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“The United Nations emerged from the ashes of the Holocaust. And a human rights agenda that fails to address anti-Semitism denies its own history. We look to our friends in civil society to keep us up to the mark.”
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June 21, 2004
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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Antisemitism is a global scourge that requires a global response. With deadly attacks escalating worldwide over the past decade—from Kansas to Copenhagen, Mumbai to Toulouse—the United Nations has a unique role to play in combating hatred, incitement and violence against Jews.

Anti-racism is the defining ideology of the United Nations and its human rights mechanisms. Yet all too often, as documented in this report’s comprehensive examination of the actions of key UN officials, agencies and experts over the past decade, it seems that the UN sees racism everywhere, and antisemitism nowhere.

There are notable exceptions. Secretary-General Antonio Guterres, like his predecessors Ban Ki-moon and Kofi Annan, has made a series of positive statements about combating antisemitism. The General Assembly hosted an informal meeting on antisemitism in 2015. The UN’s Holocaust Outreach Program commemorates and teaches about the Holocaust, reaching broad audiences worldwide.

UNESCO recently released a publication with the OSCE aimed at assisting policymakers in addressing antisemitism through education. Notwithstanding its repeated adoption of one-sided resolutions condemning Israel and downplaying the ancient Jewish heritage of Jerusalem and Hebron, UNESCO also hosted, after an initial postponement, an exhibit on the 3,000-year-old connection of the Jewish people to the Land of Israel.

Regrettably, however, the exceptions prove the rule. Over a decade when Jews were targeted for slaughter in India, France, Belgium, Denmark and elsewhere—whether in a Jewish school, museum, synagogue or supermarket—the UN’s primary agencies and officials for addressing discrimination have, for the most part, turned a blind eye to antisemitism.

UN plenaries like the General Assembly and the Human Rights Council, which enact hundreds of resolutions a year, including on subjects related to racial and religious discrimination, failed to address the threat of antisemitism, other than in a few passing words included in general statements. Until 2010, both the General Assembly and the Human Rights Council adopted annual resolutions focused on the “defamation of Islam and Muslims,” mandating special reports, yet there was never one resolution to address anti-Jewish hatred and violence.

During the course of his tenure from 2006 to 2016, Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon issued more than 100 condemnations of terror attacks worldwide. When the attack targeted religious worshippers, mosques or Christian clergy, his condemnations included strong language against the targeting of people for their religious beliefs. By contrast, he refrained from employing similarly strong language regarding terrorist attacks against Jewish targets, many of which he did not condemn at all. In a decade marked by shocking antisemitic violence, Mr. Ban was often silent. While he proved quick to condemn an anti-Muslim film or statement by private parties, he failed to address pervasive, state-sanctioned incitement to antisemitism in the Middle East, including Iran’s Holocaust denial, Jewish conspiracy theories, and calls to commit genocide.

High Commissioner for Human Rights Navi Pillay, who served from 2008 to 2014, was likewise quick to condemn a film perceived as anti-Muslim, as well as “malicious” cartoons by Charlie Hebdo. Yet in the face of murderous physical attacks against Jews, such as the shooting at a Toulouse Jewish school, Pillay was typically silent. Worse, Pillay and her office repeatedly smeared Jewish organizations as “single-issue lobbyists” for seeking to prevent antisemitism from infecting the UN’s 2009 “Durban II” conference on racism.

Current High Commissioner Zeid Ra’ad al-Hussein has not only turned a blind eye to antisemitic incitement and violent attacks—even though he has addressed incitement against Muslims in Myanmar—but he has repeatedly engaged, as have other UN officials, in what Holocaust scholar Deborah Lipstadt has called softcore Holocaust denial, through a series of statements that seek to de-Judaize the Holocaust.

The UN Human Rights Council’s Special Rapporteurs on racism and freedom of religion ought to be the first UN experts to speak out against anti-Jewish discrimination and violence. However, as a rule, successive mandate-holders over the past decade have failed to comment on rising antisemitism, including the murderous incitement against Jews in the Arab and Muslim world, or deadly attacks in Europe and elsewhere. By contrast, they did speak out on behalf of other targeted groups.

Finally, expert bodies like the Human Rights Committee and the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination (CERD), which review country compliance with international treaties, should
be affirmatively monitoring state parties for any antisemitic incitement or violence which puts Jews at risk, or infringes their rights to freely practice the Jewish religion. Yet an examination of the Human Rights Committee’s concluding observations for numerous state parties—including Arab and Muslim states where antisemitic incitement is rampant, as well as other states that have witnessed high levels of antisemitic incidents in the last ten years—reveals that antisemitism is of limited concern.

Similarly, our study of the CERD’s concluding observations for numerous countries—including Argentina, Denmark, France, Germany, Greece, Iran, Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Morocco, Oman, Qatar, Russia, Sweden, Turkey, the UAE, Ukraine and Venezuela—shows that the 18-member body rarely mentioned violent attacks on Jews or other forms of antisemitism, though it did devote attention to Islamophobia or discrimination against Roma. Moreover, though antisemitic incitement from the Arab and Muslim world has inspired horrific antisemitic attacks worldwide, the CERD addressed hate speech in these countries only when the speech was directed at other groups—but never when the target was Jews.

In conclusion, this report finds, on the basis of overwhelming evidence over the past decade, that the primary United Nations officials and bodies that should be condemning and combating antisemitism are, with limited exceptions, failing to do so.

Now is a time for leadership. We call on Secretary-General Antonio Guterres to acknowledge the demonstrable failure of the world body when it comes to antisemitism, and to set forth an action plan that will mobilize key UN stakeholders, and in particular those within its human rights machinery, to exercise their responsibilities to confront bigotry, hate or violence targeting Jews worldwide.

INTRODUCTION

The United Nations emerged from the ashes of the Holocaust, noted Secretary General Kofi Annan in 2004, and the world body has an obligation, as part of its universal anti-racism mission, to combat antisemitism—bigotry, hatred and violence against Jews.

In 2007, UN Watch published an evaluation of United Nations actions on antisemitism from 2004 to 2007. This new Report Card continues from there and examines the record over the past decade, starting from 2008 to 2017.

The report begins with a survey of antisemitism worldwide, to identify the scope and breadth of the problem that the United Nations system ought to be addressing. It then examines the actions of various member state bodies—including the General Assembly, the Human Rights Council, and UNESCO; top officials such as the Secretary-General and the High Commissioner; treaty bodies and monitors on racism and freedom of religion—to ask the following questions: Are they living up to their obligations to combat anti-Jewish racism, hatred and violence? What have they done right, and what have they done wrong? What more should relevant UN bodies and officials be doing?

RISE OF ANTISEMITISM IN PAST DECADE

Over the last decade, Jews around the world have been harassed, spat on, threatened, beaten, raped and killed—just for being Jews. Jewish sites and institutions have been desecrated, vandalized and burned. In France, Jewish students for the past few years have been attending school surrounded by barricades, barbed wire and heavily armed soldiers. In the UK, similar fears of violence against Jews prompted the government in 2017 to announce over $17 million per year to boost security for Jewish schools.

According to Tel-Aviv University's Kantor Center for the Study of Contemporary European Jewry, which publishes annual reports on antisemitism worldwide, the level of antisemitic activity in the past decade is higher than it was in the 1990s. In two of the last ten years—2009 and 2014—record highs in violent antisemitic activity were recorded, clearly associated with anti-Israeli incitement following clashes between Hamas and Israel. Still, the numbers for the intervening years reflect an overall increase from years prior. In addition, even in those years when overt antisemitic violence decreased, antisemitic harassment continued to escalate. One study conducted by the World Jewish Congress for 2016 found that an antisemitic message was uploaded to social media every 83 seconds.

3 Kantor Center Report for 2009, p. 1 (“The year in the wake of Operation Cast Lead was the worst since monitoring of anti-Semitic manifestations began two decades ago, in terms of both major anti-Semitic violence and the hostile atmosphere generated worldwide by the mass demonstrations and verbal and visual expressions against Israel and the Jews.”).
4 Kantor Center Report for 2014, p. 5 (“The year 2014 has been one of the worst years in the last decade, 2004-2014, in fact, it was the second worst year after 2009.”).
5 Kantor Center Report for 2015, p. 5; Kantor Center Report for 2013, p. 10 (“The Kantor Center has also noted that hatred of Israel cannot be the only explanation for the rise in antisemitism in recent years, as even in years with no incident in the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, anti-Semitism levels were still high. One example is the wave of anti-Jewish violence in France and the UK following the March 2012 fatal shooting attack at the Otsar HaTorah school in Toulouse, which was not linked to any event in the Israeli-Palestinian conflict.”); Kantor Center Report for 2012, p. 1 (noting “considerable escalation in level of violent and vandalistic attacks against Jewish individuals, sites and private property . . . in 2012”); Kantor Center Report for 2011, p. 2 (“physical violence against Jews remained at a considerably high level”).
6 Kantor Center Report for 2016, pp. 5-6; Kantor Center Report for 2011, pp. 1; 2; 5 (“even in countries where the number of major violent incidents decreased, reports pointed to a continuation and even an escalation in acts of harassment. . . .”); Kantor Center Report for 2010, pp. 1; 4.
In 2015 and 2016, the Kantor Center recorded a dramatic decline in violent antisemitic attacks, the lowest numbers of the decade, but noted for 2015 that these numbers were still similar to those for 2011, i.e., still higher than in the 1990s. Moreover, the Kantor Center attributed the decrease to external factors, including increased security at Jewish sites and institutions and avoidance by Jews of displaying Jewish identifying symbols in public, rather than a decrease in antisemitic attitudes. Thus, while the increase in security prevented attacks on protected Jewish sites, the unprotected Jewish cemeteries and memorials continued to be targeted.

In France, 800 Jewish institutions were under permanent governmental protection in 2016, and 10,000 soldiers deployed on the streets. Likewise, in Germany, the government must provide special protection to Jewish centers, schools and synagogues. Other communities like the UK spend millions on security every year. In Switzerland, where the government does not provide protection, these exorbitant security costs are bankrupting the Jewish communities. In North America, Jewish communities have been concerned about security for some time, as evidenced by the establishment of the Secure Community Network in 2004 to address these issues.

Significantly, Jews are targeted far more than other minorities. For example, the Kantor Center reported that in 2012, 40% of all racist violence in France targeted Jews, while Jews comprise only 1% of the population. In 2014, 51% of all racist violence in France targeted Jews. Similarly, in 2015 and 2016, the FBI found that antisemitism accounted for slightly more than 50% of religious hate crimes in America although Jews are less than 2% of the population.

The situation became so bad in 2014 that many Jewish leaders commented they were witnessing a return to the 1930s, a general feeling that has persisted. Despite the overall decrease in violence since Israel’s conflict with Hamas in Gaza in the summer of 2014, verbal and visual harassment continues to rise and Jews report an increasingly hostile atmosphere. These feelings are reinforced by the heavy security surrounding Jewish institutions and by two recent statistical studies—one on the feelings of European Jews about antisemitism and a second on the attitudes of non-Jews towards Jews around the world.

In early 2013, the European Union’s Fundamental Rights Agency (FRA) published the results of a survey of European Jews regarding antisemitism. Six thousand Jews were surveyed from eight European countries, representing 90% of the Jewish population of the European Union. The results showed that 76% of those surveyed did not report antisemitic harassment

8 Kantor Center Report for 2016, pp. 5-6; Kantor Center Report for 2015, p. 5.
9 Kantor Center Report for 2016, p. 6; Kantor Center Report for 2015, pp. 5-7; see also Brendan McDermid/Reuters, “Tony Blair: To Defeat Anti-Semitism We Must Defeat Radical Islam,” Newsweek, Jan. 27, 2016 (noting that in late 2015, Marseille Jewish leader Zvi Ammar urged Jews to avoid wearing skullcaps in the street); Itamar Eichner, “Jewish Agency is upping security in Jewish communities around the world,” Ynet, Jan. 27, 2017.
10 Kantor Center Report for 2016, p. 6.
11 Id., p. 5.
12 Id., p. 77.
13 Id.; Kantor Center Report for 2015, p. 5; Kantor Center Report for 2014, p. 5; Kantor Center Report for 2012, p. 6; Kantor Center Report for 2010, p. 6 (noting 25% of Sweden Jewish community’s budget is spent on security).
14 Kantor Center Report for 2016, p. 77.
15 Secure Community Network website, available at https://scnus.org/about.
16 Kantor Center Report for 2013, p. 2.
17 Kantor Center Report for 2014, p. 11.
20 Kantor Center Report for 2016, pp. 5-6; 9; Kantor Center Report for 2015, p. 7.
to the authorities, mostly because they did not believe reporting the incident would make any difference; 23% avoid participating in Jewish events and visiting Jewish institutes so as to keep out of harm’s way; 38% avoid identifying Jewish symbols while out in public; 46% fear becoming a victim of antisemitic harassment and 33% fear becoming a victim of a physical antisemitic attack; 66% stated that antisemitism impacts their lives; and 76% stated that antisemitism has become more severe in the last five years.\(^{23}\)

In May 2014, the Anti-Defamation League (ADL) published the results of its global attitude survey of 53,000 participants in 102 countries and territories, in which it polled worldwide attitudes towards Jews.\(^{24}\) The results showed that 26% of respondents—representing 1.1 billion adults worldwide—harbor deep-seated antisemitic feelings.\(^{25}\) The percentage fluctuated by region, with 74% harboring such antisemitic attitudes in the Middle East and North Africa, 34% in Eastern Europe, 24% in Western Europe, 22% in Asia, 19% in the Americas, and 14% in Oceania.\(^{26}\)

These studies highlight that antisemitism is extremely widespread, even in countries with very small or no Jewish populations, and that many individual Jews feel so threatened by the possibility of being targeted in an antisemitic attack that they avoid wearing openly Jewish symbols in public and frequenting Jewish institutions. This fear of being targeted is not limited to Europe. Also in Canada, Australia and other countries, Jews cannot walk around freely displaying skullcaps and other visibly Jewish symbols like the Star of David without being threatened; and many consciously avoid doing so to prevent being harassed or worse.\(^{27}\)

Governmental agencies in many countries are actively working to combat antisemitism through legislation and increased education.\(^{28}\) Nevertheless, statistics show that incidents of antisemitism continue to rise and individual Jews and Jewish communities feel increasingly threatened.

### ATTACKS INSPIRED BY RADICAL ISLAM

The last decade has witnessed a series of devastating antisemitic attacks:

- **November 26, 2008**: Al-Qaeda-linked terrorists kill six Jews at the Chabad House religious center in Mumbai, India, including the young rabbi and his wife, as revenge for supposed Israeli atrocities against Palestinians;

- **June 10, 2009**: White supremacist and avowed Holocaust denier kills security guard at the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum in Washington, D.C.;

- **March 19, 2012**: Mohammed Merah, a French-Algerian identified with al-Qaeda, kills four Jews—a rabbi, his two young sons and an 8 year-old girl—at the Otsar HaTorah school in Toulouse, France, because “the Jews kill our brothers and sisters in Palestine”;

- **April 13, 2014**: White supremacist who later confessed to wanting to “kill as many Jews as possible” murders three people outside the Jewish Community Center of Kansas City and the Village Shalom assisted-living facility in Overland Park, Kansas;

- **May 24, 2014**: French Jihadist kills four, including an Israeli couple, in shooting attack at the Jewish Museum in Brussels;

- **January 9, 2015**: ISIS-identified terrorist linked to brutal Charlie Hebdo attack two days earlier murders four Jewish men in combined hostage-taking shooting attack at Hyper Casher Kosher supermarket near Paris;

- **February 15, 2015**: ISIS supporter kills Jewish security guard on duty guarding a Bat Mitzvah celebration at Copenhagen’s Great Synagogue.

---

\(^{23}\) FRA Fact Sheet on Jewish people’s experiences of discrimination and hate crimes in European Union member states; FRA Report Discrimination and hate crime against Jews in EU Member States: experiences and perceptions of anti-Semitism; See also, Kantor Center Report for 2013, p. 2.

\(^{24}\) The results of the ADL survey are available at [http://global100.adl.org/](http://global100.adl.org/).

\(^{25}\) ADL Global 100: An Index of Anti-Semitism; see also Kantor Center Report for 2014, p. 8.

\(^{26}\) ADL Global 100: An Index of Anti-Semitism.

\(^{27}\) Kantor Center Report for 2015, p. 7; Kantor Center Report for 2010, p. 4.

\(^{28}\) Kantor Center Report for 2016, p. 10; Kantor Center Report for 2014, p. 7; Kantor Center Report for 2013, p. 4 (noting “growing discrepancy between official policies in most western countries that support commemorating the Holocaust, condemning any form of anti-Semitism, and promoting legislation against anti-Semitism and Holocaust denial, and the vox populi, that is popular opinion in such countries.”); Kantor Center Report for 2011, p. 2.
The common thread in these attacks, other than the two carried out in the U.S. by white supremacists, is the Muslim identity of the perpetrators and the radical Islamist ideology that inspired them. Despite the fact that the Jewish population in most Arab countries is zero, antisemitism in the Muslim world is rampant today. According to renowned antisemitism expert Robert Wistrich, since the establishment of the State of Israel, “hatred of Jews has become far more lethal and toxic in the Muslim world than anywhere else.”

Over the years, Muslim antisemitism, fueled by anti-Zionism and influenced by Nazism, increasingly adopted the language and imagery of classical European antisemitism, depicting Jews as “treacherous,” accusing them of plots to dominate the world, and preaching genocide using jihadist rhetoric. This virulent antisemitism, which has become a basic part of the narrative of militant Islam, is framed as a religious holy war against Jews, Israel and the West. Within Islamist rhetoric, notes scholar David Nirenberg, “Judaism is not just the Jews; it’s capitalism, colonialism, Marxism, psychoanalysis, America, homosexuality, Darwinism, a range of modern threats to godliness.”

The mostly state-owned Arab media is flooded with antisemitic incitement and slander. In 2016, the Palestinian al-Hayat al-Jadida blamed Israel for deadly ISIS attacks at the Brussels airport and metro, claiming they were the Jewish state’s revenge against the European Union for sympathizing with the Palestinians. Iraqi TV claimed that ISIS is “remote-controlled” by Israel. In Jordan, a professor expressed support for the ISIS-inspired attack on an Orlando nightclub, blaming “International Zionism” for spreading homosexuality around the world. Similarly, in 2015, newspapers in Tunisia, Lebanon, Egypt and elsewhere blamed the Jews for the ISIS attacks in France in January and November, with one publication arguing that “the Jewish Zionists suggested to the [Charlie Hebdo] newspaper to fabricate a barbaric attack against the freedom of speech in order to increase its profits.” Jordanian and Egyptian journalists denied the Holocaust, complaining that this was taboo in the West while attacks against the Prophet Muhammad were allowed.

Nowhere is this antisemitic incitement more extreme than in Iran, where the government refers to Israel as the “little Satan” (next to the “great Satan” of America), and blames Jews and Israel for all the evils in the world. Iran is the greatest state purveyor of Holocaust denial, a major characteristic of modern antisemitism. Its officials regularly question whether the Holocaust happened, and the government has hosted several cartoon contests with antisemitic themes, including its most recent Holocaust cartoon contest in May 2016. Caricatures included: Adolf Hitler emerging from the brain of Israeli Prime Minister


36 Id.

37 Kantor Center Report for 2015, p. 33.

38 Id.


40 Id., p. 15 (noting that in the last 30 years “Holocaust inversion and denial has become an increasingly important strand in contemporary anti-Semitism and anti-Zionism.”).

Netanyahu, and a cash register shaped like the gates of Auschwitz, registering the number 6,000,000 with a caption referring to the exaggeration of the number of Holocaust victims.\(^{50}\) Iran also sponsors Hezbollah and Hamas, radical Islamist terrorist groups who openly preach the genocidal destruction of Israel.\(^{53}\)

Social media is increasingly being deployed in the Muslim world to spread antisemitic incitement, often in the form of graphic images defaming Jews and Israelis, such as a caricature of a stereotypically Orthodox Jew with a Star of David next to an ISIS figure emerging from a matchbox and sparking a fire, instantaneously shared with millions.\(^{44}\) Incitement in Palestinian social media was a major factor in fueling the wave of deadly Palestinian knife and vehicular attacks in Israel in the fall of 2015.\(^{45}\) Palestinians used social media to disseminate graphic photos explaining where on the human body to stab to achieve the most lethal result, and to popularize hashtags such as “Poison the Knife before You Stab” and “Slaughtering the Jews.” ISIS also has used social media to recruit and radicalize followers and routinely employs antisemitic messages in its propaganda and recruitment materials.\(^{46}\) Al-Qaeda and its offshoots do the same, frequently calling for attacks on Jews and Israelis, accusing them of all manner of ills from dishonoring Muslims to ruling America.\(^{47}\) This toxic incitement also has been disseminated by Imams outside of the Arab world, in places like Copenhagen,\(^{48}\) Montreal,\(^{49}\) Berlin\(^{50}\) and Northern Italy,\(^{51}\) with public calls to “obliterate” Israel and annihilate the Jews.

Against this background, it is no surprise that Jews around the world have been singled out and targeted for deadly attacks by radical Islamists. Recognizing this, in January 2017, former-British Prime Minister Tony Blair told a Jewish audience that the struggle against antisemitism was not just a fight against violence, but “against the ideology that begets the violence of Islamist extremism.”\(^{52}\)

**THE RISE OF LEFT-WING ANTISEMITISM**

Together with the spread of radical Islamic ideology, a new form of antisemitism rooted in demonizing Israel and singling out the Jewish state for delegitimization has gained traction among radical-left circles.\(^{53}\) In recognition of this new antisemitism, the Working Definition of Antisemitism adopted by the 31-nation International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance (IHRA) in May 2016 includes anti-Zionism as a form of antisemitism.\(^{54}\) World leaders such as Secretary-General Antonio Guterres and French President Emmanuel Macron have publicly acknowledged that anti-Zionism is a new type of antisemitism.\(^{55}\)

This new left-wing antisemitism, which is ideologically aligned with militant Islamic terrorists and stubbornly
refuses to criticize them, was behind some of the most violent anti-Israel protests of the last decade. It also fuels the discriminatory Boycott, Divestment, Sanctions (“BDS”) movement, which singles out only one state—Israel—for punitive sanctions. BDS has flourished in the last decade, particularly on college campuses, where it is often accompanied by antisemitic violence and harassment, including Holocaust denial and abuse. A recent joint poll by Trinity College and the Brandeis Center for Human Rights Under Law showed that 54% of U.S. college students experienced or witnessed an antisemitic incident in 2014. The ADL reported that the number of antisemitic incidents on U.S. college campuses nearly doubled in 2015, with a total of 90 reported incidents on 60 campuses. Applying slight different criteria, the Amcha Initiative recorded 309 antisemitic incidents on 79 U.S. college campuses in 2015, and 433 antisemitic incidents on 72 campuses in 2016, an increase of 40% from 2015 to 2016. A study of Jewish college students in the UK showed only slightly lower levels of antisemitic incidents compared to the Brandeis Center study. Similarly, Jews at Canadian colleges feel unsafe on campus.

Students for Justice in Palestine (SJP), the pro-Palestinian group that spearheads divestment efforts on U.S. college campuses, is known for creating an atmosphere of fear, intimidation and hate directed at Jewish and pro-Israel students who oppose its tactics. Outrageously, some college professors have jumped on the bandwagon, at times openly ridiculing Jewish and Israeli students in their classrooms. SJP activists frequently also use Holocaust imagery to demonize Israel and compare it to the Nazis. Some anti-Israeli activists are less circumspect and freely advocate genocide against “the Jews,” just like the radical Islamists, chanting Nazi-reminiscent creeds like “kill the Jews” and “Jews to the gas” at anti-Israel demonstrations. Discriminatory BDS is not limited to university campuses. It has infiltrated mainstream institutions like the European Union and the United Nations, supposed bulwarks of human rights and anti-discrimination. On November 11, 2015, the European Commission adopted guidelines for labeling products from Israeli settlements. On March 24, 2016, the United Nations Human Rights Council adopted a resolution to create a database of “all business enterprises that have enabled or profited from the growth of Israeli

57 Kantor Center Report for 2009, pp. 6-10; 2014, p. 6.
58 Kantor Center Report for 2015, pp. 9, 19, 58; Kantor Center Report for 2011, p. 3; Wistrich, “Parallel Lines: Anti-Zionism and Anti-Semitism in the 21st Century,” p. 6 (quoting statement by Jewish studies professor Laurie Zoloth from 2002: “I cannot fully express what it feels like to have to walk across campus daily, past maps of the Middle East that do not include Israel, past posters of cans of soup with labels on them of drops of blood and dead babies, labeled ‘canned Palestinian children meat, slaughtered according to Jewish rites under American license’...”). Since then, the situation has only gotten worse.
64 Kantor Center Report for 2015, p. 58; 2016, p. 55.
65 “Anti-Semitism on Campus: A Clear-and-Present Danger,” Simon Wiesenthal Center, 2015, pp. 9-10 (citing examples from DePaul University and Loyola University Chicago).
66 Id., p. 18 (citing examples).
67 This is a particular hallmark of Iran and the terrorist groups it sponsors. See, e.g., Wistrich, “Parallel Lines: Anti-Zionism and Anti-Semitism in the 21st Century,” p. 3 (“It is surely no accident that those forces in the Middle East who insistently deny the Nazi Holocaust ever happened are the same elements who demand the physical elimination of the Jewish people...”), Irwin Cotler, “Global Anti-Semitism: Assault on Human Rights,” Institute for the Study of Global Anti-Semitism and Policy, Working Paper 2009, pp. 6; 8.
69 Cotler, p. 12; Benjamin Weinthal, “European Affairs: BDS Spreading Like Wildfire in Europe?,” Jerusalem Post, March 5, 2016; “UN passes resolution to ‘blacklist’ companies linked to Israeli settlements,” i24 News, March 24, 2016.
settlements”—the so-called “blacklist.”

UN Human Rights Commissioner Zeid has sent warning letters to 190 companies asking for clarification about their business activities in Israel and warning that they might be included on the “blacklist.”

TRADITIONAL RIGHT-WING ANTISEMITISM ALSO ON THE RISE

Traditional right-wing antisemitism also continues to pose a threat. The last decade has witnessed the increasing popularity and entrenchment of extreme right-wing political parties, which feed on antisemitism and hatred of the other generally, like Golden Dawn in Greece whose leaders openly incite to antisemitism. While some of these parties profess support for Israel, they typically seek to restrict the rights of local Jewish communities to kosher slaughter and ritual circumcision; others are openly antisemitic. There appears to be a correlation between the political strengthening of extreme right parties, particularly in Hungary and Ukraine, and high levels of antisemitic attacks there.

In Eastern Europe, where many countries have difficulty accepting responsibility for their role in the Holocaust, antisemitism is often expressed in the form of Holocaust denial and revisionism. For example, Russia is steadfast in its refusal to recognize the uniqueness of the Holocaust; Romania consistently seeks to justify its Nazi-era regime; and in Ukraine, the parliament recently passed a law comparing the Soviet occupation to the Nazi occupation. Similar issues in Hungary were resolved in 2015 when Hungary assumed responsibility for the Holocaust, although the issue continues to be debated, and antisemitic incidents there persist.

Resolutions

Annually over the last 10 years, the General Assembly passed two resolutions recognizing the problem of antisemitism—not as a stand-alone issue, but in the context of broader resolutions on religious freedom and racism which do not contain any concrete call for UN action to combat antisemitism. In these resolutions, antisemitism is always mentioned in passing, together with Christianophobia and Islamophobia, and usually with Islamophobia listed first, whereas by alphabetical order it would come last.

Resolution on Freedom of Religion and Belief

The religious freedom resolution, now called “Freedom of religion or belief,” recognizes with deep concern “the overall rise in instances of discrimination, intolerance and violence…directed against members of many religious and other communities in various parts of the world, including cases motivated by Islamophobia, anti-Semitism and Christianophobia…”

A similar resolution has also been passed by the Human Rights Council almost every year since 2011, but without any specific reference to antisemitism, Christianophobia or Islamophobia.

Resolution on Elimination of Racism

Until 2016, the resolution on the elimination of racism also recognized with concern the increase in
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antisemitism, along with Islamophobia and Christianophobia.\textsuperscript{82} Up until 2013, the three types of discrimination were listed in alphabetical order. However, in 2013, with the growing influence of the Islamic bloc, Islamophobia began to appear first, and out of alphabetical order.\textsuperscript{83} In the 2017 version, the resolution removed the specific references to antisemitism, Christianophobia and Islamophobia completely.\textsuperscript{84}

**Resolution on “Defamation of Religions”**

Although the UN General Assembly has taken almost no action on antisemitism since Kofi Annan’s 2004 call to action, it did adopt a special resolution every year from 2005 to 2010 entitled “Defamation of Religions”—a text sponsored by the Organization of Islamic Cooperation (OIC) that focused on the victimization of Islam and Muslims.\textsuperscript{85} The goal of the sponsors was manifest from the original name of the resolution: “Defamation of Islam.”\textsuperscript{86} The Islamic states initiated the text in wake of the al-Qaeda terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001.

The annual GA resolution typically included at least five distinct references to Islam, including expressions of alarm over “the negative projection of Islam in the media”; “deep concern that Islam is frequently and wrongly associated with human rights violations and terrorism”; and stressing “the need to effectively combat defamation of all religions, Islam and Muslims in particular, especially in human rights forums.”\textsuperscript{87}

Over time, widespread opposition arose to the concept of “defamation of religion” on grounds that it negated the basic premise that human rights are held by individuals, not by any religion or set of beliefs, and over the resolution’s chilling effect on free speech. As a result of negotiations between Western countries and the Islamic bloc, in 2011 the name of the resolution was changed to “Combating Intolerance, negative stereotyping, stigmatization, discrimination, incitement to violence and violence against persons, based on religious belief.”\textsuperscript{88} In the text, the concept of defamation of religion was replaced with protections for individuals against discrimination and violence, and the focus was broadened to include all religions.\textsuperscript{89} This revamped resolution has since 2011 been adopted every year by the General Assembly, following the original version first negotiated at the Human Rights Council in its Resolution 16/18.\textsuperscript{90}

Despite the welcome change, some argue that the annual campaign remains tainted because the Islamic bloc continues to view the resolution in the same terms as before. Indeed, its representatives have used the term “defamation of religions” to describe the new resolution, and have threatened to reintroduce a resolution using the original term.\textsuperscript{91}

In contrast to the two aforementioned GA resolutions that refer in passing to antisemitism, which mandate no concrete action or reporting on the issue, the OIC-sponsored resolution on protecting religious belief calls for an annual report by the Secretary-General on steps taken by member states to implement the resolution. Under the Obama Administration, this gave rise to a U.S.-led campaign, known as the Istanbul Process, to promote and implement the UN resolution through a series of expert meetings on the topic.\textsuperscript{92} In December 2011, Secretary of State Hillary Clinton hosted a summit of international leaders to implement the UN resolution. This shows that when the UN system truly wants to take action to address specific types of discrimination, it is well-equipped to do so.
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Istanbul Process meetings have taken place in Washington, D.C., Geneva, Doha, Jeddah and Singapore. While the Istanbul Process employs the general language of human rights and freedom of religion, it has been criticized for its focus on Islamophobia and its inability to achieve consensus about free speech issues. The fact that Saudi Arabia—which has strict blasphemy laws and where blogger Raif Badawi has been imprisoned since 2012 for the crime of insulting Islam—was allowed to host the fifth meeting of the Istanbul Process, in June 2015, shows that the Istanbul Process is more concerned with Islam than other religions. There were some indications from the sixth meeting in Singapore, in July 2016, that the participants were trying to move the Istanbul Process in a more general direction, but it is unclear how this will develop.

Resolution on “Combating the Glorification of Nazism”

Since 2006, the General Assembly has also passed an annual Russian-sponsored resolution on “combating the glorification of Nazism.” Since 2014, this resolution has condemned Holocaust denial. And in 2016, general language was added expressing concern about the “alarming increase in instances of discrimination, intolerance and extremist violence motivated by antisemitism, Islamophobia and Christianophobia.” However, earlier versions of the resolution did not mention the Holocaust or antisemitism. While at first glance the resolution may appear positive, it is understood to be a politicized Russian bid to portray its Baltic neighbors as fascists. The United States has objected that the text restricts freedom of speech and association, and has called out Russia’s motives, claiming that it uses Nazism as a pretext to justify attacks on neighboring countries. In rejecting the 2017 resolution and proposing amendments, U.S. Ambassador Kelley Currie explained that the resolution is a “cynical exercise, born from a political controversy decades removed from the defeat of the Nazis.” The Russian bid was in fact “an annual power play by one nation over its sovereign neighbors,” which sought “to exert a sphere of influence over a region” and “to criminalize free speech and expression without any genuine effort to effectively combat actual Nazism, discrimination, or anti-Semitism.”

Informal Meeting on Antisemitism

In a welcome but long overdue move, the UN General Assembly finally held its first ever informal meeting on antisemitism on January 22, 2015. The meeting was sparsely attended. While it came less than two weeks after the horrific Sabbath eve shooting attack on the Hyper Casher kosher supermarket in Paris, in which four Jewish men were killed, the UN meeting had been planned months before, in response to the deadly attacks on the Jewish school in Toulouse and the Jewish Museum in Brussels.

---
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Former Secretary-General Ban did not attend in person, but in his video message he issued a strong statement against antisemitism, which he called “one of the oldest forms of prejudice known to humankind.” Appealing to the UN’s lofty mission to fight for human rights, Ban said “a United Nations that wants to be true to its founding aims and ideals has a duty to speak out against anti-Semitism,” and that “the fight against anti-Semitism is a fight for all of us.”

Notably absent from the meeting was UN High Commissioner for Human Rights Zeid Ra’ad al-Hussein.

In a moving speech, U.S. Ambassador Samantha Power observed that the victims of antisemitism go well beyond the individual targeted; they include the families of the victims, the Jewish children forced to attend school under heavy security protection, and the many Jews around the world who cannot practice their religion freely and openly out of fear of being attacked. “Rising anti-Semitism is rarely the lone or the last manifestation of intolerance. When the human rights of Jews are repressed, the rights of other religions and ethnic groups are often not far behind,” said Power.

German representative Michael Roth, expressing deep alarm at the increasing number of antisemitic attacks, said that “the recent events in Paris show that we need to take decisive measures in our fight against anti-Semitism – both on the national and international level.” French representative Harlem Desir said that “whenever someone attacks Jews because of what he is, he is attacking all of us, the community of nations.”

The conference also had some controversy. Saudi Arabia’s Ambassador Abdallah al-Mouallimi made sure to condemn both antisemitism and Islamophobia, and then blamed Israel for the rise in antisemitism. “Colonization and occupation fuels anti-Semitism,” said the Saudi representative, and “occupation is an act of anti-Semitism” which “threatens human rights and humankind.”

While the meeting was only informal, it did conclude with a joint statement signed by more than 50 countries, calling on member states to reject antisemitism and to take concrete actions to combat antisemitism through legislation and educational programs.

The statement also called on the UN’s Department of Information to organize a follow-up conference to the “Unlearning Intolerance” series initiated in 2004, which began that year with a UN seminar on antisemitism. Regrettably, no such follow-up conference has been organized. Unlike the UN’s response to the OIC’s concerns about Islamophobia, which engendered the Istanbul Process and annual high-level meetings on the issue of religious violence (focusing on the OIC agenda), a similar response from the UN on rising global antisemitism has not been forthcoming.

A year and a half later, in September 2016, a high-level forum on antisemitism took place at UN headquarters in New York. The event was not hosted by the UN itself, but rather by Canada, Israel, the United States and the European Union. Outrageously, the President of the UN General Assembly, Mogens Lykketoft, abused the meeting on antisemitism to chastise Israel. “We the United Nations have an enormous responsibility to go up against all expressions of prejudice and incitement,” he said, “but we have also to be extremely careful and precise in what is and what is not anti-Semitism.” The head of the GA stated that “It’s not anti-Semitic to call for an end of the occupation and oppression of the people of Palestine,” nor “to demand an end to illegal settlements on occupied Palestinian land.”

This declaration had no place at an event focused on antisemitism. No one would use an Islamophobia event as a platform to accuse Muslim countries of crimes against their minority populations.

**Recommendations**

Unfortunately, the General Assembly has done little to advance public awareness or action on the issue of antisemitism, which appears only in passing in two annual resolutions on racism and religious freedom, and in Russia’s politically-motivated resolution on Nazism. While we commend the UN and certain
member states for hosting two events in the wake of violent antisemitic attacks, it is regrettable that the UN General Assembly has failed to keep the issue on the agenda through follow-up conferences or demands for concrete action.

Accordingly, we urge the General Assembly to:

- Adopt the Working Definition of Antisemitism of the International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance (IHRA).
- Mandate, in the annual resolutions on racism and religious freedom, regular reports to the General Assembly on acts of antisemitism.
- Host annual meetings on antisemitism, similar to the 2015 meeting, to enable member states to share information and best practices in combating antisemitism.
- Restart the Department of Information’s short-lived “Unlearning Intolerance” series to address aspects of modern day intolerance and include a focus on antisemitism.

We urge UN member states to:

- Speak out strongly against every antisemitic statement expressed during official UN debates.
- Forcefully condemn antisemitic attacks and incitement in their countries and take legal action against the perpetrators.
- Adopt the IHRA’s Working Definition of Antisemitism both domestically and at the UN.

SECRETARY-GENERAL
Ban Ki-Moon

In 2007, Ban Ki-moon opened his new term as secretary-general with a pledge to fight antisemitism. At a March 26, 2007 visit to Yad Vashem he wrote in the book of memory about his “determination to do my utmost in the struggle against anti-Semitism, hatred and intolerance around the world.” Regrettably, during the ensuing decade in which Jews around the world were attacked just for being Jews and Jewish synagogues, schools, cemeteries, memorials, and other institutions were burned and vandalized, Ban Ki-moon was too often silent.

During the course of his tenure, Ban Ki-moon issued more than 100 condemnations of terror attacks worldwide. When the attack targeted religious worshippers, mosques or Christian clergy, his condemnations included strong language against the targeting of people for their religious beliefs. By contrast, however, he refrained from employing similarly strong language regarding terrorist attacks against Jewish targets, many of which he did not condemn at all.

Mr. Ban's welcome statement in reaction to the February 2015 Copenhagen synagogue attack—that “there is no space for anti-Semitism or any form of racial, ethnic or religious discrimination”—proved the exception rather than the rule. Other than that, we found statements he made condemning the Tolouse school shootings, and the Brussels Jewish museum attack (though here he noted only a possible antisemitic motive, while he strongly condemned all forms of racism generally).
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As Secretary-General, Ban did issue numerous positive statements reaffirming his commitment to the fight against antisemitism. However, many of these statements were either general statements that referenced antisemitism only in passing, along with other forms of racial and religious discrimination, or statements to Jewish gatherings, often in connection with Holocaust remembrance. We found only one example of Ban spontaneously condemning the rise of antisemitic attacks in Europe in response to current events, rather than in a prepared speech. This was in August 2014, during Israel’s military conflict with Gaza, where he condemned the “upsurge in anti-Semitic attacks, particularly in Europe.” Just one day earlier, however, he harshly criticized Israel, deploring its military shelling outside an UNRWA facility as “a moral outrage,” and even “a criminal act.”

In a decade marked by shocking antisemitic violence in which Muslim extremists were behind the most devastating attacks and, particularly, in light of the inflammatory antisemitic incitement coming out of the Muslim world, Ban’s overall silence on this issue marks a moral failure. To understand how Ban could have reacted, it is worth comparing his responses to Iran’s pervasive and state-sanctioned incitement to antisemitism—including Holocaust denial, Jewish conspiracy theories, and calls to commit genocide—with his responses to sporadic criticism of Islam by private parties.

Durban II and Ahmadinejad: April 2009

The UN’s Durban Review Conference on racism, known as Durban II, took place in Geneva from April 20-24, 2009, and sparked enormous controversy. U.S. President Barak Obama, together with Canada, Germany, Italy, Australia, the Netherlands, Poland, the Czech Republic, and New Zealand refused to participate in Durban II over concerns it would be abused as a platform for other interests, as happened at the original 2001 Durban Conference with its extreme singling-out of Israel. By August 2008, preparatory documents already showed that the Durban II process was being abused by the anti-Israel agenda of Iran and others. After attending a major pre-conference event held in Nigeria, UN Watch observed that the outcome declaration “failed to address racial and ethnic crimes committed by Sudan, trampled international human rights guarantees on free speech, placed Islam above all other religions, and targeted Israel alone, implying that it is uniquely racist.”

At a subsequent pre-conference meeting in January 2009, the Iranian representative openly endorsed Holocaust denial. Among other things, Iran objected to an EU proposal to stipulate that “remembrance of the Holocaust is critical to prevent further acts of genocide,” on the grounds that such language restricted “critical examination and review and study of the Holocaust.” There was no response from any UN official.

At the conference itself in April, Iranian president Mahmoud Ahmadinejad attacked Jews and Israel from the podium, claiming that the “Zionist regime” was created “under the pretext of Jewish sufferings,” and that “Zionism personifies racism that falsely resorts to religion and abuses religious sentiments to hide their hatred and ugly faces.” Ban Ki-moon “deplored” Ahmadinejad’s use of the conference to “accuse, divide and even incite,” called the speech “destructive,” and asked UN members to “turn away from its ugly message.” However, he did not issue an unequivocal condemnation of this inflammatory and racist rhetoric as antisemitic.

Ahmadinejad continued to abuse the UN platform for his antisemitic diatribes. In September 2009 speech to the General Assembly, Ahmadinejad described Jews as “a small minority [who] dominate the politics, economy and culture of major parts of the world by its complicated networks, and establish a new form of slavery... to attain its racist ambitions.”
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Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon nor any other senior UN official condemned this statement. Ahmadinejad continued to deliver annual speeches to the UN General Assembly attacking Israel and denying the Holocaust.

**Antisemitic Statements by Iranian Officials**

On June 26, 2012, the Iranian first Vice President Mohammad Reza Rahimi spewed antisemitic blood libels and conspiracy theories at a Tehran conference co-sponsored by Iran and the UN to mark the UN International Day Against Drug Abuse. Rahimi said that the Talmud “teaches [the Jews] how to destroy non-Jews so as to protect an embryo in the womb of the Jewish mother.” He also accused “Zionists” of inciting drug trafficking, claiming “you cannot find a single addict among the Zionists.” Secretary-General Ban rebuked Iranian officials, calling on them to “refrain from these kinds of anti-Semitic statements,” and expressing generally that he “deeply regrets expressions of hatred and religious intolerance.” But Ban stopped short of outright condemning the remarks as antisemitic.

Barely two months later, in August 2012, Iran’s Ayatollah Ali Khamenei and President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad issued separate genocidal calls to destroy Israel. This time, Ban expressly “condemned these offensive and inflammatory statements.” A few weeks later, at the Non-Aligned Movement summit in Tehran (which Ban attended under criticism), the UN chief again criticized Iran for its anti-Israel statements, though indirectly. “I strongly reject any threat by any [UN] member state to destroy another,” said Ban, “or outrageous comments to deny historical facts such as the Holocaust.”

**Holocaust Cartoon Contest**

Iran argues that if Western countries tolerate speech that ridicules Islam, they should also tolerate Holocaust denial. Iran hosted its first Holocaust cartoon contest in 2006 to register its objection to the publication of anti-Islamic cartoons by the Danish newspaper *Jyllands-Posten*. In January 2015, in response to the Charlie Hebdo shootings and that magazine’s decision to continue publishing Muhammad cartoons, Iran announced a new Holocaust cartoon contest, to be held in May 2016. Shojayee Tabatayee, the contest organizer, said that its purpose was to “display the West’s double standard behavior towards freedom of expression as it allows sacrilege of Islamic sanctities . . . but prevents research on the Holocaust due to the Zionist regime’s steadfast opposition.” Tabatayee also linked the contest to Israel’s “massacres” of the Palestinians, saying that “Holocaust means ‘mass
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killing’… We are witnessing the biggest killings by the Zionist regime in Gaza and Palestine.”

Many countries condemned Iran’s contest, including the United States, Germany and Israel. “We denounce any Holocaust denial and trivialization as inflammatory and abhorrent,” said U.S. State Department spokesman Mark Toner. “It is insulting to the memory of the millions of people who died in the Holocaust.” German Foreign Ministry spokesman Martin Schaefer called the conference “regrettable,” saying, “The murder of 6 million men, women and children during the Holocaust, for which we Germans bear guilt and responsibility, must not be abandoned to ridicule.”

Ban Ki-moon’s only reaction, however, was at a January 27, 2016 UN Holocaust Remembrance Day event, where he said he was “profoundly disappointed to learn of another so-called ‘Holocaust cartoon contest’ being planned this year in Iran.” Yet Ban failed to actually condemn the contest, even after being requested to do so by several Israeli government officials.

By contrast, a strong condemnation was made by UNESCO Director-General Irina Bokova. “This contest goes against the universal values of tolerance and respect, and runs counter to the action led by UNESCO to promote Holocaust education, to fight anti-Semitism and denial,” said Bokova. “Such an initiative which aims at mockery of the genocide of the Jewish people, a tragic page of humanity’s history, can only foster hatred and incite to violence, racism and anger.”

Contrast: Ban Ki-moon’s Robust Response to Anti-Muslim Incidents

While Ban often failed to condemn Iran’s repeated and state-sponsored incitement and genocidal threats against the Jews and Israel, he did, by contrast, respond forcefully to incidents in which mere private citizens criticized the Muslim religion. The most well-known example from the last decade concerns the film “Innocence of Muslims,” produced in California by Coptic Christian filmmaker Nakoula Basseley Nakoula, and released in the summer of 2012. The film, seen as derogatory towards the Prophet Muhammad, sparked violent protests across the Muslim world. In Libya, the film was used as a pretext for an attack on the U.S. Embassy in Benghazi on the anniversary of 9/11. U.S. Ambassador Chris Stevens was killed in that attack.

In this case, Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon issued a forceful statement that he “condems the hateful film that appears to have been deliberately designed to sow bigotry and bloodshed.”

Likewise, when a Christian clergyman in Florida threatened to burn copies of the Koran on the 2010 anniversary of 9/11, Ban responded forcefully, saying, “such actions cannot be condoned by any religion,” and “contradict the efforts of the United Nations and many people around the world to promote tolerance, intercultural understanding and mutual respect between cultures and religions.” Ban immediately then announced that the UN would convene a meeting of the Alliance of Civilizations, a high-level international framework under UN auspices that was created to bridge Islam and the West. “The Alliance is part of our answer to polarization, stereotyping and hatred.”

134 Id.
135 Id.
136 “Education key to preventing new genocides, says Ban at UN special event honouring Holocaust victims,” UN News Centre, Jan. 27, 2016; “Secretary-General’s remarks on International Day of Commemoration in Memory of the Victims of the Holocaust [as delivered],” United Nations Secretary-General, Jan. 27, 2016.
142 “Statement attributable to the Spokesperson for the Secretary-General on violence in Libya and the Middle East,” United Nations Secretary-General, Sept. 13, 2012.
143 “General Assembly Chief deplores threat to burn copies of Koran,” UN News Centre, Sep. 9, 2010.
said Ban. Similarly, in response to the 2008 release of the film *Fitna* by Dutch MP Geert Wilders, Ban called the film “offensively anti-Islamic.” By contrast, he rarely used the term antisemitic to describe equally if not more offensive statements by the highest Iranian officials, including their calls to genocide.

**Ban Ki-Moon and Holocaust Denial**

Holocaust denial comes in various forms. There is outright denial that the event actually happened, which is the type preached in much of the Arab and Muslim world, and by famous Holocaust deniers like David Irving and Robert Faurisson. But “softcore” Holocaust denial, in the words of scholar Deborah Lipstadt, though often tolerated and encouraged by the mainstream, is no less malignant:

> Softcore denial uses different tactics but has the same end-goal . . . It does not deny the facts, but it minimizes them, arguing that Jews use the Holocaust to draw attention away from criticism of Israel. Softcore denial also makes all sorts of false comparisons to the Holocaust. In certain Eastern European countries today, those who fought the Nazis may be lauded, but if they did so with a communist resistance group they may be prosecuted. Softcore denial also includes Holocaust minimization, as when someone suggests it was not so bad. “Why are we hearing about that again?”

A typical form of softcore Holocaust denial is de-judaizing the Holocaust, for example by failing to acknowledge that the Jews alone were singled out by the Nazis for complete elimination, unlike Roma, homosexuals or other targeted groups which suffered tremendously at the hands of the Nazis but were not systematically wiped out. Holocaust survivor and Nobel Peace Prize laureate Elie Wiesel has rejected the universalization of the Holocaust, stating that the Holocaust is not an example of “man’s inhumanity to man,” but of “man’s inhumanity to Jews.”

Other common types of softcore denial include distortion and false equivalence, such as portraying the Germans as victims; comparing the Allied bombings, Soviet crimes or other atrocities throughout history to the Nazis mass murder of Jews—as if they were the same; and inverting the Holocaust by accusing Israel of being today’s Nazis with the Palestinians as victims of genocide, or Palestinian areas as ghettos or concentration camps.

Just after President Donald Trump took office in January 2017, he issued a statement for International Holocaust Remembrance Day that did not mention Jews at all, including only general references to “the victims, survivors, heroes,” “the innocent” and “the perished.” President Trump was sharply criticized on all sides of the political spectrum and accused by some of engaging in Holocaust denial. President Trump’s critics included Senator Tim Kaine, Hillary Clinton’s running mate in the presidential election, Holocaust historian Deborah Lipstadt, ADL CEO Jonathan Greenblatt, and Zionist Organization of America president Morton Klein.

Sadly, softcore Holocaust denial has been pervasive at the UN during the last ten years. Secretary-General Ban stresses need for tolerance and civility amid increasing polarization,” *UN News Centre*, Sep. 13, 2010.
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Ban Ki-moon routinely universalized the Holocaust and minimized it as a Jewish event. We have reviewed each of Ban Ki-moon’s annual Holocaust Remembrance Day statements since 2008, as well as other of his Holocaust-related statements. In each statement, Ban’s attempt to universalize the Holocaust has him downplaying Hitler’s genocide of the Jews and falsely equating it to Nazi crimes against other minorities. A typical example is Mr. Ban’s 2013 statement:

During the Second World War, millions of people who did not conform to Adolf Hitler’s perverted ideology of Aryan perfection—Jews, Roma and Sinti, homosexuals, communists, the mentally ill and others—were systematically persecuted, rounded up and transported to death camps.

In only one of his annual Holocaust Remembrance Day statements, his last in January 2016, did Ban specifically reference the “6 million Jews,” murdered at the hands of the Nazis, but this was soon followed by reference to the millions of others “killed alongside them,” including “prisoners of war, political dissidents, members of minority groups, such as Roma and Sinti, homosexuals, persons with disabilities, and so many more,” as if all were the same to the Third Reich.

If the highest official in the UN promotes and disseminates this type of softcore Holocaust denial, even if well intentioned, it is difficult to expect UN officials to take seriously the issue of Holocaust denial.

Antonio Guterres

Since taking over the helm at the UN in January 2017, Antonio Guterres has spoken out strongly against antisemitism. “Those like me who grew up in the post-war era,” noted Guterres in his 2017 Holocaust Remembrance Day statement, “never imagined we would again face rising attacks on Jews in my own part of the world—in Europe.” And yet, “anti-Semitism keeps coming back.”

In his 2018 Holocaust Remembrance Day speech, Guterres again made the link between the hatred that led to the Nazi genocide—“the culmination of hostility towards Jews across millennia”—and present-day antisemitism, noting that “anti-Semitic incidents are on the rise.”

At his speech to the 2017 plenary of the World Jewish Congress, he acknowledged that denial of Israel’s right to exist is “a modern form of anti-Semitism,” and he vowed that “as secretary-general of the United Nations, I will be on the front line of the struggle against anti-Semitism, to make sure the United Nations is able to take all possible actions for anti-Semitism to be condemned, and if possible, eradicated from the face of the earth.” At that event, and again on his first UN visit to Israel in August 2017, Guterres committed that under his leadership, Israel would be treated the same as any other country.

While the current UN chief has, like Ban Ki-moon before him, downplayed the unique aspects in which Jews as a people were targeted for extermination by the Nazis, by referencing the “systematic attempt to eliminate the Jewish people and so many others” (emphasis added), he has clearly acknowledged the role of antisemitism. For example, in his 2017 Holocaust Remembrance Day remarks, he said it would be “a dangerous error” to think of the Holocaust as simply the result of “the insanity of a group of criminal Nazis.” On the contrary, wrote Guterres, “the Holocaust was the culmination of millennia of hatred and discrimination targeting the Jews — what we now call anti-Semitism.”

We hope that Guterres will prove to be a more forceful leader than his predecessors in combating antisemitism and Holocaust denial at the UN.

Recommendations

Former Secretary-General Ban began his term with a lofty pledge “to do [his] utmost in the struggle against anti-Semitism.” Yet when presented with opportunities to speak out or take action, he was too often silent. Secretary-General Guterres has made lofty commitments to tackle antisemitism. We hope that he will demonstrate pro-active leadership and stay true to his word.

158 Antonio Guterres, “Secretary-General’s remarks at ceremony marking the International Day of Commemoration in Memory of Victims of the Holocaust,” United Nations Secretary-General, Jan. 31, 2018.
159 Ben Sales, “UN secretary-general: Denial of Israel’s right to exist is ‘modern form of anti-Semitism,’” JTA, April 23, 2017; see also “UN Secretary General Guterres: Israel needs to be treated like any other member state,” World Jewish Congress, April 23, 2017; video available at https://youtu.be/uqCTGynymlg.
We recommend the Secretary-General to:

- Assume leadership for UN efforts in the global fight against antisemitism, including by convening high level meetings to address the global scourge.

- Forcefully condemn incidents of antisemitism as they occur, pointing out their antisemitic nature and calling for state action against perpetrators.

- Avoid any form of softcore Holocaust denial in his own statements.

**HIGH COMMISSIONER FOR HUMAN RIGHTS**

There have been three High Commissioners for Human Rights in the past decade: Louise Arbour (2004-2008), Navanethem (“Navi”) Pillay (2008-2014) and Zeid Ra’ad al-Hussein (2014-present). The High Commissioner is a powerful and well-respected UN official with a broad mandate “to promote and protect all human rights.”

Unfortunately, beyond general statements bemoaning antisemitism along with other forms of racism and discrimination, none of the high commissioners has spoken out or acted forcefully on antisemitism.

On the issue of Holocaust remembrance and denial, the annual statements by the UN High Commissioners for Human Rights have followed the same pattern of universalizing the Holocaust as those of Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon. Louise Arbour did not mention Jews at all. Pillay and Zeid placed Jews in the same category as “Roma, Slavs, disabled people, political dissidents and others,” all of whom, in the words of Zeid, “suffered and were killed by this ghastly extermination machine.”

Below is a brief evaluation of each mandate-holder’s performance in combating antisemitism.

**Louise Arbour**

After the release of our 2007 Report Card on Antisemitism, in which we were unable to find any examples of Louise Arbour publicly confronting antisemitism, the former Canadian judge went on the defensive with a statement that she “has continuously condemned the multiple forms of intolerance and discrimination, including antisemitism, racial discrimination, and xenophobia.” However, in her last year in office, we found little improvement. And while she continued to ignore Iran’s genocidal threats against Israel and antisemitic incitement against Jews, Arbour rushed to defend the rights of Muslims when she joined Secretary-General Ban in forceably condemning the anti-Islamic film *Fitna*, calling it “hateful.”

Toward the end of her term, Arbour endorsed the Arab Charter on Human Rights even though it calls for the “elimination” of Zionism. She had issued a statement welcoming ratification of the charter, without any reservations. Only after UN Watch’s protest in February 2008, picked up by numerous Canadian newspapers, did Arbour reverse course. She issued a new statement acknowledging that various provisions of the Arab Charter were incompatible with international norms, saying that to the extent it equates Zionism with racism, “we reiterate that the Arab Charter is not in conformity with General Assembly Resolution 46/86, which rejects that Zionism is a form of racism and racial discrimination. OHCHR does not endorse these inconsistencies.” Time and again, Arbour failed to demonstrate the strong moral leadership one should expect from a High Commissioner for Human Rights.

---

161 See [http://www.ohchr.org/EN/AboutUs/Pages/WhoWeAre.aspx](http://www.ohchr.org/EN/AboutUs/Pages/WhoWeAre.aspx).

162 We searched for relevant statements of the High Commissioner by reviewing all official statements, press releases, reports and legal briefs of the High Commissioner, as found on the website of the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights and we conducted searches on LexisNexis for the High Commissioners’ names in close proximity to the following terms: antisemitism (four different variants), Jews, Judeophobia, Nazi, Holocaust and words and dates related to specific incidents.
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Navi Pillay

Navi Pillay’s record on combating antisemitism was even worse than that of Louise Arbour. One of Pillay’s first actions in 2008 was to declare herself a champion of the discredited Durban II process, and in a series of statements and interviews she described activists against antisemitism as “single-issue lobbyists.”

While Pillay chose to speak out strongly against many other forms of discrimination, she virtually ignored the alarming rise in antisemitism characterized by violent attacks resulting in death, injury and desecration of property in Jewish communities around the world.

For example, High Commissioner Pillay condemned attacks against Albinos in Tanzania, adding that “people with albinism have the right to live, like everyone else, without fear of being killed or attacked.” She condemned attacks against Christians in Nigeria, anti-Muslim riots in Sri Lanka, and attacks against Christians and Shiite Muslims in Iraq. Significantly, these condemnations also included calls to action, such as:

• “The Tanzanian authorities have the primary responsibility to protect people with albinism, and to fight against impunity…”

• “The [Sri Lankan] authorities must immediately bring the perpetrators of such attacks to book and make it clear […] that there is no place for inflammatory rhetoric and incitement to violence.”

• “It is imperative that the Iraqi government intervenes decisively and impartially at the first sign of incitement to violence…”

In another statement, Pillay generally condemned “recent attacks on religious groups in various countries.” This statement included a reference to the fact that synagogues, along with mosques and churches, had been targeted. While there was no mention of any specific antisemitic attack (of which there were many), reference was made to specific attacks against other religious groups—a bomb attack on a Coptic church in Alexandria, attacks on Christian and Muslim communities in Nigeria, attacks on Shi’a Muslims, Christians and Ahmadis in Pakistan, and more.

Pillay joined the outcry over the controversial film Innocence of Muslims and over Muhammad cartoons published by Charlie Hebdo in September 2012. Pillay denounced the cartoons as “obnoxious,” and accused Charlie Hebdo of being irresponsible for publishing them. As to the film, she said it was “malicious and deliberately provocative and portrays a disgracefully distorted image of Muslims.”

Though Pillay was highly reactive to cartoons and films perceived as anti-Islamic, she was usually silent when it came to even physical attacks targeting Jews.

We found only one instance where Pillay commented on a terror attack targeting Jews (outside of Israel). Two weeks after the Brussels Jewish Museum attack, in her opening statement to the June 2014 session of the Human Rights Council, Pillay said that “violent attacks based on religion or ethnicity—such as the antisemitic murder of four people last month at the Jewish Museum in Brussels—are not unconnected to this climate of extremism.”

Notably, Pillay did not condemn the attack, but mentioned it only as an example in the context of her

---

173 “UN condemns attacks on Tanzanian albinos; Limbs amputated while victims are still alive,” The Toronto Star, March 7, 2013.
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larger critique of the rise of xenophobia and extremism in Europe. Regrettably, we found no indignation or outrage from Pillay when three Jewish children and a rabbi were gunned down outside a Jewish school in Toulouse. Nor did we find an outcry from Pillay when a Jewish man was beaten just because he was Jewish in Lausanne, Switzerland (not far from Geneva, the seat of the High Commissioner for Human Rights) or when another Jewish man was stabbed in the parking lot of Geneva’s Natural History Museum. Likewise, Pillay was silent when angry crowds all over Europe (and elsewhere) incited violence and murder against Jews with Nazi slogans like “Jews to the gas!” at the height of Israel’s conflict with Hamas in the summer of 2014.

Beyond her failure to use her political capital to forcefully condemn virulent antisemitism, Pillay, as described below, personally associated herself with antisemites, lending them credence, and she tolerated antisemitism within her own office.

**Pillay Championed Controversial Durban II Racism Conference**

Pillay was the principal defender of the controversial Durban II conference that took place in Geneva in April 2009. As UN Watch commented at the time: “With Muammar Qaddafi’s Libya chairing the planning committee and Mahmoud Ahmadinejad’s Iran as vice-chair, it’s heart-wrenching though not surprising that Durban 2 is hijacking the noble cause of human rights and anti-racism.” Instead of taking action to ensure the conference did not duplicate the same ugly hatred and antisemitism that characterized the first Durban conference, Pillay criticized member states who took a moral stance by choosing not to attend. “I am shocked and deeply disappointed by the United States decision not to attend… A handful of states have permitted one or two issues to dominate their approach to this issue,” she said.

Pillay failed to condemn Iran’s endorsement of Holocaust denial at a preparatory meeting, as well as Ahmadinejad’s vile antisemitic attack on Israel at the conference itself. Throughout her tenure as High Commissioner, Pillay called for a stop to violent incitement against other groups; yet she stood silent when the incitement was directed at Jews and Israelis. And even though the conference failed to review a single country for its record on racism, Pillay quickly pronounced it a success, bemoaning that a “propaganda machine” called it “a failure, a hate fest and all the rest of it.”

**Pillay Participated in Events Linked to Antisemitism and Tolerated Antisemitism in her Secretariat**

Not only did Pillay provide a platform for haters and bigots like Ahmadinejad, she herself participated in events with close links to antisemitism, lending them credibility. In December 2011, Pillay opened a conference co-sponsored by “North South 21,” an entity funded by the Libyan government that bankrolled and managed the “Muammar Qaddafi International Prize for Human Rights,” and whose vice-president was UN human rights official Jean Ziegler. The now-defunct Qaddafi Prize was known for celebrating Holocaust deniers, antisemites, and anti-Western human rights abusers, with such laureates as Louis Farrakhan, Roger Garaudy, Hugo Chavez, Fidel Castro and Recep Tayyip Erdogan. Moreover, in October 2013, Pillay headlined a Geneva ceremony in which one of the final nominees for a top human rights prize was Mona Seif, an Egyptian activist who had advocated blowing up gas pipelines between Egypt and Israel, endorsed Hamas attacks against...
Israeli civilians, attacked calls to end violence against Israeli civilians as “shameful,” and expressed a personal dream of becoming a “martyr” in Jerusalem.  

Pillay also tolerated antisemitism within the ranks of her own UN human rights machinery. While she was not responsible for appointing notorious antisemite and 9/11 conspiracy theorist Richard Falk as the Special Rapporteur on the Palestinian territories, she repeatedly failed to challenge his abuses, including even after he published a blatantly antisemitic cartoon on his personal blog. The offensive cartoon depicted a dog with a kippah and a garment marked “USA” urinating on a statue of Lady Justice and devouring a dead body with blood and bones spewing out of its mouth. Initially, Pillay refused to comment about the cartoon, claiming that special rapporteurs were not under her purview. A few days later, in response to a complaint from UN Watch, Pillay called the cartoon “objectionable” and “anti-Semitic” and said she “utterly deplore[d]” it as a form of hatred and racial discrimination. Yet despite pressure from government officials in the U.S. and UK and from Jewish groups, Pillay did not call on Falk to resign, citing his apologies. Pillay’s condemnation of the cartoon, a reaction to pressure from UN Watch, was a rare instance in which Pillay eventually stood up for the values she was supposed to uphold as High Commissioner, but she did not go far enough.

During the course of her tenure, Navi Pillay had many opportunities to speak out against antisemitism, condemn violent incitement against Jews, and call on leaders around the world to act. Regrettably, she chose to ignore the issue.

Zeid Ra’ad Al-Hussein

Surprisingly, while Zeid Ra’ad al-Hussein has been invited to address the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum, his record, in the four years since he began his tenure as High Commissioner in September 2014, is one of almost complete disregard when it comes to fighting antisemitism.

Indeed, a review of all of Zeid’s official statements, press releases, reports and legal briefs as listed on his UN website (www.ohchr.org), as well as a search of news articles on the LexisNexis database, turns up not a single stand-alone statement by Zeid that reacts to antisemitic attacks or incitement.

For example, Zeid failed to condemn the deadly attacks on a Jewish supermarket in Paris, the attack on a synagogue in Copenhagen, and many other less-publicized antisemitic attacks. This stands in contrast to his rightful condemnation of attacks on albinos in Tanzania, Coptic Christians in Libya, and gays at an Orlando nightclub.

While he did address incitement against other minorities, such as against Rohingya Muslims in Myanmar, Zeid has ignored the routine, inflammatory and widespread incitement against Jews coming out of the Arab and Muslim world. Under Zeid’s tenure the UN human rights office turned a blind eye to Iran’s May 2016 Holocaust Cartoon Contest (discussed above), statements blaming Israel and Jews for ISIS attacks in France, use of Nazi imagery and terminology to describe Israel, and frequent references to the Protocols of the Elders of Zion and other similar antisemitic tropes.

Zeid’s Tweets Disregarded Current Events Targeting Jews

Likewise, a search of thousands of posts on the Twitter account of Zeid’s office (@unhumanrights) reveals that he ignored the problem of antisemitism—both its overall rise worldwide, and the particularly rabid antisemitic incitement in the Muslim world.

192 Jeremy Sharon, “Human rights chief says rapporteur’s cartoon was anti-Semitic,” Jerusalem Post, July 15, 2011; “NGO Urges UN Rights Chief to Condemn Official’s Anti-Semitic Cartoon,” UN Watch, July 6, 2011.
193 “UN rights chief: Official’s Cartoon is ‘Anti-Semitic,’” UN Watch, July 14, 2011.
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195 Emily Urquhart, “Attacked by poachers, their body parts sold; In Tanzania, people with albinism are hunted like animals. Ending the persecution, writes the mother of an affected child, begins with raising awareness,” The Toronto Star, May 31, 2015.
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Just looking at the numbers, Zeid’s office posted a total of 20 tweets mentioning Muslims or Islam; none mentioning Jews or Judaism; and three referencing antisemitism—one of these being a general post that also mentioned Islamophobia, and the other two relating to the 2017 Holocaust Remembrance Day and not to any particular antisemitic attack or current event.

Similarly, Zeid’s office posted two tweets about the Holocaust that did not refer to antisemitism—one on the 2018 Holocaust Remembrance Day that universalized the Holocaust, and the second likening today’s Western treatment of migrants to the treatment of Jews seeking to escape 1930s Germany.

Thus, while Zeid’s tweets about Muslims expressed concern over current threats to Muslims—such as violence against Muslims in India, Sri Lanka and Myanmar, or laws in Austria and France perceived to be anti-Muslim—his few tweets about antisemitism and the Holocaust either did not concern Jews at all, or were in the context of Holocaust Remembrance Day. Sadly, Zeid ignored current threats to Jews. He disregarded the many violent attacks against Jews, as well as threats to Jewish communities in Europe in the form of legislation seeking to ban fundamental Jewish rituals such as circumcision.

When terrorists struck Europe in the name of Islam, the first reaction of Zeid’s office was to portray Islam and Muslims as victims.200 “Neither Islam nor multiculturalism to blame for bloody #CharlieHebdo attack — UN Human Rights Chief #Zeid.”201 His office’s tweets did not take on the culture of terrorism or antisemitism within radical Islam.

Zeid Sought to De-Judaize the Holocaust

During the course of his tenure, Zeid trivialized and de-Judaized the Holocaust. In his annual UN Holocaust Remembrance Day statements, he never referred to the Holocaust as a national tragedy of the Jewish people in which six million Jews were systematically murdered, and did not draw any lessons from the antisemitism that led to the Holocaust in regard to current antisemitic attacks against Jews. Instead, Zeid used the Holocaust as a platform to discuss the problem of racism and discrimination generally, only twice mentioning modern antisemitism in that general context.

Examples of Zeid’s UN Holocaust Remembrance Day statements include:

- **January 2015**: Zeid made no mention of modern antisemitism, nor of the attack only two weeks earlier that killed four Jews in a Kosher supermarket in Paris. He referred to the “millions of Jewish men, women and children, as well as Roma, Poles, Soviet prisoners of war and other prisoners and deportees from all over Europe…”

- **January 2016**: Zeid referred to “groups of women, men and children – Jews, Roma, Slavs, disabled people, political dissidents and others – [who] were singled out as enemies… And then the transportations began…” He did not mention antisemitism.

- **January 2017**: Zeid highlighted that the “sadistic brutality of the atrocities inflicted by the Nazi regime on Jews, Roma, Slavs, disabled people, political dissidents, homosexuals and others was nourished by layer upon layer of propaganda, falsifications and incitement to hatred…” Instead of using this as a springboard to condemn the antisemitic incitement coming from the Middle East and driving much of the contemporary violence against Jews around the world, Zeid ignored this and made only a general reference to antisemitism along with “all forms of racial and religious hatred and discrimination today.”

- **January 2018**: While adding the Jewish term for the Holocaust – Shoah – Zeid continued to ignore the special significance of the Holocaust for Jews and to falsely equate the Nazi’s total extermination of Jews with the fate of other Nazi victims. “Every year we honor the victims of the Shoah – millions of Jews, Roma, homosexuals and political opponents who were brutally murdered, and others who survived….” Again, Zeid used his Holocaust Remembrance Day remarks to focus on general discrimination, hatred and violence, without commenting at all on antisemitism, or any particular antisemitic attack.

As noted above, according to Holocaust scholar Deborah Lipstadt, attempts to de-Judaize the Holocaust amount to a form of softcore Holocaust denial.

---


Equate Hitler's Jewish Victims With Today's Migrants

Aside from his Holocaust Remembrance Day Statements, Zeid has cynically instrumentalized the Holocaust to create a false moral equivalency between Europe's treatment of Muslim migrants today and its treatment of the Jews desperate to flee Hitler in 1938.

Zeid's only tweet mentioning the word “Jewish,” was his March 2015 tweet: "1938 Evian conf: #Hitler wanted to move Jewish pop out of #Germany. Countries didn’t want to import ‘racial pb’ Then Holocaust happened." The context for this tweet is criticism of Europe for exploitation of migrants. The tweet offensively deflects blame from Hitler for the Holocaust, and trivializes the Holocaust by comparing Europe's failure to save the Jews in 1938, who were then beginning to be subjected to genocide by Hitler, to its current treatment of Muslim migrants.

In October 2015, Zeid employed the same analogy to criticize the UK’s response to the Syrian refugee crisis, saying: “If you just look back to the Evian conference and read through the intergovernmental discussion, you will see that there were things that were said that were very similar [to what UK officials said about Syrian migrants].” Senior British politicians rightly rejected this comparison, calling it “offensive,” “overblown,” “disgusting,” and “obscene.”

Astonishingly, while freely using the Holocaust to advocate for the rights of Muslims fleeing war-torn Syria for a better life in Europe, Zeid has ignored the dangers some of these migrants pose to local Jewish communities—witness the recent assault in Germany—as they come from an antisemitic culture that denies the Holocaust, dehumanizes Jews, and incites the murder of Jews. Zeid’s cavalier use of the Holocaust in the context of debate on Muslims migrants in Europe, while ignoring violent antisemitic attacks against Jews in Europe and the radical Islamic ideology behind these attacks, is an insult to Jews, and undermines his authority as the highest human rights official.

Another examples, of Zeid's trivialization of the Holocaust is his opening speech to the June 2017 session of the Human Rights Council, when he juxtaposed Hitler's concentration camps to Palestinian refugee camps. Zeid said:

I grew up not far from the massive Palestinian refugee camp al-Baq’a. I worked across the street from the al-Wihdat refugee camp. In the past thirty years, I have been to Auschwitz-Birkenau, visited Dachau, seen Buchenwald...

Some will respond, mechanically almost, that the experiences of the two peoples are not equivalent, how could I mention them in one breath? Indeed, I agree—the Holocaust was so monstrous and so mathematically planned and executed, it has no parallel, no modern equal.

Yet, it is also undeniable that today, the Palestinian people mark a half-century of deep suffering under an occupation imposed by military force...

Though Zeid claimed the Holocaust had no equal, he chose to evoke the Holocaust—the symbol of absolute evil, and not any of the hundreds of other conflicts around the world—when discussing the plight of the Palestinians in the Arab-Israeli conflict.

Thus, while Zeid has cynically instrumentalized the Holocaust to defend Muslims and criticize Israel, he has never used the Holocaust to defend Jews against modern antisemitism. One glaring example is that even after UN Watch published numerous examples of UNRWA teachers posting praise for Hitler and classic antisemitism on their Facebook profiles, Zeid did not invoke the Holocaust to criticize UNRWA.

Recommendations

The High Commissioners, while forcefully condemning attacks against other groups, have virtually ignored...
rising antisemitism around the world, including deadly attacks against Jews in the heart of Europe and virulent antisemitic incitement throughout the Middle East. We expect the High Commissioner for Human Rights, a respected and powerful figure, to be above politics and to speak up for all human rights victims.

Accordingly, we recommend the High Commissioner to:

- Forcefully condemn all antisemitic attacks, pointing out the antisemitic nature of the incident and calling for state action against perpetrators.
- Forcefully condemn all antisemitic incitement, including the widespread anti-Jewish sentiment propagated in the Arab and Muslim world.
- Address antisemitism in the High Commissioner’s regular updates to the Human Rights Council.
- Refrain from giving legitimacy to antisemites by refusing to participate in or speak at their events, or allowing them a platform at UN human rights events.
- Challenge and oppose the appointment of antisemites to UN human rights positions.

**SPECIAL PROCEDURES OF THE HUMAN RIGHTS COUNCIL**

Independent experts, known as “special procedures,” are mandated by the Human Rights Council to report on various country situations and thematic human rights issues. They communicate with and visit UN member states, conduct studies, provide advice and engage in advocacy and raising public awareness. Currently, the HRC has more than 40 thematic special procedures on diverse topics including free speech, slavery and torture. Many of the expert mandates focus on the rights of particular groups of people, such as people of African descent, albinos, people with disabilities, indigenous people, internally displaced persons, people with leprosy, migrants and older persons. Other experts focus on more general issues like torture, human trafficking or freedom of expression. While there are special mandates for people of African descent and now albinos, there is no mandate to protect Jews or to combat antisemitism. Nevertheless, the issue of antisemitism is squarely within the mandate of at least two special procedures: the Special Rapporteur on racism, and the Special Rapporteur on freedom of religion.

**Special Rapporteur on Racism**

The racism monitor is charged with addressing “the scourges of anti-Semitism, Christianophobia, Islamophobia in various parts of the world, and racist and violent movements based on racism and discriminatory ideas directed at Arab, African, Christian, Jewish, Muslim and other communities.” This topic has been especially relevant in the last 10 years given the rise in antisemitism. Yet beyond general comments, the racism experts have for the most part failed to address antisemitism.

One area in which the experts have acted positively relates to the “Defamation of Religions” resolutions sponsored by the Islamic group, which required the racism expert to “report on all manifestations of defamation of religions, and in particular on the serious implications of Islamophobia, on the enjoyment of all rights to the Council...” As noted above, the “Defamation of Religions” resolutions were part of a campaign by Islamic states to provide a counter-narrative following 9/11 and other terrorist attacks carried out by radical Muslims. The resolutions promoted the idea that Muslims and Islam were the victims, and sought to shield Islam from any criticism. Although the resolutions requested reports only on Islamophobia, the racism experts refused to comply with that limitation and chose to address antisemitism and Christianophobia as well. Unfortunately, however,
the discussions on these topics were cursory compared to the Islamophobia discussion, which remained the main focus of the reports.

Doudou Diène (2002 -2008)

Doudou Diène was the UNHRC’s racism expert from 2002 to 2008. His last report on this topic is dated September 2, 2008.213 While he noted that the report would focus on Islamophobia per the request of the Human Rights Council, he included shorter sections on antisemitism and Christianophobia as well. Unfortunately, the section on antisemitism was far from comprehensive. Approximately one-third of the antisemitism section concerned Holocaust denial, yet it focused only on European Holocaust denial—failing to mention widespread Holocaust denial in Arab and Muslim countries, most notably by the Iranian regime. Diène’s comments seeking to distinguish anti-Zionism from antisemitism were often muddled.214 In some cases he seemed to justify anti-Zionism, while elsewhere he acknowledged that one of the characteristics of modern antisemitism is “the confusion of the State of Israel with Jewish communities of the diaspora or living in Israel.”215

In April 2009, on the eve of the UN’s controversial Durban Review Conference on racism, Diène addressed a rally in Geneva organized by a fringe coalition of anti-Western and anti-Israeli radicals. Diène said: “I think that the return of the message ‘Zionism equals racism’ – I don’t agree; Zionism is a political ideology. We need to fight it politically.” The rally was part of a conference in support of Durban II that condemned “the ongoing atrocities and extreme forms of institutionalized discrimination and racist colonialist practices committed against the Palestinian People.”216

In August 2014, Diène joined the UNHRC Commission of Inquiry into that summer’s war between Israel and Gaza, even though the former UNESCO official had no expertise in the laws of war. The resolution creating the inquiry had determined Israel’s guilt in advance. The chair of the inquiry, William Schabas, was eventually forced to resign over his undisclosed legal work for the PLO.

Githu Muigai (2008 - 2011)

Like his predecessor, Githu Muigai in July 2009 also reported to the Human Rights Council on the “serious implications of Islamophobia.” Although he recognized that members of other religions also suffer from discrimination, and stated that there is no hierarchy among forms of religious discrimination, Muigai limited his report to Islamophobia without addressing antisemitism or Christianophobia at all.217

He expressed grave concern about incitement to religious hatred, and rightly denounced a video game called “Muslim Massacre,” where players must “wipe out the Muslim race.”218 However, Muigai’s report ignored similar and worse incidents targeting Jews that were common in 2009, a year in which Jews and Jewish institutions suffered record levels of violent attacks and harassment, and genocidal slogans like “kill the Jews” and “Jews do not have a right to exist” often appeared in graffiti and were chanted at rallies.219

Similarly, in the context of an October 14, 2009 speech on discrimination against Arabs and Muslims at a conference on “Strengthening EU-UN Cooperation in the Struggle Against all Forms of Discrimination,”
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Muigai emphasized that other religions suffer from discrimination and incitement without elaborating. He added, “I am of the view that discrimination and incitement to hatred affect members of other religious and ethnic groups and should also be addressed in appropriate fora.” However, our research did not uncover any instances in which Muigai specifically addressed antisemitism in his reports, press releases or statements.

Again in July 2010, Muigai reported on “manifestations of defamation of religions,” with a focus on Islamophobia. In this report, Muigai reviewed specific cases of religiously-motivated violence or discrimination and incitement thereto. He deserves credit for, in this case, expanding the discussion beyond anti-Muslim violence and reviewing cases of violence and discrimination against other groups. Nevertheless, only five out of the more than fifty examples of religiously-motivated violence and discrimination concerned Jews. Furthermore, Muigai included a lengthy discussion about bans on religious symbols, focusing on Muslim symbols without mentioning the disturbing phenomenon of Jews who refrain from donning visibly Jewish symbols out of fear of provoking violent attacks.

**Mutuma Ruteere (2011-2017)**

Mutuma Ruteere took over as racism expert in 2011 after the “Defamation of Religions” resolution was changed and the reporting requirement on Islamophobia was removed. Aside from a few reports and speeches in which he addressed Holocaust denial in the context of reports about the rise of right-wing political parties (following similar reports by Muigai) and some passing expressions of concern about antisemitism, Ruteere failed to address antisemitism in his reports, press releases or statements.

Furthermore, both Ruteere and his predecessor Muigai completely ignored antisemitism originating from the left, Islamic fundamentalist circles, or Middle Eastern governments—all of this during a time when antisemitism reached new heights, including at least four deadly attacks between 2012 and 2015. Ruteere failed to condemn any of these attacks.

By contrast, Ruteere did speak out against anti-Muslim discrimination, criticized counter-terrorism measures as racist, and condemned President Trump’s travel ban as discriminatory.

**Special Rapporteur on Religious Freedom**

The mandate of the religious freedom expert is to promote and protect freedom of religion or belief and to identify obstacles to the enjoyment of this basic right. Certainly increased violent attacks targeting Jews is an obstacle to their freedom of religion when Jews refrain from wearing religious head coverings or other Jewish symbols in public. This ought to be a concern for an international expert charged with protecting religious freedom; yet the Human Rights Council’s religious freedom experts over the past decade—Asma Jahangir and Heiner Bielefeldt—have devoted little attention to the issue. To be fair, the research studies published by the religious freedom experts tend to address general issues, not focused on...
any particular group.\footnote{Recent studies covered topics like the interrelated rights of freedom of religion and freedom of expression, the rights of the child and his or her parents in the area of freedom of religion, and preventing violence committed in the name of religion.}

\textbf{Asma Jahangir (2004-2010)}

Asma Jahangir is to be commended for speaking out against militant Islam and widespread Palestinian incitement to terrorism against Israelis in her report on her January 2008 country visit to Israel and the Palestinian territories.\footnote{A/HRC/10/8/Add.2, “Mission to Israel and the Occupied Palestinian Territory,” Human Rights Council, Jan. 12, 2009, ¶¶ 57, 74-75.} Although most of her report focused on laws and policies impacting the various non-Jewish populations in Israel and the Palestinian territories, Jahangir did not ignore Palestinian violations of Israeli rights. She criticized Palestinian glorification of martyrdom, giving an example from Palestinian TV and referencing Palestinian textbooks, and noted that article 20(2) of the ICCPR requires that such advocacy of racial or religious hatred, which in effect incites violence, be prohibited.\footnote{Id., ¶ 57.} Jahangir emphasized this issue again in her conclusions and recommendations, stating unequivocally:

\begin{quote}
any advocacy of religious hatred that constitutes incitement to discrimination, hostility or violence should be effectively investigated, prosecuted and punished. Similarly, any related violent acts should be investigated in a prompt, transparent and independent manner, the perpetrators should be prosecuted and sentenced, and avenues for redress and protection should be offered to victims.\footnote{Id., ¶ 84.}
\end{quote}

Regrettably, while the type of violent incitement criticized by Jahangir has been rampant in the Arab and Muslim world, the religious freedom experts have not addressed the wider issue. Moreover, the persistent problem of Palestinian incitement to antisemitism— including by UNRWA teachers\footnote{“Poisoning Palestinian Children: A Report On UNRWA Teachers’ Incitement to Jihadist Terrorism and Antisemitism,” UN Watch, Feb. 2017, available at https://www.unwatch.org/130-page-report-unrwa-teachers-incite-terrorism-antisemitism/.}—has never been seriously addressed by any UN body.

\textbf{Heiner Bielefeldt (2010 – 2016)}

Heiner Bielefeldt deserves praise for highlighting specific issues affecting the Jewish community in his reports and statements, particularly related to ritual slaughter and circumcision and rights in the workplace.

In recent years, calls to prohibit Jewish circumcision and ritual slaughter have arisen in some countries. Aside from being an obstacle to the practice of Judaism which makes Jews feel unwelcome, the debates surrounding the calls to prohibit these age-old Jewish traditions provide fodder for antisemites who have accused Jews of child molestation and cruelty to animals.\footnote{Kantor Center Report for 2013, pp. 13-14.}

Likewise, failure of employers to respect Jewish traditions and practices at work creates an unwelcoming environment where Jews must choose between expressing their identity or forgoing professional opportunities.

\begin{itemize}
\item **Ritual slaughter and circumcision** – During the course of his term, Bielefeldt defended male circumcision as a religious right on several occasions. In a December 2012 report focusing on the need to protect the rights of religious minorities, he specifically mentioned bans on the ritual circumcision of males as an obstacle to freedom of religion.\footnote{A/HRC/22/51, Heiner Bielefeldt, “Report of the Special Rapporteur on freedom of religion or belief,” Human Rights Council, Dec. 24, 2012.} Again in 2014, Bielefeldt defended the right to male circumcision as a matter of religious freedom in an oral statement at the Human Rights Council.\footnote{Tovah Lazaroff, “UNHRC official: Male circumcision is protected by freedom of religion,” Jerusalem Post, March 14, 2014.} Most recently, following his country visit to Denmark in 2016, Bielefeldt expressed concern that the ban on ritual slaughter and the proposed ban on male circumcision infringes on the religious freedom of Denmark’s Jewish community.\footnote{A/HRC/34/50/Add.1, Heiner Bielefeldt, “Report of the Special Rapporteur on freedom of religion and belief on his mission to Denmark,” Human Rights Council, Dec. 28, 2016.} The report devoted more than a page to the Jewish community, covering other issues of concern to the community as well.
\end{itemize}
**Workplace Rights** - In his August 2014 report focusing on eliminating religious intolerance and discrimination in the workplace, Bielefeldt specifically addressed issues affecting religious Jews, such as religious garb, dietary restrictions and working on Shabbat and holidays.\(^{237}\)

However, as a rule, the religious freedom experts failed to comment on rising antisemitism, particularly the murderous incitement against Jews in the Arab and Muslim world, and ignored deadly attacks on Jews in recent years.

By contrast, they spoke out on many occasions on behalf of other targeted groups, including the Baha’i in Iran,\(^{238}\) religious minorities in Sri Lanka,\(^{239}\) Uighurs in China,\(^{240}\) and Ahmadis in Pakistan.\(^{241}\)

**Recommendations**

Although antisemitism is clearly covered by the mandates of the Special Rapporteurs on Racism and Religious Freedom, these experts have, with some limited exceptions, mostly avoided the issue. Accordingly, we urge these experts to:

- Publicly and unequivocally condemn antisemitic attacks and incitement as acts of racial and religious hatred and violations of human rights.
- Communicate with relevant governments to ensure they are taking all necessary actions to protect their Jewish communities and bring perpetrators to justice.
- Include a discussion of major antisemitic incidents and the problem of antisemitism generally in their annual reports to the Human Rights Council and the General Assembly.
- Investigate antisemitism around the world with at least the same priority given to Islamophobia.

**UN TREATY BODIES**

The Treaty Bodies are committees of independent experts tasked with monitoring implementation of ten core international human rights treaties. The monitoring is conducted through review of state parties’ periodic reports and individual complaints and, in the case of six of the treaties, by also carrying out country inquiries. Information is provided to the treaty bodies by state parties, national human rights institutions, civil society organizations, UN entities and various other governmental, professional and academic entities. At the end of each country review, the treaty body publishes its concluding observations.

At least two of the treaty bodies are obliged to address the issue of antisemitism: the Human Rights Committee, comprised of 18 experts who are typically legal scholars or former diplomats, tasked with monitoring country compliance with the International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR); and the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination (CERD), also comprised of 18 experts, which monitors compliance with the International Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Racial Discrimination (ICERD).\(^{242}\)

**The Human Rights Committee**

Article 20 of the ICCPR prohibits “any advocacy of national, racial or religious hatred that constitutes incitement to discrimination, hostility or violence.” Moreover, in guaranteeing civil and political rights, the treaty obligates signatory states to respect such rights without distinction on grounds of “race, color, sex, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, property, birth or other status,” and to guarantee to all persons protection against discrimination on any such grounds.\(^{243}\) Furthermore, the ICCPR guarantees freedom of religion, including the right to openly manifest one’s religion, and

---


\(^{238}\) “Iran: Most recent backlash against Baha’i exposes authorities’ extreme intolerance for religious minority group,” *Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights*, June 8, 2016.


\(^{242}\) Our analysis of the Treaty Bodies is based on a review of the relevant UN web pages, available here: [http://www.ohchr.org/EN/HRBodies/Pages/TreatyBodies.aspx](http://www.ohchr.org/EN/HRBodies/Pages/TreatyBodies.aspx); [http://www.ohchr.org/EN/HRBodies/CCPR/Pages/CCPRIndex.aspx](http://www.ohchr.org/EN/HRBodies/CCPR/Pages/CCPRIndex.aspx); [http://www.ohchr.org/EN/HRBodies/CERD/Pages/CERDIndex.aspx](http://www.ohchr.org/EN/HRBodies/CERD/Pages/CERDIndex.aspx), review of concluding observations for selected countries as detailed below, and review of the media (press releases, statements and featured stories) for the last ten years found on the respective CCPR and CERD web pages.

\(^{243}\) Articles 2 and 26, International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights (1966).
obligates states to protect religious minorities.244

Accordingly, the Human Rights Committee should be affirmatively monitoring state parties for any antisemitic incitement or violence which puts Jews at risk and infringes their rights to freely and openly practice the Jewish religion.

However, an examination of the Human Rights Committee’s concluding observations for selected state parties—notably, Arab and Muslim states where antisemitic incitement is rampant, and states that have witnessed high levels of antisemitic incidents in the last ten years245—reveals that antisemitism is of limited concern to the Human Rights Committee.

The Human Rights Committee reviews states approximately once every four years. During the review process, the Committee sends each state a list of issues of concern to address. While the Committee has taken the opportunity to question some countries about increased incidents of antisemitism—most recently in France, Germany and Sweden—it has not done so as a matter of course, and has not treated the issue with the gravity it warrants.

For example, in August 2014—at the height of the summer 2014 Hamas-Israel conflict, when antisemitic incidents were at an all-time high—the Human Rights Committee asked France several pointed questions about increases in violent racist and religious attacks against Muslims, and an increase in prejudice against Islam, but not about antisemitism. This was followed by a general question on what measures France has taken to combat racially and religiously motivated crimes against Jews, Muslims and Roma.246 Even though antisemitism had been on the rise in France for years, and despite the fact that the country had seen the highest levels of antisemitic violence in the world for several consecutive years—with children brutally killed in an antisemitic attack on a Jewish school in Toulouse just two years earlier—the Human Rights Committee failed to treat antisemitism as a unique problem deserving of the same kind of special attention as attacks against Muslims.

Again, in its concluding observations on France published in August 2015, after the deadly January 2015 attack on the Hyper Casher supermarket and the December 2014 antisemitic rape of a Jewish woman in her boyfriend’s home, the Human Rights Committee failed to acknowledge the severity of the problem, making only one general and passing expression of concern about “the upsurge in violent incidents of a racist, anti-Semitic or anti-Muslim nature.”247 Similarly, when examining Sweden in 2014, the Human Rights Committee asked one general question on the rise in hate speech against Muslims, Afro-Swedes, Roma and Jews.248 The concluding observations, published in April 2016, included a short section on “racism and hate speech,” expressing concern about hate speech against Muslims, Afro-Swedes, Roma and Jews, and about physical assaults against religious minorities, such as Muslims and Jews.249 While the comment specifically mentioned “the chronic negative portrayal of Muslims in the media,” it ignored frequent antisemitic remarks by Swedish politicians and media outlets.250 Furthermore, it failed to address the fact that Swedish Jews avoid wearing identifying Jewish garb or symbols in public out of fear of attacks.251

The Committee’s recent concluding observations for many other countries which have experienced a rise in antisemitism and antisemitic attacks in recent years—Argentina, Denmark, Greece252, Russia and Venezuela—
did not mention antisemitism at all, or only in passing.\textsuperscript{253}

No less troubling is that the Human Rights Committee’s review of countries like Iraq, Iran and Jordan ignored the vicious and often state-sponsored antisemitic incitement coming out of the Arab and Muslim world. These frequently include calls to genocide, and have inspired many of the antisemitic attacks around the world in the last ten years, certainly the most violent and deadly of the attacks which were perpetrated by Muslim extremists.\textsuperscript{254} While the Human Rights Committee has demonstrated that it can address the issue of hate speech in these countries, it has never done so with respect to antisemitic incitement.\textsuperscript{255}

\textbf{The Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination}

The ICERD defines racial discrimination as “any distinction, exclusion, restriction or preference based on race, colour, descent, or national or ethnic origin which has the purpose or effect of nullifying or impairing the recognition, enjoyment or exercise, on an equal footing, of human rights and fundamental freedoms in the political, economic, social, cultural or any other field of public life.”\textsuperscript{256} Pursuant to the convention, state parties must condemn racial discrimination and undertake to eliminate it by all appropriate means.\textsuperscript{257} This includes ensuring protection against violence or bodily harm inflicted by anyone.\textsuperscript{258} Furthermore, states undertake to eradicate all incitement to racial hatred or discrimination and to criminalize such activity.\textsuperscript{259} Accordingly, the CERD should be actively monitoring states for incidents of violence and harassment against Jews and for any antisemitic incitement and violence which place Jews, as an ethnic group, at risk. Inexplicably, however, antisemitism is barely mentioned in the Committee’s country reviews.

The CERD claims that it reviews states approximately every two years, but in practice it is closer to once in five or more years. Each review is followed by the Committee’s publication of concluding observations for the country reviewed.\textsuperscript{260}

Remarkably, our study of the CERD’s concluding observations for numerous countries—including

\textsuperscript{253} CCPR/C/ARG/CO/5, “Concluding observations on the fifth periodic report of Argentina,” \textit{Human Rights Committee}, August 10, 2016 (criticizing slow progress of investigation of AMIA bombing, but not mentioning death of Alberto Nisman or issue of antisemitism); CCPR/C/DNK/CO/6, “Concluding observations of the sixth periodic report of Denmark,” \textit{Human Rights Committee}, August 15, 2016 (no mention of Copenhagen Synagogue attack or Jews or antisemitism); CCPR/C/IRN/CO/3, “Consideration of reports submitted by States parties under article 40 of the Covenant, Concluding observations of the Human Rights Committee, Islamic Republic of Iran,” \textit{Human Rights Committee}, Nov. 29, 2011 (ignoring rhetoric by Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad denying the Holocaust and calling Israel a “cancerous tumor” and frequent calls for the annihilation of Israel and other antisemitic expressions in Iranian); CCPR/C/JOR/CO/4, “Consideration of reports submitted by States parties under article 40 of the Covenant, Concluding observations of the Human Rights Committee, Jordan,” \textit{Human Rights Committee}, Nov. 18, 2010 (ignoring frequent disparagement of Israel using Holocaust terminology and controversy among government officials about whether to include Holocaust in school curriculum with Ministry of Education deciding to exclude it); CCPR/C/IRQ/CO/5, “Concluding observations on the fifth periodic report of Iraq,” \textit{Human Rights Committee}, Dec. 3, 2015 (ignoring book fairs featuring numerous antisemitic books and Iraqi television series depicting ISIS as the product of the devil and a Jewish woman).

\textsuperscript{254} CCPR/C/TUR/CO/1, “Concluding observations on the initial report of Turkey adopted by the Committee at its 106th session,” \textit{Human Rights Committee}, Nov. 13, 2012 (expressing concern about “unpunished hate speech in the media” in the context of hate crimes against non-Muslim religious communities, but failing to address inflammatory antisemitic and anti-Israel rhetoric which proliferated in the country following the May 2010 Gaza flotilla incident and caused the Jewish community to feel threatened).

\textsuperscript{255} CCPR/C/TUR/CO/1, “Concluding observations on the initial report of Turkey adopted by the Committee at its 106th session,” \textit{Human Rights Committee}, Nov. 13, 2012 (expressing concern about “unpunished hate speech in the media” in the context of hate crimes against non-Muslim religious communities, but failing to address inflammatory antisemitic and anti-Israel rhetoric which proliferated in the country following the May 2010 Gaza flotilla incident and caused the Jewish community to feel threatened).

\textsuperscript{256} Article 1, Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Racial Discrimination (1965).

\textsuperscript{257} Id., Article 2.

\textsuperscript{258} Id., Article 5.

\textsuperscript{259} Id., Article 4.

\textsuperscript{260} Concluding observations were reviewed for the following State parties: Argentina, Denmark, France, Germany, Greece, Iran, Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Morocco, Oman, Qatar, Russia, Sweden, Turkey, Ukraine, UAE, and Venezuela.
Argentina, Denmark, France, Greece, Iran, Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Morocco, Oman, Qatar, Russia, Sweden, Turkey, the UAE, Ukraine and Venezuela—shows that the Committee rarely mentions Jews or antisemitism, and that when it does, this is usually but a passing reference to Jews, along with other minority groups like Muslims and Roma, without any real discussion of the problem of antisemitism.

Despite the alarming rise in violent antisemitism in recent years, as detailed at the outset of this report, CERD’s recent concluding observations have devoted much more attention to Islamophobia, or discrimination against Roma, than to antisemitism.

Moreover, though antisemitic incitement from the Arab and Muslim world has inspired horrific antisemitic attacks worldwide, and despite the obligation of ICERD signatory states to eradicate incitement to racial hatred, the CERD has addressed hate speech in these countries only when the speech was directed at other groups—not Jews. The CERD has never once addressed the virulent and murderous incitement to antisemitism rampant in Arab and Muslim countries.

The Human Rights Committee and the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination have failed to exercise even a bare minimum of their respective responsibilities to protect victims of anti-Jewish racial discrimination. We urge each treaty body to:

- Specifically and meaningfully address antisemitism in the concluding observations of their country reviews.
- Address antisemitic incitement as prohibited hate speech, even in countries with small to non-existent Jewish communities such as in Arab and Muslim countries.
- Treat antisemitism with the same priority as other forms of discrimination, such as Islamophobia and anti-Roma discrimination.
- Include in the list of issues for countries being reviewed specific questions about antisemitic incidents in those countries.

---

261 “Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination considers report of France,” April 29, 2015, available at http://www.ohchr.org/EN/NewsEvents/Pages/DisplayNews.aspx?NewsID=15904&LangID=E. The committee appears to be more concerned with criticizing France’s National Action Plan against Racism and Anti-Semitism than with the shocking number and severity of attacks against Jewish targets in France. In this regard, the French delegation responded to the concerns defensively that “There was a need to maintain a special focus on anti-Semitism, because Jews were still being killed in France for being Jews.”

262 CERD/C/DEU/CO/19-22, “Concluding observations on the combined nineteenth and twenty-second periodic reports of Germany,” June 30, 2015 (criticizing Germany for not doing enough to combat Islamophobia and including a section on Sinti and Roma, but mentioning antisemitism only in passing to praise Germany’s efforts to combat it, but no other mention of Jews or antisemitism; entire section is devoted to Roma).

263 CERD/C/RUS/CO/23-24, “Concluding observations on the twenty-third and twenty-fourth periodic reports of the Russian Federation,” Sept. 20, 2017 (no mention of Jews or antisemitism although there is a discussion of hate speech generally; an entire section is devoted to Roma).


265 CERD/C/JOR/CO/22-23, “Concluding observations on the twenty-second and twenty-third periodic reports of Jordan,” Oct. 4, 2016 (expressing concern about racially motivated crimes against various groups, including Jews; entire sections are devoted to the situations of Roma and Crimean Tatars).

UN HOLOCAUST COMMEMORATION

The UN Holocaust Outreach Program

One area for which the UN deserves praise is its Holocaust Outreach Program, launched in 2006 following the adoption of General Assembly Holocaust Remembrance Resolution 60/7 on November 1, 2005. That resolution designated January 27 as “an annual International Day of Commemoration in memory of the victims of the Holocaust,” and requested the Secretary-General to establish an outreach program on “Holocaust and the United Nations,” and to mobilize civil society for Holocaust remembrance and education.267

The UN’s Holocaust remembrance initiative includes two main components: the international day ceremonies, and educational programming. The UN has an entire website devoted to the program (http://www.un.org/en/holocaustremembrance/bg.shtml).268

While there were concerns at the outset as to whether the program would be adequately funded, the program is now an established part of the UN.

Every year on January 27, the UN in New York hosts a well-attended and tasteful ceremony, along with smaller events in Geneva and around the world. The main ceremony includes a message from the Secretary-General, as well as speeches by other dignitaries and a Holocaust survivor. An additional array of programming—exhibits, film screenings, concerts, lectures, panel discussions and briefings—takes place at the UN in New York throughout the week. The UN also hosts other Holocaust-related events throughout the year on Kristallnacht, Israel’s Yom HaShoah and other days.

One positive outcome of the establishment of January 27th as International Holocaust Commemoration Day is that the network of 63 United Nations Information Centers (UNICs) located throughout the world have undertaken to mark the day with educational and cultural events organized with assistance from the Holocaust Outreach Program in New York. Many of these UNICs are located in places where there are no Jews or Holocaust survivors, and where the governments might be hostile to Israel. UNIC locations which have hosted Holocaust outreach programs in recent years include Madagascar, Burundi, Senegal, Nigeria, Zambia, Togo, Namibia, Cameroon, Bangladesh, Nepal, the Philippines and Myanmar, among many others. The program has grown substantially over the years, starting with ten Holocaust education and remembrance activities in ten countries in the first year, to supporting 150 activities in 50 countries in the first seven months of 2017 alone. It is a noteworthy accomplishment that the Holocaust is being taught and commemorated in so many countries.

The educational, artistic and cultural component of the UN Holocaust Outreach Program has enabled it to expand beyond the Jewish community to diverse audiences. In partnership with the IHRA, the US Holocaust Memorial Museum, Yad Vashem and others, the UN Holocaust Outreach Program has developed valuable educational materials which serve as a resource and are available on its website. These include educational videos, study guides and journals with articles by leading Holocaust academics and scholars like Nobel Laureate Elie Wiesel, Dr. Mario Silva of the IHRA, Simone Veil of Fondation pour la Mémoire de la Shoah, David Matas of B’nai B’rith Canada and others. In addition, as noted above, the Holocaust Remembrance Day commemorations include film screenings, musical programming, art exhibits and other cultural events. The educational and cultural materials are available in all six official languages of the United Nations and are sometimes translated to other languages. For example, the “State of Deception: The Power of Nazi Propaganda” exhibit which opened this year was also translated into Hungarian, Ukranian, Dutch and Kiswahili.

While the accomplishments of the UN Holocaust Outreach Program in New York and at information centers around the world are impressive, this is not reflected in the larger UN agencies like the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights which devote scant attention to Holocaust Remembrance Day. The High Commissioner usually delivers a video message at the main ceremony in New York. However, his Geneva-based agency OHCHR, with 1,000 employees, has never organized its own ceremony.

Furthermore, while the establishment of the Holocaust Outreach Program is an important first step in fighting modern antisemitism, the UN has not maximized its


268 The information in this section is based on a review of the UN’s Holocaust website, available at http://www.un.org/en/holocaustremembrance/; an interview with the Holocaust Outreach Program’s director, Kimberly Mann and interviews with experts at organizations close to the program, such as B’nai B’rith and the American Jewish Committee.
potential. It must be noted here that Holocaust Outreach Program Director Kimberly Mann has participated in the Global Forum on Combating Anti-Semitism held in Israel, as the representative of the UN Department of Public Information. In addition, Ms. Mann participated in the expert working group for the OSCE/UNESCO Policy Guidelines on combating antisemitism through education, released in June 2018. However, some in the Jewish community have expressed a view that the UN’s Holocaust Outreach Program is lacking because the content of the programs, cultural events and educational materials focus on commemoration of the historical event without making the connection to present-day occurrences and addressing modern antisemitism as part of its mandate.

**Recommendations**

The UN’s Holocaust Remembrance Day programming has become a permanent fixture of Holocaust remembrance for the Jewish and general world community. The program’s quality educational content is widely disseminated. Our only recommendation for improvement is to bridge the gap between the historical event and current events by including contemporary antisemitism in the Holocaust Remembrance Day programming and educational materials.

**UNESCO**

The United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) is a case study of how the agenda of UN agencies is shaped by member states for good and for bad.

The Nazi genocide against the Jewish people was very much on the minds of the founders of UNESCO.

Their November 1945 constitution opens with a preamble that identifies the “doctrine of the inequality of men and races” as a cause of “the great and terrible war which has now ended,” along with “the denial of the democratic principles of the dignity, equality and mutual respect of men.”

In reaction to this, Article 1 affirms that the purposes of UNESCO shall be to “contribute to peace and security” by promoting “collaboration among the nations through education, science and culture” in order to further “universal respect for justice, for the rule of law and for the human rights and fundamental freedoms which are affirmed for the peoples of the world, without distinction of race, sex, language or religion, by the Charter of the United Nations.”

However, over the years, the organization has been hijacked by dictatorships. Its work has been politicized.

In addition to its severe anti-Israel bias, which has only worsened since it allowed the Palestinians to join as a member state in 2011, UNESCO has repeatedly acted in ways that are antithetical to its mandate.

For example, UNESCO allowed the murderous Syrian regime to remain on its committee to judge human rights complaints, despite that regime’s documented international law and human rights violations. In 2013, UNESCO honored Cuban executioner and founder of its “labor camp” system, Che Guevara, by including “The Life and Works of Ernesto Che Guevara” in its Memory of the World Register.

UNESCO awards prizes named after Bahraini despot King Hamad Bin Isa al-Khalifa and sponsored by Equatorial Guinea dictator, Obiang Nguema, described as “one of the world’s most infamous dictators.”

Current Executive Board members of UNESCO include Iran, Sudan, Qatar, Pakistan, Russia, China, Algeria and Bangladesh.

In October 2017, the U.S. announced it would pull out of UNESCO, citing “US concerns with mounting arrears at UNESCO, the need for fundamental reform

---


in the organization, and continuing anti-Israel bias.”\(^{275}\)

The agency’s outgoing head, Irina Bokova, has said that UNESCO’s “universal mission was in jeopardy.”\(^{276}\)

Against this backdrop, in a close and closely watched election, France’s former culture minister, Audrey Azoulay, beat out former Qatari culture minister, Hamad bin Abdoulaziz al-Kawari, and became the first Jewish Director-General of UNESCO. This does not mean the organization will automatically change.\(^{277}\) Azoulay has pledged to “restore [UNESCO’s] credibility, restore the faith of its members and its efficiency so it can act.”\(^{278}\) Given the organization’s recent history, she certainly faces challenges in implementing her vision.

**UNESCO Holocaust Education Program\(^{279}\)**

UNESCO is well known for its educational programs on diverse topics ranging from sex education to clean water.\(^{280}\) Notwithstanding recent criticisms of UNESCO, one area in which the organization has acted positively is Holocaust education. In 2007, UNESCO adopted resolution 34C/61, requesting the UNESCO Director-General to see what role UNESCO could play “in promoting awareness of Holocaust remembrance through education and in combating all forms of Holocaust denial in accordance with the United Nations General Assembly Resolutions.”\(^{281}\)

Since then, UNESCO has developed a well-regarded program which raises awareness about the Holocaust, paying tribute to the victims, and educates about how and why the Holocaust happened in the broader context of genocide prevention education. The UNESCO program offers numerous resource materials, all available through its special Holocaust website (http://en.unesco.org/holocaust-remembrance/resources).

The program deserves praise for being sensitive and well thought-out.

UNESCO partners with respected Holocaust institutions such as IHRA, the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, Yad Vashem, Shoah Memorial, USC Shoah Foundation, and others. Former Director-General Irinia Bokova recently described the program as a resource for policy-makers, curriculum developers and textbook writers to “engage in or reinforce education about the Holocaust and the prevention of genocide.”\(^{282}\)

Working with its partners, UNESCO’s accomplishments include:

- **Commemorative, cultural and educational events every year since 2008, mostly around January 27.** For example, UNESCO gathered about 3,000 diplomats, students, representatives of Holocaust and survivor organizations, and the wider audience, for a series of events to commemorate the 70th anniversary of the liberation of the Auschwitz-Birkenau camp by Soviet troops. Since 2008, UNESCO has presented 21 exhibitions about the Holocaust at headquarters and field offices.

- **Capacity-building seminars for senior education stakeholders from over 30 countries, representing all regions of the world.** This includes the creation of a Latin American Network of Education on the Holocaust and other Genocides to coordinate efforts in the region. In the same spirit, UNESCO also launched in 2015 with the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum an International Conference on Education and the Holocaust to build the capacity of education policy-makers and support the development of their projects in the field, in countries as diverse as Chile, India, Lithuania, Namibia, or the Republic of Korea.

---

275 “Welcome in Israel, new French Jewish head of UNESCO won’t mean immediate change,” *Times of Israel*, Oct. 13, 2017. The U.S. withdrawal will take effect as of December 31, 2018. Israel quickly followed the U.S. with its own announcement of withdrawal from UNESCO. However, Israel’s UNESCO representative in Paris, Ambassador Carmel Shama Hacohen recently called for both Israel and the U.S. to reevaluate their decisions to withdraw from the agency in light of the positive response to Israeli’s diplomatic efforts and the delays this year of the votes on the anti-Israel resolutions, discussed further below. See Tovah Lazaroff, “Israel Envoy: We Should Delay UNESCO Exit,” *Jerusalem Post*, June 28, 2018.

276 Id.

277 Id.


279 The information in this section is based on a review of the UNESCO’s Holocaust website (http://en.unesco.org/holocaust-remembrance) and communications with insiders knowledgeable about UNESCO’s Holocaust Education Program.


281 UNESCO Resolution 34C/61.

• Research on how the Holocaust is taught worldwide and guidance to education stakeholders.  

• Reinforcing networks in support of Holocaust education and research. For example, UNESCO created four University Chairs in Holocaust/genocide education/prevention, at Rutgers University, University of Southern California, Jagellonian University of Krakow, Aix-en-Provence-Marseille University/Les Milles Memorial Site. UNESCO also expanded the Memory of the World Register to include Yad Vashem’s Pages of Testimony collection, the International Tracing Service archives, the Anne Frank Diaries and the Ringelblum Archives.

UNESCO also has been active in developing educational materials and programming to combat modern antisemitism. Specifically, UNESCO worked closely with the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE) on guidelines for policymakers and on curriculum materials for teachers on how to combat antisemitism through education, launched in June 2018. These materials will provide practical advice on how to address contemporary manifestations of antisemitism in and through education. Additionally, UNESCO worked with the IHRA to organize a public event in December 2016 on “How to Respond to Anti-Semitism through Education, Culture and Communication.” The event, in which the EU and OSCE participated, highlighted contemporary challenges related to antisemitism, and provided information about the definition of antisemitism recently adopted by IHRA Member States. Significantly, UNESCO’s Holocaust Outreach Program is the brainchild of Israel and the United States who, until a few years ago, funded the program which is not covered by UNESCO’s regular budget. Questions about the continued viability of the program arose after UNESCO accepted the Palestinians into the organization in 2011 and Israel and the United States withdrew their funding from UNESCO. Since then, UNESCO has managed to find other regular donors to keep the program going.

**UNESCO as a Vehicle for Promoting the Anti-Israel Narrative**

The politicization of UNESCO is perhaps most striking in its treatment of Israel, leading to an absurd reality in which the organization that works so hard to preserve Holocaust memory and promote Holocaust education, at the same time casually erases centuries of Jewish history in Jerusalem and Hebron for purely political reasons. This unacceptable perversion of history is part of the Palestinian campaign to isolate and delegitimize Israel in international bodies. Unfortunately, the Palestinian campaign has been able to succeed at UNESCO due to the automatic anti-Israel majority in the organization, which unfortunately cannot be changed by a new Director-General.

Between 2009 and 2014, UNESCO adopted 46 resolutions against Israel, only 1 on Syria, and none on any other country. UNESCO postponed the two anti-Israel resolutions slated to be voted on in the October 2017 session to April 2018. At the April 2018 session, the resolutions were again delayed. Despite this recent positive move, UNESCO has...
become notorious for a series of inflammatory and one-sided Arab-sponsored resolutions that effectively deny Jewish and Christian ties to the Temple Mount as well as centuries of Jewish history and archaeological evidence.\textsuperscript{291} Fortunately, Azoulay's predecessor, Irina Bokova, emphatically opposed the resolutions, saying, “Jerusalem is the sacred city of the three monotheistic religions – Judaism, Christianity and Islam. To deny, conceal or erase any of the Jewish, Christian or Muslim traditions undermines the integrity of the site, and runs counter to the reasons that justified its inscription on the UNESCO World Heritage list.”\textsuperscript{292}

Bokova also responded to letters by outraged Israeli politicians Naftali Bennett and Tzipi Livni, assuring them of UNESCO's commitment to fight antisemitism. In her letter to Bennett, she wrote: “Allow me to reassure you of my absolute commitment to continue all efforts in countering all forms of anti-Semitism, including those drawing on partial or distorted visions of culture and history, as well as those that seek to challenge the existence of Israel.”\textsuperscript{293} In her letter to Livni, she linked demonization of Israel and antisemitism, writing that “UNESCO is the sole UN organization that has educational programs on the lessons of the Holocaust, with the aim of combating modern anti-Semitism including the delegitimization of Israel.”\textsuperscript{294}

Bokova did not stop there. In her January 2017 Holocaust Remembrance Day speech, she spoke powerfully about the link between preserving history and preventing antisemitism and racism—“The better we know our own history and that of others, the stronger the bonds we forge with humanity,”\textsuperscript{295} she said.

Later, in her April 2017 speech to the World Jewish Congress Plenary Assembly, she echoed Guterres' earlier remarks. “There is a new form of anti-Semitism expressed in the form of demonization of Israel,” she said, and the fight against antisemitism was a core part of UNESCO's wider peace-building efforts.\textsuperscript{296} Unfortunately, despite Bokova's strong opposition to the politicized resolutions on Jerusalem and eroding support from some member states, as reflected in the votes, the Palestinians are continuing to push forward the resolutions.\textsuperscript{297} In July 2017, they went even further, fast-tracking the adoption of a resolution by UNESCO's World Heritage Committee declaring Hebron, the burial site of Judaism's forefathers and foremothers, a Palestinian world heritage site in danger.\textsuperscript{298} Outrageously, while UNESCO has been busy lodging political accusations against Israel, neither its Executive Board nor its World Heritage Committee has taken any action against Hamas in Gaza for destroying irreplaceable archaeological treasures. Most recently, in October 2017, Hamas bulldozed a 4,500 year-old Bronze Age settlement for construction projects and military bases.\textsuperscript{299}

UNESCO and Bokova have been on the front lines of the Palestinian effort to delegitimize Israel at UN bodies since the Palestinians joined UNESCO in 2011. The recent UNESCO Jerusalem resolutions followed a failed effort by Arab States to cancel an exhibit at UNESCO's Paris headquarters entitled “People, Book, Land: The 3,500-year relationship of the Jewish People with the Holy Land.”

Designed by Hebrew University professor and antisemitism expert Robert Wistrich, and jointly organized with the Simon Wiesenthal Center in Los Angeles,\textsuperscript{300} the exhibit was poised to open in January 2014. But a coalition of 22 Arab States objected to the exhibit, claiming the subject was too political in
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light of a peace push by then-U.S. Secretary of State John Kerry.\textsuperscript{301} Regrettably, Bokova caved in to the pressure from the Arab States, and postponed the opening of the exhibit from January to June 2014.\textsuperscript{302} She was roundly criticized for that decision.\textsuperscript{303} However by the time the exhibit opened in June,\textsuperscript{304} Bokova had redeemed herself in the eyes of Jewish leaders through her support for the exhibit and strong pro-Jewish statements.\textsuperscript{305}

The fact that UNESCO organized and hosted an exhibit on Jewish ties to Israel is itself commendable. As then-U.S. Ambassador Samantha Power pointed out in March 2015 when the exhibit opened at UN Headquarters in New York:

This exhibit is important, not just because of the exhibit itself, but because of what it means [for it] to be shown here, at the United Nations. One panel reminds us that it was a vote by the United Nations 67 years ago that helped lead to the creation of the Jewish state. Unfortunately it was also here 40 years ago in 1975 that the United Nations General Assembly issued its infamous resolution declaring that Zionism is a form of racism.\textsuperscript{306}

Likewise, the exhibit’s author, Robert Wistrich, noted that “Once [the exhibit] has the authorization of UNESCO, that is also symbolically important, as well as politically and culturally,” because of UNESCO’s influence in many countries, including in Asia and Africa.\textsuperscript{307}

Since its opening in Paris, the historical exhibit has traveled to multiple countries and has been viewed by thousands around the world.\textsuperscript{308} In March 2017, the exhibit opened in Buenos Aires,\textsuperscript{309} and it was at the British House of Commons just before that in February.\textsuperscript{310}

Bokova also deserves praise for her February 2015 decision to veto the inclusion of a collection of Palestinian-themed posters in UNESCO’s Memory of the World register, on grounds that the posters fuel hatred and antisemitism.\textsuperscript{311} Many of the posters featured deadly weapons and some glorified murderous Palestinian terror attacks against Israeli civilians.\textsuperscript{312} Several posters honored the terrorist Dalal Mughrabi, with one referring to her brutal massacre of 38 Israeli civilian bus passengers as “a military operation near Tel Aviv.”\textsuperscript{313} The Palestinians sought to have the posters included in the UNESCO archive that preserves documents of “world significance and outstanding universal values.”\textsuperscript{314} Bokova rejected the posters, calling them “totally unacceptable,” and “counter to the values of UNESCO.”\textsuperscript{315} She further expressed her “conviction that UNESCO should not associate itself with such documents whose inscription could fuel hatred and anti-Semitic perceptions.”\textsuperscript{316} Bokova’s welcome reaction to the offensive and hateful Palestinian posters stands in stark contrast to other UN bodies and officials which have ignored widespread Palestinian incitement to terrorism, including in UN agencies such as UNRWA.
Recommendations

While UNESCO’s Holocaust education program is a positive contribution in the fight against antisemitism, the unfortunate politicization of the organization contributes to modern antisemitism by singling out the Jewish State for unfair scrutiny and endorsing the purposeful distortion of Jewish history; none of this serves the organization’s mission.

Though Irina Bokova denounced the use of UNESCO as a political tool to advance the Palestinian narrative through incitement and historical revisionism, her position as Director-General unfortunately did not allow her to prevent the adoption of politicized resolutions.

It is regrettable that UNESCO’s organizational structure has allowed it to be hijacked by states seeking to further their political agendas at the expense of the organization’s actual mission of preserving culture and heritage.

Accordingly, we recommend:

- We urge new Director-General Audrey Azoulay to implement necessary organizational changes to keep UNESCO to its mission.
- We urge UNESCO member states to take a strong stand against attempts to politicize the organization by speaking out forcefully and voting against the distorted anti-Israel resolutions.
CONCLUSION

In conclusion, this report finds, on the basis of overwhelming evidence over the past decade, that the primary United Nations officials and bodies that should be condemning and combating antisemitism are, with limited exceptions, failing to do so.

Now is a time for leadership. We call on Secretary-General Antonio Guterres to acknowledge the demonstrable failure of the world body when it comes to antisemitism, and to set forth an action plan that will mobilize key UN stakeholders, and in particular those within its human rights machinery, to exercise their responsibilities to condemn and confront bigotry, hatred or violence targeting Jews worldwide.