility to insure that minorities can function freely and safely within society. We very much appreciate that you were able to channel funds during this past year to provide a significant, one-time payment to the Jewish Community (as a national minority) to install security enhancements. However, much of the community security also requires maintaining trained personnel, and thus we hope that the Swedish Government will find a way to provide annual financial support. We have seen how events in the Middle East frequently trigger anti-Semitic incidents in Europe, and in light of the current conflict with Gaza we should be braced.
2. Sweden’s National Council for Crime Prevention (BRA) is widely recognized for its comprehensive work in documenting incidents of hate crimes, including those of an anti-Semitic nature. Their data (available through 2011) document the high level of police reports with anti-Semitic motives that have occurred in Stockholm, Gothenburg and especially Malmo. Incidents in Malmo in particular seem to parallel controversies relating to Israel and the Middle East, but the current reporting procedures of BRA do not identify the perpetrators of these anti-Semitic incidents, even if they may be discerned from the police reports. However, BRA officials informed us that if tasked with such an assignment from the Government they would be able to review police reports and offer an informed analysis of the sources of anti-Semitic incidents. Such a report would have obvious value—a sharper knowledge of the source of the problem can help to devise better ways to combat it. Thus, the Government should ask BRA to prepare this analysis as soon as possible.

3. It is also important to note that by BRA’s own measures, approximately half of all hate crimes that the Council identifies from its analysis of police reports are in fact not classified as such by the police officers themselves. Even though reporting forms contain a box for police to check if it appears that the crime was such, they obviously lack the knowledge or instructions to do so properly. If only for this reason, it would be important for police officers in Sweden—and particularly those in the region covering Malmo—to participate in appropriate hate crime training programs. Recognizing that the final decision on such matters rests with the twenty-one independent regional police agencies, we hope you and other senior officials in the Ministry of Justice will follow through as promised and encourage participation in the OSCE’s TAHCLE police training program particularly for that region that encompasses Malmo.

4. Sweden is to be commended for providing a generous grant to the Swedish Committee Against anti-Semitism to implement a teacher training program for combating anti-Semitism in the Malmo region that is expected to reach 400 teachers and that will make use of materials originally developed in conjunction with ODIHR. However, recognizing that Jewish students have reported that some teachers are often indifferent to or dismissive of their complaints, this teacher training project should also include an evaluation component to determine its effectiveness.

5. There is little doubt that the frequently provocative and even incendiary statements of Malmo Mayor Reepalu have exacerbated the problem in that city while also projecting a negative picture of Sweden internationally. This only underscores the importance of national leaders to speak out clearly and swiftly when there are instances of anti-Semitism as well as finding ways to demonstrate their solidarity with the Jewish community at these times. One notable and innovative example has been the Kippah walks that have occurred on some Saturdays in Malmo, and I want to thank you for your personal participation in this. It is useful to note that they provide an innovative example of employing electronic social media to counter anti-Semitism and intolerance which could be replicated elsewhere.

In closing, I can report that most people with whom I spoke on this visit indicated that in recent months the problem of anti-Semitism in Sweden has received increased attention and generated thoughtful and serious discussion. We all know that this is an essential first step if the problem is to be properly addressed. And the problem, as we also see, is still very much present. However, I am hopeful that with
continued efforts and with the leadership in this area that you have personally exhibited, there will be success.

As I noted during our meeting, we anticipate that the OSCE will organize a conference on Jewish community security in the first part of 2013 that will bring together Jewish community leaders, governmental authorities and representatives of the participating States in order to discuss this critical problem and showcase best practices that are worth replicating. It would be a good opportunity for Sweden to share its own experiences.

Let me thank in advance for your continued attention to this issue.

With sincere regards,

[Signature]
Mr. SMITH. Thank you very much, Rabbi Baker. Without objection, your reports and your entire testimony and that of all of our distinguished witnesses will be made a part of the record. And thank you for that very fine testimony.

I would like to recognize Rabbi Meyer, if you would proceed.

STATEMENT OF RABBI DAVID MEYER, PROFESSOR OF RABBINIC LITERATURE AND CONTEMPORARY JEWISH THOUGHT, PONTIFICAL GREGORIAN UNIVERSITY

Rabbi MEYER. I would like, first of all, to thank you for asking me to testify in front of this committee and to offer me the opportunity to share my experience of anti-Semitism in Europe, but as well my understanding of the nature of what I perceive as a renewed threat of European anti-Semitism. Now as a rabbi based in Brussels, at the heart of Europe, and carrying both a French and an Israeli citizenship, I have witnessed and experienced in my life the reality of what it means to be a Jew at least in Western Europe.

I was born and raised in Paris. I have lived in France for many years. I have served as a rabbi in the United Kingdom and as well as in Brussels. I am working in universities in Rome as you have mentioned. But let me add that my personal life has taught me some difficult experience of anti-Semitism. First of all, of course, because of the memory of my own family which is the memory of the Shoah, but also because as a young boy at the age of 13 I was the victim of the first terrorist attack against my synagogue in 1980. But also some more subtle forms of anti-Semitism that I have experienced later on in my life in the political French or British arena. So now between my work in Rome and France and Belgium and England, I think I have maybe some sort of perspective at least on the current state of anti-Semitism in Europe.

Now I believe that two powerful trends of anti-Semitism are currently at work in most European countries, and permit me to illustrate this with just two recent concrete examples which have already been mentioned before in the panel. The first example just literally over a year ago in the small Jewish school of Toulouse in March of last year. And we know that there, a radical young French Muslim man killed, literally, in cold blood three Jewish children, age three, six and eight, as well as the rabbi who was also a teacher in the school and who was the father of some of the victims. And the killer not only did the killing but also filmed his action with a certain pride, certainly, and intended to post it on the Internet. And we all know and heard about that atrocity.

The second example I want to mention relates to a trend that many have observed in Europe during the last decade. And that trend has taken the form of this proposed legislation that we have already mentioned a few times this morning that tend to outlaw some Jewish practices and some Jewish rituals. At first it started many years ago with questions about Jewish kosher ritual slaughtering, but more recently as we know, it moved against circumcision. And only last year the German courts attempted to ban circumcision, defining it really as a barbaric practice that was totally contrary to the understanding of European human rights, and in-
sinuating that such a Jewish practice was not equal or proper European custom.

Now the idea spread within weeks to its neighboring countries, notably to Switzerland, to Austria, but to others as well, and what is worrying is that many in the intellectual and in the university circles have been very receptive and very sympathetic to that kind of arguments. Now of course today the German ruling have been quashed, but there is very little question in my mind that the problem will come back and eventually we will have to face such a difficult situation. So from these two very different examples of attacks against Jews and Judaism, I think some understanding of what is at stake in Europe can be gained.

First, there is no doubt that many of the violent acts of anti-Semitism in recent years have been at the hands of radicalized youth, often from Muslim backgrounds, very often marginalized by society and influenced by their religious preachers and leaders. Often the acts of violence are linked as we know to the conflict of the Middle East, and what is a racist violence against Jews is often masked as a frustration and a real hate against the State of Israel. We are all aware that in that respect and for those people, the use of the term anti-Zionism is simply a code word and it really stands for anti-Semitism. Now it is of course totally impossible for any of us to understand what went through the mind of the killer in Toulouse as he shot the Jewish children, but I think it is not a stretch to say that the Israeli conflict was probably not, really not what made him put a bullet through the brains of these children and the rabbi.

Now at this first level many in the Jewish community believe, and I think they are right, that as long as this link to the conflict in the Middle East is tolerated, as long as this radical form of violent Islam is tolerated, and as long as virulent calls to delegitimize the very existence of Israel is tolerated, then anti-Semitism will also of course be tolerated because as Jews, whether or not we carry a dual citizenship as I do, our link with Israel is deep, it is real and it is enduring, and as such we will continue to be seen as related to Israel.

Now second, and developing in the shadow of these very violent and visible attacks against Jews, is the very concept of Judaism, I think, as a religion that is now somehow questioned by many in Europe as being simply not compatible with European ethics, human rights, charters, and sensitivities. As a European Jew, I can say that what hurts the most today is the knowledge that behind these various attempts at undermining the legality of Jewish practices lies the widely held view that even after 2,000 years of attested Jewish life in Europe we are still perceived as a foreign tribe who has recently landed on the continent, and that when all is said and done we are still often perceived as a tolerated minority whose religious practices are well below the standards of the image Europe likes to project about itself.

Now antagonizing through the coverup of legal proceeding with a moralistic undertone, the ethics and practice of Judaism on one hand versus the European understanding of its own charter of human rights on the other hand runs the risk of putting for the long term Judaism in Europe on a colliding path that is most wor-
risome and potentially very dangerous. In addition I feel it is im-
portant to add that the legal nature of this new anti-Semitism is
particularly troubling. As worrisome as the street noises, it is
through legislation that some in Europe are attempting to give a
cloak of respectability to anti-Semitism, and the memory of the
past century should make it crystal clear that legal proceeding
against Judaism and its practice never stop with attacks on reli-
gious practices alone. It inevitably ends with attacks against Jews
which are eventually also done under the cover of legality. Now it
is my view to conclude that what Europe needs to do maybe, in
order to truly fight anti-Semitism, is to really accept, really to ac-
cept and not just to tolerate its own Jewish population. To value
Judaism and to value Jewish community in Europe cannot be lim-
ited to simple words of comfort when tragedy strikes. We appre-
ciate the words of comfort but that is not really what we need. It
requires more than that. It needs a leader to show a real interest
in Judaism and to do so publicly. An interest that would not simply
be the expression of a devotion to the mythical image of the Jews
that would be just a remnant from the past that once contributed
to the makeup of Europe and its culture and later almost exterminated from Europe, but rather a genuine interest. Because
as a minority even if very small in number, very small and declin-
ing, we are still contributing to make Europe what it is today,
bringing a certain diversity of values and knowledge. Tolerating
any level of anti-Semitic acts against Jews, either under the cover
of anti-Zionism or less subtly for just being Jewish, is a sign of a
wider feeling of intolerance and hate within our society and not
just against Judaism but against all citizen of all faith and threat-
ens a return to the darkest years in Europe when those who were
different were selected for a fate that we all remember.
So thank you so much for taking the time to listen to this brief
testimony and contribution to your discussion.
[The prepared statement of Rabbi Meyer follows:]
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Title of Hearing: “Anti-Semitism: A Growing Threat to All Faiths”
I would like first of all to thank all of you for asking me to testify in front of this committee and to offer me the opportunity to share with you my experiences of anti-Semitism in Europe as well as my understanding of the nature of the renewed threat of European anti-Semitism. As a rabbi based in Brussels, at the heart of Europe, carrying both a French and Israeli citizenship, I have witnessed and experienced the reality of being a Jew in Western Europe. I was born and raised in Paris, I lived in France for many years, I have served as a rabbi in both the United Kingdom and in Brussels; I am currently a professor of rabbinic literature at the Gregorian Pontifical university in Rome as well as at the University of Leuven in Belgium. So between France, Belgium, England and Italy, I believe that my experiences as a Jewish religious leader in these countries has given me a perspective on the current state of anti-Semitism in Europe.

My first encounter with the reality of anti-Semitism happened in 1980. In October of that year, as a young boy about to become a Bar Mitzvah, I found myself on a Friday night in synagogue. This particular synagogue was in central Paris – known as the Synagogue Copernic. Towards the end of the service, a bomb suddenly exploded just outside the doors; when the panic and confusion subsided, four people had lost their lives – one, a woman entering the synagogue and three others who were passing by. At almost 13, prior to this day, I could never have been able to imagine that as a Jew I could be targeted in such a way. In the hours following the bombing, the Jewish community heard the expected reactions, linking such an act of Jewish hatred to the never-ending conflict in the Middle East. What was not expected, however, and far more shocking, were the words of the then Prime Minister, Raymond Barre. In front of the nation, the Prime Minister deplored the attack on the synagogue and expressed condolences to the victims and their families, but then went further and made sure to specify that “this horrendous attack was aimed at the Jewish community but it is finally innocent French citizens that were mostly the victims”. Even to a young and naïve boy, it did not take long to truly understand the meaning of these words. It was clear – the Jew entering the synagogue was not innocent whereas the people passing by were. From that day, more then 33 years ago, I have learnt and never forgotten that many in Europe could never see me as a citizen like any other.

Many years after the bombing in Paris and by then an ordained Rabbi, I was once again profoundly shaken. I was honoured when I was invited as a guest speaker in front of one of the military sub-commission of the French Senate in Paris. The topic I was asked to address was “the impact of the Middle East conflict in European societies”. As one does under such circumstances, I started to briefly present myself: as a rabbi, with dual citizenship (French and Israeli), having lived and worked in four different western European countries, widely published on both Jewish and Israeli issues in respected national newspapers. In so doing, I had believed that I was presenting my “credentials” - seeking to establish in my own way some from of credibility that would allow me to present to such a forum, my view on such an important topic. To my audience, however, I had done just the opposite. Certain members of this commission, who questioned the legitimacy of my dual citizenship, abruptly interrupted me. Not only were my credentials to speak before the commission deemed unsuitable, but my very loyalty to France was called into question and I was told very bluntly to “return to my country” – clearly the
reference being Israel. As a Jew, claiming and affirming a deep relationship with
Israel, in the eyes of this commission, I could not be a loyal citizen of France and that
clearly I did not have a place among them.

I could certainly carry on with more examples. I could tell you how a high official in
England once very rationally explained to me (ironically during a discussion on
interfaith dialogue) why as Jews we should never forget that we were only a
“tolerated minority” in the country. By “tolerated” I can only assume that as
humans, we were not equal. But going on with my personal examples would be to
miss the point of my testimony today. My experiences of anti-Semitism have
certainly wounded me and affected my views on my own personal future as a Jew in
Europe but yet, they pale in comparison to the violence that has been inflicted to
others within the Jewish community. How not to think of the sheer horror that was
inflicted on a small Jewish school, in March of 2012 in Toulouse? There, a radical
young French Muslim killed, in cold blood, three Jewish children aged 3, 6 and 8 as
well as a rabbi, a teacher and a father of one of the victims. In Synagogues across
Europe and in Jewish community centres, who can say today that we do not have a
moment of hesitation and fear as we enter the doors and pass through guards and
security? How not to mention as well the never-ending cases where the Holocaust is
both denied and in the same breath (and often by the same leaders) deemed not to
have gone far enough. The memory of the Holocaust has now become in Europe a
theme of division. As a father, how can I not look at my daughters without a mix of
fear and apprehension about what Jewish life in Europe will be, for not only them,
but also for their own children?

But is this a new reality to Europe? There is no denying that Europe has never been
kind to its Jewish population and we can evoke unspeakable horror. Yet, what is
new is that after a period of roughly 50 years following the second world war and
the Holocaust, during which anti-Semitism - it was believed and hope - had ceased,
we see and witness again renewed expression and acts of Jewish hatred in the public
domain. We again see tragedies, we again see physical attacks on Jews whose only
crime is to be Jewish, we see and hear verbal expressions of hatred against Jews and
Judaism and we again see attacks on Jewish institutions and synagogues. Clearly,
this is an upsetting trend and is deeply troubling.

Of course, many leaders in Europe are committed to fighting this renewal of anti­
Semitic expression and violence. In France in particular, we have been fortunate to
have had and continue to have courageous Presidents, one after the other, both from
the right and from the left, clearly affirming that the fight against anti-Semitism was
and is a national priority. In Germany as well, political leaders have been for many
years now in the forefront of this fight against the resurgence of anti-Semitism. The
words, in this respect, have been right, the speeches moving and the tone solemn.
But anti-Semitism remains on the rise. Jewish communities are more and more
fearesome for their own security and the physical safety of individual Jews is once
again an issue. So beyond the words of condemnation that are heard after tragedies,
beyond the words of comfort to the victims and their families, have our political
leaders done what is necessary? The uncomfortable truth is that, whatever the words
of politicians in Europe, it is somehow accepted for Jews to be targeted. There is a
level of “tolerance” to acts of violence against the Jewish community that is profoundly disturbing.

I believe that in order to try to understand why a certain level of anti-Semitism remains “tolerated”, one needs to dig deeper into our analysis of anti-Semitism in Europe. There is no doubt that many of the violent acts of anti-Semitism in recent years has been at the hands of a radicalised youth, from Muslim backgrounds often marginalised and influenced by their religious preachers and leaders. Often the acts of violence are linked to the conflict in the Middle East and what is racist violence against Jews is often masked as frustration against Israel. We are all aware that for these people, “anti-Zionism” is but a code word for “anti-Semitism”. Of course it is impossible to understand what went through the mind of Mohamed Merah as he shot dead Jewish children in Toulouse last year but it is not a stretch to say that the Israeli conflict was probably not what made him put a bullet through the brains of these innocent children. At this first level, many in the Jewish community believe – and they are right - that as long as this link to the conflict in the Middle East is tolerated, as long as a radical form of violent Islam is tolerated, as long as virulent calls to delegitimize the very existence of Israel is tolerated, anti-Semitism will also somehow be tolerated because as Jews, whether or not we carry an dual citizenship as I do, our link with Israel is deep, real and enduring.

Yet, anti-Semitism in Europe is not limited to these radical groups and this specific brand of anti-Semitism alone. A second level of anti-Semitism operates and thrives in the shadow of the first, one feeding from the other. It is a form of anti-Semitism that runs deep through the veins of European society – through its universities, leaders, policy makers and decision makers and politicians both from the far right to the radical left. It is the result of an old European mentality that has never really accepted the place of not only Jews as individuals but also of Judaism as a religion in its midst and that thrives in any historical moment of turmoil and economic difficulty. A situation and a reality that enables some level of anti-Semitism to remain “tolerated” within many European societies. One could hope that through education, perhaps even peace in the Middle East, the first level of anti-Semitism could, in some utopic future be eradicated. With this second level of anti-Semitism however, if the horrors of the Holocaust have not dampened it and it has not only survived but thrives in Europe today, not even the most naïve form of hope seems to be on the horizon. As Jews, we have very good reason to worry.

It is with great anxiety that over the last decade we have witnessed how this “old European based feeling of anti-Semitism” morphs into a new form of expression of rejection of Jews and Judaism. It has taken the form of proposed legislations that seek to outlaw Jewish practices and rituals. Recently, in Germany, a court attempted to ban circumcision as a barbaric practice contrary to European understanding of human rights and insinuating that such a Jewish practice is not “equal” to “proper” European customs. The idea spread within weeks to its neighbours, notably Switzerland and Austria. Many, in intellectual and university circles have been receptive and sympathetic to these arguments. This current situation raises an important question for Europe. The wording of the ruling makes it clear and states that the “irreversible bodily harm” thus imposed on the child without his consent is illegal. This, the court argues, amounts to a crime and a breach of the European...
charter of human rights as it exposes the infant to "potential physical dangers" for no other reason then the religious conviction of his parents. One could easily extrapolate from there that the same conclusions could be reached regarding not just circumcision but the very notion of Jewish identity. Most Jews are simply born Jewish, without any form of choice. In light of European Jewish history, where the very act of being Jewish was enough to bring death and violence, one could then argue that being born from a Jewish mother could very well expose the child - without his consent - to "potential physically dangers". By over-emphasising the rights of the child and the constant need for "consent", the German judges are setting themselves on a colliding path with Jewish identity, "choice-less" in its nature. Thus, the real issue is a philosophical one. Does Europe, in its own system of thought, leave a place for a tradition like ours based on a "choice-less" identity? The question is daunting. The "choice-less" reality of Jewish existence shatters many aspects of contemporary European thinking and is therefore not a stretch of the imagination to foresee a potential clash of deep philosophical values between Europe and its Jews.

As a Jew, as a rabbi having spent a great deal of time studying Jewish European history, the current state of anti-Semitism leads me to some simple observations with which I would like to conclude. The first one is the realization that what hurts the most in Europe today is the knowledge that behind these various attempts at undermining the legality of Jewish practices, lies the widely held view that even after 2000 years of attested Jewish life in Europe we are still perceived as a foreign tribe recently landed on the European continent.

The second observation is specifically linked to the "legal" nature of this new anti-Semitism. As worrisome as the "street noises", it is through legislation that some in Europe are attempting to give a cloak of "respectability" to its anti-Semitism. The memory of the past century should make it crystal clear that legal proceedings against Judaism and its practices does not stop with attacks on religious practices. It inevitably ends with attacks against Jews.

Thirdly, that Europe should learn to come to terms with the emotional bond many Jews have to Israel. As Jews, we do have deep emotional feelings for the State of Israel that goes well beyond the rigorous criticism of Israel's policies that is at time needed. As such, systematic diabolisation of Israel will always end with a diabolisation of the Jews and to anti-Semitic violence.

It is my view that what Europe needs to do in order to truly fight anti-Semitism is to truly accept and not just tolerate its own Jewish populations. To value Judaism and Jewish communities in Europe cannot be limited to words of comfort when tragedy strikes. It requires much more then that. Our leaders need to show a real interest in Judaism and to do so publically. An interest that would not simply be the expression of a "devotion" to the mythical image of the Jews, remnant from the past that once contributed to the make-up of Europe and its culture and later almost exterminated from Europe. But rather a genuine interest, because as a minority, even if very small in numbers, we are still contributing to making Europe what it is today and bringing a certain diversity of values and knowledge. Tolerating any level of anti-Semitic acts against Jews - either under the cover of anti-Zionism or less subtly, for just being.
Jewish is a sign of a wider feeling of intolerance and hate within our society— not just against Judaism but against all citizens, of all faiths and threatens a return to those darkest years in Europe when those that were different were selected for death.
Mr. SMITH. Rabbi Meyer, thank you very much for your excellent testimony, and I would like to now ask Rabbi Bleich if he would proceed.

STATEMENT OF RABBI YAAKOV BLEICH, CHIEF RABBI OF KIEV AND UKRAINE

Rabbi BLEICH. Thank you very much. First and foremost, I would like to say how proud I am to be here today. I am proud not only as the Chief Rabbi of Ukraine who has been living in Ukraine for 23 years through Soviet rule, downfall, and the birth of an independent Ukraine, but I am proud as an American citizen that my country recognizes that opportunities cause obligations. The opportunity for these distinguished members of the House to positively affect the lives of Jews and other minorities living in Europe has cause them to act and have this hearing today.

On the one hand, I think that many in Ukraine would be quite happy about today's hearing. We finally made it. We are part of Europe. Something that we have been pushing and bargaining for, for many years. However, it is quite unfortunate circumstance that brings us here today, the question of anti-Semitism in Ukraine. Being that the situation with anti-Semitism in Ukraine is very different from Western Europe, I would like to explain a few things about the history of anti-Semitism in Ukraine.

There were historically two camps in Ukraine that were competing with each other. There was the extremist negative nationalist animosity toward Jews, which is probably best portrayed in Sholom Aleichem's writings such as "The Fiddler on the Roof." But moreso was the government sponsored anti-Semitism begun by the czars as official edicts and decrees against the Jews. It was perfected to a science by the Soviets. I won't even mention or get into when the government provoked the local pogroms and used the locals. During Soviet times Jews were systematically discriminated against in every single sphere of society and social life. As of 1992 and Ukraine's independence, government anti-Semitism has—all but disappeared. There are instances of anti-Semitic acts carried out in Ukraine, but I would like to now speak about the form and substance of anti-Semitism problems in Ukraine, home to one of the largest Jewish communities in Europe.

Besides being a society that has not yet perfected to put it mildly, the rule of law, Ukrainian Jews live in a double shadow of the Holocaust and Soviet rule. The first and foremost form, of course, is acts of violence and vandalism. When people and property are attacked because they are Jews, which we have been hearing about this morning, that is an expression and most painful form of anti-Semitism, and thank God that is the least prevalent in Ukraine. Although we have had instances of attacks, thank God they have been few.

The second form of anti-Semitism is publication of literature, speeches, political platforms which incite or may incite against Jews as individuals or as a group. This is more prevalent although not at epidemic proportions at all. I think it is important to point out that there was a time not too long ago when this was a very serious problem in Ukraine. There was a so-called university in Ukraine which was printing and distributing tremendous amounts
of anti-Semitic literature with total impunity in Ukraine. This was stopped when the ones who were sponsoring this anti-Semitism withdrew their financial support. By the way, the sponsors were not Ukrainians and not even people or groups living or based in Ukraine.

The third form of anti-Semitism, which I think is unique to that part of let us say Eastern Europe and Soviet Union, is what I call psychological anti-Semitism. It may be unique to countries that have suffered from the Holocaust and from government anti-Semitism. People who have suffered from a feeling of being unprotected by law enforcement will react and be frightened when seemingly harmless things happen such as a street being named in honor of Stepan Bandera. Most Jews and many others consider Bandera and his group of Ukrainian nationalists in Western Ukraine responsible for dozens of pogroms during World War II and the time before and after. It may or may not be true, but to someone who believes it, it will be frightening. When former President Yushchenko who was widely regarded as pro-Western and prodemocratic was President of Ukraine, when he decided to honor Bandera and Shukhevich with the highest civilian honor as Heroes of Ukraine, it brought out a terrible reaction by the Jewish community. Nobody was hurt. No one was attacked. Nobody was cited or spoken against. But for the psyche of a Ukrainian Jew that was anti-Semitic. And that brings me to the subject at hand.

I believe that 7 percent of the parliamentary seats in Ukraine occupied by members of the Svoboda party is definitely something that should concern us all. It should not be downplayed or ignored. Just as we all agree that understanding the true threat is very, very important, understating it is wrong, so too overstating it and blowing it out of proportion is damaging. I am not an apologist for Ukraine nor for its government or its people. However, I think it is important that we study the source of the votes, evaluate that true power of the party, its members, and know where it is heading.

The Jews of Ukraine, a historically vulnerable community, does not feel very vulnerable. This may be naivete or it may be the fact that Svoboda has never put up a serious platform. The majority of their voters were protest voters voting for the most outspoken opposition party. The Svoboda party has not been able to achieve anything in the local councils that they control, and in the opinion of some analysts, Svoboda is just a populist party whose members are not united by any ideology whatsoever other than a seat in Parliament and the power that comes with it. Indeed, Mr. Tyagnabok, the head of the party, has been trying to meet with members of the Jewish community to convince them that he is not in any way anti-Semitic. He has met with the United States' Ambassador and more recently with the Israeli Ambassador. So the impression is that Mr. Tyagnabok just doesn't control the members of his party.

That is not very comforting since the rhetoric is continuing. It may, however, show that the party has no discipline, which may stop them from introducing any serious legislation to the Parliament. However, if the politics of right wing nationalism, anti-Semitism, xenophobia, are allowed to fester and are ignored, the
danger of this 7 percent growing is very possible. Nobody is passing laws or even trying to pass legislation against Jews in Ukraine. No one is calling for Jews to be deported, or worse, God forbid. However, we need not wait for something like that to happen.

We therefore appreciate the statements made by the government, by Prime Minister Azarov stating that the Government of Ukraine will never negotiate agreements for coalition or legislation with Svoboda or any party that puts forth anti-Semitism as part of its platform. While anti-Semitism remains a political problem in Ukraine, there is by no means a greater threat than in other East European countries nor in many established European democracies where anti-Semitic parties and leaders retain significant political support. Moreover, the Government of Ukraine has a pretty good level of high level participation and events organized by the Jewish community including Holocaust commemoration.

Jewish life inside Ukraine is dynamic with the functioning of numerous Jewish schools, vibrant religious life, and a network of important cultural and community centers. In addition, significant work is being done by Ukranian NGOs and research institutions and by a network of scholars who are committed to examining the historical evidence related to the Holocaust, Soviet era official anti-Semitism and anti-Jewish violence that erupted over the centuries. A number of energetic publishers issue a wide array of books on Jewish culture, Ukrainian Jewish history, Holocaust studies in Ukraine for a general audience and for higher educational institutions.

Finally, Ukraine’s state relations with Israel are on a very strong footing, including in the cultural sphere, which contributes to confidence of Ukraine’s Jewish community and reinforces strong links between the Jewish homeland and Ukraine’s Jewish diaspora. I hope that Ukraine continues its development into a true Western democratic, pluralistic society where all citizens will continue to feel safe and protected. It is my hope that European leaders will all join in making that statement reality. That Jews throughout Europe and indeed the world will live as full citizens of their countries and that anti-Semitism, anti-Zionism and other negative feelings of discrimination and xenophobia are overpowered by feelings of respect and harmony.

I would like to thank the NGOs, the basis of our great democracy here, and civil society in the United States for seeing beyond the borders of the United States and speaking out on these issues. I especially want to thank Mark Levin and the NCSJ for being our voice in Washington for so many years.

[The prepared statement of Rabbi Bleich follows:]
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First and foremost, I would like to say how proud I am to be here today. I am proud not only as the Chief Rabbi of Ukraine who has been living abroad for 23 years, through Soviet rule, downfall and the birth of an independent Ukraine. I am proud as an American, that my country recognizes that opportunities cause obligations. The opportunity for these distinguished members of the House to positively affect the lives of Jews and other minorities living in Europe, caused them to act and have this hearing today.

On the one hand, I think that many in Ukraine will be very happy about today’s hearing! We finally made it! Ukraine is finally recognized as part of Europe! Something we have been pushing and bargaining for many years. However, it is an unfortunate circumstance that brings me here today. It is the question of anti-Semitism in Ukraine.

Being that the situation with anti-Semitism is very different from Western Europe, I would like to explain a few things about the history of anti-Semitism in Ukraine. There were historically 2 camps competing with each other. There was the nationalist grass roots animosity between Ukrainians and Jews which is probably best portrayed in Sholom Aleichem’s writings such as The Fiddler on the Roof. But more so was the Government sponsored anti-Semitism. Begun by the Czars as official edicts and decrees against the Jews, it was perfected to a science by the Soviets. I am not mentioning when the government provoked the local pogroms. During Soviet times Jews were systematically discriminated against in every single sphere of society and social life.

As of 1992 and Ukraine’s independence, government anti-Semitism has thank G-d all but disappeared. There are instances of anti-Semitic acts carried out in Ukraine but I would like to now speak about form and substance of Anti-Semitism. I believe that that is very important in understanding the unique forms of anti-Semitism prevalent in a society that has not yet perfected, to put it mildly, the rule of law.

1) The first and foremost form is of course acts of violence and vandalism. When people or property are attacked because they are Jews, that is the expression and most painful form of anti-Semitism. Thank G-d that is the least prevalent in Ukraine. Although we have had instances of attacks, thank G-d they have been few.

2) The second form of anti-Semitism is publication of literature, speeches, political platforms which incite or may incite against Jews as individual or as a group. This is more prevalent in Ukraine, although not at epidemic proportions at all. I think that it is important to point out, that there was a time, not too long ago when this was a serious problem. There was a so called University in Ukraine printing and distributing tremendous amounts of anti-Semitic literature with total impunity in Ukraine. This was stopped when the ones sponsoring this anti-Semitism
withdrew their financial support. By the way, the sponsors were not Ukrainians and not even people or groups living or based in Ukraine.

3) The 3rd form of Anti Semitism in Ukraine I would call psychological Anti-Semitism. It may be unique to Eastern Europe, to countries that have suffered in the not so distant past from the Holocaust, from Government Anti-Semitism. People who have suffered from a feeling of being unprotected by law enforcement will react and be frightened when seemingly harmless things happen. Such as a street being named in honor of Stepan Bandera. Most Jews and many others consider Bandera and his group of Ukrainian nationalists in Western Ukraine responsible for dozens of pogroms. It may or may not be true, but to someone who believes it, it will be frightening. When Former President Yushchenko, the so called Pro Western and Pro Democracy President of Ukraine decided to honor Bandera and Shukhevich with the highest Civilian Honor as Heroes of Ukraine, it brought out a terrible reaction by the Jewish Community. Nobody was hurt, attacked or even incited or spoken against! But for the psyche of a Ukrainian Jew that was anti-Semitic. And that brings me to the subject at hand.

Just as you will all agree that understating the true threat is wrong, so too, overstating it and blowing it out of proportion is damaging. I am not an apologist for Ukraine. Not for its government or for its people. I believe that the 7% of the Parliament seats in Ukraine occupied by members of the Svoboda party is definitely something that should concern us and should not be downplayed or ignored. However, we must study the source of the votes and evaluate the true power of the party, its members and know where it is heading. The Jews of Ukraine, an historically vulnerable community, does not feel vulnerable. Is it naivette? Or is it the fact that the Svoboda party has never put up a serious platform? The majority of their voters were protest voters, voting for the most outspoken opposition party. The Svoboda party has not been able to achieve anything in the local councils they control. It is the opinion of some analysts, that Svoboda is a populist party, its members not united by any ideology whatsoever, other than a seat in Parliament and the power that comes with it. Indeed, Mr. Tyagnabok, the head of the party has been trying to meet with members of the Jewish Community to explain to them that he is in no way Anti-Semitic. He has met with the US Ambassador, and more recently with the Israeli Ambassador. The impression is, that Mr. Tyagnabok does not control his members. That is not very comforting since the rhetoric is continuing. It may show, that the party has no discipline, which can stop them from introducing any serious legislation to the parliament. However, if the politics of right wing nationalism, anti-Semitism, xenophobia, are allowed to fester and are totally ignored the danger of this 7% growing is possible. Nobody is passing laws or even trying to pass legislation against Jews in Ukraine. Nobody is calling for Jews to be deported or worse G-d forbid. However, we need not wait for something bad to happen. We therefore appreciate the statements made by Prime Minister Azarov, stating that the government of Ukraine will never negotiate agreements for coalition or legislation with Svoboda or any party that put forth Anti-Semitism as part of its platform.

I hope, that Ukraine continues its development into a true Western democratic society, where all citizens will continue to feel safe and protected. It is my hope that European leaders join in making that statement a reality. That Jews throughout Europe, and indeed the world, will live as full citizens of the countries of Europe. That the anti-Semitism, anti-Zionism and other negative feelings of discrimination and xenophobia are overpowered by feelings of respect and harmony.
Mr. Smith. Chief Rabbi Bleich, thank you very much for that very powerful testimony and thank you for being here, for coming all this way. I would like to now, Mr. Srulevitch, if you would proceed.

STATEMENT OF MR. ANDREW SRULEVITCH, DIRECTOR OF EUROPEAN AFFAIRS, ANTI-DEFAMATION LEAGUE

Mr. Srulevitch. Mr. Chairman, on behalf of the anti-Defamation League I want to express our appreciation to you and to the members of the subcommittee for holding this hearing today, and for the many hearings, letters and statements with which you have underscored the importance of combating anti-Semitism. ADL's written statement covers a variety of concerns relevant to this hearing and the subcommittee, but one of the most alarming, as has been spoken about, is the election of neo-Nazi parties to European parliaments. Now this concern is shared at the highest levels of the European Union.

Just 4 weeks ago, the EU Commissioner for Home Affairs, Cecilia Malmstrom, the counterpart for our Attorney General, said, “Not since the Second World War have so many extremist political movements had such a place in so many elected parliamentary assemblies. In some countries we also have neo-Nazis elected. If this trend continues the next European elections for 2014 could strengthen these forces, and we should not underestimate what this will mean for the European project.”

Now since you have heard about Jobbik, though more could and should be said, and about Svoboda, I want to speak about Golden Dawn in Greece to make clear why Golden Dawn is a neo-Nazi political party. It combines an ideology of ethnic purity, anti-Semitism, and violence against minorities. Their published platform proposes that “only men and women of Greek descent and consciousness should have full political rights.” They have declared that the purity and preservation of the Hellenic race is of greater value than any individual person, and it is written that Jews are again “absolute evil.” So when you read this and you read reports that “Mein Kampf” is displayed at their headquarters that shouldn’t come as any surprise.

Golden Dawn’s leader, however, has denied the Holocaust, saying there were no gas chambers or crematoria in Auschwitz, while at the same time another MP in their party who was the member of a rock band called Pogrom, they had a song called Auschwitz, among the lyrics to which were “Auschwitz, how much I love it.” Now days ago, this same party filed a parliamentary motion complaining that Greece commemorates the Holocaust.

In October, a Golden Dawn MP read from the Protocols of the Elders of Zion in a parliamentary debate and later wrote, “The fear of the Jews is obvious and this fact is enough for us to realize that we are on the right path.” And as has been widely reported, vigilante groups of black-shirted Golden Dawn thugs have terrorized dark-skinned people in Greece whether they are there legally or undocumented. The immunity of three Golden Dawn MPs was lifted in order to prosecute them for participating in such acts of violence.
Now this violence also goes far beyond vandalism. Just last month a 27-year-old Pakistani was stabbed to death. Police discovered a variety of weapons along with dozens of Golden Dawn leaflets at the home of one of his assailants. This is a party that received 7 percent of the vote and is now polling at around 10 percent. Now if such violent bigotry was supported or even just condoned by one out of ten Greeks that would already be alarming, but unfortunately we are seeing anti-Semitism and intolerance in Greece beyond Golden Dawn.

Recent stories in the right wing Democratia newspaper have referred to one Israeli of Greek origin as “the characteristic type of Greek Jewish businessman who changes his appearance according to the circumstances of his work.” And they described his father as a characteristic Jew for having business cunning. A popular Greek singer is currently advertising his show with posters all around Athens showing an intertwined swastika and Star of David. And the conviction of a self-professed anti-Semite under Greece’s anti-racism law was overturned by the Athens appeal court which explained in its decision, and I am quoting from their decision, “the defendant does not revile the Jews solely because of their racial and ethnic origin, but mainly because of their aspirations to world power, the methods they use to achieve these aims, and their conspiratorial activities.” Two days ago the head of Greece’s military tweeted that only ethnic Greeks should be allowed in the military academy, and his proposal was immediately supported by a Golden Dawn MP as well as a significant number of MPs from the governing New Democracy party.

So when anti-Semitism and bigotry are tolerated in the media, advertisements, the judiciary, and the military, Jewish communities feel extremely vulnerable. And it is incumbent on political leaders to speak out regularly and firmly and to adopt zero tolerance policies for hate crimes and for hate speech. We welcome the Greek Government’s establishment of special police units to combat hate violence, but strongly encourage the government to be more vocal about the dangers posed by Golden Dawn. Regrettably, Prime Minister Samaras has only one critical statement about Golden Dawn on his official Web site, condemning the slapping by a Golden Dawn MP of an MP of the far left Syriza party.

I began with a quote from a European leader. I want to end with something from a Greek leader. This is from the leader of Greece’s Socialist party, which participates in the governing coalition, who recently said, “We are seeing a form of Mithridatism in Greek society today with regard to fascism.” And he was referring to a king who ruled Anatolia two millennia ago and took small doses of poison to innoculate himself. And Mr. Venizelos continued, saying, “There is a gradual drop by drop dilution of the conscience, a loosening of reflexes.”

So Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, I would respectfully suggest that your voices can help counter that dilution of conscience, that loosening of reflexes, because the poison, that poison, the nature of Golden Dawn is known, and the question is whether Greek society and the Greek Government will respond with rejection or accommodation. So let us all do what we can to
encourage rejection. And thank you very much for the honor of appearing before you today.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Srulevitch follows:]
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Let me offer special thanks on behalf of the Anti-Defamation League and its National Director, Abraham Foxman, to Chairman Smith and all the Members of the Subcommittee for holding this hearing today and for the many hearings, letters, and rallying cries that have kept this issue front and center. Your commitment to the fight against anti-Semitism and your determination to move from concern to action inspires and energizes all of us.

The history of the Jewish people is fraught with examples of the worst violations of human rights - forced conversions, expulsions, inquisitions, pogroms, and genocide. The struggle against the persecution of Jews was a touchstone for the creation of some of the foundational human rights instruments and treaties as well as the development of important regional human rights mechanisms like the human dimension commitments of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE).

We focus today on anti-Semitism but we are mindful that, in advancing the fight against anti-Semitism, we elevate the duty of governments to comply with broader human rights commitments and norms. That is the core of ADL’s mission: to secure justice and fair treatment for Jews in tandem with safeguarding the rights of all groups.

Anti-Semitism is a primary concern for the Anti-Defamation League – not just because we are a Jewish community organization, but because anti-Semitism, the oldest and most persistent form of prejudice, threatens security and democracy, and poisons the health of a society as a whole. The Anti-Defamation League was established in 1913 with its core mission to combat the then horrific discrimination against Jews in all facets of American life and the growth of anti-Jewish movements and organizations peddling their hate around the world. Over nearly a century, as part of the fight against anti-Semitism and all forms of bigotry, we have been at the forefront of the campaign to secure historic civil rights achievements, pioneered the development of model hate crimes laws, and developed anti-bias education models to address all forms of prejudice and to prepare each succeeding generation to live in an increasingly diverse society. As we have learned: where anti-Semitism flourishes, no minority group is safe.
We work in a rights-based framework here in our communities and around the world. Human rights are universal, and our community has experienced the truism that, by safeguarding Jewish rights, we advance the cause of rights for everyone. The Jewish community worked with Congress to put the issue of the denial of the right of Jews to emigrate from the USSR onto the US policy agenda and ultimately onto the world stage. This was the basis for the Jackson Vainik Amendment that tied Most Favored Nation trade status to free emigration and that initiative was one of this country’s most important and successful human rights initiatives. Indeed this advocacy movement served as an inspiring model for the campaign to pass the International Religious Freedom Act of 1998.

In the U.S., our campaign to address anti-Semitism as a civil rights issue and in the context of defending the rights of all groups blazed a trail for the creation of model hate crimes monitoring and policy responses. Today we are working to enhance U.S. efforts to promote understanding of the value and the need to institute hate crime response mechanisms in other countries.

What is Anti-Semitism?

Anti-Semitism is a form of hatred, mistrust, and contempt for Jews based on a variety of stereotypes and myths, and often invokes the belief that Jews have extraordinary influence with which they conspire to harm or control society. It can target Jews as individuals, as a group or a people, or it can target Israel as a Jewish entity. Criticism of Israel or Zionism is anti-Semitic when it uses anti-Jewish stereotypes or invokes anti-Semitic symbols and images, or holds Jews collectively responsible for actions of the State of Israel. I have appended to my statement a brief description of anti-Semitism and manifestations we are seeing today. Appendix I of this statement notes the key themes of contemporary anti-Semitism, and Appendix II outlines select incidents that exemplify some of the trends discussed below.

Overview and Trend Spotting

As a practical matter, since the fall of the Soviet Union, anti-Semitism ceased to be expressed as state sponsored discrimination and manifested itself in two primary areas: a hostile public discourse and incidents of harassment, vandalism and hate violence. Today, we are seeing a shocking reemergence of political anti-Semitism espoused by political parties as part of their rhetoric and policy platforms. These parties play on public fear and hatred of other groups such as Roma and LGBT communities.

The Return of Political Anti-Semitism

The return of political anti-Semitism in Hungary, Greece and Ukraine is raising serious concern. Jobbik is a major Hungarian party, which won over 16 percent of the vote in the 2010 parliamentary election. On the floor of the parliament over the last year,
Jobbik leaders have called for compiling a list of Jews in the Hungarian parliament and government, referring to them as national security risks, and have invoked a famous Hungarian blood libel. The notorious anti-Semitic forgery, Protocols of the Elders of Zion, can be found on the Jobbik website.

Last year in Greece, the neo-Nazi Golden Dawn party was elected for the first time to the Greek parliament. Its leaders have denied the Holocaust. The party regularly publishes blatantly anti-Semitic articles, and one of its parliamentarians read from the Protocols of the Elders of Zion during a parliamentary debate.

In Ukraine, the anti-Semitic Svoboda party was elected to parliament in October with a political platform that promotes ethnic Ukrainian nationalism, excluding Ukrainian Jews. Recently, for example, a Svoboda leader said that the actress Mila Kunis, who was born in Ukraine, was a ‘yid’ and not a Ukrainian. Svoboda’s platform proposes that candidates for elected office be required to publicize their ethnicity and that the ethnic makeup of parliament should reflect the proportion of citizens of those ethnic groups in Ukraine. Svoboda has organized demonstrations against Jewish pilgrimages to Hassidic Jewish holy sites in Ukraine, and tried to prevent Holocaust education films from being shown in schools in Lviv.

Hate Violence, Harassment, Vulnerability

Overt anti-Jewish discrimination is no longer the law of the land anywhere, nor is it the chief barrier to the full realization of the rights of Jews. Today, the main threats to a Jew’s right to live in security with dignity and freedom to express his/her identity are an atmosphere of intimidation and ugly acts of hatred, which manifest themselves in the form of violent hate crimes against Jewish schools, synagogues, and cemeteries. It is the everyday harassment that prevents Jews in certain places from being able to express who they are, to freely wear yarmulkes, Stars of David, or even T-shirts bearing Hebrew lettering. Rabbis, parents, and students live with the knowledge that walking the streets bearing an identifiable Jewish symbol could risk, intimidation, harassment, or even violence. This is the unwritten rule too many Jews are forced to live by.

Violence against Jews and Jewish institutions has been documented mostly in Western Europe and North America – with large concentrations of reported incidents in France, the UK, the US, and Canada. These are countries with large Jewish communities and also more effective government and NGO monitoring.

The French Jewish community’s security agency, SPCJ, just released its 2012 report which showed an alarming increase in both the number and violence of incidents. The SPCJ recorded 614 anti-Semitic acts in 2012, compared to 389 in 2011, a 58% increase. Physical and verbal attacks rose by 82%, from 171 in 2011 to 315 in 2012. Of those physical attacks, 25% involved a weapon.
The European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights conducted a survey of Jewish communities in nine countries in 2012 to assess the communities’ sentiments. While the results will only be published later this year, preliminary findings from three countries found that 40-50% of respondents have considered emigrating from their country out of concern for their safety.

Threats to Religious Freedom

Violence and harassment are not the only concerns. Two of the most fundamental Jewish rites -- circumcision and kosher slaughter -- are increasingly being challenged in Europe.

*Brit milah*, ritual circumcision of newborn male children, is a core religious rite of Judaism, practiced by Jews around the world. Government restrictions on the age of the child or on *mohelim*, Jewish ritual circumcisors, and government requirements for a declaration of adherence to Judaism as a condition for a legal *brit milah*, are intolerable burdens on the free exercise of religion by Jews. When a 2012 German court ruling called into question the legality of ritual circumcision, the German government and parliament responded with appropriate legislation to safeguard this rite.

Proposals have also been made in several European countries to ban the slaughter of unstunned animals. Government requirements that all animals be stunned before slaughter would constitute a *de facto* ban on *shechita*, or kosher slaughter. Pre-slaughter stunning renders the animal unfit to use for kosher meat. Recently, both The Netherlands and Poland have achieved positive resolutions to these challenges.

Rise in Anti-Semitic Attitudes

A 2012 ADL survey of anti-Semitic attitudes in ten European countries found that large swaths of the population subscribing to classical anti-Semitic notions such as Jews having too much power in business, being more loyal to Israel than their own country, or "talking too much" about what happened during the Holocaust. Nearly one-third of those surveyed held pernicious anti-Semitic beliefs.

In comparison with a similar ADL poll conducted in 2009, several of the countries showed dangerously high levels in the overall level of anti-Semitism, while other countries experienced more modest increases:

- Austria experienced a slight decrease, to 28% from 30% in 2009.
- France: The overall level of anti-Semitism increased to 24% of the population, up from to 20% in 2009.
- Germany: Anti-Semitism increased by one percentage point, to 21% of the population.
- Hungary: The level jumped to 63% of the population, compared with 47% in 2009.
• Poland: The number remained unchanged at 48% of the population.
• Spain: Anti-Semitic attitudes were held by 53% of the population, compared to 48% in 2009.
• United Kingdom: Anti-Semitic attitudes jumped to 17% of the population, compared to 10% in 2009.

Polling in 2012 indicated anti-Semitic attitudes in 35% of the Italian population, 10% of the Dutch population, and 16% in Norway.

Anti-Zionism as a Mask for Anti-Semitism

Not only are events in the Middle East a catalyst for anti-Semitic incidents, but anti-Zionism and anti-Israel animus are used as thin disguises for anti-Semitism. The European Union’s Fundamental Rights Agency (FRA) in its Working Paper on anti-Semitism (April 2011) notes “the use of anti-Zionism as a way to circumvent prevailing taboos that still exist around using old anti-Semitism.” This follows on other FRA reports like one in 2008 that observed: “Anti-Semitic activity since 2000 is increasingly attributed to a ‘new anti-Semitism’ characterized primarily by the vilification of Israel as the Jewish collective, and perpetrated primarily by members of Europe’s Muslim population.”

Equating Israel with Nazism and Jews with Nazis

The use of Nazi imagery to portray the Jewish state is a perversion of memory, an insult to those who perished in the Holocaust, an affront to those who survived the horrors of Nazi Germany and to those who fought to defeat the Nazis.

This widespread use of Holocaust and Nazi analogies goes well beyond legitimate criticism of Israel. Particularly dangerous and disturbing is the use of Nazi imagery to depict Israelis and comparisons of Israel’s actions to the absolute evil perpetrated by the Nazis in the Holocaust. These comparisons and imagery are modern incarnations of the age-old myths of Jews as a satanic and conniving force which endeavors to take over the world.

Caricatures that depict Israelis as Nazis appear with alarming frequency on the editorial pages of newspapers in the Arab and Muslim world, on the web, and even in some mainstream European newspapers. European media have also published clearly anti-Semitic caricatures.

• This cartoon which appeared in a Saudi newspaper last fall shows a stereotypical Jewish figure and equates Israel/Jews and Nazis. It reflects imagery and messages found in newspapers across the region on an almost daily basis.

In Norway, one of the largest mainstream dailies, Dagbladet, published a cartoon in October 2011 that compared Gaza and Buchenwald.

In Belgium, a major Flemish paper, De Morgen, published a cartoon of a Jew carrying two suitcases bursting with cash and the caption, "Switzerland, the Promised Land."
Conspiracy Theories Penetrate Mainstream Public Discourse

One of the constant themes of anti-Semitism is that, in every generation, conspiracy theories emerge that appeal to people both at the fringes of society to some in the mainstream.

In early February 2013, a rogue’s gallery of conspiratorial anti-Semites and anti-Zionists gathered for conference sponsored by the Iranian government on “Hollywoodism,” which purported to explore the role of Hollywood in promoting negative views of Iran and in fomenting religious conflicts around the globe. The conference “partners” included a number of American and international anti-Semites and conspiracy theorists. Sessions explored topics like how Zionists and their allies in the West use the film industry to promote negative views of Iran and to provoke religious conflicts around the world. Iranian officials speaking that the conference promoted the classical anti-Semitic stereotype of Jewish domination and control of the film industry.

In September 2012 – amidst the tragic attack on the U.S. embassy in Benghazi – the myth that an Israeli-American producer and group of Jewish investors financed the virulently anti-Islam film “Innocence of Muslims,” took hold. Despite being thoroughly debunked in the West, the rumor went viral in the Muslim world and mutated into new forms in the Arab media. In a series of virulently anti-Semitic cartoons and caricatures appearing in Algeria, Bahrain, Gaza, Iran, Jordan, Oman, Qatar, Saudi Arabia and elsewhere, Jews, America and Israel were blamed for having maliciously made a film intended to offend Muslims and sow unrest and discord around the world. A number of anti-American protests in Cairo, Gaza, and Sudan included anti-Semitic and anti-Jewish slogans, as well as condemnations of Jews and Israelis for being the true parties responsible for the film.

In Sweden in 2009, a false and malicious report in a Swedish newspaper that Israeli soldiers abducted and killed Palestinians, including children, to harvest their internal organs mushroomed into a global conspiracy theory. Within months, the story generated several conspiracy theories about Jewish plots to harvest organs from victims around the globe, including from kidnapped Algerian and Ukrainian children and from Haitians pulled from the rubble of the earthquake by Israeli rescue personnel.

The rumor about the Israelis in Haiti reached all the way to the British House of Lords, where Baroness Jenny Tonge called on Israel to launch an investigation into the conduct of its military in Haiti. Tonge made the comment after an English-language Palestinian newspaper, The Palestine Telegraph, published an article that cited a report by Hezbollah’s Al-Manar TV regarding the organ trafficking allegations. The Palestinian paper lists Tonge as one of two members of a “board of patrons.” Following the story, Tonge apologized. However, Nick Clegg, the leader of the Liberal Democrat party, called Tonge’s comment “unacceptable” and he subsequently removed her from her position as party spokeswoman on health issues.
These conspiracy theories were reported as fact by Iranian and Arab media, including Syrian TV, Press TV, a state-funded Iranian TV news channel, and leading pan-Arab satellite news networks Al Jazeera and Al-Arabiya. In addition, newspapers in Jordan, Oman, Qatar, and other Arab countries published a series of editorial cartoons that depicted Israelis as vicious butchers who were gleefully cutting off the body parts of Arabs and trading in Palestinian organs.

**Anti-Semitism Crosses Borders, Continents and Countries**

While Europe is a focus of this hearing, phenomena like the manipulation of anti-Semitism for political purposes are not limited to Europe. During the 2012 Presidential elections in Venezuela, blatant anti-Semitism was being promoted in government owned and aligned media directed against opposition candidate Henrique Capriles Radonski, a devout Catholic with Jewish ancestry, who ran against incumbent Hugo Chávez. Opinion articles in government controlled media spread myths of Jewish control, financial influence, as well as the deicide charge.

Deliberate and persistent anti-Semitism has been used in the past by the Venezuelan government apparatus as a divisive political tool to scapegoat and harass Jews. Since 2006, the League has been following closely the constant anti-Semitic pronouncements emanating from the government of Venezuelan President Hugo Chávez.

The government and some of its followers have publicly accused the Jewish community of disloyalty and the community's institutions and houses of worship have been attacked. More recently, news reports indicate that Venezuela's Government Intelligence Agency (SEBIN) received instructions to carry out clandestine surveillance operations against members of the Jewish community and to spy on Venezuelan companies and organizations with ties to Israel.

Anti-Semitism has also resurfaced in Argentina, home to the largest Jewish community in Latin America. In 2011, ADL and the Delegación de Asociaciones Israelitas Argentinas (DAIA) commissioned a survey on attitudes towards Jews in Argentina, which found that classical anti-Semitic stereotypes are deeply ingrained in society. The poll found that the majority of Argentinians believe that Jews are more loyal to Israel than Argentina.

Last week, during a debate in the Argentine Senate about the terrorist attack against the AMIA Jewish cultural center, a senator differentiated between "Argentinians of the Jewish religion" and "Argentinian Argentinians" who were killed.

**Incubator, Broadcaster: The Arab and Muslim World**

For decades, the Anti-Defamation League has focused on monitoring and exposing the anti-Semitism that has pervaded the Arab and Muslim print and broadcast media, websites and even now, apps for smart phones and tablets.
The impact of decades of these demonizing depictions on generations of Arabs and others across the Middle East cannot be discounted. While reading the morning newspapers or watching television with their family, many in the region have only encountered Jews as images of evil, threatening, subhuman figures to be feared, hated and fought against.

Compounding this problem is the instantaneous, global transmission of these images via the internet and satellite television, from the Middle East to Europe, Africa, Asia, and the United States, reaching and potentially radicalizing a much larger audience.

In the era of the “Arab Spring,” we have seen new manifestations of anti-Jewish demonization. In Egypt, for example, in the wake of the power vacuum that has engulfed the country following the 2011 revolution which overthrew Hosni Mubarak, there has been a steady escalation of anti-Semitic and anti-Israel themes in public discourse and by Muslim Brotherhood leaders in particular. Although the official platform of the Brotherhood and its political party, the Freedom and Justice Party (FJP) is couched in terms of democracy and peace, the organization continues to lash out against Israel and Jews, and to express support for terrorist organizations dedicated to the destruction of the Jewish state. Egypt’s President, Mohammed Morsi, the FJP candidate who assumed office in June 2012, is a long-time Brotherhood leader.

- In October 2012, in a nationally broadcast Friday sermon attended by Egyptian President Mohamed Morsi and other high ranking government officials at the Al-Taneem Mosque in Mersa Matrun, Imam Fatouh Abdul Nabi called on God to “deal harshly with the Jews and those who are allied with them.” During this part of the sermon, President Morsi was shown on television mouthing “amen.”
- ADL continues to compile examples of anti-Semitic statements by Brotherhood leaders and affiliated clerics. Among the most egregious is the Brotherhood’s Supreme Leader, Mohammed Badie, who has a long record of anti-Semitic statements and calls for belligerent actions against Israel. For example, in October 2012, Badie’s weekly column in the Brotherhood’s newsletter accused Israel and Jews of “shedding the blood of the people, trampling sanctuaries and holy places” and desecrating Muslim, Christian and Jewish holy places in Jerusalem. Badie called for the Islamic community to rise up against the “Zionists” and to commit to jihad to recover Jerusalem and liberate all of Palestine. “The time has come,” Badie wrote, “for the Islamic ummah to band together for Jerusalem and Palestine since it has been dominated by the Jews...” In his holiday greetings marking the start of the Islamic holy month of Ramadan in July 2012, Badie wrote that the central goal of “Muslim leaders was the recovery of the Al Aqsa mosque and its liberation from Zionist filth...” Badie also urged the world’s Muslims, Christians and Jews to “stand up against the crimes of the Zionist gangs in the raped

\[1\] For more examples, see ADL’s report: Brotherhood of Hate: Muslim Brotherhood’s Hatred for Jews and Israel Flourishes in “New” Egypt
lands.” and the only solution is for Islamic rule to be imposed “throughout all of beloved Palestine.” At a Brotherhood rally in June 2012, Badie declared: “Allah has warned us the tricks of the Jews, and their role in igniting the fire of wars. . . . The Almighty said: ‘Every time they light the fires of war, Allah extinguishes them, and they labor hard to spread corruption on earth and Allah does not love the spreaders of corruption.’”

ADL monitoring has consistently found that US elections are a vehicle for the promotion of anti-Semitic imagery and caricatures. The 2012 campaign was no different, with scores of cartoons depicting President Obama and Governor Romney, and the U.S. electoral system, as controlled by Israel and Jews.

Anti-Semitism is also broadcast on television across the Arab and Muslim world.

Traditionally, during Ramadan, the Muslim holy month observed by fasting and prayer, many state and satellite channels in the Arab world broadcast special programs for the occasion that are rife with anti-Semitism and harsh anti-Israel expressions.

Among the most infamous examples are two dramatic, multi-part mini-series: The Egyptian-produced Horseman Without a Horse – which originally aired on Egyptian state television in 2002, and the Syrian-produced Ash-Shatat – aired in 2003 on the
Al-Manar has a long record of incendiary anti-Jewish, anti-Israel and anti-American programming. It appears to be the source of the conspiracy theory that claimed that 4,000 Israelis were absent from their jobs at the World Trade Center on September 11, 2001, thereby implying that Israel was in some way behind the attack. The story was posted on its Web site on September 17, 2001 and picked up by extremists around the world. It has been banned from broadcasting several European countries and the United States.

See ADL’s report: Iran’s Press TV: Broadcasting Anti-Semitism in the English-Speaking World
Abdul Alim Musa, head of the Masjid Al Islam Mosque in Washington, D.C., who is affiliated with the anti-Semitic Sabiqun movement; Mark Glenn, a virulently anti-Semitic conspiracy theorist; and Mark Dankof, a contributor to American Free Press, an anti-Semitic conspiracy-oriented newspaper that promotes a variety of 9/11 conspiracy theories accusing Jews of perpetrating the attacks.

Another way entrenched anti-Jewish attitudes and conspiracy theories are spreading internationally from the Middle East are through the use of tablet and smart phone apps with downloadable podcasts, widely available through iTunes and Google Marketplace. Such podcasts feature broadcasts from Hezbollah's Al-Manar, Iranian television networks, and vehemently anti-Semitic sermons and lectures from Middle Eastern-based Muslim clerics. One example is a downloadable lecture by Abu Bakr al-Jaza'iri, a prominent scholar and Islamic studies professor who lives in Saudi Arabia, who accuses Jews of spreading atheism and corruption in the world. The lecture, titled "The Role of Jews in Defaming the Hijab," blames Jews for setting off a women's liberation movement in Islam and claims that Jews aim to spread the same corruption and immorality among Muslims that they previously spread to Europeans. Al-Jaza'iri says, "They [the Jews] targeted Europe. How did they attack it? They founded the Bolsevik secular atheist sect also known as Marxist Communism... humanity never knew atheism before the Jewish gang plot." He also accuses Jews of causing world wars: "The Second World War was sparked by the Jews... no world war was started without the Jews."

What is the impact of this steady drum beat of anti-Semitic broadcasts, imagery and messages have on individuals? We know well the connection between charged rhetoric and violent action. Incitement can create an environment conducive to, and accepting of, violence and terrorism. We have also seen that where Jews are scapegoated and demonized, incendiary anti-American rhetoric flourishes as well, inviting extremists to step in with violent action.

Recommendations for Action:

Governments bear the primary responsibility to ensure that Jews are afforded the same rights as others to live in security and with dignity in their communities. Whether it is espoused by hate groups on the margins or political parties garnering support in elections, governments and civil leaders can mobilize political will to reject anti-Semitism and its messengers and to use human rights and anti-discrimination instruments related to anti-Semitism and intolerance.

Below are recommendations for governments to institutionalize a systemic, comprehensive strategy.

**What All Governments Can Do**

1. **Start by using your own bully pulpit to speak out.** Political leaders have the most immediate and significant opportunity to set the tone of a national response
to an anti-Semitic incident, an anti-Semitic party, or an anti-Semitic parliamentarian. Nothing gives a greater sense of security than seeing anti-Semitism publicly rejected. This signals that the government takes seriously the impact of this climate on the community. Even without a legal tool, where there is political will, where the police know anti-Semitism when they see it, when local and national officials marginalize and reject it, people are more secure.

2. **Lead by example and set a tone of civility.** Political leaders should lead by example in their own country and must never engage in divisive appeals that demonize any member of society based on race, ethnicity, sexual orientation, gender, gender identity, or religion. When political leaders are determined to build consensus across party lines to demonstrate that some behaviors are beyond the pale, we see real change. We know in our own country the power that words have to shape, not just our political debate, but the environment in which targeted communities live.

3. **Enact inclusive hate crimes laws.** The OSCE has developed guidance to establish a common framework for improving responses to hate crimes across different countries and legal contexts. Other tools also encourage governments to partner with communities and empower them to help address hate crime.

4. **Educate about anti-Semitism and empower students to reject and combat it.** Anti-bias lessons which focus on the specific nature of anti-Semitism should be integrated into the curriculum and into after-school activities. Education ministries should establish anti-bias teaching standards and model policies to protect students from school-based anti-Semitic incidents and harassment. Schools should adopt formal written policies governing how teachers, administrators and security professionals identify and respond effectively to bias-motivated bullying, violence, and harassment. The policy should include formal reporting and complaint procedures and facilitate cooperation between educators and law enforcement officials.

5. **Promote effective Holocaust remembrance and education.** There is increased recognition that Holocaust education alone does not counter anti-Semitism and that effective programs must also address contemporary anti-Semitism as a separate subject.

6. **Parliaments Should Have Zero-Tolerance for Anti-Semitism and bigotry.** Voters are free to cast votes for anti-Semitic parties, but parliamentarians also have the ability to reject their anti-Semitism and ensure that parliaments are a platform to showcase a society’s highest ideals. Parliaments can be a vehicle for positive proactive action of all types. The All-Party Parliamentary Inquiry into Antisemitism in the UK is also a model other parliaments could follow. Parliamentarians from different countries gathered in London in February 2009 for the founding Conference and Summit of the Inter-parliamentary Coalition for Combating Antisemitism, issued a “London Declaration on Combating...
Antisemitism” which any parliamentarian can endorse. A follow-up conference was held in Ottawa in November 2010, which led to the Ottawa Protocol on Combating Antisemitism of September 2011. In December 2012, over 150 members of parliaments from 30 countries wrote a letter to the President, Prime Minister, and the Speaker of the Parliament of Hungary to condemn the Jobbik MP’s statement in parliament asking for a list of Jews in government and parliament to be created.

What the US Can Do

1. Prioritize combating anti-Semitism on bilateral agendas. The US should let our allies know that addressing anti-Semitism and hate crime is part of our bilateral agenda. The State Department’s Special Envoy to Monitor and Combat Anti-Semitism should place this on the Secretary of State’s agenda with foreign leaders. Congress has a central role to play in promoting this issue within the State Department and in bilateral contacts and outreach to foreign officials.

2. Sunlight is the Best Disinfectant: U.S. Monitoring. US reporting on anti-Semitism as a human rights and religious freedom issue is an indispensable tool in spotlighting the problem and for US diplomatic action. The Global Anti-Semitism Awareness Act, introduced by Chairman Smith, requires US embassies to seek out information on anti-Semitism as part of their core human rights and religious freedom monitoring obligations.

3. Nominate an Effective Special Envoy and Support Robust Work of the Special Envoy’s Office. Continued support for a strong Special Envoy will ensure that the US maintains a specialized focus on anti-Semitism and a dedicated effort to mobilize the arsenal of US diplomatic tools to respond. As this testimony has set out, it sometimes must be addressed in unique ways and requires the attention of someone experienced to have a particular focus on crafting a strategy to address it.

4. Equip U.S. Diplomats with Training to Sustain Improvement in U.S. Reporting and Response. Anti-Semitism is a continuously mutating phenomenon that is not always easy to discern. The Special Envoy expanded training on anti-Semitism in the State Department’s Foreign Service Institute to give diplomats the understanding and tools to recognize anti-Semitism and the contemporary forms it takes. The Foreign Service Institute course on “Promoting Human Rights and Democracy” should consistently include such training.

5. Congress and the Administration should have visible contact with Jewish communities. This hearing is a best practice in this area. While many embassies have deep and longstanding relationships with Jewish community activists, there are many communities which have never had contact with their
local US mission. Outreach to Jewish communities is one way to facilitate data collection and connect Jewish communities with US resources and efforts.

6. Combating anti-Semitism should be part of the full array of human rights and democracy programming, funding, and public diplomacy efforts. For example, the State Department’s International Visitor Programs and other US-funded exchange and public diplomacy programs should reflect the growing US and international recognition of anti-Semitism and of the problem of hate crime broadly. US assistance programs should fund prevention as well as response efforts. While part of the challenge is to institute legal norms and protections for victims of anti-Semitism, we also know that prevention efforts can head off tension, conflict, and violence that can erupt when anti-Semitism goes unanswered. US assistance programs could focus on public education campaigns to promote tolerance.

7. Addressing Anti-Semitism in the Muslim and Arab World The US should make clear to emerging leaders in Middle Eastern countries in political transition that anti-Semitism and demonization of Israelis and Jews is unacceptable and inappropriate in any democratic societies. Hatred of Jews is deeply rooted in that region and is poised to be part of the landscape for generations if it is not addressed as part of democratic transitions. The instruments of US public diplomacy and President Obama’s emissary to the Organization of the Islamic Conference should seek ways to address the issue of anti-Semitism where it is needed most.

8. Provide training and assistance to improve the policing and prosecution of anti-Semitism Much more can be done to leverage existing international training programs, particularly those geared toward law enforcement such as the Department of Justice OPDAT and ICITAP programs or training delivered through US International Law Enforcement Academies that reach governmental and law enforcement audiences around the world. We should not miss an opportunity to provide training on hate crime response, including legal tools, model policies, and training on investigating and prosecuting anti-Semitic crimes.

9. Lead by Example: Strengthen the fight against anti-Semitism and intolerance at home. Congress has been instrumental in advancing the fight against global anti-Semitism on the international stage. Legislators also have the ability to also strengthen America’s efforts to address and prevent anti-Semitism and hate crime here at home. The federal government has an essential role to play in helping law enforcement, communities, and schools implement effective hate crimes prevention programs and activities. We know of no federal anti-bias or hate crimes education and prevention programming that is currently addressing youth hate violence. Members of Congress should authorize federal anti-bias and hate crimes education programs to help schools and communities address violent bigotry.
Appendix I: What is Anti-Semitism?

Anti-Semitism is a form of hatred, mistrust, and contempt for Jews based on stereotypes and myths. It can invoke the belief that Jews have extraordinary influence with which they conspire to harm or control society. It can target Jews as individuals, as a group or a people, or it can target Israel as a Jewish entity. Criticism of Israel or Zionism is anti-Semitic when it invokes anti-Jewish stereotypes, symbols and images, or holds Jews collectively responsible for actions of the State of Israel.

Anti-Semitism has existed over many centuries and the negative stereotypes it draws on have taken hold in the popular culture and thought of many societies. It can take the form of hate speech, discrimination, or violence against people or property. It may target individuals or communities on small or large scales. The most extreme example of this was the Nazi’s organized plan to exterminate the Jews through the Holocaust.

Various forms of intolerance - racism, xenophobia, anti-Semitism - share many elements in common. Stereotyping, seeing the victim as the other, are among these common elements. On the other hand, there are core characteristics unique to each type of hatred. In the case of anti-Semitism, it resides in a matrix of three beliefs about Jews:

1. They have almost mythical, overwhelming power;
2. They are more loyal to an outside party than they are to their own country;
3. They approach work or involvements, not merely as individuals, but rather in a cabal, in a conspiracy to achieve some sinister, Jewish-centric end.

This matrix is insidious and provides the fuel for a lethal form of hatred, political anti-Semitism. This belief system, when running rampant, created the justification for large-scale murders of Jews on the grounds that Jews were so poisonous that society had a right to defend itself in any way against this poison.

There is sometimes confusion around the term “Semitic,” which historically has referred to a language group that includes Arabic, Amharic, and Hebrew. “Semite” was a term that described a person who spoke one of these languages. Notwithstanding the traditional meaning of the word “Semite,” anti-Semitism in conventional English refers specifically to hatred of Jews.

The word “anti-Semitism” is generally attributed to Wilhelm Marr, who used the German term “Antisemitismus” in a book entitled “The Way to Victory of Germanicism over Judaism,” in 1879. Marr claimed that “scientific” research into the characteristics of the Jewish “race” justified hatred for Jews. The same year his book was published, Marr founded a political party, “The League of Antisemites,” which campaigned for the expulsion of Jews from Germany. Just over half a century later, Adolf Hitler and the Nazi Party took this racial hatred for Jews a deadly step further when they exterminated six million Jews in what they called “The Final Solution.”

There are two key points to understanding the origins of the word “anti-Semitism.” The first is that “anti-Semitism” was popularized as a term not by Jews themselves, but by
individuals and political groups who openly proclaimed hatred of the Jewish people. The second is that “anti-Semitism” in modern English refers solely to hatred directed against Jews. Some who express prejudice or hatred toward the Jewish people claim that they cannot be anti-Semites because they too, as speakers of a Semitic language, are technically “Semites.” This semantic argument that a speaker of a certain language cannot by definition hold prejudice against Jews detracts from the real issue and undercuts the potential for dialogue about ways to end hatred of all kinds.

Today, it is all too common to find anti-Semitism under the guise of extreme criticism of Israel or of Zionism, the founding nationalist ideology of the Jewish state. In these cases, criticism of Israel crosses the line into anti-Semitism when such criticism invokes age-old anti-Jewish stereotypes, or when Israel is singularly demonized.

Holocaust denial is a form of anti-Semitism that minimizes or denies the Nazi regime’s systematic mass murder of six million Jews in Europe during World War II. Holocaust deniers suggest that Jews pulled off a scam of monumental proportions, compelling governments, media, and academia around the world to acknowledge a catastrophe that never really happened.

The most vexing issue raised by anti-Semitism is its constant presence throughout history, across different societies and cultures, as well as its continued existence in our own time. It’s important to note that the presence of a substantial Jewish community is not a necessary condition for anti-Semitism to emerge. An anti-Semitic campaign launched by Poland’s communist regime in the late 1960s was described by one scholar as “anti-Semitism without Jews”, because Poland’s Jewish community, which numbered over 3 million before World War II, had already been decimated by the Nazi Holocaust and further depleted by the emigration of survivors. Today, the Arab and Islamic world is a major incubator of anti-Semitism towards Jews individually or as a collective, even though the Jewish population in these countries is nearly invisible.

The existence of anti-Semitism in societies where there are few or no Jews, and its evolution throughout history, demonstrates how deeply embedded anti-Semitism has been across different cultures and also why persecution has been a constant fear in Jewish life for centuries. Anti-Semitism has been compared to a virus which adapts to different conditions. As with a virus, when it comes to anti-Semitism, it is possible to identify both consistent elements and elements which, while borrowing from previous eruptions, are updated to suit a particular environment. Many of these elements – conspiracy theories, myths, mob violence and much else – recur throughout the history.

Raul Hilberg, an eminent historian of the Holocaust, telescoped the history of anti-Semitism like this: “The missionaries of Christianity had said in effect: You have no right to live among us as Jews. The secular rulers who followed had proclaimed: You have no right to live among us. The German Nazis at last decreed: You have no right to live. The German Nazis, then, did not discard the past; they built upon it. They did not begin a development; they completed it.”
APPENDIX II: EXAMPLES OF ANTI-SEMITIC INCIDENTS 2012-2013

ARGENTINA
October 19, 2012 — Concordia, Entre Rios - A discriminatory and anti-Semitic message, which included Nazi references, was painted on the front of a public school.

September 6, 2012 — Cordoba - The singer Miguel Vilanova said during a performance that “I am anti-Semitic, but not anti-Jewish” and “the Zionist plan to buy the Patagonia is more than 150 years old”.

September 6, 2012 — Mendoza - During a basketball game, the father of the player Andres Berman was physically assaulted after he criticized anti-Semitic statements by fans of an opposing team.

AUSTRALIA
February 1, 2012 — Melbourne - “The best Jew is a dead Jew” and a picture of hanged stick figure were spray-painted in a public marketplace bathroom located in the Wantirna suburb of Melbourne.

AUSTRIA
August 30, 2012 — Vienna - A rabbi attending a local soccer was greeted by a fan with chants of “Heil Hitler” and a Nazi salute.

BELGIUM
November 18, 2012 — Antwerp - Demonstrators at an anti-Israel rally chanted “Hamas, Hamas, all Jews to the gas.”

October 9, 2012 — Brussels - A synagogue was vandalized by two unidentified male perpetrators who spray-painted “death to the Jews” and “boom” on the wall of the Beth Hillel synagogue.

BRAZIL
November 20, 2012 — Sao Paulo - Swastika graffiti was found on a wall in a neighborhood where a number of Jewish institutions are located.

CHILE
August 31, 2012 — Santiago - The president of Chile’s Palestine Federation, Mauricio Abu Ghosh, told the radio station Cooperativa that “the Nazis were small fry compared to today’s Zionists, who make up the State of Israel.” He also said, “The Nazis were children next to the actual Zionists as they are incarnated through the State of Israel.”

January 21, 2012 — Vina del Mar — A 23-year-old Jewish man was attacked at a party by three assailants who punched him, kicked him in the face, and screamed “F------ Jew” at him.

CANADA
April 12, 2012 — Val Morin — Several Jewish-owned summer homes were broken into and defaced with swastikas and anti-Semitic messages.

CZECH REPUBLIC
September 26, 2012 — Prague — Vandals knocked over 25 tombstones in a Jewish cemetery south of Prague.
FRANCE
February 5, 2013 – Toulouse - A woman with a history of aggression toward Jews threatened a 16 year-old boy wearing a kippah with a knife. The incident occurred close to the Jewish school, where three children and a rabbi were murdered by Mohammed Merah, an Islamic radical terrorist.

February 4, 2013 – Marseille - A 20-year-old Jewish man wearing a Star of David pendant was mugged and robbed twice outside Marseille’s main train station. Two men on a scooter tore the chain off his neck and called him a “dirty Jew.” Moments later, another group of young men approached the victim and hurled anti-Semitic insults before stealing an MP3 player and 100 Euros. They also reportedly hit the victim.

January 3, 2013 – Toulouse - Anti-Semitic slogans, including a swastika alongside the words “SS” and “get the f** out”, were spray-painted on a local chapter of the Paris Psychoanalytical Society. The incident occurred less than a year after a terrorist killed a rabbi and three students at a Jewish school in the city.

December 11, 2012 – Istres - A high school teacher, who had been regularly taunted with anti-Semitic epithets by some of her students, was targeted with an acid bomb. A bottle containing hydrochloric acid was rolled into the room at 8:30am at the beginning of a class. A student shouted about a bomb and everyone was able to get out before the explosion. A catalyst of aluminum had been added, causing the bottle to explode and spray the acid. One student was hurt. The police arrested a 19 year-old and are investigating.

December 3, 2012 – Sarcelles - Large swastikas were scrawled on a kosher pizzeria in suburban Paris.

November 29, 2012 – Aix en Provence – A Jewish man heard shouts of “Dirty Jew! Dirty Jew! We'll give you a Shabbat shalom!” outside his ground floor apartment door at around 10:30pm. When he opened the door, three young men of North African descent hit him, kicked him, ripped the mezuzah off his door, spit on him, and urinated on him.

November 17, 2012 – Sarcelles – In this Paris suburb, a young Jewish man left a synagogue and was assaulted by three young men of North African descent, who yelled “Hey dirty Jew! F-- - Israel, we’re going to kill you!” Two of the assailants punched and kicked him, while the third hit him in the arm with a baseball bat.

October 28, 2012 – Aix-les-Bains – Anti-Semitic fliers referring to Jews as “the main people responsible for the decadence of the White People and the invasion of sub-races” were mailed to town residents.

October 22, 2012 – Paris – A 12 year-old Jewish boy was stand his school bus stop, when two men in their 40s, speaking Arabic, began to insult him and then hit him with their belts. Passersby intervened and the attackers fled.

October 9, 2012 – Avignon – The plaque at the entrance to the Jewish cemetery, with a Magen David and marked “Jewish Cemetery”, was smashed.

October 9, 2012 – Paris – A 19 year old was shot in the arm with a pellet gun as he was leaving a synagogue, leaving him with a bruise.
October 5, 2012 – Seine St. Denis – A family was eating dinner in their sukkah when a group of individuals began chanting and using their hands to make horns on their heads. A few minutes later cobblestones and chunks of asphalt rained down through the top of the sukkah. The family reported hearing: “Dirty Jews, we’ll get you - Jews we’ll have your skin - Get out of here - Go back home,” as well as some words in Arabic. One woman was injured when a stone hit her back.

September 19, 2012 – Sarcelles – A firebomb was thrown into a Kosher supermarket by two masked assailants, causing at least one injury.

September 4, 2012 – Montreuil – “F--- the Jews. F--- the school.” was spray-painted in huge letters at the entrance of the Paul-Eluard public high school in the Paris suburb of Montreuil. The high school is located near a Jewish trade school, ORT Daniel Mayer.

August 7, 2012 – Paris – A 17 year-old Jewish girl was severely beaten by an 18 year-old Arab girl at a mall in a Paris suburb. The attacker made anti-Semitic insults during the incident, including “Dirty Jew, I’m going to put you in the ground.” Police at the mall arrested the assailant.

July 20, 2012 – Paris – A synagogue was desecrated for the third time in 10 days, when vandals threw prayer books and shawls on the floor and shattered the building’s windows.

July 5, 2012 – Toulouse – A 17-year-old student of the Ozar Hatorah Jewish school, where four Jews were murdered by Mohammed Merah on March 19, was assaulted on a train going from Toulouse to Lyon. The two young men responsible for the attack were arrested.

June 8, 2012 – Sarcelles – An 18-year-old Jew was physically assaulted and had a phone stolen by assailants who were shouting anti-Semitic insults.

June 2, 2012 – Lyon – Three Jewish youth wearing skullcaps were assaulted while walking to a Jewish school for Shabbat services. A group of more than 10 assailants surrounded the youths chanting “dirty Jew,” and proceeded to attack them with hammers and bars, hitting two in the head and one in the arm.

March 26, 2012 – Paris – A 12-year-old Jewish boy was beaten outside the Ozar Hatorah Jewish school in Paris by youths reciting anti-Semitic slogans. The boy was hit and punched in the back of his head as he left the school.

March 19, 2012 – Toulouse – Four Jews were shot and killed at the Ozar Hatorah Jewish school by an armed terrorist on a motorcycle, later identified by authorities as Mohammed Merah. Rabbi Jonathan Sandler, 30, and his two children Aryeh, 6, and Gabriel, 3, were killed as they were entering the school premises. Merah then entered the school, continuing to shoot at students and faculty, and eventually set his sights on 8-year-old Miriam Monsonego, the daughter of the school’s principal, whom he chased down and killed. Merah is also believed to be responsible for the killing of three French soldiers the previous week. In a phone call to a French television station, Merah stated that he targeted the Jewish school to avenge the killing of children in Gaza. Reports indicate that Merah traveled to and received training in Pakistan and Afghanistan and identified with the terrorist organization Al Qaeda. He may have also had links to Forsane Alizza, a radical organization that was banned by the French government in
January for supporting terrorism. On March 22, following a 32-hour standoff with French police, Merah was killed in his apartment complex.

GERMANY
November 9, 2012 - Greifswald - On the anniversary of Kristallnacht, neo-Nazis vandalized the city's Holocaust memorial.

September 3, 2012 - Charlottenburg - 13 Jewish children attending a Chabad School were subjected to anti-Semitic taunts including "Are you Jewish?" by a group of several unidentified youths. One of the perpetrators also spat on the ground in front of the students.

August 29, 2012 - Berlin - A rabbi in visible Jewish garb was physically attacked by a group of youths, causing a head wound that required hospitalization. The rabbi was walking with his six-year-old daughter in downtown Berlin when the group asked if he was Jewish, and then proceeded to assault him. They also threatened to kill the rabbi's young daughter.

GREECE
October 26, 2012 - Rhodes - Vandalized spray-painted the city's Holocaust monument with swastikas.

HUNGARY
November 26, 2012 - Budapest - In a parliamentary session to discuss the conflict in Gaza, ultranationalist Jobbik party member Marton Gyongyosi suggested that members of the Hungarian Parliament who are Jewish or of Jewish origin be counted and registered, "in order to avoid the national security risk caused by the Jews."

November 19, 2012 - Nyiregyhaza - A Holocaust memorial was vandalized.

October 23, 2012 - Budapest - Supporters of the ultranationalist Jobbik political party burned an Israeli flag in front of the city's main Synagogue.

October 5, 2012 - Budapest - A Jewish community official was physically attacked and insulted outside of a synagogue. Two men were identified by the suspect and detained by local police.

August 15, 2012 - Budapest - A chant of "dirty Jews" ("mocskos zsidők") was heard on the TV broadcast of a soccer match between the Hungarian and Israeli national teams.

July 22, 2012 - Kaposvar - Vandals toppled 57 tombstones in the city's Jewish cemetery.

June 20, 2012 - Bekescsaba - The entrance to a building currently used as the local synagogue was vandalized with yellow paint.

June 9, 2012 - Nagykanizsa - A large menorah outside the Jewish community's Holocaust memorial was vandalized.

June 3, 2012 - Székesfehérvár - Several graves in the Jewish cemetery were vandalized.

March 25, 2012 - Budapest - The main Holocaust memorial was vandalized with Stars of David and graffiti that said, "This is not your country, dirty Jews" and "You are going to be shot there" next to an arrow pointing to the nearby Danube river. In December 1944 and January 1945, the
Nazi-allied Hungarian Arrow Cross shot about 20,000 Jews on the banks of the Danube and threw them into the river. Just days prior to this incident, a statue of Raoul Wallenberg was vandalized with pigs feet.

IRELAND
April 25, 2012 – East Antrim Coast – A 14-year-old boy suffered repeated anti-Semitic attacks from his classmates after it was revealed, during a class on the Holocaust, that his great-great-grandmother was Jewish. The boy was physically assaulted, verbally taunted for being a “Jew boy” and had swastikas etched in his school books.

ITALY
Dec.; 10, 2012 - Catania, Sicily - Unknown vandals detached a menorah that was set up in Piazza Universita.

November 24, 2012 - Genoa - “Israel Nazi state” was painted on the door of the central synagogue. On a nearby wall, “Free Palestine” was written.

November 18, 2012 - Parma - Red paint was thrown at the front door of the synagogue.

MOROCCO
August 29, 2012 - Safi – The city’s Jewish cemetery was vandalized when some tombstones adorned with Hebrew writing were removed and others destroyed.

NEW ZEALAND
October 19, 2012 — Auckland — Vandals spray-painted gravestones in the Jewish section of the Karangahape Road Cemetery with swastikas and the number 88 (a code used by neo-Nazis to mean “Heil Hitler” with H being the eighth letter of the alphabet).

PARAGUAY
January 14, 2013 - Asunción – Graffiti with Nazi symbols were found in a neighborhood.

PERU
August 21, 2012 — Lima - Holocaust denial and neo-Nazi Martin Quispe Mayta, leader of the Andean Peru National Socialism movement, called for the expulsion of Peru’s 5,000 Jews. He said that Jews are to blame for his childhood poverty because Jews control the world economy, and claimed he found inspiration in Henry Ford’s tome “The International Jew” and in Hitler’s “Mein Kampf.”

POLAND
November 18, 2012 – Lodz – At least 20 tombstones were toppled over and broken in half in the city’s historic Jewish cemetery.

July 3, 2012 – Lodz – Swastikas and other Nazi symbols were painted on the entrance of a synagogue.

June 21, 2012 – Starachowice – Swastikas and symbols of the extremist National Rebirth of Poland party were spray-painted on the entrance of the Jewish cemetery.

April 8, 2012 – Wysokie Mazowieckie – Swastikas and anti-Semitic slogans were spray-painted on tombstones and memorial plaques in the Jewish cemetery.
ROMANIA  
February 8, 2013 - Timisoara - Vandals spray-painted “death to Jews” and a swastika on the wall of the city’s Jewish cemetery.

RUSSIA  
February 18, 2013 - Ulyanovsk - Vandals damaged a menorah lamp near a building belonging to the local Jewish community.

July 14, 2012 – Rybinsk - A yellow Star of David, a swastika, and “Death to Jews!” were painted on the front door of the Jewish community center.

July 6, 2012 – Irkutsk - A swastika was painted on the city’s synagogue.

July 5, 2012 – St. Petersburg - Swastikas and other anti-Semitic graffiti were painted on a building that houses the Jewish Agency for Israel office. The words “All of you – to Buchenwald” were found on the side of a neighboring building.

SPAIN  
November 18, 2012 – Barcelona - Vandals spray-painted a red swastika and other graffiti on the wall of a synagogue. The graffiti read: “Stop killing Gazas children, Israel kills, Zionist genocide assassins.”

July 22, 2012 – Barcelona – The Star of David and ‘Juden’ were painted on the façade of two banks.

SWEDEN  
November 30, 2012 – Malmo - Two Jewish women had their home burgled and suffered sustained anti-Semitic abuse. A menorah, mezuzah and prayer book were stolen from their apartment, and their front door and balcony were painted with swastikas. The women told police they regularly encounter anti-Semitism in the city, being frequently called “Jewish whores” and “Jewish pigs”.

September 28, 2012 – Malmo – An explosive device was detonated at a Jewish communal building in the early morning hours. No one was injured, but damage was caused to the building.

UKRAINE  
November 29, 2012 – Odessa - A large cross was erected on a major square with portraits of the Romanov czarist family. Attached was a placard saying that the royal family was “brutally tortured and ritually murdered by Jewish savages.” After being alerted, municipal authorities removed the placard.

UNITED KINGDOM  
July 4, 2012 – London - A Jewish male walking near a Stamford Hill Yeshiva was severely beaten by four assailants and taunted with anti-Semitic epithets.

VENEZUELA  
November 28, 2012 – Merida – Anti-Semitic imagery, including swastikas, was found painted throughout the city.
Mr. SMITH. Thank you very much for the work of ADL and your leadership as well. Great testimony. Just a few questions and then I will yield to my distinguished colleagues. Let me begin.

Rabbi Meyer, in your statement you talked about the second level of anti-Semitism that thrives in the shadow of the first and runs through the veins of European society, to use your quotes, to the university leaders, policy makers and decision makers. And you talk about how with this second level of anti-Semitism the horrors of the Holocaust have not dampened it, and it has not only survived but thrives in Europe today, and you say as Jews we have very good reason to worry. My hope is—and we do have large numbers of members of the media and some watching by way of video telecast—this needs to be a warning, and if you would like to elaborate on that as well.

And Chief Rabbi Bleich, you mentioned Mark Levin. I traveled with Mark Levin, the executive director of NCSJ, in 1982 to Moscow and Leningrad. And I will never forget, not only did we meet with refuseniks and did our level best—and he was a tremendous leader and still is—to try to get the Soviets to allow Jews to leave, but I will never forget we went to Kazan Cathedral, which was a museum on atheism, and the Muslim faith, the Christian faith, and the Jewish faith were mocked. And a whole streaming group of Young Pioneers, little children, came walking through with their kerchiefs, and we heard some of the translation and it was all about how stupid religion was and how evil it actually was. And it was a wake-up call, and of course many churches and synagogues were turned into museums on atheism.

Now our earlier testimony spoke to the issue of aggressive secularism which is making the understanding of the Jewish people harder by people who almost, as Solzhenitsyn said about militant atheism in the Communist model, a more aggressive secularism also discounts faith as trivial or worse. And then we have as was said earlier by one of our witnesses about this radical Islamists being a root cause. So you have all of these competing views. And I think the secularism and the Islamists creates a very volatile and potent synergy of hate.

So your thoughts on that and any others who would like to speak to that issue of this second level of anti-Semitism. Rabbi Meyer?

Rabbi MEYER. Yes, I have in the written testimony, I have indeed spoken about how I feel we have a good reason to worry. And I would say my analysis of it is that those reasons are based on three realities and possibly four. I mean the first one being that clearly we start to see a limitation of religious rights, and very bluntly it actually means today that there are countries in Europe where a certain number of rituals are not permitted. As long as Europe is not too united we can actually sort out the problem. Because what is not permitted here is permitted elsewhere and this is how it works. If I cannot get the kosher slaughtering wherever I live, I can get it just across the border that might not be too far away.

But there is certainly a fear, I think, within the Jewish community that if it becomes strongly united in terms of laws then that even won’t be an option and therefore we might end up being actually left out with no possibility of practicing Judaism. So that is the
first level of the worry. I think the second level of being worried is because of this legal aspect and what I call the cloak of respectability. When you take a feeling, an anti-Semitic feeling and you dress it up as a legal, intellectual debate, then you run the risk of detaching, entirely detaching the reality of the topic you are talking about from the reality of the people to a truly abstract level. And I think that in itself is very dangerous.

Now the third level where I see a danger, and sadly I have to say for that I don’t think there is much we can do, is the fact that we are fewer and fewer in numbers as Jews in Europe. The decline of the Jewish community is extremely strong, and what it means is that for most European, talking about Jews is an intellectual exercise that doesn’t relate to a human reality because they don’t really know Jews. Jews are not really part of the popular culture. They might have been part of an anti-Semitic trend that has existed over the century, but we are not really part of the popular culture.

I just give you one very simple example some years ago. For Hanukkah there was commercials—and I remember I was in France—with something like: “Light your Hanukkah candles.” And they have made a survey asking people, what does that mean? What do you understand of that advert on the billboards? And people answered they thought that Hanukkah was the brand of the candles. Because there is no knowledge. That is what I mean, when there is not enough Jews to create a real knowledge of what Judaism is. And therefore, any sort of discussion on Judaism, on Jewish issues such as the one we had in Germany about circumcision becomes a purely intellectual one disconnected from a human reality. And I think when you start to disconnect a debate from a human face and from a confrontation with someone is front of you as a human being and it becomes a purely theoretical exercise, then that is where it opens door for all sorts of very slippery roads, and I think that is in that sense that I feel particularly worried.

Mr. Smith. Let me ask Mr. Fellegi. When Chief Rabbi Metzger dedicated Hungary’s oldest synagogue in Obuda—I could be mispronouncing that—in 2010, Prime Minister Netanyahu said, “the reopening of this synagogue is a true symbol of the Jewish renaissance in Hungary.” I wonder if you could, in light of Jobbik and its virulent anti-Semitic views, if you could speak briefly about the renaissance and the reaction of Prime Minister Orban to Jobbik and his view in terms of combating anti-Semitism.

Mr. Fellegi. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, for your question. I think it is very relevant and important. I would put this question into the perspective of two things. One is the level of sensitivity in society toward racism, xenophobic views and within this anti-Semitism. This relates to the points that the Rabbi made just a minute ago that the important thing is to make sure that society understands the framework in which all these atrocities happen in our societies, and we have a clear understanding that there has to be a zero tolerance policy toward racism of any kind.

The other thing that is important is to make clear that there are at least two interconnected levels of frameworks of understanding and making actions against anti-Semitism and racism. One is civil society, the NGO world and all those people who take up the issue,
and make sure that through education and through civil actions and organizations, society can be educated into a more tolerant and more sensitive situation. And the other is what your question was basically about is, is the political reaction, what government is doing or not doing vis-à-vis racism and within that anti-Semitism.

In terms of our civic society duties and our situation, indeed, as I mentioned in my brief opening statement but I elaborated on this in my written statement, there has been a huge revival of Jewish life in Hungary which is very promising and it has been welcomed by all the political parties in Hungary. The important part of it is that the official Hungary’s track record is not impeccable, in certain cases we were slow in denying or denouncing actions that can be deemed as racist or anti-Semitism. But the overall track record of the country, I think, is positive and it is improving. While at the same time, what we cannot deny is there is an increase of anti-Semitic atrocities in the country, in verbal and physical as well, but rather more verbal.

So what I would reply, very briefly, is that Prime Minister Orban, last summer, gave an interview to a German magazine called Focus, in which he announced the zero tolerance policy toward racism and anti-Semitism. And let me just highlight another point, because there is a long list of potentially quoted statements by Hungarian politicians denying and denouncing anti-Semitism and anti-Semitic acts, but let me just refer to the Prime Minister’s statement in Parliament he made after the incident with this Jobbik MP, Mr. Gyongyosi, who wanted to list Jewish representatives and government people as national security risk for Hungary. And he made it very clear that Hungary will not tolerate such acts and any form of anti-Semitism, and the government’s job is to fight this. Thank you.

Mr. SMITH. Yes.

Mr. SRULEVITCH. I just had a few comments on Hungary. Mr. Fellegi is right that the government has been making progress on this issue, that they have made statements condemning anti-Semitic actions. However, one concern is that they haven’t yet made clear that Jobbik is not simply a political competitor but that Jobbik is a threat to Hungarian democracy. When your colleague Joseph Crowley, Representative Crowley, wrote a letter to Prime Minister Orban last spring with concerns about statements of anti-Semitism and homophobia in Hungary, the response that he received from the Prime Minister was a request for help in shutting down an American based Hungarian language Web site. Mr. Fellegi mentioned kuruc.info as being one of the prime instigators of anti-Semitism in Hungary.

And while that may be true, it is also true that one can find on Jobbik’s Web site the “Protocols of the Elders of Zion.” One can find on Jobbik’s Web site examples of Holocaust denial, something for which a specific individual had been convicted in Hungary. But I don’t speak Hungarian, and these are things that I am able to find on the Hungarian Web site. So there is, as Mr. Fellegi said, there is more that can be done. But we do need to also recognize the steps that have been taken. After there were three instances of hate speech in the Parliament, the Parliament did change the law to allow the speaker to punish the person who was inciting.
When after Mr. Gyongyosi’s statement there was a civic demonstration against hate speech, the government did decide to send a representative. That was a very important step, something that we hadn't seen before. So again these are important steps, but the step of really identifying and targeting Jobbik as a threat to Hungarian democracy is the one we would like to see.

Mr. SMITH. Very briefly.

Mr. FELLEGI. Yes. If I may I would like to add to Andrew’s point, fully agreeing with his assessment of the situation in terms of Hungary. It needs to make more to make sure that the situation is not developing into the wrong direction. Let me just add to this point. I found the exact statement by Prime Minister Orban referring to Mr. Gyongyosi’s statement in Parliament requesting this Jewish registration issue. “As long as I am in this post no one in Hungary can be harmed because of their faith, convictions or origin. I would like to make it clear that we Hungarians will protect our Jewish compatriots.” Then adding that “Hungary has suffered dictatorship, and nothing or no one will derail Hungary from the democratic conviction.”

So this is very clearly a statement which shows that the mainstream Hungarian political forces from the left to the right fully understand that xenophobia, racism in general, and when it appears in politics especially, is against democracy as such. It is about the total democratic values of, and history of these countries. So the real issue here is to fight for democracy and at the same time, through democratic means, beating racism. Thank you.

Mr. SMITH. I will come back to a couple of other questions, but I yield to Mr. Marino.

Mr. MARINO. Thank you, Chairman. Gentlemen, thank you for being here today, and it is truly an honor for me to be having this dialogue with you. I am not going to direct my question or questions to any particular individual, however, please feel free to chime in at any time. I do want to preface with a brief statement, and I usually do not do this. As a prosecutor I get right to the heart of things.

But my father was a man of few means, salt of the earth. He was a firefighter and a janitor to raise his family. He passed away shortly before I was sworn into Congress, but he always said to me, Son, it is very difficult to reason with stupid people. And I have twisted that a little bit, added another phrase to it, and I have said, it is very dangerous because you cannot reason with stupid, arrogant people, which is a deadly combination. And my son who is 13, we watch the news together and I try to refrain from voicing my opinion—I don't always have complete control over myself when I hear some things—because I want to hear from him. And Victor has said to me on a couple of occasions, not facetiously—he is a very bright kid. He studies physics a great deal and space in general. And he says, you know something, Dad, there is a reason that extraterrestrials do not visit us here on Earth, because there is no intelligent life. And he was very serious when he said that.

The President has an opportunity, the quintessential opportunity when he goes to Israel very shortly to let the rest of the world know and the good people of the world that we are going to stand by them and fight the bad people in the world. I think this is just
an opportunity that he should take advantage of and speak very clearly and very directly about.

But now my question is, what specifically can we do here in Washington, what can Congress do to, if not eliminate the problems that we are having that you have each so eloquently spoke about but at least mitigate it? And how do you get the point across to people who just do not want to listen to it? How do you deal with that? So anyone? Go ahead, sir.

Mr. SILBERSTEIN. First of all, you should know that the world really listens to the United States. So when you in your contacts with other countries keep repeating how unacceptable it is in countries when they tolerate in any way both anti-Semitism and other form of racism, constantly, I am sure this will have an effect.

And let me add one thing which maybe only has a Swedish perspective. We have huge problems in Sweden with the fact that on Internet the hate that is spread there is beyond belief. And we have tried to do something about this. And I don't know the legal details about this, but the Swedish authorities say we cannot do anything because the servers are placed in the United States. And I guess it is hard for you to do anything either, but if anyone could look at this and see if there is anything that could be done. Because what is being published on the Internet, not the least about Jews, you would be terrified if you could read that. So please, if you can, do something.

Mr. MARINO. Now please bear in mind that our First Amendment to the Constitution here in the United States is very clear on freedom of speech. It does not mean that one has unfettered access to freedom of speech such as shouting “fire” in a movie theater, which is one of the cases, but do you think that the courts, the Supreme Court should get involved in situations like this? Because evidently, if issues like this are raised in the House there are going to be appeals and lawsuits right straight to the Supreme Court on controlling the Internet and what people can say on it.

Mr. SILBERSTEIN. I understand that this is technical. I know nothing about this. For me, being the president of the Swedish Committee Against anti-Semitism, when I see what is being written about me, about my son, about my family, and about so many other Jews, and they also incite, they want people to do things. I don't know enough about your laws here in the United States, but if there is any way you could do anything that would be so much appreciated.

Mr. MARINO. Chairman, may I have some more time? Thank you. Anyone else?

Rabbi BAKER. I would like, if I could, to join this discussion. We have often focused on the number of the problems that we see with anti-Semites throughout these places. I think it is important to recognize what may be equally important is the number of anti-Semitism, people that really respond, act, and speak out. And that is not so common. And there are still places where I think political leaders calculate that doing something on behalf of these concerns, these complaints, may be politically costly to them. Unfortunately that is true in too many places.

Clearly there is a hate on the Internet that we see as ever-present. It simply replaced the kind of anti-Semitism that decades
ago would be in broadsides or written in graffiti or so on. There are ways that go well beyond violating the principles of the First Amendment to encourage those who moderate what goes on the Internet to control, to limit, but also I think it reflects the importance of getting voices to speak out.

I know that even as I say this we need to focus as well on specific steps that governments can take. And one cannot underestimate the importance of your voices here in Washington, of Congress taking these issues up with different governments, with your counterparts. It goes on, for example, in the OSCE parliamentary assembly. But I really mean in specific ways. There are proposals from Jewish community organizations in Hungary, for example, on the reform of the national educational curriculum which is ongoing. Prime Minister Orban who has been outspoken, generally, somehow still as it filters down hasn't found a way to incorporate this. This would be critical.

We have heard about Sweden. They do an incredible job of monitoring incidents of hate crime, but the very institution that does this job is hampered because the government will not ask it to look more carefully as to who the perpetrators of these crimes are. Again, I think because it will point out as we heard, particularly in southern Sweden, that much of this comes out of an Arab or Muslim community, and that would require specific actions to be taken.

The issue of kosher slaughter has been raised. The reality is that in various countries even if it is possible to appeal to religious freedom traditions, Jewish communities say, “We won't do it. It will create a climate of anti-Semitism.” In the Netherlands, the Jewish community said we can't oppose this on the principle of religious freedom because we fear that more Dutch citizens are more disposed to principles of animal rights than religious freedom. So when you confront this, I think hearing from American voices, about how this plays out here, if you will, it would be a very helpful step.

And then finally, we have identified the basic concern of Jewish community security. I am pleased at the OSCE that literally today the chair-in-office and the director of ODIHR have written to the German Minister of Interior, who has offered to play a facilitating role to organize a European-wide conference under the OSCE auspices to focus on security. The very basic element comes even to just financial support for the need, for involving police and law enforcement. There is much that we have done in this country that can be replicated. We shall try to press these good examples so other countries can come forward, this will be an opportunity. And again it is a place where the U.S. sits around the table, where Members of Congress sit together with members of Parliaments of other OSCE countries. So those specific steps hopefully can be advocated and I trust implemented.

Mr. MARINO. Let me just add that I am now becoming a member involved in the NATO Parliamentary Assembly and I have been to my first meeting, and we sat down of course with 27 other NATO members. And I will certainly take this up when appropriate with the 27 other nations and have a frank discussion about this.
Chairman, does anyone else want to say anything? May the Rabbi speak?

Rabbi BLEICH. Yes, a few things about the questions that were asked. First of all, it will sound funny, but I think that there should be a way that the Congress should find some tool, since most of what is going on, what is based on these servers here in the United States and is being used for anti-Semitism overseas, it may be allowed in the United States, but overseas in many countries incitement and racial hatred is illegal. It is not included in freedom of speech. And there should be, I am sure, a way, a creative way to find to limit these servers that are maybe based in the United States, but are literally or virtually if you have a breaking of law in other countries throughout the world by inciting anti-Semitism and hatred.

I want to mention just something that the chairman mentioned before about the religion and the question of atheism. In Ukraine, which I don't believe is strongly unique but is quite, quite strong, the religious community has actually come together in a very, very strong and organized way. There is a Council of Churches and religious organizations that is basically representative of 95 percent of the faithful, different religions in Ukraine. And if you have 80 percent of the population consider themselves religious, it is probably one of the more powerful NGOs today in Ukraine.

And I am one of the founders and also co-chair, and we have come together many, many times to counter not only anti-Semitism but anti-Islamism, Islamophobia and other racial and other xenophobic acts or rhetoric that has come up in Ukraine. So it is quite interesting that today the religious community, I think, is one of the more outspoken, and I think that is something concrete that can be and should be mentioned by the United States Congress when they are negotiating with Ukraine. And there is so much to negotiate with them about, to just put in some honorable positive mention about the good things that are happening, and I am sure they will accept the criticism a lot better that way.

Mr. MARINO. Well, thank you. And Rabbi, just to conclude, I sit on the Judiciary Committee and I am vice chair of the Internet Subcommittee, so perhaps we can address that as well. Thank you. And Chairman, thank you so much for giving me the extra time.

Mr. SMITH. Oh, thank you very much. We do have to end the hearing in a moment or two. There is another hearing coming into this actual hearing room. But I just want to just bring up a couple of final things. Michael Horowitz was very helpful and instrumental in promoting the importance of this hearing and I want to thank him publicly. But also, he had an idea that I hope all of us take back too, and that is that there is a compelling need for highly visible visits, and in some cases it will be revisits, by heads of state and very high ranking members of government to synagogues in their respective countries, particularly in the capital cities throughout Europe, to speak out against anti-Semitism.

And one of our action items that we will undertake here as part of this committee will be to write and to make that appeal. If you have been there, great. Go back. The time has come to go back and to really speak out. And Rabbi Baker pointed out the huge increase of anti-Semitic acts in France, and they need to thanked, frankly,
for at least chronicling and being willing to come forward with the
information, but it is a very disturbing piece of information at that.
So those kinds of high visibility contacts, I think, would have an
impact.

And I do have a lot of questions but we have run out of time.
But if there is anything any of you would like to say in conclusion
as we conclude this hearing, I want to thank you. Without objec-
tion, there is a letter from the Simon Wiesenthal Center from Mark
Weitzman that will be included in the record without objection.

Reverend Dr. C. Welton Gaddy, president of Interfaith Alliance,
has sent a letter of support of this effort signed by 50 eminent indi-
viduals, many of them representing leading religious and human
rights organizations. That also will be made a part of the record.

Would anyone like to just make a concluding remark? We will
leave it at that. Thank you so much and we will continue on. This
will be the first in this Congress of what will be a series of hear-
ings on combating anti-Semitism. It is not the last. Thank you.

[Whereupon, at 12 o’clock p.m., the subcommittee was ad-
journed.]
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The Simon Wiesenthal Center is a global Jewish human rights organization that confronts antisemitism, hate and terrorism, promotes human rights and dignity, stands with Israel, defends the safety of Jews worldwide, and teaches the lessons of the Holocaust for future generations. With a constituency of over 400,000 households in the United States, it is accredited as an NGO at international organizations including the United Nations, UNESCO, OSCE, Organization of American States (OAS), the Latin American Parliament (PARLATINO) and the Council of Europe. Headquartered in Los Angeles, the Simon Wiesenthal Center maintains offices in New York, Toronto, Miami, Chicago, Paris, Buenos Aires, and Jerusalem.

Mr. Chairman, thank you for including this statement into the Committee’s hearing record for the House Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Africa, Global Health, Global Human Rights and International Organizations Hearing on “Anti-Semitism; A Growing Threat to All Faiths.”

In 2004 Natan Sharansky, the famous Israeli human rights activist, testified before the United States in Congress about a rise of European antisemitism and famously described a “New Antisemitism”, one which focuses on delegitimizing the existence of the State of Israel. Sharansky was of course, right on target with his description, but the rise of a “new antisemitism” doesn’t mean that the older, more traditional forms of antisemitism have withered away. Today we are seeing in Europe a resurgence of some of the more traditional types of antisemitism, an antisemitism that has resulted in what some have described as an “exodus” of Jews from countries such as Hungary and France.

This antisemitism cannot be simply dismissed as political disagreement or criticism of Israel. Now, basic markers of Jewish identity are under attack, and many of these anti-Jewish initiatives are happening in the liberal societies of Western Europe. Traditional Jewish observances such as b’rit milah (circumcision of new born male children) and kashrut (ritual slaughter) that have
identified Jewish life for thousands of years are under attack. In Germany, a controversy arose when a court ruled circumcision illegal, a ruling that set off a public discussion that soon allowed Germans “to vent (their) outright hostility” towards Jews, as one observer put it. Last summer some Austrian and Swiss hospitals followed the German ruling in halting circumcision. In Norway the Children’s Ombudsman, as well as the Center Party have called for a ban on the practice, with the Center Party’s spokesperson declaring “circumcision on religious grounds should be a criminal offense.” These actions followed on the heels of a February declaration by the Swedish Pediatric Society calling for the banning of circumcision in Sweden and a proposal by a Finnish Parliamentarian (from Finland’s ruling Finn Party) to ban circumcision there as well. In reaction to the German court ruling, the Bundestag passed a law protecting the right to perform ritual circumcisions, and the Swiss also resumed allowing the practice. In Norway, a Simon Wiesenthal Center delegation was assured by government officials that no ban would be enacted. However, the calls for a ban still persist.

Moreover, circumcision is not the only aspect of Jewish observance under attack. In the Netherlands, a bill banning shechita, the practice of ritual slaughter that makes meat kosher, was originally passed by the lower house of the Dutch Parliament last year. Ultimately an agreement was reached this spring, and ratified by the Dutch Senate, which allowed for practice to continue, yet some politicians are still demanding that the practice be proscribed. Meanwhile, in England, former Food and Farming Minister James Paice has publicly described shechita as “wholly unacceptable” and has called for including shechita in a public review of animal welfare laws.

In France, during last spring’s presidential election campaign, Francois Fillon, then-prime minister of Nicholas Sarkozy’s center-right government, urged Jews and Muslims to give up their traditional methods of slaughter. Further east, Poland’s attorney general joined the chorus, stating in late June that shechita was unconstitutional (this despite the 2011 pronouncement by Polish President Bronislaw Komorowski that the proposed Dutch bill had led to “a crisis of tolerance” in Europe). These calls are in addition to the bans on shechita that already exist in Europe, some dating from the 1930s, such as in Norway, Sweden, Luxembourg and Switzerland.

But it is not just Jewish observances that have been attacked. In France, for the second time in the last seven years, Jews have been murdered just for being Jews. The murder in Toulouse last year, following the murder of Ian Halimi in 2006, have left many Jews feeling threatened and worried about their physical safety in the heart of Western Europe. Last summer, senior staff members of the Simon Wiesenthal Center visited Toulouse and five neighboring communities and met with survivors and family of hate crimes victims. The delegation also met with France’s Interior Minister, and commended the government of President Hollande for the steps they are taking to try and better protect France’s Jewish community. In the Swedish city of Malmo, attacks on Jews have led to a member of the Jewish community there to say that for Jews “Malmo is a place to move away from.” Our Center The Simon Wiesenthal Center has met with
Malmo’s Mayor, Sweden’s Justice Minister and Jewish, Muslim and Roma community leaders to try aid the situation there.

Hungarian Jews are also leaving in large numbers. The rise of the antisemitic Jobbik party, with its call to register all the Jews of Hungary, the physical attacks on prominent Jews, the honoring of Nazi collaborators (some have now even been included in the national curriculum) and outright Holocaust denial and overt antisemitism by politicians have created a poisonous public atmosphere. If the resurgence of traditional antisemitism is a significant aspect of European antisemitism, then the acceptance of hardcore antisemitism into legitimate public discourse is a second significant factor. Antisemitism has now been politically legitimated by parties such as Jobbik in Hungary, and the ruling Fidesz party that has thus far enabled them. Only recently, over the past few months, has the government begun to slowly distance themselves from the radical antisemitism apparent in Hungary.

In Greece, the Golden Dawn Party, which entered Parliament for the first time last year, represents this trend, with members who have publicly denied the Holocaust and who have quoted the infamous Protocols of the Elders of Zion in Parliament. In Turkey, government leaders have employed extremely harsh language about Israel; despite statements by the Prime Minister that “anti-semitism is a crime against humanity” this hostility has been translated into popular manifestations of antisemitism and popularity for antisemitic books, videos and other media.

These factors, taken together with the still virulent anti-Israel sentiment that exists in Europe, have conspired to create an environment where Jews and Jewish life are physically and ritually threatened. Throughout Europe many Jews see no future, and as a result many are leaving or contemplating leaving.

If this trend is to be reversed, a series of vigorous steps must be undertaken. These include guaranteeing the physical safety of Jews and Jewish institutions. Threats to Jewish security must be taken seriously, and radical antisemitism must be investigated and prosecuted to the fullest extent. Secondly, guarantees of religious freedom, and the ability to follow traditional observances must be enforced, and commitments to this principle as embodied in international covenants such as the Universal Declaration of Human Rights or the OSCE commitments embodied in the Helsinki Final Act and following instruments or their own national constitutions or laws must be upheld.

The Simon Wiesenthal Center is committed to working to ensure that Europe’s Jews can lead lives free of physical fear and religious threats. Our Digital Hate and Terrorism project, one of the largest NGO efforts on extremism online, is soon to release our 15th annual report that maps online threats to Jews and others. Our Museum of Tolerance based in Los Angeles and New York, hosts and works with many European governments and NGO’s to ensure freedom and tolerance. The Center, as an active NGO in the UN, OSCE and Council of Europe, is a full and
active participant in political efforts to fight antisemitism and other forms of intolerance. As an active member of the ODJHR Advisory Panel of Experts on Freedom of Religion or Belief, I have personally been involved in these efforts, such as the 2011 OSCE High-Level Meeting on Preventing and Responding to Hate Incidents and Crimes Against Christians and the OSCE High Level Meeting on Confronting Anti-Semitism in Public Discourse held in Prague in the same year. The OSCE has become one of the most important addresses for these issues and its role is vital in combating antisemitism and other forms of intolerance.

Another vital tool in this fight is the International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance, or IHRA (formerly the International Task Force for Holocaust Education, Research and Remembrance, or ITR). As a member of the official US delegation to the IHRA since it began in 2000, I have seen the organization finally move to include antisemitism in its active agenda. And, as Chair of the IHRA’s relatively new Standing Committee on Antisemitism and Holocaust Denial, I have been able to sharpen the focus on the topic by including, for example, reports about member countries that are discussed at the biannual IHRA meetings and have been observed by senior diplomats from the countries involved, thus sending a strong message of engagement on the issue. These efforts began under the Norwegian Chair of 2009, and the incoming Canadian Chair has assured me that they will be an active propriety of their Chair. Although the IHRA is underpublicized, the work that they can do in dealing with this issue on both a political and grassroots level is extremely important, and should be supported.

In that vein, the work that is done by the Office of Holocaust Issues at the State Department must be acknowledged. Douglas Davidson, its Director, and Elizabeth Nakian, the Deputy Director, have shouldered a tremendous load and been stalwart in demonstrating the commitment of the U.S. government to this issue. Their implementation of US policy has helped make the United States the recognized international leader in combating antisemitism. They have been in the forefront of these efforts on a daily basis, and have done it with increasingly diminished resources. Their work is indispensable, and I hope that together with the Office of the Special Envoy to Monitor and Combat Antisemitism, they can be supported to the greatest extent possible.

Antisemitism in Europe today is taking forms that haven’t been seen for almost a century. It appears to have morphed into an acceptable form of public discourse, first as attacks on Israel’s right to exist, then as attacks on Jewish rites and rituals, and finally, in some places, naked threats and even violence against Jews that poses an existential threat to Europe’s small Jewish population. If left unchallenged, Europe may actually become “Judenrein”, free of Jews, or at least of a visible Jewish presence. These attacks often target not only Jews, but Muslims, Roma, LGBT and other “aliens”, thus suggesting that other victims are on the horizon as well. Almost 70 years after the end of the Holocaust and the liberation of the death camps, it appears that the battle for Europe’s soul is still up in the air.
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As a Baptist minister, a patriotic American and the President of Interfaith Alliance, I submit this testimony to The House Committee on Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Africa, Global Health, Global Human Rights, and International Organizations for the Hearing Record on “Anti-Semitism: A Growing Threat to All Faiths.” A national, non-partisan organization, Interfaith Alliance celebrates religious freedom and is dedicated to protecting faith and freedom with members nationwide who belong to 75 faith traditions as well as those without a faith tradition.

Interfaith Alliance focuses not only on religious freedom but also on uniting diverse voices to challenge extremism, toward an end to bigotry and ignorance. One of Interfaith Alliance’s top priorities is combating religion-based discrimination, whatever form it takes, and hatred against religious groups. In the last few years domestically, much of our focus has been on combating anti-Muslim bigotry, as well as bigotry against Sikhs and Hindus. Unfortunately, hate crimes, violent attacks on mosques and temples and Muslim, Sikh and Hindu individuals have too often shown the need for this work, for dialogue, for better education about our neighbors of different faiths. This is not to say that anti-Semitism has ceased to exist in our nation—sadly it has not—but if I have learned one thing, it is the cyclical nature of bigotry against minority faith groups; at one time it was Catholics, at too many times it has been Jews and now it is Muslims, Sikhs and Hindus. Each wave of antagonism against one faith or another leaves indelible blemishes on our country.

Though the scope of this hearing is anti-Semitism abroad and the scope of our work is on domestic issues, we know that bigotry does not stop at national borders. Throughout history, we have too often seen the impact of hatred abroad here at home, and vice versa. I applaud the sentiment of the title of this hearing and would add that bigotry against one group—be it a group that is religious, racial, ethnic or otherwise—should be seen as a threat to any group of individuals who can far too easily fall victim to stereotyping and generalizations of a virulent nature.

Yet, the issues we face here in the United States are not unique to our nation. Bigotry against religious communities can take many shapes depending on the country, the city even, in which we focus our discussion. Nazi and Holocaust rhetoric and the occasional overlap of anti-Israel sentiments with broader anti-Semitic are just a few of the signs that, sadly, anti-Semitism is not yet a thing of the past and indeed continues to morph into new (and sometimes subtler) forms. Similarly, solutions take different forms in different parts of the world based on the facts on the ground.

Though the primary focus of my work—both at Interfaith Alliance and beyond—is here in the United States, it is not my only focus. In the 15 years I have led Interfaith Alliance, I have
participated in many international conferences that have informed my work at home—much of it related to anti-Semitism. Participating in two international dialogues hosted by the King of Spain and the King of Saudi Arabia, I witnessed a gaping absence of Jewish participation and a quiet unwillingness to talk about the need for a Jewish presence.

Personally, I have had great opportunities to exchange best practices, share the American experience of interfaith cooperation abroad, and learn from the on-the-ground experiences of colleagues worldwide. Most recently, a trip to Israel with several other civil rights leaders to learn about the conflict between Jews and Arabs taking place in the Middle East was eye-opening and inspiring. Though no simplistic answers suffice when combating anti-Semitism, I must observe that anti-Semitism could be reduced considerably by the public paying attention to more accurate information about what is occurring in the Middle East. Interactions with Sikhs, Muslims, Hindus and leaders in other traditions have taught me that the problem with anti-Semitism is not inherent in any religion. The problem results from propaganda, poor media coverage, and uninformed political leaders who stir up prejudice.

Across the past 15 years I have not met anybody that wanted to foster anti-Semitism. During the same time I have encountered scores of people who revealed an anti-Jewish bias as a result of misinformation or incomplete information about the truth on the ground in the Middle East and the political and financial support for both Jews and Muslims abroad. With the help of Jewish, Christian and Muslim leaders along with supporters from other religious traditions, Interfaith Alliance has sought to serve as an agency of mutual understanding and mutual cooperation. Make no mistake about it though, that work among us, even as among any person or institution doing that work, requires patience and a will to listen to criticism in order to get to a better place.

Whatever the result of this hearing, be assured that I personally and Interfaith Alliance institutionally are willing to do all we can to eliminate the presence of anti-Semitism in the United States. We are delighted you share that goal.