

Mission Statements

1. Mission Statement of the Working Group on Antisemitism in the Muslim and Arab World

Arab and Muslim Antisemitism is growing and having a major impact on the Palestinian Authority, in Arab-Muslim countries and in the West. As a result of large-scale immigration that is changing the makeup of Europe, and through the widespread dissemination of hate messages by satellite TV and internet, Arab-Muslim Antisemitism is having an effect beyond the Middle East. Arab communities outside the Middle East are echoing the hate speech of radical Islam .

The hate messages of this Antisemitism are many and varied. Some of them are based on various classical sources from Islam that depict Jews as cursed by Allah, descendants of monkeys and pigs and destined for genocide. According to this Islamic-based Antisemitism, Jews at best are protected and must submit to Muslims, and at worst must all be killed to bring the “hour” of resurrection. Hating, fighting and killing Jews can be perceived as worship of Allah.

Other Arab – Muslim Antisemitism focuses on demonizing Jews because of so-called Israeli oppression of Palestinians. Jews all over the world are included in the collective blame for Israel's behavior. This often includes the attribution of demonic and evil acts to Israel, just as Jews were accused throughout history of poisoning wells and using blood for Matzah. Often the same people will quote both the Islamic-based and nationalistic-based hate speech.

Counter force

Alongside the Muslims who are screaming, “Kill the Jews,” however, is a small but increasingly vocal number of Muslims who are rejecting this hate speech. Muslims who themselves were brought up on the hate messages and were themselves disseminating them in the past have now rejected the hate speech and are rallying and speaking on behalf of Israel and Jews. These are the voices from the inside that must be tapped to seek the way to confront the current wave of Arab-Muslim Antisemitism .

The Working Group will have three sessions:

Working Group Session 1:

Analysis of the messages of today's Arab and Muslim Antisemitism, with focus on both Palestinian Antisemitism and global Islamic Antisemitism. This first part will include the presentation of texts, videos, cartoons, educational materials, etc. This group will feature two speakers. One will present Palestinian Antisemitism and the other the global fundamentalist Islamic arena.

Working Group Session 2:

The second part will be built around Muslims who have experienced indoctrination to Antisemitism hatred. The presenters will be people who were brought up on this hate speech as Muslims, and at a certain point in their lives rejected it. They will explain the processes and education that inculcated them with a hatred they believed to be justified. They will describe the environment that fomented the hatred of Jews they personally experienced, and how it influenced them .

Next, they will explain what happened in their lives that made them reject the hatred. Finally, they will recommend what steps need to be taken to fight the Antisemitism that they know from the inside. Muslims from the PA, the Middle East and Western countries will be invited to offer their insight based on their personal experiences as they relate to Palestinian and global Islamic Antisemitism.

Working Group Session 3:

The third working group will be a discussion among all the workshop participants and speakers to examine ways to deal with the phenomena that have been described in the first two sessions. There will be an attempt to synthesize the information to create a clear picture of the following :

- Identify and categorize the different hate messages of Muslim-Arab Antisemitism among the PA, Arab-Muslim countries and Muslims in the West .
- Identify the means of dissemination of the different messages, especially to youth, in both the closed and more open environments.
- Build mechanisms to expose, counter and undermine the means of dissemination of Antisemitism in the Palestinian Authority and in Western countries.
- Create an international public mechanism for exposing and publicly delegitimizing the hate speech that is expressed in Middle Eastern countries and that cannot be fought from the inside. The goal would be to formulate recommendations to reduce the scope of the Antisemitism and neutralize its influence.

The goal is that the working group will produce a paper that defines the nature of Muslim-Arab Antisemitism, describes its means of transmission and creates a concrete plan to combat it, including combating the means of transmission.

2. Mission Statement of the Working Group on Antisemitism in Latin America

Rationale

The “new” or “renewed” antisemitism has found diverse ways to emerge in Latin America, and is expressed both at governmental and at civil society levels. Among others axes, this “renewed” antisemitism refers to updated accusations of “deicide”, “global conspiracy”, “blood libel”, as well as delegitimation of Israel, distortion or denial of the Holocaust, “Nazification” of Jews and Israel, and accusations against Israel of being an “apartheid State that should be diluted”.

The strategies to strengthen these antisemitic attacks include political, diplomatic and legal proposals, aimed at isolating Israel. This trend is currently “main stream”, and so such antisemitism, aimed at isolating and, ultimately, promote Israel’s dilution or destruction, has become “politically correct”.

Among the civil society main initiatives is the “BDS” movement, which promotes “boycott, divestment and sanctions” against the Jewish State. This movement is silently growing in the region, especially through social networks that call for boycott against Israeli goods, and also

through calls to cancel the free trade agreement between Israel and the South American Common Market.

We can identify two main axes which currently encourage antisemitism in Latin America: a) the growing Iranian presence and influence; b) the echoes of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, and the Palestinian Unilateral Initiative, resulting in a wave of recognitions of a Palestinian State which strengthened the Palestinian presentation at the UN.

Regarding Iran, among its interests in the region are to counter isolation, to increase commercial ties, to send “missionaries”, acquire mineral resources, and eventually access nuclear technology.

At a governmental level, the countries of the so-called “ALBA” (“Bolivarian Alternative for the Americas”) bloc have become the main vector to facilitate the Iranian presence in the region. Other countries have also expressed their interest to reach the Iranian market, thus opening the door for closer political ties. Iran also opened a state TV channel in Spanish which reaches the region via Internet as well as via the Venezuelan-based Telesur regional network.

In the case of the Palestinian initiative, the support was not limited to ALBA countries, but also comprised most of the region.

At the civil society level, the radical World Social Forum (which held a special edition dedicated to the Palestinians in November, 2012) as well as grassroots “social movements” have become good allies for both, Iranians and Palestinians, as they all share the “struggle against imperialism”. These groups are the main advocates for BDS initiatives. They also constitute a powerful lobbying coalition against Israel.

Nevertheless, a good signal is that fastest growing religious force in the continent is Evangelical (in its diverse forms), an important ally. No effort should be spared in building coalitions with groups that are willing to join the defense of Israel and the Jews.

Goals

The purpose of the working group on “Antisemitism in Latin America” is to address current trends in the antisemitic discourse and practices in the region, especially in reference to the disguise of ordinary anti-Jewish actions as “anti-Israeli” / “anti-Zionist”. The group will discuss actual cases and try to outline proposals for best practices in terms of prevention. We will pay particular attention to initiatives connected to the BDS movement.

Expectations

We aim to overseeing the current situation of antisemitism in Latin America, have the opportunity to present diverse national cases and identify the main regional threats and challenges. As outcome of the deliberations, we expect to elaborate a series of guidelines for action, which might help communities to better confront, prevent and contain antisemitism in the region.

3. Mission Statement of the Working Group on Antisemitism in the Former Soviet Union and Eastern Europe Region

Rationale

While state-sponsored anti-Semitism is virtually non-existent in the former Soviet Union (FSU) region, “traditional” anti-Semitism, rooted in history and popular anti-Semitic stereotypes, remains an issue of concern.

In the CIS, manifestations of popular antisemitism, such as desecration of Jewish cemeteries and memorials, antisemitic graffiti and attacks on Jewish institutions continue. Skinheads and neo-Nazi groups that target ethnic minorities and advocate racial and religious hatred are active. While violent attacks motivated by xenophobia and racism are directed mainly at natives of Central Asia, Caucuses and Africa, antisemitism remains a part of extremist ideology.

In the Baltic states, on-going restitution efforts and issues of national identity spur anti-Semitic sentiments, hate speech and historical revisionism.

In Eastern Europe, radical right wing and extremist political parties remain popular, and support for some, such as *Svoboda* in Ukraine, is growing.

There is inconsistency in local governments’ condemnation of incidents of antisemitism and incitements to racial, ethnic or religious hatred. In many FSU countries, hate crime legislation is inadequate and its enforcement is not consistent. The weak rule of law and pervasive corruption in these countries hinders implementation of such legislation.

In view of these recurring problems, governments and NGOs need to work together to ensure greater education of the general population about xenophobia and antisemitism.

Governments of the FSU need to develop better mechanisms to confront extremists’ political messages. Condemnation of antisemitic sentiments and incitements to ethnic or racial hatred needs to be consistent and timely.

Appropriate hate crime legislation needs to be developed further and mechanisms of its enforcement improved.

Goals

The Working Group will discuss ways to promote coalition building across international, regional and local organizations, and practical steps to engage governments and civil society to improve education about antisemitism, develop mechanisms to confront extremism and enhance hate crime legislation and its enforcement.

Expectations

The Working Group members will be asked to provide their input on antisemitic trends in the FSU and Eastern Europe. Participants will share strategies undertaken by their organizations to combat antisemitism in their respective countries. Specific examples of coalition building and engagement with local governments and civil society will be discussed, and mechanisms for future action will be developed.

4. Mission Statement of the Working Group on Antisemitism in the EU and Western Europe

The members of the Working Group are subject experts working for, and representatives of, the communities of Western Europe. We are variously employed to monitor and combat antisemitism, or are elected lay leaders with this focus.

Through written and oral presentations on antisemitism facing the major communities, and by shorter interventions by those from smaller communities, we shall examine the state of antisemitism in the region and collaborate towards producing some plans for our communities' national and regional responses.

Our professional experience persuades us that discussion and a focus on practical and realisable responses will allow our communities to better recognise the similarities and differences that exist, and encourage our communities to respond effectively.

Sixty five years after the defeat of Nazism Jewish communities in Western Europe are again faced with a rise in antisemitism

Opinion polling suggests that Jews are still frequently regarded as 'the other' or different by many in Western Europe. However, contemporary antisemitism comes from a multiplicity of sources including: the residue of Christian anti Jewish theology, non state actors such as Muslim Brotherhood and Global Jihad networks and affiliates, other Islamists, the malign influence of the anti Zionist left, the far right and ultra nationalism.

All too often, anti Israel propaganda serves as cloak for antisemitic attitudes.

European governments have become increasingly aware that antisemitism, and terrorism, threaten their Jewish citizens and their communities; some have acted to combat these threats and recognise their responsibilities towards their Jewish citizens. Others have been less responsive, or have yet to take effective protective action.

Jewish communities now require police protection to prevent terrorist attacks against their institutions, and all too often Jewish communities are left to bear the financial burden of paying for their physical needs. As citizens of their countries, Jews have the right to have their physical security needs met by the state.

The inter governmental agencies, the Council of Europe, the European Commission and the OSCE Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights, reflect these concerns and have put in place agreements to record and analyse these threats, which are rightly seen as threats to community cohesion and democracy.

Despite their concern however too many states fail to monitor antisemitism, despite being required to do so as a result of accords reached by the European Union and the OSCE. Without reliable data, neither national governments nor the international government organisations can analyse the occurrence or other important characteristics of contemporary antisemitism, and propose remedies.

Accordingly, the Mission of the Working Group is to:

- analyse the nature of contemporary antisemitism and the directions from which it comes

- assist Jewish communities and their leaderships to engage with their governments and law enforcement agencies in a sustained and effective manner
 - publicise these efforts within their communities, and to the wider world.
-
-

5. Mission Statement for the Working Group on the Guise of Delegitimization and Anti-Zionism

Rationale

The effort to delegitimize Israel has been ongoing since the rebirth of the state. In fact, the Arab boycott began even before Israel became independent. The campaign gained momentum and has become more dangerous since the Durban Conference which laid out a strategy promoting “a policy of complete and total isolation of Israel . . . the imposition of mandatory and comprehensive sanctions and embargoes, the full cessation of all links (diplomatic, economic, social, aid, military cooperation and training) between all states and Israel.” We now see the campaign manifesting itself in a variety of ways, including efforts to mobilize boycotts of Israeli universities, to discourage artists, musicians and others from the world of culture from visiting and performing in Israel, to prevent sporting events and Israeli participation in international competitions, to convince universities, trade unions, churches and others to divest from Israeli companies and/or domestic companies doing business with Israel, and to isolate Israel in international forums.

Goals

This task force aims to break down the various types of delegitimization campaigns, to identify existing resources combatting them, to show the link between anti-Semitism and delegitimization of Israel, to determine where overlaps occur and efforts can be merged, and what new legal, political, economic and other strategies can be employed to preempt and defeat these campaigns. For example: changing the law to sentence boycott activists. We also want to share our information concerning the global boycott campaign, to improve communication and intelligence about the delegitimizers to better anticipate their activities so help can be provided to those who need assistance. Besides defensive measures, our goal is to identify offensive steps that can be taken to set the agenda with regard to discussions about Israel, to help create a more positive image of Israel and to educate the majority of people who are ill-informed or ignorant about Israel and can potentially become friends.

Expectations

Our expectations are that we will not spend time restating problems that we already know exist and, instead, participants will come with very specific ideas and cases for how we can work together to solve them. Ideally, we will divide the labor among individuals and groups with specialties in the various areas targeted by the delegitimizers rather than everyone try to do everything. For example, those with ties to labor could work with unions; those with expertise in international relations could work with members of UN agencies; those involved

in media and PR could focus on journalists and messaging; those concerned with legal issues could work with lawyers-judges and MP's, and those familiar with campus issues could work with students, faculty and other stakeholders.

6. Mission Statement of the Working Group on Antisemitism in the Internet and in the Media

Rationale

The internet has made the world smaller place. It connects us across national boundaries and empowers individuals and communities. Without safeguards, that power can be abused by racist hate groups, terrorists, bullies and those ignorant of the damage their actions cause to people and communities. The impact of online antisemitism is not limited to the internet. Online hate can lead to real world hate crimes, it can dramatically decrease the sense of safety in Jewish communities, and it can exclude Jews from both online and real world society.

The Internet facilitates the spread of hate across national borders and enables greater coordination between hate groups. Due to 'Antisemitism 2.0', the values of society are under threat as antisemitism spreads in social media, with little response from platform providers, and creates social acceptability where antisemitism as no more than an alternative opinion. Search engines like Google, Yahoo, and Bing are the internet's gatekeepers and often promote hate sites and their conspiracy theories ahead of legitimate information. A major social media Platform provider declared Holocaust denial would not be regarded as hate. Blogs are used for impromptu campaigns against the Jewish State, sometimes based on classic antisemitic canards. A classic blood libel in a Swedish newspaper spread around the world through the Internet. The "below the line" comments on online newspapers can be virulently antisemitic without sufficient moderation, and many media outlets continue to apply a double standard to the Jewish State.

In the few years since the advent of YouTube, Wikipedia, Facebook, Twitter and other Web 2.0 technologies, we have seen a sudden and rapidly increasing wave of antisemitic content. Videos and images in the form of racist 'memes' spread rapidly across national borders, and law enforcement struggles to cope with the international nature of the problem. While there have been some successes in stopping or blocking the spread of internet antisemitism, we face an uphill battle in a constantly changing online environment.

The purpose of this working group is to discuss the spread, and facilitation of the spread, of antisemitism through the internet and the specific steps needed to mitigate this growing threat. The working group will also consider the role the media plays in both combating and promoting antisemitism, both online and through traditional mainstream media channels.

Goals

The Global Forum recognizes the urgent need to combat antisemitism online and in the media. This working group will address and discuss what is being done, and what needs to be done, to mitigate or prevent the spread of antisemitism through the internet and the media. We aims to develop an appreciation of the extent of the problem, share best practices and analysis the

techniques available to combat the spread of antisemitism through the internet and the media.

Expectations

The working group last convened as an expert forum in 2011, and the work of that conference will be shared with participants as a starting point for our deliberations. Participants are invited to submit abstracts describing a particular project or response they, or organizations they represent, have undertaken to combat online antisemitism. These will be compiled as a survey of global activities. A selection of the participants will be invited to present to the working group. We also invite descriptions of the challenges ahead, and potential approaches. These will be discussed in the working group and presented to the forum as recommendations. The expectation is that the working group will propose a model or blueprint for future action to combat hate on the internet and the media.

7. Working Group on Law, Legislation and Enforcement in Combating Antisemitism

Rationale

The working group will raise problems and offer possible solutions in legislating for the prohibition of antisemitism in Europe and the United States. Antisemitic actions and expressions are generally regulated as subcategories of the prohibitions on (1) non-discrimination, (2) crimes motivated by religious or racial hatred ("hate crimes" or aggravating circumstances) and (3) incitement to hatred ("hate-speech"). Further to the European Union Framework Decision of 2008 on combating racism and xenophobia, all Member States were required to amend their laws and add prohibitions on hate crimes, incitement to hatred, and Holocaust and genocide denial. Most countries complied, to varying degrees. During 2013 the EU Justice Department is scheduled to release a report on the implementation status of the Framework Decision among the Member States.

Holocaust denial is prosecuted in some European countries under the general incitement to hatred clause, while others have enacted specific laws on Holocaust denial. Both the incitement to hatred and Holocaust denial clauses require that the speech must reach a certain threshold in order to be deemed prohibited. Within this wide spectrum, Germany at one end requires the least minimal threshold of prohibiting speech that violates the dignity of victims, while, at the other end, other countries only prohibit speech that is likely to cause violence. (An interesting example is Spain: in 2007 the Constitutional Court ruled that "simple" Holocaust denial was protected under the Spanish Constitution's freedom of expression, and the prohibition was deemed unconstitutional. In January 2013 the cancelled clause was redrafted, ostensibly to withstand free speech constraints, and is scheduled to enter into force in 2014. A ruling of the Spanish Supreme Court in 2011 has further exemplified Spain's position on the hate-speech/freedom of expression debate by permitting the dissemination of neo-Nazi propaganda, unless it is used to incite violence or danger.)

The United States, famous for its staunch protection of the first amendment, requires the highest standard yet, and prohibits only "fighting words" or speech that causes an imminent danger of violence. These varying degrees of prohibitions (and punishments) among the

countries constitute a platform for internet users to easily circumvent national prohibitions by using U.S. servers for their websites. It has, in essence, turned the US to an internet haven for hate mongers and Holocaust deniers. The working group will discuss these and other legal aspects of combating Antisemitic expressions on the internet.

The working group will also discuss Antisemitism in U.S. and U.K. campuses. Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 prohibits discrimination at federally funded programs and activities. While the Education's Office for Civil Rights has interpreted this as also applying to discrimination against Jewish students, the definition of antisemitic conduct is ambiguous. Most notably, anti-Israel demonstrations on campuses, using classic antisemitic tropes (now targeting Israelis, "Zionists", instead of or in addition to "Jews"), have not been banned and create a hostile atmosphere for Jewish students. The main challenge in this respect is to clearly define when speech may be categorized as criticism of Israel (and thus within the scope of academic freedom), and when it includes generalized attacks on Jews (and thus antisemitic).

In this context the working group will discuss the feasibility of implementing the European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights' Working Definition of Antisemitism in university campuses. It should be noted that the U.S. State Department and the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights have endorsed the Working Definition, as well as the California Assembly in a 2012 resolution. The Ottawa Protocol on Combating Antisemitism has also called for universities and colleges to adopt the Working Definition. It should be noted, however, that its adoption is a contentious issue, currently discussed in a University and College Union (UCU) tribunal trial in the U.K. During the trial the UCU has been accused of institutional antisemitism, in breach of the UK Equality Act of 2010; evidence of this is, among other things, its resolution to boycott Israeli academia and refusal to adopt the Working Definition.

Goals

The working group aims to:

- Discuss and analyze the above mentioned problem areas in US and Europe law, as well as recent rulings.
- Raise possible solutions, including:
 - Discuss and offer best practices, such as: Germany and France, in which both the initiator of the content and the internet service providers are liable; Hungary's appeals court recently convicted the first Holocaust denier and ordered him to visit Auschwitz memorial site or Yad Vashem. Is this educational approach a viable solution, especially within the context of the freedom of expression debate?
 - Discuss possible amendment of laws to prevent creating internet havens in the US;
 - Recommend the adoption of the Working definition within university campuses and law enforcement agencies.
- Formulate an action plan based on the group's discussion and recommendations.

Expectations

The working group will formulate an action plan for advocating necessary amendments in the legislative efforts to combat antisemitism; namely, calling for clear cut, enforceable definitions of what constitutes antisemitism and Holocaust denial.

8. Mission Statement of the Working Group on Interfaith Dialogue as an instrument to mitigate Antisemitism

CAN RELIGIOUS INTERFAITH DIALOGUE MITIGATE ANTI-SEMITISM

Rationale

The multilateral interfaith dialogue, within the framework of numerous local, national or international meetings, has enabled for many years different religious authorities to discuss their common values, declare their common respect for the divine words and messages of peace and human fraternity, and strive to let those common values prevail on different religious and sometimes opposite customs and narratives which often divide believers.

Solemn declarations are regularly issued after such encounters, but in general the final conclusions and recommendations remain restricted to declarations against intolerance, without any specific mention of anti-Semitism.

Thus, the subject of anti-Semitism is only raised in the context of bilateral organizations favouring closer links and better understanding between Jews and other faiths.

Regarding this issue, we can say that in the wake of the Shoah, most **Christian** churches have undergone a process of repentance and rethought their teachings about Jews and Judaism.

The **Catholic** church, in 1965, adopted the famous *Nostra Aetate* declaration at the Second Vatican Council; in 1967, its earlier calls for the internationalization of Jerusalem became a request for “international guarantees of freedom of access for the holy places; in 1993, the diplomatic recognition of the State of Israel was official, leading later Popes John Paul II and Benedict XVI to visit Israel.

Protestant churches have issued similar statements on their co-responsibility and guilt for the Shoah, recognizing the abiding election of the Jewish people, the Jewish roots of the Christian faith, the irreconcilability of Christian faith with anti-Semitism and all forms of hatred for Jews, even though if, in Germany particularly, the Protestant church is, in fact, more ambiguous. The central role of the State of Israel for Judaism has nevertheless been recognized, along with wishes for a just and peaceful resolution of the Middle East conflict.

The more complex **Christian Orthodox**-Jewish relations mix clear declarations of indignation of the Shoah crimes and expressions of solidarity towards the Jewish people, and still anti-Semitic theological, social and political declarations.

Concerning **Jewish-Hindu** dialogue, the recent years have led to some official high level encounters concluding that both the Hindu and Jewish traditions affirm the sanctity of life and aspire for a society in which all live in peace and harmony with one another. Accordingly they condemn all acts of violence in the name of any religion or against any religion.

Coming to **Muslim-Jewish** bilateral relations and Islamic anti-Semitism, which is today the most crucial problem, a few initiatives in European, North American and Israeli organizations have managed to install some bilateral dialogue leading Muslim clerics to denounce anti-Semitism and reject holocaust denial. Recalling the mention by the Prophet Mohammed regarding the Jews as the People of the Book who must be respected, and putting in sight the common Jewish and Muslim biblical prophets, this Jewish-Muslim dialogue has been, in fact, largely overshadowed by hate speeches based on Islamic sources depicting Jews as pigs and apes who have to be destroyed. When this dialogue still exists, it varies according to the religious Jewish liberal or orthodox tendencies as well as to the Shiite or Sunnite conservative

or moderate currents, invariably linked to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict and developments, as well as to the diverse internal and national political situations.

Even in Western countries like France, Belgium, or England, where some Jewish-Muslim dialogue exists, anti-Jewish terrorism perpetrated by Muslims “in the name of Allah”, has never been unequivocally denounced by Muslim authorities in those countries.

In Iran and Arab countries, the situation is clearly different: anti-Semitic and not only anti-Zionist declarations issued by Muslim clerics are overwhelmingly the rule in mosques, religious TV programmes and on the internet, holocaust denial being the *doxa* except for Turkey, “Palestine”, and some North African countries. It is clear that the ongoing Arab-Israeli conflict has made all tentative of interfaith dialogue extremely complicated.

From the above remarks, one can infer that multilateral interfaith experiences, in its present form, has not been an effective tool in mitigating anti-Semitism whereas bilateral interfaith work has been more productive in this regard.

To conclude quickly, what made the difference concerning anti-Semitism in the Christian world was the important Nostrae Aetate declaration, with its world consequences in the catholic teaching and official texts, but no such fatwa has ever been issued by eminent Muslim leaders. Regarding the other faiths, not speaking of the European neo Nazi Christian old anti-Semitism, it remains difficult to separate anti-Semitism from anti-Zionism. In addition, the growing strong European anti-Muslim racism and xenophobia in Europe renders our topic even more difficult.

Goals

If bilateral interfaith experiences are considered by participants to be a better way to mitigate anti-Semitism, sharing best practices in order to develop possible new ways should be the purpose of this working group. The need to educate young theologians about what Jews and Judaism, on a reciprocal basis, should be experimented. High level bilateral meetings of religious authorities should be tried: the essential point of all those possible experiments is that they have to be sustainable projects with the constitution of a small task force able to follow up the work.

Expectations

Participants are invited to submit abstracts describing a particular project or response they, or organizations they represent, have undertaken to combat anti-Semitism. These will be compiled as a survey of global activities. A selection of the participants will be invited to present their projects to the working group. We also invite them to suggest guidelines to the working group who will propose a working plan with objectives, agenda, and criteria of assessing the implementation of some of the suggested projects.

9. Mission Statement of the Working Group on Maintaining Continuance of Diaspora Jewish Life

Rationale

Against the background of demographic shifts including the mass migration of non-European populations to Europe, the recent attempt to restrict rights to normative Jewish practice in Europe could be viewed as the latest juridical/political aspect of a larger identity backlash against multi-cultural policies. While apparently directed mainly against Muslims, this new and vigorous opposition to particularist religious practices affects the status of Judaism, and may, in the long term, pose a serious challenge to the future thriving of European Jewish communities and beyond.

- The attempt to ban circumcision in Germany (rule adopted by the Bundestag on December 10, 2012 but 75% of Germans oppose it resting on human rights and medical claims),
- The attempt to ban Shechita in Holland (already effective in Switzerland, Sweden, Norway and Iceland – resting on animal rights claims),
- The proposed abolition of eternal cemeteries (in Switzerland and Belgium, resting on a claim of environmental interest),
- The rejection of requests for accommodation of public examinations in light of the Jewish calendar (in France and Switzerland, resting on a claim of separation between Church and State),
- The rejection of requests for non-electric entry access in private condominiums (in France, resting on security claims),
- The reconsideration of the traditional massive public funding of Jewish cultural institutions and the increasing pressure on Jewish day schools, resting on ethnic non-discrimination claims), and more.

It is worthwhile to consider whether current approaches and methodology utilized by Jewish communities, winning short-term votes and attaining back-door agreements but not always engaging with the wider developments in public opinion will protect Jewish practices over the long-term. There is no certainty that answers and institutions that have been effective in the past will adequately fit tomorrow's challenges.

Goals

Assess existing national and trans-European communal mechanisms and launch an “out-of-the-box” process to develop a bold vision able to meet future developments as they emerge. As numbers and political sway diminish within some European Jewish communities, coordination with non-European Jewish actors could be considered in order to elaborate a global coordination mechanism and propose a comprehensive and professional response.

Expectations

1. Learn from the Jewish people response to the attempts to ban ritual slaughter in Holland and circumcision in Germany.
2. Map and assess the coming attempts to Jewish rituals and Jewish life in Europe.
3. Discuss some of the critical policy dilemmas
4. Discuss models of pan-European and international coordination mechanisms.

Open issues and policy dilemmas

Political

- Should Israel be involved and/or lead in these Diaspora affairs?
- Should Israeli top-level politicians address this issue with their European counterparts?
- Should American Jewry lobby within the US political establishment or directly intervene at the local political European level?
- Is there a need for greater coordination internationally to aid local communities often lacking political know-how and financial resources? Is there room for Jewish communities to coordinate collective action with the much more numerous Muslim communities?
- What are likely to be the costs and benefits of such a strategy?

Communal

- What could be the cumulative effects of what we call a growing de-legitimization of the Jewish religion on the core Jewish population and on disaffiliated Jewish families? What will be the symbolic and economic effects on communal life?
- Should we encourage protest and resistance, or laying low?
- Should they seek the intervention of international and Israeli actors and how would that impact the community's status?
- Should Jews claim that Judaism and liberalism share the same basic universal values or should they seek support from within more conservative circles?
- Should Jewish rights be afforded in a derogatory fashion as separate ethnic communities or within the pure law itself as regular citizens?

Action items

- Should we develop a Jewish legal mechanism to confront existing and expectable new claims against Jewish practice?
 - Should we build coalitions with the numerous opponents of state intrusion in religious life, and should we refuse such state interference into religious affairs?
-
-

10. Mission Statement of the Working Group on Antisemitism on Campus and Education for Tolerance and Mutual Respect

Context: College campuses, as well as the academic and intellectual environment have become increasingly hostile to Jewish students and scholars. In fact, it is this context that has become the frontline of the propaganda war against Israel and the Jewish people. Israel is increasingly delegitimized and demonized on campus and also within more course curriculum, exposing Jewish students and intellectuals to harassment, intimidation, which threatens, at times, grade advancement and career development.

The impact of funding, and potential funding, from Gulf states to academic institutions in the West, comprises an element to this issue – which has not been well documented. This campaign has successfully exploited the language of human rights, including contemporary post-modernist notions, which cloak its hateful and illiberal message. This process is also adopting an increasingly classic antisemitic discourse, under the guise of anti-Zionism and

Israel bashing. The use of traditional antisemitic imagery and comparisons between Israel and Apartheid or Nazi Germany, mixed with post-colonial mythologies, are entering into mainstream discourse, even within respected academic institutions throughout Europe, North America and beyond. The problem of Islamic radicalization on campuses possesses another related challenge. Some western countries experience these processes differently; the UK is a key center of radicalization, recruitment and extremism. In France and Belgium, for example, there is a convergence between brown, green and red ideologies. In the United States its free market system can make it more susceptible to financial donations an effective tool to garner support and influence.

Biased scholarship and an anti-Israel Middle East departments on campuses internationally develop curriculum disconnected from historical reality, which encourages the delegitimatization of the Jewish State, preparing a generational bias against Israel. The 2011 One State Conference at Harvard University is a reflection of the hostile ideology that is increasingly permeating campuses. These developments have been generally tolerated by university leadership and by civil society.

While some organizations monitor academic activity, most pro-Israel organizations, *including diplomatic representatives*, have countered the negative campaign against Israel with a strategy of positive messaging about Israel, unrelated to the conflict. It is reasoned that positive images of Israel will successfully neutralize the negative. Therefore, many organizations ignore events such as "Israel Apartheid Week" so as not to draw further attention to it. There is no systemic analysis of funding (follow the money) and there is no analysis of curriculum development to counter the attacks that are rooted in antisemitism and deligitimisation.

A new effective strategy to confront the demonization of Israel is required and would allow greater control over the message and put the focus on Israel's detractors, rather than on Israel itself. While the language of human rights has been co-opted as a weapon against Israel, it is henceforth through the language of human rights that this campaign can be effectively defeated, but as prosecutors not as victims demanding justice. It is important to develop a strong and declarative confidence in the Zionist position.

Research is necessary to discern the group or groups that may be funding, directing, influencing and/or manipulating anti-Israel agitation and to reveal the forces behind this anti-Israel academic campaign, which is part of the psychological war against Israel. It is also important to support critical studies of Palestinian society, and other Middle Eastern societies, its politics and culture for developing a new symbolical weapon in this struggle. The relations and interests of international relations and trade also need to be assessed. These matters require systemic interdisciplinary scholarly analysis, as well as subsequent policy development and implementation. In doing so and within this context, the Working Group will put forth research projects and policy development initiatives to be carried out in the future by members of the Working Group.

Inter-Parliamentary Coalition for Combating Antisemitism (ICCA) Task Force 30th May - Panel on Internet Hate: Strategies and Best Practices for Combating Online Hate

Executive Summary

In 2010, the Inter-Parliamentary Coalition for Combating Antisemitism established a Task Force on Internet Hate, and appointed as co-chairs MK Yuli-Yoel Edelstein, Israel's Minister of Information and Diaspora, and Christopher Wolf, an American Internet lawyer. The Task Force met in the UK Houses of Parliament for a hearing on the nature and scope of Internet hate, and in 2012, at Stanford University with representatives of the Internet industry. Following that meeting, the Task Force appointed ADL to convene the Anti-Cyberhate Working Group to build best practices for understanding, reporting upon and responding to Internet hate. The group includes representatives from the major internet platforms, academics and industry experts. This session will include a report of the task force's findings and recommendations for establishing effective strategies to combat internet hate, including the importance of dialogue with the industry.

Panel Moderator: Mr. Christopher Wolf, ICCA Co-Chair

Panelists: Opening – Mrs. Fiamma Nirenstein

John Mann, MP British Parliament

Mr. Robert Trestan, ADL

Professor Jeffrey Rosen, The George Washington University/The New Republic