

# THE UNITED NATIONS AND ANTI-SEMITISM

---

*2004-2007 Report Card*

UN  Watch

Presented at Yale University  
November 1, 2007

# THE UNITED NATIONS AND ANTI-SEMITISM

---

*2004-2007 Report Card*

UN  Watch

---

Presented at Yale University  
November 1, 2007

---

*“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.”*

---

**UN Secretary-General Kofi Annan's 2004 Call to Action on Anti-Semitism**  
Seminar on Anti-Semitism, UN Headquarters, New York, June 21, 2004

---

Friends, Ladies and Gentlemen,  
Welcome to United Nations Headquarters.

In holding this series of seminars, the United Nations is true to one of the most sacred purposes of the world's peoples in whose name the Organization was founded: "to practice tolerance and live together in peace with one another as good neighbors."

No Muslim, no Jew, no Christian, no Hindu, no Buddhist—no one who is true to the principles of any of the world's faiths, no one who claims a cultural, national or religious identity based on values such as truth, decency and justice—can be neutral in the fight against intolerance.

Clearly, our success in this struggle depends on the effort we make to educate ourselves and our children. Intolerance can be unlearned. Tolerance and mutual respect have to be learned.

Future seminars will deal with other specific groups against whom intolerance is directed in many parts of the world, notably Muslims and migrants—groups which overlap, but each of which, sadly, encounters prejudice in its own right.

Yet anti-Semitism is certainly a good place to start because, throughout history, it has been a unique manifestation of hatred, intolerance and persecution. Anti-Semitism has flourished even in communities where Jews have never lived, and it has been a harbinger of discrimination against others. The rise of anti-Semitism anywhere is a threat to people everywhere. Thus, in fighting anti-Semitism we fight for the future of all humanity.

The Shoah, or Holocaust was the epitome of this evil. Germany in the 1930s was a modern society, at the cutting edge of human technical advance and cultural achievement. Yet the Nazi regime that took power set out to exterminate Jews from the face of the earth.

We know—and yet we still cannot really comprehend—that six million innocent Jewish men, women and children were murdered, just because they were Jews. That is a crime against humanity which defies imagination.

The name "United Nations" was coined to describe the alliance fighting to end that barbarous regime, and our Organization came into being when the world had just learned the full horror of the concentration and extermination camps. It is therefore rightly said that 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.

Worldwide revulsion at this terrible genocide was the driving force behind the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. As the Preamble to the Declaration says, "disregard and contempt for human rights have resulted in barbarous

acts which have outraged the conscience of mankind." And it was no coincidence that, on the day before it adopted the Declaration in 1948, the General Assembly had adopted the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide.

It is hard to believe that, 60 years after the tragedy of the Holocaust, anti-Semitism is once again rearing its head. But it is clear that we are witnessing an alarming resurgence of this phenomenon in new forms and manifestations. This time, the world must not, cannot be silent.

We owe it to ourselves, as well as to our Jewish brothers and sisters, to stand firmly against the particular tide of hatred that anti-Semitism represents. And that means we must be prepared to examine the nature of today's manifestations of anti-Semitism more closely, which is the purpose of your seminar.

Let us acknowledge that the United Nations' record on anti-Semitism has at times fallen short of our ideals. The General Assembly resolution of 1975, equating Zionism with racism, was an especially unfortunate decision. I am glad that it has since been rescinded.

But there remains a need for constant vigilance. So let us actively and uncompromisingly refute those who seek to deny the fact of the Holocaust or its uniqueness, or who continue to spread lies and vile stereotypes about Jews and Judaism.

When we seek justice for the Palestinians—as we must—let us firmly disavow anyone who tries to use that cause to incite hatred against Jews, in Israel or elsewhere.

The human rights machinery of the United Nations has been mobilized in the battle against anti-Semitism, and this must continue. I urge the special rapporteurs on religious freedom and on contemporary racism, working with the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights (which has recently strengthened its anti-discrimination unit), to actively explore ways of combating anti-Semitism more effectively in the future. All parts of the Secretariat should be vigilant. And of course—as always—we look to our friends in civil society to keep us up to the mark. It is very good to see so many non-governmental organizations represented here today.

My friends, next January it will be sixty years since the first of the death camps were liberated by advancing Soviet forces. There could be no more fitting time for member states to take action on the necessity of combating anti-Semitism in all its forms—action comparable, perhaps, to the resolutions they adopted on apartheid in the past, or the admirable recent resolution of the Commission on Human Rights, which asked

---

the Special Rapporteur on contemporary forms of racism to examine the situation of Muslim and Arab peoples in various parts of the world, with special reference to physical assaults and attacks against their places of worship, cultural centers, businesses and properties. Are not Jews entitled to the same degree of concern and protection?

Member states could follow the excellent lead of the Berlin Declaration, recently issued by the Chairman of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe.

Let me remind you that the Declaration condemned without reserve all manifestations of anti-Semitism, and all other acts of intolerance, incitement, harassment, or violence against persons or communities based on ethnic origin or religious belief, wherever they occur.

The Declaration also condemned all attacks motivated by anti-Semitism or by any other forms of religious or racial hatred or intolerance, including attacks against synagogues and other religious places, sites and shrines.

And it declared unambiguously that international developments or political issues, including those in Israel or elsewhere in the Middle East, never justify anti-Semitism.

The Berlin Declaration proclaimed those principles, which I hope the broader membership of the United Nations will adopt. Even more important, it must make sure these principles are put into practice, and carefully monitor its own progress in doing so. The fight against anti-Semitism must be our fight. And Jews everywhere must feel that the United Nations is their home too.

We must make this vision a reality while we still have survivors of the Holocaust amongst us—like my dear friend Elie Wiesel, with whom I have the great honor of sharing this platform. We owe them no less.

Let me conclude by quoting something Elie wrote, which could make a wonderful mission statement for this series on “Unlearning Intolerance”:

There is divine beauty in learning, just as there is human beauty in tolerance. To learn means to accept the postulate that life did not begin at my birth. Others have been here before me, and I walk in their footsteps. The books I have read were composed by generations of fathers and sons, mothers and daughters, teachers and disciples. I am the sum total of their experiences, their quests. And so are you.

Elie, thank you for that, and for so much else that you have given us. Let me now yield you the floor.

---

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

---

Executive Summary ..... 7

Introduction ..... 9

## PART ONE:

### ASSESSING UN ACTIONS AGAINST ANTI-SEMITISM

Global Rise in Anti-Semitism..... 13

Resolutions on Anti-Semitism..... 13

Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon ..... 17

Human Rights Machinery ..... 17

High Commissioner for Human Rights Louise Arbour .... 18

Expert on Racism Doudou Diène ..... 23

Expert on Freedom of Religion Asma Jahangir ..... 26

Holocaust Remembrance and Education ..... 28

General Assembly Special Session..... 29

General Assembly Resolution for Annual Remembrance.. 30

Holocaust and the UN Outreach Program ..... 31

Combating Holocaust Denial ..... 34

Conclusion and Recommendations ..... 51

## PART TWO:

### ASSESSING UN ACTIONS THAT FOSTER ANTI-SEMITISM

The Campaign at the UN to Redefine  
and Deny Anti-Semitism ..... 39

Demonization of Israel ..... 41

Legitimate Criticism or Illegitimate Demonization ... 41

Background: UN Infrastructure of Demonization..... 44

Examining UN Record of 2004-2007: Case Studies ... 45

General Assembly ..... 45

Human Rights Council..... 46

UN Member States ..... 47

Effect of One-Sided UN Resolutions against Israel..... 48



---

# EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

---

Anti-Semitism, in the words of former Secretary-General Annan, is a unique manifestation of hatred, intolerance and persecution that over history has been a harbinger of discrimination against other minorities. As we witness an alarming resurgence of this age-old scourge, our report measured the performance over the past three years of key UN bodies and officials in fighting anti-Semitism, according to the yardstick and call for action outlined by Mr. Annan in June 2004. Now more than ever, it is incumbent upon the UN to live up to its promise.

While progress in some areas was encouraging, our report also revealed inaction, and, worse, the aiding and abetting of anti-Semitism through an infrastructure of manifestly one-sided and irrational UN measures designed to demonize the Jewish state. In the fight against anti-Semitism, and dealing with its own past, it is clear that the UN needs to do far more.

Under the leadership of Mr. Annan, since June 2004 there were several unprecedented advances, mostly concerning remembrance of the Holocaust. These include the establishment of an annual UN day for Holocaust commemoration, the GA special session on the liberation of Auschwitz, and the creation of a UN Holocaust education program. At a minimum, these efforts serve as a counter to Holocaust denial, a pernicious form of anti-Semitism that has become a global campaign led by the government of Iran. Not accidentally, the same person proclaiming the Holocaust to be a “myth” also avows to finish the job. To their credit, key UN bodies and officials—Mr. Annan, the Security Council, the General Assembly, Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon—have publicly protested the hatred and incitement preached by President Ahmadinejad. This admirable response should become sustained, reiterated after every offense, rather than isolated.

Regrettably, some UN officials have failed to answer the call. For example, after examining the public actions of High Commissioner for Human Rights Louise Arbour, we were unable to find any noteworthy action on her part against Holocaust denial or any other form of anti-Semitism. Because Ms. Arbour is charged with overseeing the UN effort to protect human rights and fight racism, this lapse is disappointing and cause for concern.

Other officials in the UN human rights apparatus have taken several positive steps to combat anti-Semitism. Most importantly, racism expert Doudou Diène has on more than one occasion confronted the government of Iran for its anti-Semitic statements, forcing the regime to answer for its actions. However, a seminar on racism and anti-Semitism organized by Mr. Diène in 2004, which served as the basis for one of his reports on anti-Semitism, raised serious questions for relying heavily on a French author known best for opposing the fight against anti-Semitism. Citing such marginal figures contributed to occasional incoherence in Mr. Diène’s analyses, with some of his reports condemning the denial of Israel’s right to exist as a Jewish state, and others defending it as legitimate anti-Zionism.

Freedom of religion expert Asma Jahangir, whose mandate includes religious intolerance, addressed the phenomenon of anti-Semitism in France during her mission there, but on the whole has not been outspoken on this issue. A joint protest with Mr. Diène was sent to Saudi Arabia over an anti-Semitic drawing published in a state-controlled newspaper. Both experts, however, failed to recognize that this phenomenon was hardly an isolated case, but rather a pattern and practice of anti-Semitic propaganda that is prevalent throughout the region. Similarly, despite repeated requests by UN Watch and other groups and individuals, both experts have insufficiently addressed the incitement to hatred against Jews, Christians and other non-Muslims, that have been documented in children’s textbooks distributed by the governments of Egypt and Saudi Arabia.

In addition to measuring efforts at the UN to fight anti-Semitism, one must also address efforts that undermine this cause. The Islamic bloc of fifty-six states has waged a steady campaign in key UN bodies to gut anti-Semitism of its meaning, by making the absurd argument that the term also refers to hatred against Arabs and Muslims. This is a pernicious distortion of language and meaning designed to prevent the UN from coherently expressing sympathy for Jews as victims, and to create a form of immunity for Arab and Islamic states accused of fostering anti-Semitism.

---

---

Finally, the report examines the annual onslaught of one-sided UN resolutions in the General Assembly and the Human Rights Council that contribute—whether by intent or in their effect—to an atmosphere that demonizes the Jewish state and promotes hostility toward Jews as a whole. In the past year at the General Assembly, only a handful of countries were criticized, in no case by more than one resolution. Israel, by contrast, was targeted in no less than twenty-two resolutions, all of them one-sided. Worse, in 2006-07, the Human Rights Council passed one hundred percent of its condemnatory resolutions against Israel, ignoring the other 191 UN member states, including the world's worst abusers. All of this amounts to an irrational obsession by key UN bodies with singling out Israel for censure, turning the organization into Ground Zero for the international campaign to delegitimize and demonize the Jewish state.

Contrary to the argument that these resolutions are meaningless, an analysis of published speeches and articles in the Middle East demonstrates that extremist states and terrorist groups make direct use of these resolutions to justify their cause and to delegitimize Israel. In addition, the indirect effect of such resolutions throughout the world is to create the perception of Israel as an outlaw state and of Jews as criminally guilty by association. Perpetrators of anti-Semitic incidents around the world have often cited animosity towards Israel as their motive.

In conclusion, the UN since June 2004 has made progress in some areas, while other areas have seen stagnation or regression. The UN has a unique role to play in addressing the global challenge of anti-Semitism and must begin to fully live up to its promise.

---

# INTRODUCTION

---

In June 2004, the United Nations in New York held a historic gathering that for the first time addressed the matter of anti-Semitism. Secretary-General Kofi Annan, in his opening remarks, called upon civil society to keep the United Nations “up to the mark” by monitoring the organization’s vigilance in combating anti-Semitism. This report answers that call.

Examining the period beginning from Mr. Annan’s June 2004 call to action until today, we review key actions taken by a full range of UN bodies and officials, including the Security Council, the General Assembly, the Human Rights Council, the Secretary-General, the High Commissioner for Human Rights, independent experts, and other members of the Secretariat, as well as relevant member states acting within the UN.

In several instances our study finds admirable UN action against anti-Semitism. In others, we find UN actors who have fallen short—who have done little, or sometimes nothing at all, to combat anti-Semitism—and whose performance needs improvement. In still other cases, we find a series of UN actions that have actually *promoted* rather than fought anti-Semitism.

Secretary-General Annan launched this important conversation on June 21, 2004. For the first time in its history, the United Nations held a major event dedicated to combating anti-Semitism. Organized as a seminar by the UN Department of Information (DPI), Secretary-General Annan delivered opening remarks that were both candid and profound. We present them in their entirety at the beginning of this report.

Specifically, Mr. Annan appealed to two UN human rights officials, the experts on religious freedom and on racism, to take on the cause of combating anti-Semitism. Mr. Annan also made several direct calls to the member states of the UN. He suggested that the upcoming sixtieth anniversary of the liberation of Nazi death camps, which was then a year away, would be a good opportunity for UN action against anti-Semitism. He also urged member states to follow the example of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) and, inter alia, to declare “unambiguously that international developments or political issues, including those in Israel or elsewhere in the Middle East, never justify anti-Semitism.”<sup>1</sup> Experts agree that Mr. Annan played a singular role in leading the successful efforts to convene a UN special session to commemorate the liberation of Auschwitz, as well as to enshrine an annual Holocaust commemoration day at the UN.

The scope of this report is limited to the three-year period between 2004 and 2007, though it may also be considered a case study for consideration of the UN’s record as a whole.

|||||||

1 UN Press Release, “Throughout History Anti-Semitism Unique Manifestation of Hatred, Intolerance, Persecution Says Secretary-General in Remarks to Headquarters Seminar,” 21 June 2004, UN Doc. SG/SM/9375.



---

**PART ONE:  
ASSESSING UN ACTIONS  
AGAINST ANTI-SEMITISM**

---



---

# GLOBAL RISE IN ANTI-SEMITISM

---

Anti-Semitism is rising. In Geneva a synagogue is torched. In Montreal a Jewish school is firebombed. In France visibly identifiable Jews are attacked. In the Islamic world, though today largely devoid of Jews, anti-Semitic literature and cartoons are pervasive. According to the US State Department's 2005 *Report on Global Anti-Semitism*, there has been an "increasing frequency and severity of anti-Semitic incidents since the start of the 21st century."<sup>2</sup> According to Tel Aviv University's Stephen Roth Institute for the Study of Contemporary Anti-Semitism and Racism, since 1989, anti-Semitic attacks have risen sharply, reaching their highest point in sixteen years in 2006.<sup>3</sup> The year 2006 witnessed "a sharp escalation in physical, verbal and visual manifestations of anti-Semitism."<sup>4</sup> Mr. Doudou Diène, the UN's expert on racism, reported to the UN Human Rights Council on June 11, 2007, about a rise of anti-Semitism.<sup>5</sup> In short, the issue is urgent, it is global, and the UN is obliged to take action. But is it?

---

# RESOLUTIONS ON ANTI-SEMITISM

---

In this first section we examine UN resolutions adopted after Mr. Annan's June 2004 call to action that expressly mentioned anti-Semitism.<sup>6</sup>

UN resolutions count. As the late U.S. Ambassador Jeane Kirkpatrick wrote, they define "world opinion" on major issues.<sup>7</sup> The General Assembly (GA) is the main deliberative body of the UN, representing all 192 member states. Although its resolutions on non-budgetary issues can be considered non-binding—the UN Charter contemplated a GA that would "make recommendations" to the Security Council and member states, or "initiate studies"—it is often regarded as the voice of the UN. Another UN body, the Human Rights Council (successor to the Commission on Human Rights), is considered the primary intergovernmental policymaking body for human rights issues, and is the UN agency principally responsible for combating racism. The Council is, in theory at least, mandated to protect human rights and fundamental freedoms, address violations, and make recommendations. It has an overall responsibility to coordinate human rights within the United Nations system. Both the GA and the Human Rights Council, whatever their deficiencies, are influential on the global stage, with their decisions cited throughout the world.

Referencing anti-Semitism in resolutions by these bodies is, accordingly, important. When the Islamic-dominated Commission on Human Rights instructed UN racism expert Doudou Diène to investigate Islamophobia only, he justified his additional consideration of anti-Semitism by citing not only Kofi Annan's call to action, but also a GA Resolution that had referenced anti-Semitism as well as Christianophobia.<sup>8</sup> As discussed below, Diène's reporting on anti-Semitism proved significant when he forced Iran to answer for its leader's Holocaust denial and incitement to destroy Israel.

|||||||

|||||||

2 United States Department of State, Bureau of Democracy, Human Rights, and Labor, *Report on Global Anti-Semitism*, January 5, 2005, at <http://www.state.gov/g/drl/rls/40258.htm>.

3 Tel Aviv University Stephen Roth Institute for the study of Contemporary Anti-Semitism and Racism, *Statistics*, at <http://www.tau.ac.il/Anti-Semitism/statistics/statistics.htm>.

4 Tel Aviv University, Stephen Roth Institute for the Study of Contemporary Anti-Semitism and Racism, *Anti-Semitism Worldwide 2006 General Analysis* (2006).

5 Press Release, UN Office of High Commissioner for Human Rights, June 11, 2007.

6 Further in the report we assess other resolutions, such as the General Assembly's resolutions on Holocaust remembrance, and the problematic record of both the General Assembly and the Human Rights Council concerning their astonishing amount of one-sided resolutions that, taken together, contribute to the demonization of Israel.

7 "Since there are no other arenas in which all the countries of the world express their opinion on policy, the decisions of UN bodies are widely taken as the most valid expression of 'world opinion.'" Amb. J. Kirkpatrick, U.S. Dept. of State, *Report to Congress on Voting Practices in the United Nations* 3 (20 May 1985).

8 He cited 58/160 from 2003, the annual GA resolution on racism and the Durban Declaration, which is discussed more fully below. See UN Doc. E/CN.4/2005/19, report by Doudou Diène dated 23 December 2004.

**MEASURING IMPROVEMENT  
SINCE JUNE 2004**

Did UN resolutions improve their track record on anti-Semitism after Annan’s June 2004 call to action? The record is mixed.

One hard-won advance came in November 2004, when the GA for the first time condemned anti-Semitism in its annual resolution on religious intolerance.<sup>9</sup> Doing so was far from easy. The year before, Ireland, the traditional sponsor of this annual resolution, rebuffed pressure to include anti-Semitism—which it feared would jeopardize consensus support—by promising to introduce a separate, stand-alone resolution on the subject. After Arab and Islamic opposition, however, this went nowhere.<sup>10</sup>

In the year 2004, following the OSCE’s consequential Berlin Declaration against anti-Semitism in April, and Annan’s June session, there was a new push for a stand-alone UN resolution. Expected German leadership on this issue was stymied by reported threats from the Arab and Islamic states to retaliate against Germany’s hopes for a permanent seat on the Security Council.<sup>11</sup> The fallback effort was to mention anti-Semitism in the religious intolerance resolution. Hopes that the EU would ensure reference to the Berlin Declaration—which importantly opposed anti-Semitism connected to the Jewish state—were also rejected by the EU in face of Arab and Islamic opposition.<sup>12</sup>

In the end, despite determined efforts by Arab and Islamic states within the UN, the resolution successfully included a reference to anti-Semitism, recognizing with deep concern “the overall rise in instances of intolerance and violence directed against members of many religions and other communities in various parts of the world, including cases motivated by Islamophobia, anti-Semitism and Christianophobia.” (Islamophobia, it is interesting to note, was taken out of alphabetical order and placed first.)

The drama saw a series of maneuvers by the Islamic bloc to prevent or change the reference to anti-Semitism. Its attempt to amend the text was defeated by a vote of 85 votes to 45, with 29 abstentions.<sup>13</sup> Then there was a vote to eliminate the reference entirely, which was defeated 99 to 33, with 21 abstentions.<sup>14</sup> The thirty-three nations who opposed mentioning anti-Semitism were: Algeria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Brunei Darussalam, Comoros, Djibouti, Egypt, Gambia, Guinea, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Kuwait, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Morocco, Niger, Oman, Pakistan, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Somalia, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Turkmenistan, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, Yemen, and Zimbabwe.<sup>15</sup>

The Israeli representative was “saddened at the efforts of several States to remove the condemnation of anti-Semitism from the resolution ... Despite the flimsy pretexts that certain States had offered, their motives for seeking to amend paragraph 9 were as transparent as they were repulsive. Their attempt was the strongest evidence of the need for strong condemnation of anti-Semitism.”<sup>16</sup>

|||||||

9 Resolution entitled “Elimination of all forms of intolerance and discrimination based on religion or belief,” 59/199 of 2004.

10 According to Professor Anne Bayefsky, “Israel agreed to drop efforts to include ‘anti-Semitism’ in the religious intolerance resolution in exchange for a promise from Ireland to introduce a new resolution specifically on anti-Semitism. But after the General Assembly’s Third Committee adopted the resolution on religious intolerance minus any reference to anti-Semitism, Ireland refused to carry out its side of the bargain.” A. Bayefsky, “The UN’s Dirty Little Secret,” *Wall Street Journal*, Dec. 8, 2003. Other observers, however, do not fault Ireland for its role in this episode.

11 A. Bayefsky, “Fatal Failure,” *National Review Online*, November 30, 2004.

12 *Ibid.*

|||||||

13 Summary record, 22 November 2004, UN Doc. A/C.3/59/SR.50.

14 *Ibid.*

15 *Ibid.*

16 *Ibid.*

Apart from the Arab and Islamic countries' general opposition on this issue, it is interesting to note that during the debates they invoked the specific argument that anti-Semitism is only racial and not religious, and that it therefore did not belong in this particular text.<sup>17</sup> The rationale relates to the fallacious and absurd claim that because Arabs are "Semites" they are themselves victims of anti-Semitism (as are Muslims, too, by some leap), and therefore they oppose anti-Semitism being represented as connected to members of the Jewish faith. The strategic and psychological motives underlying this oft-repeated claim—to shield against accusations of state-sanctioned anti-Semitism in several of these countries—are treated in a separate section further below.

All in all, the inclusion of anti-Semitism in the GA's religious intolerance resolution marked a new achievement, maintained in successive iterations of the resolution in 2005 and 2006.<sup>18</sup> The 2007 text, as this report goes to press, has not yet been presented.

In 2004, and in the years since, anti-Semitism was also mentioned in a GA resolution on racism and implementation of the 2001 Durban Declaration.<sup>19</sup> This maintained the same situation as before 2003 and therefore did not mark any improvement. Because of numerous objectionable aspects connected to the Durban Declaration and the 2001 conference as a whole—Israel was the only country singled out for opprobrium—both Israel and the U.S. have opposed this resolution, even though it happens to also include a mention of anti-Semitism.

|||||

17 *Ibid.*

18 GA Resolutions 60/166 of 2005 and 61/161 of 2006.

19 The resolution on "Global efforts for the total elimination of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance and the comprehensive implementation of and follow-up to the Durban Declaration and Programme of Action Resolutions" was adopted in A/RES/59/177 of 2004, A/RES/60/144 of 2005 and A/RES/61/149 of 2006. The 2006 version, for example, "recognizes with deep concern the increase in anti-Semitism, Christianophobia and Islamophobia in various parts of the world, as well as the emergence of racial and violent movements based on racism and discriminatory ideas directed against Arab, Christian, Jewish and Arab communities, as well all religious communities, communities of people of African descent, communities of people of Asian descent, communities of indigenous people and other communities."

As for the Commission on Human Rights, the situation in 2005 remained the same as the year before. Subsequently, however, under the new Human Rights Council, things became worse.

The first meeting of the Commission following Mr. Annan's call to action was its 61<sup>st</sup> session, held in March 2005. Three resolutions mentioned anti-Semitism: one on religious intolerance,<sup>20</sup> one on racism,<sup>21</sup> and one on the incompatibility between democracy and racism.<sup>22</sup> Each mention was essentially the same as had occurred the year before, and therefore there was no noticeable improvement following the June 2004 call to action.<sup>23</sup>

Since the Commission was recreated as the new Human Rights Council in June 2006, no resolution has referenced anti-Semitism. The previous annual Commission resolutions that had referenced Islamophobia, anti-Semitism and Christianophobia dropped references to all three.<sup>24</sup> However, there is currently a draft resolution on religious intolerance pending before the Council that would return to the previous practice of referencing anti-Semitism together with the other two phobias.<sup>25</sup>

|||||

20 Resolution E/CN.4/2005/40 entitled "Civil and Political Rights: Elimination of All Forms of Intolerance and of Discrimination Based on Religion or Belief." It "*Recognize[d] with deep concern* the overall rise in instances of intolerance and violence directed against members of many religious communities in various parts of the world, including cases motivated by Islamophobia, anti-Semitism and Christianophobia." Anti-Semitism was mentioned in 2003, 2004 and 2005.

21 Resolution E/CN.4/2005/64 entitled "World Conference against Racism, Racial Discrimination, Xenophobia and Related Intolerance and the comprehensive implementation of and follow-up to the Durban Declaration and Programme of Action." Anti-Semitism was mentioned in 2004 and 2005: "Recognizing with deep concern the increase in anti-Semitism, Christianophobia and Islamophobia in various parts of the world, as well as the emergence of racial and violent movements based on racism and discriminatory ideas directed against Arab, Christian, Jewish and Muslim communities, communities of people of African descent, communities of Asian descent and other communities."

22 Resolution E/CN.4/2005/36 entitled "Civil and Political Rights: The Incompatibility Between Democracy and Racism." Anti-Semitism was included in 2004 and 2005, in identical language to the Durban resolution above.

23 In the religious intolerance resolution, the reference in 2005 moved from the preamble to an operative paragraph.

24 Human Rights Council resolution 4/10 on religious intolerance; resolution 3/103 and 6/22 on Durban follow-up; and 2/06 on the incompatibility between democracy and racism.

25 The relevant section of Resolution A/HRC/6/L.15 reads: "*Recognizes with deep concern* the overall rise in instances of 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."

---

**COMPARING UN TREATMENT OF  
ANTI-SEMITISM AND ISLAMOPHOBIA**

If it had the will, the UN could do far more to fight anti-Semitism in its resolutions. This is evident when one considers and compares how Islamophobia is treated. Since 1999, resolutions making special mention of Islamophobia have frequently been enacted by the General Assembly and the Commission on Human Rights (and by its successor, the Human Rights Council), in texts concerning “defamation of religions.” These Islamic-sponsored resolutions “stress the need to effectively combat defamation of all religions, Islam and Muslims in particular”; express “deep concern” at “attempts to identify Islam with terrorism, violence and human rights violations”; express concern at laws “specifically designed to ‘control’ and ‘monitor’ Muslim and Arab minorities,” and at the “ethnic and religious profiling of Muslim minorities.”<sup>26</sup> In addition, these resolutions typically request special reports—on Islamophobia or the “defamation” of Islam—from the Secretary-General, the High Commissioner for Human Rights, or the independent experts on racism and religion, in order to force the issue to remain constantly on the agenda and under plenary discussion.

By contrast, neither the GA nor the Human Rights Council has yet to pass any dedicated resolution or request any report on the hatred of Jews or Christians. Addressing this phenomenon, Mr. Annan asked: “Are not Jews entitled to the same degree of concern and protection?” So far, under GA and Human Rights Council resolutions, the answer is no. Mr. Annan also cited key elements of the Berlin Declaration that he hoped “the broader membership of the United Nations will adopt.” Regrettably, despite expectations in 2004, so far it has not.

|||||||

26 See, e.g., GA Resolutions A/RES/60/150 of 2005, A/RES/61/164 of 2006; Commission on Human Rights Resolutions 1999/82, 2000/84, 2001/4, 2002/9, 2003/4, 2004/6, 2005/3; and Human Rights Council Resolution 4/9 of 30 March 2007, all entitled “Combating defamation of religions.”

---

## SECRETARY-GENERAL BAN KI-MOON

---

Although less than one year in office, Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon already seems to be following in the steps of his predecessor, Kofi Annan, in denouncing Holocaust denial and confronting the global scourge of anti-Semitism. On the day that he was sworn in to office, Mr. Ban condemned Iran's Holocaust denial conference as "not acceptable . . . nor is it acceptable to call for the elimination of any State or people."<sup>27</sup> In his message on the UN's second annual Holocaust memorial day, he said that we must remain vigilant against "new outbreaks of anti-Semitism and other forms of intolerance," which is "an essential response to those misguided individuals who claim that the Holocaust never happened, or has been exaggerated."<sup>28</sup>

In comments after the adoption of the GA resolution condemning Holocaust denial, Mr. Ban explained that "this reflects the prevailing view of the international community" and that "the denial of historical facts such as the Holocaust is unacceptable."<sup>29</sup> Following his visit to Yad Vashem, Israel's national Holocaust museum, Mr. Ban concluded a tree-planting ceremony by stressing that "the UN as a whole has enlisted in the battle against hatred and anti-Semitism."<sup>30</sup> He added that the UN today is "helping member countries operate educational programs on the Holocaust." The Holocaust was "a unique occurrence that has to be remembered and must never be allowed to happen again."<sup>31</sup>

---

## HUMAN RIGHTS MACHINERY

---

*A human rights agenda that fails to address anti-Semitism denies its own history.*

—Kofi Annan, June 2004

Mr. Annan's call to action specifically appealed to his organization's human rights apparatus—the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR)—to work with the UN experts on racism and religious intolerance to "actively explore ways of combating anti-Semitism more effectively in the future." In this section, we ask: does the UN human rights agenda address anti-Semitism?

Our focus is on key figures concerned with this issue: High Commissioner for Human Rights Louise Arbour, Special Rapporteur on racism Doudou Diène, and Special Rapporteur on religious intolerance Asma Jahangir.<sup>32</sup> Except where otherwise indicated, our discussion should not be considered a comprehensive survey of their entire record, but rather an analysis of key actions.

|||||

27 UN press release, "UN Assembly condemns Holocaust denial by consensus; Iran disassociates itself," 26 January 2007.

28 Statement by the Secretary-General, UN Doc. SG/SM/10844, 19 January 2007.

29 Statement attributable to the Spokesperson of the Secretary-General on the General Assembly Resolution on Holocaust Denial, 26 January 2007.

30 Jewish National Fund press release, "UN Secretary General Ban Ki-Moon Plants an Olive Tree in Israel," March 27, 2007.

31 *Ibid.*

|||||

32 Other related entities such as the Human Rights Committee and the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination have on occasion raised the issue of anti-Semitism, but are not examined in this study.

## HIGH COMMISSIONER FOR HUMAN RIGHTS LOUISE ARBOUR

High Commissioner Arbour, as head of the UN human rights machinery and its global anti-discrimination effort, carries a unique responsibility to fight global forms of racism such as anti-Semitism. Regrettably, however, apart from certain private letters written in response to NGOs, we were unable to find any public action of substance taken by Ms. Arbour against anti-Semitism. (Our study does not examine Ms. Arbour's record on Israel, which has drawn criticism for being one-sided against the Jewish state.<sup>33</sup>) We examined all official statements, press releases, reports and legal briefs of the High Commissioner since she took office in the summer of 2004 until October 2007, as found on the websites of her agency and that of the UN Geneva headquarters.<sup>34</sup> Other than one passing reference in a 2005 speech to attacks on synagogues, churches, and mosques, we were unable to find any public statement, reference, or action by Ms. Arbour against anti-Semitism.<sup>35</sup> To confirm our findings, on four separate occasions we asked the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights for a list of actions by Ms. Arbour and her colleagues against anti-Semitism. There was no reply.

By contrast, as documented in this report, several other high officials within the UN and its human rights machinery have publicly spoken out against anti-Semitism—such as Iran's Holocaust denial—including Secretary-General Ben Ki-moon, former Secretary-General Kofi Annan, and racism expert Doudou Diène.

Ms. Arbour holds one of the world's leading moral pulpits and her potential influence is significant. She has the power to draw public attention to the evils of anti-Semitism and should do so. As a resident of Geneva she surely heard this past May of the arson that struck its most active synagogue—situated minutes from the High Commissioner's headquarters, and in the city whose name symbolizes international humanitarian law and human rights. The High Commissioner has an obligation to speak out.

In addition to Mr. Annan's call to action, Ms. Arbour was specifically asked several times by non-governmental organizations to speak out publicly against anti-Semitism emanating from governments and their leaders, but failed to do so. As documented further in this report, several UN bodies and high officials have rebuked Iranian President Ahmadinejad over his repeated calls to "wipe Israel off the map." President Ahmadinejad's incitement to destroy the Jewish state, which today includes more than half of the Jewish people, is incitement to genocide—and, as the UN special rapporteur on racism Doudou Diène said, is anti-Semitic. It is disturbing, therefore, that the public response of the UN's highest human rights official has been silence.

Ms. Arbour's failure to speak out on this issue comes despite appeals to her from diverse coalitions of non-governmental organizations. On January 29, 2007, a group of over forty NGOs—including Human Rights First, Freedom House, the Democracy Coalition Project, the Darfur Relief and Documentation Centre, the World Federation of Methodist and Uniting Church Women and UN Watch—asked the High Commissioner to use the occasion of the United Nations' second annual Holocaust commemoration "to condemn, strongly and specifically, the repeated and ongoing denials of the Holocaust by the government of the Islamic Republic of Iran."<sup>36</sup>

|||||

33 See, e.g., L. Gagnon, "Me Arbour et son conseil," *La Presse* (Montreal), July 25, 2006; editorial, "Arbour's folly," *National Post*, July 21, 2006; Alan M. Dershowitz, "Arbour must go," *National Post*, July 21, 2006.

34 We examined the regularly updated Website media centers of the OHCHR ([www.ohchr.org](http://www.ohchr.org)) and of the UN Office in Geneva ([www.unog.ch](http://www.unog.ch)). In addition to searching these materials for occurrences of the term "anti-Semitism," we also searched for potentially relevant terms such "Jews," "Judeophobia," "Ahmadinejad," "Holocaust," and "Nazi."

35 In a speech she mentioned that "disturbing reports about attacks against synagogues, mosques, churches and other sacred places remind us that we have to address the complex roots of present intolerance." High Commissioner Louise Arbour, "Speech on the Annual International Day for the Elimination of Racial Discrimination," March 21, 2005 (available at [ohchr.org](http://ohchr.org)).

|||||

36 See press release dated Jan. 29, 2007 on the UN Watch media center at [www.unwatch.org](http://www.unwatch.org).

One of the outrages cited by the NGOs was a January 8, 2007 letter by the Iranian Mission in Geneva, sent to the President of the Human Rights Council, justifying the conference in Tehran that questioned the Holocaust. (It had been the Office of the High Commissioner that—pursuant to protocol—circulated the obscene letter to all governments and accredited NGOs.) Regrettably, Ms. Arbour failed to rebuke that letter or any of the comparable statements by President Ahmadinejad. During a recent visit to Tehran, Ms. Arbour reportedly described the same Iranian Mission in Geneva as “very good.”<sup>37</sup> Given that mission’s leadership role in promoting Holocaust denial within the UN Human Rights Council—among other objectionable statements and actions—the compliment was ill-advised.

Other NGO requests to Ms. Arbour on anti-Semitism were equally unsuccessful, meeting at best with strictly private responses. On November 9, 2005, the Anglican Consultative Council, Socialist International Women, the Transnational Radical Party and twenty-six other non-governmental organizations—from Kosovo to Thailand—asked the High Commissioner to condemn Iranian President Ahmadinejad for his repeated calls to “wipe Israel off the map.” In this case, High Commissioner Arbour deserves credit for responding affirmatively. However, it came only in a private letter, and with a questionable form of condemnation. Compared to all the possibilities for public statements, private letters are considered weak gestures carrying little impact, and send a message of minimal concern for the issue at hand. Worse, even in her private letter, Ms. Arbour’s criticism of Ahmadinejad was pointedly implicit:

With reference to the second paragraph of your letter, I wish it to be known that I fully endorse the very clear statement made on behalf of the United Nations Organization by the Secretary-General on 27 October 2005, on this subject.

|||||||

37 *Islamic Republic News Agency*, quoted in A. Bayefsky, “Sanctioning Human Wrongs,” *National Review Online*, September 7, 2007.

On the spectrum of condemnations used in the world of UN diplomacy, a dry reference to a previous statement stands at the bottom. It is the difference between denouncing someone as a “murderer,” or calling them “the person described on the bottom of page 895 of the Concise Oxford Dictionary, 9th edition.”

In July 2005, when UN Special Rapporteur on the right to food Jean Ziegler compared Israeli soldiers to concentration camp guards, UN Watch asked Ms. Arbour to take action. Ms. Arbour responded to UN Watch—also with a private letter—by dissociating herself from Ziegler’s remarks, and calling them “inflammatory.” In this case, the High Commissioner for the most part said the right things.<sup>38</sup> However, here too her response was strictly private, and came only after being asked.

The significance of Ms. Arbour’s choice not to issue a public statement was asserted by none other than her own spokesman. At a UN press conference in Geneva, the issue came up when a question was asked by a journalist who had heard about “the statement by High Commissioner Arbour on the Special Rapporteur on the right to food Jean Ziegler.”<sup>39</sup> In reply, Ms. Arbour’s spokesman took pains to emphasize that “the High Commissioner had responded to the NGO in the form of a letter, not a statement.”<sup>40</sup> When a journalist asked for a copy of Ms. Arbour’s letter to UN Watch, her spokesman refused, saying “the Office was not releasing the letter, and that he had just spoken about the substance of the letter. If the NGO wished to release the letter, it was up to them.”<sup>41</sup>

By contrast, in reaction to the same incident, leaders of the U.S. House International Relations Committee, Representatives Henry Hyde (R-IL), Tom Lantos (D-CA), Mike Pence (R-IN), and Ileana Ros-Lehtinen (R-FL) circulated sign-on letters addressed to the Secretary-General and UN Commission on Human Rights Chair Makarim Wibisono.<sup>42</sup>

|||||||

38 Ms. Arbour also wrote that “Mr. Ziegler informed me that...the statement you referred to was a quote from Michel Warschawski, an Israeli scholar.” By quoting this offensive excuse she gave it a seriousness it did not deserve. The classic refuge of bigots is the claim to have merely repeated something that was originally said by a member of the injured minority group.

39 UN Summary of Regular Press Briefing, 22 July 2005, available at [www.unog.ch](http://www.unog.ch).

40 *Ibid.*

41 *Ibid.*

42 See link to letters in “UN Official Abusing Food Mandate to target America,” UN Watch press release dated October 27, 2005, at [www.unwatch.org](http://www.unwatch.org).

The letters denounced anti-Semitism within the United Nations and elsewhere, condemned Mr. Ziegler's outrageous remarks, and asked that he be released from his post. The letters were signed by seventy members of the U.S. Congress and published prominently on congressional Websites.<sup>43</sup> This is the kind of serious action that Ms. Arbour should have taken, and on her own initiative.

More recently, Ms. Arbour was involved in an incident where she was accused of making "anti-Semitic statements" by a United States member of Congress. In May 2007, the British University and College Union voted to boycott Israeli universities, eliciting a sharp rebuke from the heads of leading academic institutions in the U.S. and around the world, as well as charges of anti-Semitism. (In September 2007, the union announced that it would not pursue a boycott of Israeli academics, after the union's legal advisors determined that such a boycott would be unlawful for violating anti-discrimination legislation.) When asked at a May 31, 2007 UN press conference about the boycott, Ms. Arbour replied that "public debate, particularly coming from informed communities is, from a human rights perspective, a good thing."<sup>44</sup>

In response, on June 13, 2007, U.S. Congressman Anthony Weiner (D-NY) sent a letter to Secretary-General Ban, saying that "the U.N. must be a force in the fight against discrimination, and the rise of anti-Semitism around the world. It appears that Ms. Arbour is at odds with that mission. If the Human Rights Commissioner thinks it's a 'good thing' to consider these shameful boycotts, she is unfit to hold such an important office and should be dismissed immediately." Ms. Arbour commented later that "I said I thought it was a good thing for academics to have a debate on this issue but that, as human rights commissioner, I did not have an opinion on the outcome. To base such attacks on those remarks cheapens the debate tremendously."<sup>45</sup> After reviewing the issue, Secretary-General Ban concluded that Arbour "made no anti-Semitic remarks, nor was anything anti-Semitic implied in her remarks."<sup>46</sup> While the accusation

43 See, e.g., statement available at [http://www.house.gov/hensarling/rsc/mem\\_activity2005.shtml](http://www.house.gov/hensarling/rsc/mem_activity2005.shtml).

44 High Commissioner Louise Arbour, UN press conference, 31 May 2007.

45 M. Perelman, "U.N. Rights Chief Takes Her Case to Congress, Arbour Fights Threatened Funding Cut, Antisemitism Charges," *Forward*, July 11, 2007.

46 *Ibid.*, quoting UN spokesman Stephane Dujarric.

was disproportionate to her remarks, one does hope that Ms. Arbour will follow the lead of other high UN officials, not to mention hundreds of college presidents, who have recognized the inherently discriminatory nature of boycott campaigns that irrationally single out Israel.<sup>47</sup>

### ARBOUR'S NEW YORK REPRESENTATIVE REFUSED TO CONDEMN AHMADINEJAD

A telling incident in 2006 involving Ms. Arbour's representative in New York, Craig Mokhiber, is also worthy of mention here. The contrast between the well-intentioned and well-organized UN Holocaust outreach program on the one hand—which is discussed below—and the hesitant focus from other UN departments on the other hand, was strikingly demonstrated at the roundtable discussion on the theme "Remembrance and Beyond: The United Nations and the Response to Genocide" on September 14, 2006. The keynote speaker, Dr. David A. Hamburg, Chairman of the Secretary-General's Advisory Committee on Genocide Prevention, delivered a lecture on the UN's potential for preventing genocide.

Edward Mortimer, Secretary-General Annan's Director of Communications, asked the panel what was to be done about the public questioning of the Holocaust by Mahmoud Ahmadinejad—who would be speaking before the GA five days later.<sup>48</sup> Dr. Hamburg replied that it was hard to think of anyone since Adolf Hitler who so repeatedly and explicitly called for genocide. He said the situation was unique because Ahmadinejad was calling for genocide—repeatedly and explicitly against one group—and was also on the verge of developing nuclear weapons. Given this conjunction of an

■■■■■■■■■■

47 UNESCO Director-General Koïchiro Matsuura expressed concern over the British University and College Union's planned boycott of Israeli academics. "If we are serious about the need to promote sustained peace, democracy and development, I believe that we have the moral responsibility to share knowledge and promote understanding," he said. UN Press Release, "UNESCO chief voices concern over potential boycott of Israeli academic institutions," 22 June 2007. Also taking a principled stance was noted Canadian jurist Stephen J. Toope, member of the UN Working Group on Enforced Disappearances. In his capacity as president of the University of British Columbia, Professor Toope admonished "those British professors who have brought forward this shameful scheme" for the "intolerance they are communicating to their students." S. Toope, "Comment: Boycott Threatens Everyone," available at [www.president.ubc.ca/news/british\\_boycott.html](http://www.president.ubc.ca/news/british_boycott.html).

48 See UN webcast video, "The United Nations and the response to genocide," September 14, 2006, available at <http://157.150.195.10/webcast/SE2006.html>.

explicit call for genocide and nuclear weapons, this matter had to be seriously discussed. He called for stronger, high-level diplomacy, adding that education of public opinion in the world was vital.

The other panelists, including Craig Mokhiber, the New York Representative of High Commissioner for Human Rights Louise Arbour, declined to address the issue.<sup>49</sup> Following such a thorough answer, and on the eve of Mr. Ahmadinejad's GA speech, it would have been natural for Mr. Mokhiber to stand with Dr. Hamburg and echo previous UN condemnations of Ahmadinejad by Secretary-General Annan and the Security Council. Mr. Mokhiber was willing to absolutely condemn Holocaust denial in general. But he pointedly refused to discuss the specific example of Ahmadinejad—even after a separate question from the audience was directly posed to him. Instead, he said, "I probably [did not] understand that question at all."<sup>50</sup>

Toward the end of the event, Mr. Mokhiber chose to criticize the question about Iran's Ahmadinejad, objecting to "partisan or parochial arguments" about human rights violations concerning "my people" or "those people." The international human rights movement, he said, was above all that.<sup>51</sup>

"If you think that a state is a good guy, you're making a mistake. With all due respect, there are 192 states in the UN system that have *serious* human rights problems."<sup>52</sup> Since all countries are violators, he argued, any comparison between countries is always biased. Mokhiber said individuals should be protected from crimes committed by *all* states, and, while apparently reading from prepared notes, cited only four specific examples: "the government of Sudan or the government of Iran, or the government of Israel or the government of the United States."<sup>53</sup> Having selected two governments most associated with the crime of genocide, he then threw in the U.S. and Israel, asserting that none of the four was worse than the other.

It was deeply unfortunate that at an event dedicated to developing ways to prevent genocide, the representative of the UN's highest human rights authority refused to acknowledge that inciters of genocide were any different than their would-be victims.<sup>54</sup>

|||||||

49 *Ibid.*

50 *Ibid.*

51 *Ibid.*

|||||||

52 *Ibid.*, at Minute 2:22:00.

53 *Ibid.*, at Minute 2:22:00.

54 Years before he was hired to represent the UN human rights apparatus in New York, Mr. Mokhiber was politically active against Israel, saying how it was guilty of "very clearly racist violence" that was "random," "perpetrated against the elderly, the infirm," indeed against "anyone who happened to be a non-Jewish member of that society." Mokhiber put all of this in print in his 1988 contribution to a radical publication, *Palestine Papers—Everyday Horrors*, after he traveled to the West Bank to show solidarity with Yasir Arafat's first intifada. One would hope that all UN officials would strive to fulfill their obligations to respect the principle of objectivity.

**ARBOUR ACTED ON ISLAMIC  
PROTEST OVER CARTOONS**

When the alliance of fifty-six Islamic states complained to Ms. Arbour in 2005 about the cartoons in a Danish newspaper that they deemed blasphemous—and which eventually served as grounds for bloody riots—she reportedly instructed the UN experts on racism and religion to follow up on their complaint. “I would like to emphasize that I deplore any statement or act showing a lack of respect towards other people’s religion,” she wrote to the Organization of the Islamic Conference, according to Denmark’s *Berlingske Tidende*.<sup>55</sup> In her letter, Arbour reportedly directed the UN experts on religious freedom and racism to investigate the matter, saying, “I’m confident that they will take action in an adequate manner.”<sup>56</sup> A diplomat from one of the Islamic countries told the newspaper that the governments were pleased with Ms. Arbour’s answer. We are not aware, however, that Ms. Arbour has done the same regarding allegations sent to her about anti-Semitism.

**HIGH COMMISSIONER ARBOUR  
OBLIGED TO SPEAK OUT**

To summarize, despite Mr. Annan’s call for action, Ms. Arbour has failed to take any public action against anti-Semitism. Her occasional private letters are an inadequate and insufficient response. With the Human Rights Council tightly controlled by the Organization of the Islamic Conference, the High Commissioner is presumably under considerable political pressure. However, political capital is to be used, and a high commissioner is obliged to speak out for human rights principles over politics.

|||||||

55 Quoted in “Prophet cartoons wrong UN commissioner,” *Copenhagen Post Online*, December 7, 2005, available at <http://www.cphpost.dk/get/92663.html>.

56 *Ibid.*

## EXPERT ON RACISM DOUDOU DIÈNE

The UN independent expert on racism, Doudou Diène, holds a mixed record in his treatment of anti-Semitism.<sup>57</sup> To his credit, he has made a determined effort to follow up on Secretary-General Annan's call to action on addressing anti-Semitism. He has done more than many other UN experts in tackling controversial matters in this regard. As discussed below, however, the conclusions reached by Mr. Diène have not always been coherent or productive for advancing the fight against anti-Semitism at the UN and beyond. Together with other UN agencies and officials, he frequently cites the views of purported Jewish or Israeli experts who are fringe figures who, in one form or another, actually oppose the efforts of advocates against anti-Semitism. With no other religious or ethnic group is this done.

### DECISION TO ADDRESS ANTI-SEMITISM AND CHRISTIANOPHOBIA

UN independent human rights experts used to be appointed by the Chair of the Commission on Human Rights (the Commission), and in the future will be selected by the entire 47-nation Human Rights Council, successor to the Commission. Their mandates were crafted by member states of the Commission and therefore often reflect a bias concerning a particular region, or, in this case, theme. Some experts happily accept these biases, while others push against the limitations of their mandates in an attempt to address human rights situations as equitably as possible. On important occasions, Doudou Diène admirably took the latter approach.

In April 2004, Diène was specially tasked by the Commission to examine “the situation of Muslim and Arab peoples in various parts of the world,” with special reference to “physical assaults and attacks against their places of worship, cultural centers, businesses and properties in the aftermath of the events of 11 September 2001.”<sup>58</sup> The Commission instructed him to address only the consequences of intolerance toward Arabs and Muslims, but not toward members of other peoples or religions. However, Mr. Diène courageously decided to expand the scope of his report to

■■■■■■■■■■

57 His full title is “Special Rapporteur on contemporary forms of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance.”

58 E/CN.4/RES/2004/6, adopted 13 April 2004, by a vote of 29 to 16 with seven abstentions.

also include anti-Semitism and Christianophobia. To explain his decision, Mr. Diène cited Kofi Annan's June 2004 call to action on anti-Semitism, as well as a 2003 GA resolution that expressed concern over discrimination against Muslims, Christians and Jews.<sup>59</sup>

### BARCELONA SEMINAR ON RACISM

Diène's first action on the subject was to initiate a seminar, hosted by the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights and the UNESCO Center of Catalonia, on “Defamation of Religions and the Global Compact against Racism: Anti-Semitism, Christianophobia, Islamophobia,” from 11 to 14 November 2004. While the seminar may have been well-intentioned, the outcome was problematic and sparked concerns in the Jewish world.

Unlike the June 2004 seminar organized by the UN Department of Public Information, the Barcelona event failed to feature the leading Jewish NGOs concerned with anti-Semitism. Out of two experts commissioned to contribute studies, one was Professor Esther Benbassa, whose latest book, *Suffering as Identity*, accuses Jews of imagining a tearful history—a book that is being heartily embraced in Europe by those unsympathetic to both Jews and Israel.<sup>60</sup> Benbassa has previously written about how “money flows to create pulpits on anti-Semitism and genocide, to finance museums, and research... as if nothing else were significant or had ever existed.”<sup>61</sup> She has also in the past complained of the “intimidation” that “eagerly sees behind each word, each gesture, and each criticism of Israeli policy, an anti-Semite.”<sup>62</sup>

Whether or not one agrees with her views, there is no precedent in the UN for holding an event to tackle a form of bias, and then inviting speakers who denounce that very cause along with those who are dedicated to fighting the bias. In addition to Ms. Benbassa, two Israelis from the “Alternative Information Center,” a radical left-wing group, reportedly participated in the seminar. The center

■■■■■■■■■■

59 E/CN.4/2005/19, 23 December 2004.

60 E. Benbassa, *La souffrance comme identité*, Editions Fayard (2007).

61 Quoted in A. Bayefsky, “Your Tax Dollars at Work,” *Wall Street Journal*, November 18, 2004.

62 Quoted in A. Bayefsky, “Fatal Failure,” *National Review Online*, November 30, 2004.

is headed by Michael Warschawski, a self-described “well-known anti-Zionist activist” who has written that “ethnic cleansing is a basic Zionist principle and policy.”<sup>63</sup> The center’s work is concerned with Palestinians and its officials have no connection to combating anti-Semitism. Why they were invited to Barcelona is far from clear.<sup>64</sup>

Mr. Diène may well have invited Benbassa on his own. There also seems to be a short list of Israeli and Jewish figures who are known to and approved by certain UN agencies. For many years, the UN’s only experience with holding events on Jewish or Israel-related topics came from the hundreds of conferences it held around the world condemning Israel, as organized by the UN’s Division of Palestinian Rights. (See section on Israel below.) As happened at a recent August session in Brussels, the UN’s Palestinian conferences typically invite a few selected radical Israelis who agree with the ardently pro-Palestinian line of the conference. Usual figures include Warschawski and the Israeli left-wing journalist Gideon Levy. And so when the UN racism expert convened his first conference for the cause of combating anti-Semitism, and invited figures antagonistic towards its leading advocates, or who have no experience with the subject at all, it might not necessarily have been malice. It may have been as simple as a bureaucrat opening the UN rolodex for past panelists on Jewish/Israel subjects, and finding only those figures on the UN Palestinian division’s invitation list.

With input from such figures, it is no surprise that the outcome document took pains to emphasize the right of those who considered themselves anti-Zionists not to be called anti-Semites.<sup>65</sup> The recommendations were directed at Jewish leaders, suggesting that they separate their struggle against anti-Semitism from their support for Israel, and that they make sure always to incorporate other serious historical tragedies in any discussion of the Holocaust. What is remarkable is that these recommendations are aimed at the *victims* of anti-Semitism—instead of the perpetrators.

|||||

63 Quoted in A. Bayefsky, “Your Tax Dollars at Work.”

64 Warschawski is frequently cited by discredited UN official Jean Ziegler when the latter is accused of making an anti-Israel or anti-Semitic remark. When Kofi Annan and Louise Arbour criticized Ziegler’s comparison of Israeli soldiers to concentration camp guards, his defense was that Warschawski said it first.

65 Report by Doudou Diène, UN Doc. E/CN.4/2005/18/Add.4, 13 December 2004, par. 38, at 13.

It is impossible to imagine a UN conference on Islamophobia that would conclude with criticisms of the advocates for Muslim victims of discrimination. Accordingly, the Barcelona event can hardly be considered a constructive addition to the global struggle against anti-Semitism. There are some who believe that giving certain UN bodies a mandate to address important issues is always liable to backfire, when implementation is executed by governments or officials unfriendly to the stated cause, and according to their own terms.

#### 2004 REPORT COVERING ANTI-SEMITISM

Following the Barcelona conference, in December 2004, Diène prepared a report for the Commission entitled “Defamation of Religions and Global Efforts to Combat Racism: anti-Semitism, Christianophobia and Islamophobia.” In some ways the report improves upon the Barcelona seminar, however it also incorporates a number of its misguided conclusions.

To his credit, Mr. Diène discussed ways to identify when criticism of Israel becomes tainted by anti-Semitism. He cites analysts who suggest indicators such as when “character traits attributed to Israel are imbued with recognizable anti-Semitic stereotypes”; or when “Israelis and Jews are represented as cosmic devils, blamed for global disasters and compared with Nazis, diabolical figures par excellence”; or when “the legitimate right of Israel as a Jewish State to exist is questioned.”<sup>66</sup> These are important criteria that, as discussed in the section below concerning Israel, are shared by many leading scholars on anti-Semitism.

However, immediately thereafter in the report, Diène discusses the opinions of “other experts” as to what constitutes legitimate criticism of the Israeli government, and he includes “anti-Zionism.”<sup>67</sup> It is not clear if this expresses his own view or that of the “experts” (presumably the same from the Barcelona conference), who are also cited in defense of anti-Zionism, and for the claim that conflating it with anti-Semitism would “trivialize” the concept of anti-Semitism.<sup>68</sup> Further in the report, Diène again cites the opinions of the Barcelona experts, stating that “it is neither justifiable

|||||

66 *Ibid.*, at 13.

67 *Ibid.*, par. 39, at 13.

68 *Ibid.*, par. 39, at 13.

nor appropriate to exploit a real problem (anti-Semitism in the narrow sense) to seek to strip a political adversary of legitimacy by leveling accusations of racism.”<sup>69</sup> In reality, of course, this is but a projection of precisely what the anti-Zionists seek to do to Israel.

### CRITICISM OF IRAN AND SAUDI ARABIA

To Mr. Diène’s credit, he has become perhaps the only UN human rights expert to publicly denounce Iranian President Ahmadinejad’s calls to destroy Israel and his Holocaust denial. Mr. Diène was quick to react to Mr. Ahmadinejad’s October 2005 statement that Israel should be “wiped off the map.” On December 12, 2005—following an appeal sent to him by a coalition of twenty-nine NGOs including UN Watch—Diène sent what is known as an “allegation letter” to the Iranian government, expressing his concern. In his report he explained:

The Special Rapporteur... does not equate anti-Zionism with anti-Semitism, even if certain forms of anti-Zionism can hide manifestations of anti-Semitism. However, the President of the Islamic Republic of Iran has crossed a line by calling for the “wiping off the map” of a State Member of the United Nations and by organizing a conference in Tehran which questioned the historic truth of the extermination of Jews in Europe by Nazi Germany.<sup>70</sup>

Diène’s letter caused Iran to reply, in a sharply worded diplomatic note verbale in defense of Ahmadinejad:

The President’s remarks came up in the form of a “research question” and deserve an academic answer, rather than creating a politically charged environment and fuss emotions which runs counter to the freedom of expression.<sup>71</sup>

Unlike the Jewish religion and Jews, which Iran claimed to respect, “Zionism is an ideology based on hegemonic desires and political ambitions, articulated by colonial powers and artificially injected in the Middle East for their purposes.”<sup>72</sup> Indeed, said Iran, “Systematic oppression against the Palestinian People by Israel during last half a century cannot be forgotten and is known to fair and justice-oriented peoples of the world.”<sup>73</sup>

And Iran’s proof for the diabolical character of Zionism? “*Various documents in the United Nations and its Human Rights Machinery, including Special Mechanisms,*” which, according to Iran, “*unambiguously attest to the atrocities perpetuated in the occupied territories by the Zionist Regime*” (emphasis added).<sup>74</sup> For those who oppose the UN’s outrageously disproportionate condemnations of Israel, but dismiss them as having little impact, here is proof to the contrary—that the effect can be, as in this case it was, moral justification for incitement to destroy a nation.

In addition, Mr. Diène has criticized Mr. Ahmadinejad’s legitimization of other forms of racism, his inviting prominent figures of European anti-Semitism and American anti-black racism to the Holocaust denial conference, as well as Ahmadinejad’s sponsorship of a Holocaust cartoon conference, in reports of January and May 2007, respectively.<sup>75</sup>

Finally, Mr. Diène has also admirably taken action against the publication of an anti-Semitic cartoon in a government-controlled Saudi newspaper. On April 12, 2005, he sent a letter of allegation to the government of Saudi Arabia, jointly with Asma Jahangir, the UN independent expert on religious freedom. The cartoon depicted rats wearing Star of David skullcaps, scurrying back and forth in a building labeled “Palestine House.” The letter noted that this image replicated a scene from the Nazi film *Jew Sues*.<sup>76</sup> When Saudi Arabia failed to reply to the allegation letter, Mr. Diène wrote that he was “forced to consider [the] case no longer as an

|||||||

72 *Ibid.*

73 *Ibid.*

74 *Ibid.*

75 UN Doc. A/HRC/4/19, 12 January 2007, at 16, and UN Doc. A/HRC/5/10, 25 May 2007, at 21. UN Watch praised Mr. Diène for these reports in a June 11, 2007 statement delivered in the Council plenary.

76 UN Doc. E/CN.4/2006/16/Add.1, 27 March 2006, at 23-24.

|||||||

69 *Ibid.*, par. 43, at 14.

70 UN Doc. A/HRC/4/19/Add.1, 5 June 2007, at 27.

71 UN Doc. E/CN.4/2006/G/10, “Note verbale dated 10 March 2006 from the Permanent Mission of the Islamic Republic of Iran to the United Nations Office at Geneva addressed to the secretariat of the Commission on Human Rights,” 17 March 2006.

## EXPERT ON FREEDOM OF RELIGION ASMA JAHANGIR

allegation but as a proven fact.”<sup>77</sup> Diène should recognize that such cartoons are in fact routine in many state-run Arab newspapers. But his decision to address at least one racist cartoon is a good start.<sup>78</sup>

In his latest report to the Human Rights Council, Diène warns that “in the Arab-Muslim world, anti-Semitism continues to be a matter of concern.” He further notes “with preoccupation” the availability of anti-Semitic books such as *The Protocols of the Elders of Zion*, “where the myth of Jewish conspiracy for world domination is represented.” These are encouraging statements by the Special Rapporteur, and one hopes he will more systematically confront the phenomenon.<sup>79</sup>

Asma Jahangir, the Special Rapporteur on freedom of religion or belief, has, like Mr. Diène, resisted undue pressure from the Islamic and Arab states on the Council. In one of the first actions taken by the new Human Rights Council in June 2006, the OIC-led majority requested Ms. Jahangir and Mr. Diène to report to the Council on the “increasing trend of defamation of religions.”<sup>80</sup> At the UN, this is a euphemism for any journalistic expression construed to be critical of Islam. The September 2005 publication by a Danish newspaper of cartoons depicting the Prophet Mohammed led to a protest campaign by these states that effectively justified the violent outrage of Islamic protestors worldwide. (The new process to prepare for the UN’s 2009 Durban Review Conference against racism has already become overtaken by this same campaign.)

The ensuing report by Mr. Diène and Ms. Jahangir upset Islamic states. It discussed anti-Semitism and Christianophobia as well as Islamophobia. In addition, the two experts made the obvious but crucial point that international human rights law protects “primarily individuals in the exercise of their freedom of religion and not religions per se.” Ms. Jahangir further angered Islamic states by reporting to the Council that “those who fuelled reactions to such expressions merely added to the violence” and should therefore be denounced.<sup>81</sup>

Ms. Jahangir, like Mr. Diène, deserves credit for standing up to attempts by Islamic states to constrain her into reporting exclusively on Islamic issues at the expense of victims belonging to other religions. In recent years she has made several formal inquiries concerning anti-Semitic incidents, to governments such as Belarus, Russia and Tajikistan. Apart from these, the only significant effort against anti-Semitism that she undertook since Mr. Annan’s 2004 call appears to be a 2005 visit to France described below. To compare with Mr. Diène’s record, his actions have not all resulted in positive steps to fight anti-Semitism, but their number indicates that

|||||||

77 UN Doc. A/HRC/4/19/Add.1, 5 June 2007, at 39.

78 For examples of such cartoons, see, e.g., Joël et Dan Kotek, *Au nom de l'antisionisme: L'image des Juifs et d'Israël dans la caricature depuis la seconde Intifada* (Brussels: Edition Complexe, 2003).

79 Report dated 21 August 2007, UN Doc. A/HRC/6/6, par. 39.

|||||||

80 Human Rights Council Decision 1/107, 30 June 2006.

81 UN Doc. A/HRC/2/SR.9, 25 October 2006, at 12. The two experts’ joint report also noted that “criminalizing defamation of religion can be counterproductive.” Consequently, further OIC-sponsored Council resolutions on the subject, which welcomed past reports of the experts, failed even to mention their joint report.

he has more substantially heeded Mr. Annan's appeal. We hope that Ms. Jahangir will redouble her efforts to take more actions in the future.

### MISSION TO FRANCE

The primary action on anti-Semitism by Ms. Jahangir following Mr. Annan's appeal was a mission to France. After receiving information, including from UN Watch, regarding incidents of anti-Semitism in France, Ms. Jahangir visited Strasbourg, where a Jewish cemetery had been desecrated, and met with local authorities and Jewish community representatives. In her report on the visit, she noted that the largest proportion of acts of racism and xenophobia in France targeted Jews. While she said that it was difficult to distinguish which of these acts targeted individuals or groups "primarily because of their religious beliefs," it was "indisputable that a proportion of these acts were directly related to the religion of the victim."<sup>82</sup>

### INCITEMENT IN TEXTBOOKS

Ms. Jahangir deserves modest credit for paying some attention to anti-Semitism and other forms of religious intolerance in government textbooks used regularly in the Arab world. In January 2005, UN Watch submitted letters of allegation to Ms. Jahangir and Mr. Diène regarding textbooks distributed by the governments of Egypt and Saudi Arabia that promote hatred toward Jews and Christians. Along with the letters, UN Watch submitted detailed reports published by the Center for Monitoring the Impact of Peace and the American Jewish Committee detailing the falsehoods and blatant anti-Semitism taught to schoolchildren in these countries from a young age. At the request of OHCHR staff, UN Watch sent further detailed information in May 2005. However, for more than a year and a half, neither expert took any action on the allegations, even as both experts—as well as other high UN officials—criticized the Danish government for being insufficiently quick to condemn the publications of the Mohammed cartoons.

|||||||

82 UN Doc. E/CN.4/2006/5/Add.4, 8 March 2006, at 10.

UN Watch brought the issue to the floor of the Council plenary during an interactive dialogue with Ms. Jahangir in the September 2006 session. This time she responded directly to UN Watch's question, expressing regret that such textbooks "will further indoctrinate young minds into an intolerant society and constituency."<sup>83</sup> In her subsequent report of December 2006, Ms. Jahangir wrote that "unfortunately, she regularly receives allegations about schoolbooks which display, and even encourage, a lack of respect for members of non-traditional religious minorities or for religions that differ from the predominant religion in the country."<sup>84</sup> She wrote that when she receives the reports, she calls the authorities and asks them to remove such passages. However, Ms. Jahangir did not specify which countries were involved, nor provide any indication that any such passages have been removed.<sup>85</sup> We hope that this grave matter—the poisoning of millions of young minds to hatred of other religions—will begin to be treated with the utmost seriousness. It should be at the center of missions by Ms. Jahangir to such countries, and be addressed in official allegation letters as well.

### LACK OF ATTENTION TO THE MIDDLE EAST

One shortcoming of both Ms. Jahangir's and Mr. Diène's work on anti-Semitism is that they largely or exclusively address acts of anti-Semitism within European countries. Mr. Diène has only addressed Middle Eastern anti-Semitism with, as mentioned above, his condemnations of Iranian President Ahmadinejad's hateful incitement and his communication to Saudi Arabia regarding its Nazi-style cartoon. Ms. Jahangir addressed anti-Semitism in France, and Mr. Diène has reported on anti-Semitic political movements in Austria, Germany, Italy, Poland, Russia, the United Kingdom, and Hungary, and has tracked far-right groups for xenophobia, though not necessarily anti-Semitism, in Belgium, Denmark, France, the Netherlands, and Switzerland.<sup>86</sup>

|||||||

83 See UN webcast video, Human Rights Council, 2nd session, 21 September 2006, available at <http://www.un.org/webcast/unhrc/archive.asp?go=060921>.

84 Asma Jahangir, *Implementation of General Assembly Resolution 60/251 of 15 March 2006 Entitled "Human Rights Council," Report of the Special Rapporteur on freedom of religion or belief*, UN Doc. A/HRC/4/21 (2006).

85 UN Doc. A/HRC/4/21, 26 December 2006, at 17.

86 UN Doc. A/HRC/5/10, 25 May 2007, at 7-14.

# HOLOCAUST REMEMBRANCE AND EDUCATION

While it is important to address the threat of anti-Semitism from European right-wing extremists, the majority of government-sponsored anti-Semitism in the present day emanates from the Arab and Islamic world.<sup>87</sup> The fact that varying levels of anti-Semitism is practically state policy for certain of these governments should not be ignored or downplayed by UN experts. The United States Commission on International Religious Freedom's 2007 Annual Report noted worrying anti-Semitic trends, for example, in Turkey, Egypt, and Iran.<sup>88</sup> Both UN experts would do well to modify their emphasis and show that they are, indeed, unafraid of confronting the centers of modern-day anti-Semitism—the places where the *Protocols of the Elders of Zion* are propagated in books and on television—even if it risks the wrath of certain powerful Arab or Islamic governments who prefer not to be held to account.

The most significant advance at the UN concerning anti-Semitism has been a series of new steps resulting from General Assembly decisions to institutionalize Holocaust commemoration and education. Because the Holocaust was the epitome of anti-Semitism, where hatred and demonization of Jews led to the Nazi murder of one third of the Jewish people, raising awareness of the Holocaust ought to provide a powerful lesson against the evils of anti-Semitism. As Mr. Annan has said, “The Holocaust came as the climax of a long, disgraceful history of anti-Semitic persecution, pogroms, institutionalized discrimination and other degradation... We must be on the watch out for any revival of anti-Semitism, and ready to act against the new forms of it that are happening today.”<sup>89</sup> The resolution on Holocaust education does not expressly reference anti-Semitism and there is always the danger that this lesson will be obscured. This would be tragic. “An affirmation of ‘Holocaust remembrance’ accompanied by an overlooking of the Jewishness of most of the Holocaust's victims,” writes Hillel Halkin, “is simply exchanging one form of Holocaust denial for another.”<sup>90</sup>

|||||

87 See, for example, Robert Wistrich, “Islamic Judeophobia: An Existential Threat,” in David Bukay, ed., *Muhammed's Monsters: A Comprehensive Guide to Radical Islam for Western Audiences* (New Leaf Press, 2004) and Wistrich, *Muslim Anti-Semitism* (American Jewish Committee, 2002).

88 U.S. Commission on International Religious Freedom, *Annual Report of the United States Commission on International Religious Freedom* (2007).

|||||

89 Kofi Annan, *Statement to the special session of the General Assembly, commemorating the 60th anniversary of the liberation of the Nazi death camps*, U.N. Doc. SG/SM/9686 (2005).

90 H. Halkin, “We Should Remember,” *New York Sun*, January 30, 2007, at 7.

## GENERAL ASSEMBLY SPECIAL SESSION

The first positive action following Mr. Annan's June 2004 challenge—and under his leadership—came several months later, in the January 24, 2005 GA special session to commemorate the sixtieth anniversary of the liberation of Auschwitz, the most infamous Nazi death camp. The session was addressed by high-level dignitaries such as Mr. Annan, GA President Jean Ping of Gabon, Holocaust survivor and Nobel Laureate Elie Wiesel, German Foreign Minister Joschka Fischer, as well as several other foreign ministers. The decision to convene the session, according to the Israeli government's count, was supported by 151 of the existing 191 UN member states.

Mr. Annan spoke strongly, emphasizing the UN's obligations to recall its history and founding mission:

The United Nations must never forget that it was created as a response to the evil of Nazism, or that the horror of the Holocaust helped to shape its mission. That response is enshrined in our Charter, and in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.<sup>91</sup>

He paid tribute to all the victims of the Nazis while emphasizing their genocidal war against the Jews:

[T]he tragedy of the Jewish people was unique. Two thirds of all Europe's Jews, including one and a half million children, were murdered. An entire civilization, which had contributed far beyond its numbers to the cultural and intellectual riches of Europe and the world, was uprooted; destroyed; laid waste.... As Elie [Wiesel] has written, "not all victims were Jews, but all Jews were victims".<sup>92</sup>

He also acknowledged the role of Israel in regard to Holocaust commemoration:

It is fitting, therefore, that the first State to speak today will be the State of Israel—which rose, like the United Nations itself, from the ashes of the Holocaust.<sup>93</sup>

In all, the January 2005 special session was a significant and indeed historic event. For the first time in its history, the representative body of all UN member states commemorated the Holocaust and honored its victims and survivors. Mr. Annan commendably urged action against anti-Semitism—this time at an even more momentous UN forum than the gathering in June 2004.

Some protested that the session fell short because the speakers failed to address glaring examples of anti-Semitism being sponsored by UN member states today. In essence, they argued that a session connected to anti-Semitism that did not confront the states who in our age continue to distribute Nazi-like propaganda failed to grab the bull by the horns. Some also pointed to the fact that in order to gain the broad support of 151 UN member states, the European Union had to agree that there would be no resolution, decision, or final declaration as an outcome of the special session.<sup>94</sup>

However, in a powerful open letter reflecting upon the session and its place in history, Felice Gaer, director of the American Jewish Committee's Jacob Blaustein Institute for the Advancement of Human Rights, explained that avoiding controversial contemporary matters was the secret to the event's exceptional success.<sup>95</sup> Her portrait of the session is moving and apt:

In the General Assembly hall, where Israel has been so commonly vilified, leaders came to say to Israelis and Jews everywhere—and before all the nations of the world—that they understand

■■■■■■■■■■

93 *Ibid.*

94 A. Bayefsky, "Never Again?" *National Review Online*, 27 January 2005.

95 The ground rules preventing a resolution or declaration from being adopted at the Special Session also meant that current events (read: the Mideast conflict) would not be the focus of amendments, denunciations, challenges from the Arab or Islamic bloc. None of them were permitted to deny the Holocaust, the numbers of victims, or the affirmation of the State of Israel as a respected and legitimate outcome of the very events that led to the founding of the United Nations. Open letter from Felice D. Gaer, *An Open Letter About the UN General Assembly Special Session Commemorating the Liberation of Auschwitz* (Feb. 2005) (available at [www.ajc.org](http://www.ajc.org)).

91 United Nations Press Release GA/10330, "General Assembly Marks 60<sup>th</sup> Anniversary of Liberation of Nazi Death Camps," 24 January 2005.

92 *Ibid.*

## GENERAL ASSEMBLY RESOLUTION FOR ANNUAL REMEMBRANCE

the uniqueness of the Jewish experience, that anti-Semitism led to the worst crime in modern history, and that their predecessors' indifference or complicity led to these unspeakable horrors. Annan and others affirmed that Israel—like the UN itself—is a much needed and legitimate outcome of that experience. They cited contemporary manifestations of anti-Semitism and professed that the lessons of the Holocaust are universal.<sup>96</sup>

Although the special session of January 2005 was defined as commemorative only, with no outcome document requiring follow-up impact, it soon led to another resolution that would make remembrance permanent.

At the start of the GA's 60<sup>th</sup> session, in the fall of 2005, member states went a step further, approving Resolution 60/7 that, for the first time, created a permanent annual UN day of Holocaust remembrance, dedicating the date of January 27.<sup>97</sup> The resolution also urged member states to develop education programs to “inculcate future generations with the lessons of the Holocaust in order to help prevent future acts of genocide”; rejected Holocaust denial; and requested the secretary-general to establish an outreach program on the “Holocaust and the United Nations.”

The resolution, initiated by Israel and supported by 103 additional co-sponsors, was adopted without a vote. Those not sponsoring included most of the Arab and Islamic countries.<sup>98</sup> That a majority of UN member states not only supported but officially co-sponsored the resolution was an achievement, particularly considering the context. The resolution was adopted only one week after Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad's highly publicized comments that Israel should be “wiped off the map.”<sup>99</sup> Mr. Ahmadinejad's rhetoric had become increasingly hostile toward Israel since he was elected in June of that year.

While no member states formally voted against the resolution, it was disturbing that several rejected giving attention to the Nazi Holocaust. Egypt, for example, expressed reservations about the resolution's call for

|||||||

97 A/RES/60/7, adopted without a vote, 1 November 2005.

98 A total of 104 UN member states (out of 191 at the time) co-sponsored the resolution. Of the 87 countries not sponsoring the resolution, it is not difficult to distinguish between those who acted deliberately as opposed to those modestly sized missions who, for one reason or other, failed to submit the necessary forms in time. The 87 *non-sponsors* were: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua-Barbuda, Armenia, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Bhutan, Botswana, Brunei Dar-Salam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cape Verde, Chad, Comoros, Cuba, DPRK, Djibouti, Dominica, Egypt, Eritrea, Ghana, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Laos, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libya, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Qatar, Saint Lucia, St. Vincent Grenadines, Sao Tome Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syria, Tajikistan, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, United Arab Emirates, Tanzania, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Vietnam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

99 Nazila Fathi, “Iranian says wipe Israel ‘off the map,’ New leader revives an old rhetorical tack,” *International Herald Tribune*, 27 October 2005, at 5. In a press release the following day, then-Secretary-General Annan expressed his “dismay” at Ahmadinejad's remarks, reminding all member states that “under the United Nations Charter, all Members have undertaken to refrain from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State.” See UN Press Release SG/SM/10188, “Secretary-General Dismayed at Iranian President's Remarks on Israel,” 27 October 2005.

|||||||

96 *Ibid.*

## HOLOCAUST AND THE UN OUTREACH PROGRAM

education programs to be developed about the Holocaust and complained about Jews having a “monopoly on suffering.”<sup>100</sup> Indonesia regretted that the resolution did not simultaneously address other human tragedies.<sup>101</sup> Jordan said that Holocaust remembrance was sometimes used to justify policies of “continued domination of one people by another,” a thinly veiled jab at Israel.<sup>102</sup> Venezuela called for commemorating “other holocausts” that occurred during World War II, referring expressly to “the annihilation of Hiroshima and Nagasaki.”<sup>103</sup> The representative of the Chavez government said, “[T]he United States and other nations had participated in systematic genocides against the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America, which must be collectively remembered.”<sup>104</sup> Malaysia called for the resolution to be “broadened.”<sup>105</sup>

These member states sought to undermine the impact of the Holocaust remembrance resolution by claiming that nothing about the Nazi massacre of six million Jews was unique. Their claim to be upholding principle—that they opposed the singling out of one cause in a resolution—was less than persuasive. All of these states systematically sponsor or vote to support a plethora of special UN resolutions, reports, and mechanisms concerning the Palestinians, or, more recently, concerning Islamophobia and the “defamation of religions.” In those votes, which occur routinely throughout the UN, their supposed opposition to privileging one group or to sanctioning a “monopoly on suffering” has been curiously absent.

Perhaps the best outcome of the Holocaust remembrance resolution derives from the last operative paragraph, which created a program of outreach on the “Holocaust and the United Nations.” Thanks to this outreach program, which is based in the Department of Public Information in New York and includes a handful of full-time staff, UN employees, diplomats, and visitors stand to learn more about the Holocaust. Along with coordinating the Annual Holocaust Observance Day in New York, the outreach program has organized briefings and film screenings throughout the year, published discussion papers, created displays for the UN visitors’ lobby, and held training sessions for UN Information Centers (UNICs) in conjunction with the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum.

### ANNUAL COMMEMORATIONS IN NEW YORK

Both the 2006 and 2007 annual commemorations in New York were well organized and involved a full week of activities. In 2006, the events included a traveling exhibit on the life of children during the Holocaust from Yad Vashem and two screenings of the movie *Fateless*, based on the novel by Nobel Laureate Imre Kertesz. There was a briefing for NGOs on promoting tolerance, featuring Israeli Ambassador Dan Gillerman and Judea Pearl—father of murdered *Wall Street Journal* journalist Daniel Pearl. A candlelit vigil was held in the UN visitors lobby, with statements from UN General Assembly President Jan Eliasson, read by Acting President Ronaldo Mota Sardenberg of Brazil and US Ambassador John Bolton, together with the reading by Holocaust survivors of excerpts from the UN Charter and Universal Declaration of Human Rights. The events were appropriate, serious, and substantial.

The commemoration in the GA plenary was equally impressive. In his statement opening the January 27, 2006 ceremony, former under-secretary-general Shashi Tharoor emphasized that the UN’s existence is intricately tied to the Holocaust, as world leaders sought to create an institution that would prevent the horrors of the Nazi death camps from ever happening again. There was a videotaped message from Secretary-General Annan, a message from GA President Eliasson (read by Acting President Sardenberg), and a statement by Israeli Ambassador Gillerman. Holocaust

100 United Nations Press Release GA/10413, “General Assembly Decides to Designate 27 January as Annual International Day of Commemoration to Honour Holocaust Victims,” 1 November 2005.

101 *Ibid.*

102 *Ibid.*

103 *Ibid.*

104 *Ibid.*

105 *Ibid.*

survivor Gerda Klein spoke, and the keynote lecture was delivered by Professor Yehuda Bauer, academic advisor to Yad Vashem and the International Task Force for International Cooperation on Holocaust Education, Remembrance, and Research, which represents twenty-four governments. The event was well attended and received.

Likewise, in the following year of 2007, the week of the Holocaust Commemoration at the UN in New York featured two exhibits in the UN Visitors' lobby, on the experience of Roma and Sinti during the Holocaust, and on artwork by Holocaust survivors. Two movies were screened about Holocaust survivors, there was a concert at Carnegie Hall, sponsored by the UN Department of Public Information and the Raoul Wallenberg Foundation, and the publication of a discussion paper by Professor Ben Kiernan, director of the Genocide Studies Program at Yale University. The commemoration ceremony in the plenary again featured speeches by Under Secretary-General Tharoor—who played a key role in making these into meaningful events—GA President Sheikha Haya Rashed Al Khalifa, Israeli Ambassador Gillerman, and a video message from Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon. The keynote speaker was Simone Veil, a Holocaust survivor and president of the *Fondation pour la Mémoire de la Shoah*. The ceremony was again well attended, and Mr. Tharoor spoke about the significance of the consensus adoption of a GA resolution earlier that month that condemned Holocaust denial (discussed further below).

### COMMEMORATIONS IN GENEVA

Commemorations have not been limited to New York, but have also been held at the UN European Headquarters in Geneva. This is particularly important as it was in Europe that the crimes of the Nazis and their collaborators occurred. While the 2006 and 2007 ceremonies in Geneva were serious, they were not as well-organized and developed as those in New York, and were arranged only at the last minute.

In 2006, the speakers included the director-general of the UN Office at Geneva (UNOG) Sergei Ordzhonikidze, Israeli Ambassador Itzhak Levanon, and Holocaust survivor and retired UN staffer Tom Luke. In order to synchronize with the 10:30 am ceremony in New York and view it by live video, the Geneva commemoration took place at 4:30 pm local time, on a Friday. The UN should have showed greater sensitivity to

the fact that this time was too close to sunset, and therefore traditional Jews—a significant part of the constituency interested in attending Holocaust commemorations—were precluded from participating.

The more substantial event was held earlier that day by an NGO, UN Watch, featuring Ambassador Levanon, Rwandan Ambassador Venetia Sebudandi, with compelling testimony by Auschwitz survivor Benjamin Orenstein. There were also poignant remarks from Mehmet Ulkumen, a Turkish Muslim then serving as the UN Geneva Chief of Protocol. Mr. Ulkumen's father was a Turkish diplomat on the Isle of Rhodes who famously saved Jews from deportation to Auschwitz. A local Geneva high school student read a poem and the event concluded with Geneva Rabbi Francois Garai reading out the Kaddish memorial prayer.

In the following year of 2007, the UN in Geneva organized a far more substantial event in the grand *Salle des Assemblées*, attended by hundreds. The highlight was the powerful keynote speech by Professor Irwin Cotler, a Canadian member of parliament and former justice minister and attorney-general. Other speakers included Director-General Ordzhonikidze, Ambassador Levanon, Holocaust survivor Ruth Fayon, and two young Europeans from the Auschwitz International Youth Meeting Center. There was a musical ensemble whose melodies struck the right note. The important role of the director-general, as well as that of Mrs. Marie Heuzé, Director of the United Nations Information Service in Geneva, helped ensure the overall success of the event.

As in the previous year, the event also took place in the evening—this time, though, on a Monday instead of Friday—in order to watch live video of the New York ceremony (though technical problems prevented the video from working). Most people are less interested in attending a gathering that merely shows a video of events occurring elsewhere, and the Geneva annual ceremony should focus on inviting its own live speakers.

### COMMEMORATIONS AT UN INFORMATION CENTERS

In addition to New York and Geneva, it is impressive that, in 2006, commemorations were also held by UN Information Centers (UNICs) in Nairobi, Lima, Kathmandu, and Baku. The UN Office at Nairobi (UNON) displayed an exhibition of photographs of the persecution of Jews and other ethnic minorities under Nazi Germany. The Israeli and German ambassadors to Kenya spoke, and the director-general of the UNON delivered a message from Secretary-General Ban. Kenya's last Holocaust survivor, Ezra Pakter, attended, as well as representatives of the Jewish community of Kenya. The Lima ceremony focused on the lessons of the Holocaust and included a prayer led by a local rabbi and words from the Israeli ambassador to Peru. The observance in Baku also involved the Israeli ambassador, Arthur Lenk. In Kathmandu, the UN summary describes engagement by a UNIC officer with students from twenty-one Nepalese high schools, but it is unclear if the content or timing had any direct relation to the annual Holocaust remembrance.<sup>106</sup>

### OUTREACH PROGRAM

The outreach program "Holocaust and the United Nations," as mandated in GA Resolution 60/7, has an annual budget of \$345,000. The program, led by the able Kimberly Mann, has held several roundtables and briefings, screened Holocaust-related movies, published discussion papers, and become a permanent observer at the 24-nation Task Force for International Cooperation on Holocaust Education, Remembrance and Research. The seriousness and frequency of these events, and the number of diplomats and UN officials they draw, have been particularly commendable. While this branch of the DPI has a modest budget and staff—dwarfed, for example, by the numerous UN departments, committees, and information programs dedicated to criticizing Israel—it may well be the most substantial effort that the UN has taken to address issues related to anti-Semitism since Kofi Annan's June 2004 call to action. It has been comprehensive and consistent, and while occasionally the focus has broadened from the Holocaust to other acts of genocide, this has not, in general, obscured its efforts against anti-Semitism.

Along with the briefings, films, and remembrances, one particularly successful aspect of the outreach program has been the coordination with the UNICs around the world, several of which, as mentioned above, held ceremonies on the UN's annual Holocaust commemoration day. In addition, Ms. Mann has organized training programs for UN staff on anti-Semitism and Holocaust remembrance. The outreach program has also published books and pamphlets on Holocaust education and fighting anti-Semitism, under the auspices of the DPI, and has distributed them to some fifty UNICs, including in countries where Holocaust education is not in the curriculum.

|||||||

106 "The Information Officer appraised [the high school students] of UN's engagement, both internationally and in Nepal, with focus in areas of peace, development (MDGs) and human rights. Even the students of remote village schools possessed an astounding amount of knowledge about the UN on issues ranging from the nuclear proliferation to the 'US influence over the UN.'" See summary at [http://www.un.org/aroundworld/unics/english/issues\\_holocaust.htm](http://www.un.org/aroundworld/unics/english/issues_holocaust.htm).

---

# COMBATING HOLOCAUST DENIAL

---

Mr. Ahmadinejad's rhetorical assault on the Jewish state was not confined to his October 2005 call for it to be "wiped off the map." Two months later, Ahmadinejad made a series of remarks denying the Holocaust. First, after denying Israel's legitimacy, calling it a "cancer" and arguing that a Jewish state should have been founded in Germany or Austria, he claimed there was "historical proof" that the Holocaust did not happen. Six days later, he publicly called the Holocaust a "myth" in a speech before thousands in the Iranian city of Zahedan.<sup>107</sup>

To their credit, both Secretary-General Annan and the Security Council immediately condemned Ahmadinejad's Holocaust denial. Annan was the first to do so and deserves special credit. He expressed "shock" at the remarks, affirmed the historicity of the Holocaust, and repeated his October statement "remind[ing] all Member States that Israel is a long-standing Member of the United Nations with the same rights and obligations as every other Member, and that, under the United Nations Charter, all Members have undertaken to refrain from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State."<sup>108</sup> One cannot recall similar remarks from Mr. Annan's predecessors. The Security Council then condemned Ahmadinejad in a unanimous press statement and reaffirmed that the UN Charter prohibits threats of force against member states.<sup>109</sup>

The General Assembly did not react until the following year, after Ahmadinejad's notorious two-day, faux-academic conference in Tehran questioning the Holocaust.<sup>110</sup> On January 26, 2007, the day before the second official commemoration of the UN's Holocaust remembrance day, the GA, in its 61<sup>st</sup> session, adopted without a vote Resolution 61/255 condemning Holocaust denial.<sup>111</sup> While the previous year's GA Resolution 60/7 on Holocaust remembrance included a rejection of Holocaust denial, the 2007 statement was more direct, "condemn[ing] without any reservation any denial of the Holocaust," and urging member states to reject Holocaust denial "or any activities to this end."

While the resolution did not explicitly mention Iran, the United States and Israel both explained to the GA plenary that the Iranian president's threats to Israel and denial of the Holocaust provided grounds for the resolution.<sup>112</sup> Iran for its part defended its conference—effectively acknowledging the GA resolution's object—saying that basic principles of democracy "should pave the way to explore different aspects of history without arbitrary restrictions."<sup>113</sup> Iran then formally disassociated itself from the resolution. Indonesia, as it did in 2006, said that the Holocaust was "hardly the only human tragedy," while Venezuela criticized Israel and the United States.<sup>114</sup>

|||||||

107 "Ahmadinejad courts radicals with new Israel outburst," Agence France Presse, 9 December 2005, and "Iranian leader: Holocaust a 'myth,'" CNN, 14 December 2005. See also "Holocaust comments spark outrage," BBC News, 14 December 2005.

108 United Nations Press Release SG/SM/10258, "Secretary-General Shocked at Remarks on Israel Attributed to President of Iran," 8 December 2005.

109 United Nations Press Release SC/8576, "Security Council Press Statement on Remarks by Iran's President," 9 December 2005.

|||||||

110 The conference participants included former American Ku Klux Klan leader David Duke as well as Robert Faurisson, a French lecturer known for questioning the Holocaust, and Michele Renouf, an associate of British author David Irving, who was serving a prison sentence in Austria for Holocaust denial. Prior to the conference, beginning in August 2006, Iran sponsored a Holocaust Cartoon Contest which displayed anti-Semitic content. As the *New York Times* describes, the content "has little to do with the events of World War II and Nazi Germany. There is instead a drawing of a Jew with a very large nose, a nose so large it obscures his entire head. Across his chest is the word Holocaust. Another drawing shows a vampire wearing a big Star of David drinking the blood of the Palestinians. A third shows Ariel Sharon dressed in a Nazi uniform, emblazoned not with swastikas but with the Star of David." Michael Slackman, "Iran Exhibits Anti-Jewish Art as Reply to Danish Cartoons," *New York Times*, 25 August 2006, at A8.

111 A/RES/61/255, adopted without a vote, 26 January 2007.

112 UN Press Release GA/10569, "General Assembly Adopts Resolution Condemning Any Denial of Holocaust," 26 January 2007.

113 *Ibid.*

114 *Ibid.*

The resolution enjoyed virtually the same amount of support as the 2006 Holocaust remembrance resolution, with 103 co-sponsors this time. The list of those who for one reason or another did not sponsor the resolution included mostly Arab and Islamic states.<sup>115</sup> However, it is noteworthy that a minority of eight African countries who are members of the 56-strong Organization of the Islamic Conference—Benin, Cameroon, Gabon, Mozambique, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Togo, and Maldives—did choose to co-sponsor. This was a welcome development.<sup>116</sup>

|||||

115 A total of 103 UN member states (out of 192) co-sponsored the resolution. Of the 88 countries who did *not* sponsor the resolution it is not difficult to distinguish between those who acted deliberately as opposed to those modestly sized missions who, for one reason or other, did not submit the necessary forms in time. Following are the 88 countries that did not co-sponsor the resolution: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua-Barbuda, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Bhutan, Botswana, Brunei Dar-Salam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cape Verde, Chad, China, Comoros, Cuba, DPRK, Djibouti, Dominica, Ecuador, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Gambia, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kiribati, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Laos, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libya, Malawi, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, Qatar, Saint Lucia, St. Vincent Grenadines, Sao Tome Principe, Saudi Arabia, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syria, Tajikistan, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, Tanzania, Uzbekistan, Venezuela, Vietnam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

116 Since there was no vote on the issue, the best way to judge where member states stood is to see whether they co-sponsored the resolution. In this case, all the countries in the Western European and Others Group (the UN regional bloc for Western countries) co-sponsored the resolution, while none of the 21 members of the League of Arab States co-sponsored. A number of historically anti-Israel states, including Saudi Arabia, Syria, Sudan, and Zimbabwe, were uncharacteristically absent when the resolution was adopted, a sign of opposition. See "UN resolution condemns denials of the Holocaust," *Star Ledger* (Newark), 27 January 2007.



---

**PART TWO:  
ASSESSING UN ACTIONS  
THAT FOSTER ANTI-SEMITISM**

---



---

# THE CAMPAIGN AT THE UN TO REDEFINE AND DENY ANTI-SEMITISM

---

At the September 2007 session of the UN Human Rights Council, Pakistan took the floor on behalf of the 56-strong Islamic bloc to declare that “a cruel form of anti-Semitism” is “Islamophobia.” Algeria added that there is “a worrying upswing in anti-Semitism which now targets Arabs and is extended by oversimplification to all Muslims.” These are but the latest salvos in an absurd yet dangerous campaign at the UN to define away the term for the hatred of Jews, waged by the very states with the most to answer for.

The argument that anti-Semitism refers also to Arabs since they too are “Semites” is a facile play of words that, in the words of eminent Middle East scholar Bernard Lewis, “lacks all merit” and demonstrates “either ignorance or bad faith.”<sup>117</sup> It is akin to arguing that one cannot possibly be homophobic because one belongs to the *Homo sapiens* species. The word anti-Semitism was coined in the 1870s by Wilhem Marr, the German proto-Nazi, as a euphemism for *Judenhass*, Jew-hatred, and remained the accepted term for hostility or prejudice against Jews. As anti-Semitism scholar Robert Wistrich notes, the concept was meant to provide a racial and political euphemism to replace traditional Christian Jew-hatred in Europe.

Semite is a classification of language, explains Lewis, not of race or nationality.<sup>118</sup> It says something, he remarked, that Adolf Hitler, the greatest anti-Semite in history, had no qualms about allying himself with the Palestinian Arabs, represented by Grand Mufti Haj Amin al-Husseini, who was warmly hosted in Berlin during World War II.<sup>119</sup>

Yet the absurd argument that Arabs are victims of anti-Semitism has echoed for years in the halls of the UN—and appears to be intensifying. It may have been given new steam from the Durban conference in 2001, in the notoriously specious text of the NGO Forum declaration, perhaps known best for accusing Israel of genocide. “Anti-Arab racism is another form of anti-Semitism and Islamophobia,” it declared, and “Arabs as a Semitic people have also suffered

from alternative forms of anti semitism [sic], manifesting itself as anti Arab [sic] discrimination and for those Arabs who are Muslim, also as Islamophobia.”<sup>120</sup>

Six months later, at the March 2002 session of the Commission on Human Rights in Geneva, Palestinian observer Nabil Ramlawi told the plenary that “the Israeli Government itself was practicing anti-Semitism against the Palestinians.”<sup>121</sup> Several months after that, in the General Assembly’s committee that treats human rights, Lebanese diplomat Semi Zeidan declared that “Arabs had themselves been subjected to alternative forms of anti-Semitism.”<sup>122</sup> A few days later, his Egyptian colleague, Amr Roshdy, rejected accusations of anti-Semitism “because the Egyptians were more Semitic than the Israelis, having lived in their country for 7,000 years.”<sup>123</sup> The same Mr. Roshdy then brought his logic to Geneva for the 2003 session of the Commission, where he asserted that “no one could accuse Egyptians of being anti-Semitic since that would be a contradiction in terms.”<sup>124</sup> Absurd as the argument is, its function is clear.

The Syrians have made frequent use of the argument as well. In a June 2001 letter to the secretary-general circulated to all UN member states, the Syrian government insisted that “[t]he charge of anti-Semitism that is made against the Arabs from time to time is no more than ignorance of the fact that the Arabs are Semites by origin, and this requires that Israel should desist from making a false accusation that is refuted by history and contradicted by any sound logic.”<sup>125</sup> In 2002, Syria’s Al Haj Ali objected to using the term anti-Semitism in reference only to Jews as it “was not the monopoly of a particular group.” Rather, the word means “prejudice against

|||||||

117 Bernard Lewis, “The Arab World Discovers Anti-Semitism,” *Commentary*, May 1986, at 30-35.

118 *Ibid.*

119 Joseph B. Schechtman, *The Mufti and the Fuehrer* (New York, Thomas Yoseloff: 1965).

|||||||

120 NGO Forum Declaration and Programme of Action, World Conference Against Racism, Racial Discrimination Xenophobia and Related Intolerance, Durban, South Africa, August 27-Sept 1, 2001. As indicated, the original text has the hyphens missing.

121 Commission on Human Rights, 58th Session, 19 March 2002, UN Doc. E/CN.4/2002/SR.3.

122 Third Committee of the General Assembly, 57th Session, 24 October 2002, UN Doc. A/C.3/57/SR.26.

123 Third Committee of the General Assembly, 57th Session, 29 October 2002, UN Doc. A/C.3/57/SR.29.

124 Amr Roshdy, Commission on Human Rights, 59th Session, 1 April 2003, UN Doc. E/CN.4/2003/SR.15.

125 Letter from the Chargé d'affaires a.i. of the Permanent Mission of the Syrian Arab Republic to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General, General Assembly, 56th Session, 15 June 2001, UN Doc. A/56/94.

all Arabs, regardless of their diverse religious beliefs.”<sup>126</sup> In 2004, Syria’s Mikhail Wehbe, went so far as to claim that “Arabs were also Semites and the racist Israeli leaders, such as Ariel Sharon and others, were the real anti-Semites.”<sup>127</sup>

Recent years have seen no abating in such statements. At the June 2007 session, Algeria’s Idriss Jazaïry, envoy to the UN in Geneva, complained to the Human Rights Council that while “anti-Semitism towards Jews was currently deemed to be politically incorrect, anti-Semitism towards Arabs was still considered politically correct.”<sup>128</sup>

Though no serious person gives this argument any thought, it is worrisome that the concept, after being repeated in UN records again and again, has already seeped into the discourse of a major international anti-racism initiative. Several Arab states must certainly consider it a useful rhetorical device to deflect accusations of anti-Semitism prevalent in their societies or state-sanctioned media, and render themselves immune from the charge.

The argument is related to the claim by many of the same governments that anti-Semitism remains a strictly European phenomenon. Wistrich explains that if an attitude is anti-Semitic, it will not stop being anti-Semitic if the nationality or language of the person holding that attitude changes. The truth is that anti-Semitism for some years now has been most alarming precisely in the Arab world. As Bernard Lewis observed:

The volume of anti-Semitic books and articles published... their place in school and college curricula, their role in the mass media, would all seem to suggest that classical anti-Semitism is an essential part of Arab intellectual life at the present time—almost as much as happened in Nazi Germany, and considerably more than in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century France.<sup>129</sup>

At the UN, those who make the argument may or may not believe it, but they apparently hope to convince enough of their fellow diplomats who may not be so knowledgeable about the subject. Or their attempt may be just to sow confusion, thereby gutting any condemnations of anti-Semitism of their meaning.

For if there is no word for the hatred of Jews, how can the UN express sympathy for its victims?

|||||||

126 Third Committee of the General Assembly, 56th Session, 7 March 2002, UN Doc. A/C.3/56/SR.62.

127 Commission on Human Rights, 60th Session, 2 April 2004.

128 Human Rights Council, Fifth Session, 11 June 2007.

129 Bernard Lewis, *Semites and Anti-Semites* (New York/London: Norton, 1986), at 286.

---

# DEMONIZATION OF ISRAEL

---

*[T]he United Nations' record on anti-Semitism has at times fallen short of our ideals. The General Assembly resolution of 1975, equating Zionism with racism, was an especially unfortunate decision...*

— Kofi Annan, June 21, 2004

In this section we examine the 2004-2007 record of UN bodies in singling out Israel for grossly disproportionate condemnation through one-sided resolutions that, in the case of the Human Rights Council's first year, amounted to as much as one hundred percent of all country censures. In

doing so we pose the question as to when legitimate criticism by UN bodies or officials of specific Israeli government actions or policies becomes something else, and crosses over into the irrational demonization of the entire Jewish state and people and becomes anti-Semitism. We begin by defining key indicators for what is a matter of heated controversy, presenting the views of leading authorities, scholars and practitioners. With that basis, and an appreciation of the relevant UN history and background on this issue, we assess the UN's recent record, focusing on the GA and the Council as case studies.

## LEGITIMATE CRITICISM OR ILLEGITIMATE DEMONIZATION

---

Even leading officials of the UN have acknowledged that the demonization of Israel—denying its very right to exist, or denying only the right of the Jewish people to self-determination—can constitute anti-Semitism. Former Secretary-General Annan was particularly forthright. “Criticism of Israeli policies is one thing,” he said in 1999. “But it is quite another when such critiques take the form of attacks, physical or verbal, on Jewish individuals and the symbols of their heritage and faith ... No one should be allowed to use criticism of Israel’s actions as a mask for anti-Semitism.”<sup>130</sup> In discussing anti-Semitism at the June 2004 gathering, Annan was unafraid to cite his own organization’s treatment of Israel: “Let us acknowledge that the United Nations’ record on anti-Semitism has at times fallen short of our ideals. The General Assembly resolution of 1975, equating Zionism with racism, was an especially unfortunate decision.”

Annan has criticized not only that infamous 1975 GA resolution, repealed in 1991, but also the “exclusion of Israel from the system of regional groupings” and “the intense focus given to some actions taken in Israel, while other situations

sometimes fail to elicit similar outrage.” These and other circumstances, he said, give the impression of “bias and one-sidedness.” To some, noted Annan, “it sometimes seems the United Nations serves the interests of all the world’s peoples but one: the Jews.”

Similarly, UN racism expert Doudou Diène, as discussed above, has recognized that “certain forms of anti-Zionism can hide manifestations of anti-Semitism.” Most famously, he described Iran’s leader as a “sobering example” of the new forms of anti-Semitism, citing the latter’s calls to destroy Israel.<sup>131</sup> In addition, as discussed above, Diène has cited the views of experts who identify the following criteria for assessing when extreme criticism of Israel crosses over anti-Semitism:

- “When the language, images and character traits attributed to Israel are imbued with recognizable anti-Semitic stereotypes”;

|||||||

130 K. Annan, “The Inaugural Robert Burns Memorial Lecture,” 13 January 2004, UN Press Release SG/SM/9112.

|||||||

131 See reports by Doudou Diène, UN Doc. A/HRC/4/19, 12 January 2007, at 15-16, and UN Doc. A/HRC/4/19/Add.1, 5 June 2007, at 27.

- “When Israelis and Jews are represented as cosmic devils, blamed for global disasters and compared with Nazis, diabolical figures par excellence”;
- “When Israelis and Jews who support the State of Israel are singled out and attacked and are treated in a manner that is out of proportion to the issue at hand and in comparison with the actions of other countries”; or
- “When the legitimate right of Israel as a Jewish State to exist is questioned.”<sup>132</sup>

In addition to UN authorities, other leading inter-governmental organizations have addressed the potential for anti-Semitism to mask itself as anti-Israelism or anti-Zionism. In its 2004 Berlin Declaration on anti-Semitism, the OSCE—a regional security organization comprised of 56 countries—confronted the connection between criticism of Israel and anti-Semitism.<sup>133</sup> A more substantial treatment of this issue came in the 2004 analysis on anti-Semitism by the European Monitoring Centre on Racism and Xenophobia (EUMC), a body now known as the EU Agency for Fundamental Rights, in its working definition of anti-Semitism.<sup>134</sup> Other government authorities, such as the U.S. Special Envoy for Monitoring and Combating Anti-Semitism, have in turn treated this definition as a starting point in the fight against anti-Semitism.<sup>135</sup> According to the EUMC, examples of the ways in which anti-Semitism manifests itself with regard to the Israel could include:

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

■■■■■■■■■■

132 Report by Doudou Diène, UN Doc. E/CN.4/2005/18/Add.4, 13 December 2004, par. 38, at 13.

133 In one of the declaration’s three main articles, the OSCE states decided to “[d]eclare unambiguously that international developments or political issues, including those in Israel or elsewhere in the Middle East, never justify anti-Semitism.” OSCE Berlin Declaration, April 29, 2004.

134 EUMC Working Definition of Anti-Semitism, 2004 (<http://fra.europa.eu/fra/material/pub/AS/AS-WorkingDefinition-draft.pdf>).

135 Fact Sheet, U.S. State Dept., Office to Monitor and Combat Anti-Semitism, Washington, DC, February 8, 2007 ([state.gov/g/drl/rls/56589.htm](http://state.gov/g/drl/rls/56589.htm)).

- “Applying double standards by requiring of it a behavior not expected or demanded of any other democratic nation”;
- “Using the symbols and images associated with classic anti-Semitism (e.g., claims of Jews killing Jesus or blood libel) to characterize Israel or Israelis”;
- “Drawing comparisons of contemporary Israeli policy to that of the Nazis”; or
- “Holding Jews collectively responsible for actions of the state of Israel.”<sup>136</sup>

However, the EUMC points out, “criticism of Israel similar to that leveled against any other country cannot be regarded as anti-Semitic.”

In wake of the UN’s 1975 adoption of the “Zionism is Racism” resolution, a number of scholars examined the interplay between anti-Zionism, demonization of Israel, and anti-Semitism.<sup>137</sup> When he was U.S. assistant secretary of state in the 1980’s, Alan Keyes wrote that “the thought is father to the deed. The anti-Zionist movement in the UN prepares the way for defending, as a form of punishment or legitimate struggle, the terrorism directed against supporters of Israel, rather than by condemning it as barbaric violence against the innocent ... the UN’s anti-Zionism campaign has, I believe, been part of and contributed to existing anti-Semitic tendencies.”<sup>138</sup>

■■■■■■■■■■

136 EUMC Working Definition of Anti-Semitism, 2004.

137 See, for example, published papers from the International Legal Conference on Anti-Semitism, Anti-Zionism and the United Nations. Yoram Dinstein, *Anti-Semitism, Anti-Zionism and the United Nations*, 17 I.Y.H.R. 15 (1987) (summarizing the conference); John Carey and Henry F. Carey, *Hostility in United Nations Bodies to Judaism, the Jewish People and Jews as Such*, 17 I.Y.H.R. 29 (1987); Sidney Liskofsky and Donna E. Artz, *Incitement to National, Racial and Religious Hatred in United Nations*, 17 I.Y.H.R. 41 (1987); Allan Gerson, *The United Nations and Racism: The Case of the Zionism as Racism Resolution as Progenitor*, 17 I.Y.H.R. 68 (1987); Seymour Maxwell Finger, *The Effect of the Institutionalization of Anti-Zionism on the Integrity of the United Nations Secretariat*, 17 I.Y.H.R. 74 (1987); Edward C. Luck, *The Impact of the Zionism-Racism Resolution on the Standing of the United Nations in the United States*, 17 I.Y.H.R. 95 (1987); Gidon Gottlieb, *The Legitimacy of General Assembly Resolutions*, 17 I.Y.H.R. 120 (1987).

138 Alan L. Keyes, *Anti-Zionism, Anti-Semitism and the Decline of the UN Ideal*, 17 I.Y.H.R. 24 (1987).

More recently, with a worldwide increase in anti-Semitism together with efforts to single out Israel for boycotts and sanctions, the issues have been revisited by the leading contemporary scholars of anti-Semitism. Historian Walter Laqueur, in his recent work, *The Changing Face of Anti-Semitism*, notes that in the past those who felt antipathy toward Jews were not afraid to call themselves anti-Semites. Hitler, however, gave anti-Semitism a bad name. After the Holocaust, even those harboring extreme distaste for Jews were reluctant to admit to anti-Semitism.<sup>139</sup> When Stalin rooted out and executed scores of Jews in the 1950s, he called this move “anti-Zionism” rather than anti-Semitism.<sup>140</sup> As William Korey has documented, the Soviet Union played a leading role at the UN in the pushing the “Zionism is Racism” resolution, of which it then made extensive use at home, in a state-sponsored, anti-Zionist campaign of books, newspapers, and journals, replete with classic themes of anti-Semitic propaganda.<sup>141</sup>

According to Laqueur, traditional anti-Semitism of the extreme right is on the decline in the modern world, but it has been replaced by a new form of antipathy toward Jews, often from the left. Laqueur sets forth a two-fold test to distinguish this modern anti-Semitism from legitimate criticism of Israel. The first test deals with the root of the criticism. Attacks against specific policies of the Israeli government can be legitimate, while attacks against the very existence of Israel are anti-Semitism. The second test deals with selectivity. If the attacks give “constant and relentless publicity” to the misdeeds of Israel, while consistently ignoring all the other evils in the world, then the attacks are anti-Semitism.<sup>142</sup> Leading Canadian human rights advocate David Matas writes that “selective criticism directed to Israel, when far worse offender countries and non-governmental entities are ignored, is obviously about something else than

promoting respect for human rights. That something else is demonization and ultimately the destruction of the State of Israel.”<sup>143</sup>

Natan Sharansky, former Israeli cabinet minister and Soviet prisoner of conscience, who was sent to the Gulag for the crime of seeking to emigrate to Israel, has a similar test for gauging criticism of Israel—the “3D test.” The first is demonization. If Israel is demonized, if Israelis are compared with Nazis and Palestinian refugee camps with concentration camps, and if Israeli actions are “blown out of all sensible proportion,” then the critique is anti-Semitism. The second is double standards, and this test is similar to Laqueur’s “selectivity” criterion. Sharansky explains that when Israel is continually singled out for criticism but those same standards are not applied to major human rights abusing countries (and here Sharansky specifically identifies Israel’s treatment at the United Nations as satisfying this test), then the critique is anti-Semitism. The third is delegitimization, and this test overlaps with Laqueur’s first criterion judging the root of the criticism. For Sharansky, like Laqueur, when Israel’s fundamental right to exist is denied, then the critique is anti-Semitism.<sup>144</sup>

If there is a thread uniting the different tests, it is that of rationality. The embrace of anti-Semitism has always been the embrace of irrationality. As we examine the UN’s record this is worth bearing in mind.

139 Walter Laqueur, *The Changing Face of anti-Semitism* (London: Oxford University Press, 2006), 16.

140 Walter Laqueur, *Dying for Jerusalem: The Past, Present and Future of the Holiest City* (Sourcebooks, Inc., 2006), 55.

141 William Korey, *The Kremlin and the UN ‘Zionism Equals Racism’ Resolution*, 17 I.Y.H.R. 133 (1987); and William Korey, *Russian Antisemitism, Pamyat, and the Demonology of Zionism* (Chur, 1995).

142 Laqueur, *Dying for Jerusalem*, 55.

143 David Matas, *Aftershock: Anti-Zionism and Anti-Semitism* (Dundurn, 2005), 39.

144 Natan Sharansky, “3D Test of Anti-Semitism: Demonization, Double Standards, Delegitimization,” *Jewish Political Studies Review* 16:3-4 (Fall, 2004).

## BACKGROUND: UN INFRASTRUCTURE OF DEMONIZATION

---

An alien observing UN debates, reading its resolutions, and walking its halls could well conclude that a principal purpose of the world body is to censure a tiny country called Israel. Beginning in the late 1960s, the full weight of the UN was gradually but deliberately turned against the country it had conceived by General Assembly resolution a mere two decades earlier. The campaign to demonize and delegitimize Israel in every UN and international forum was initiated by the Arab states together with the Soviet Union, and supported by what has become known as an “automatic majority” of Third World member states.

The campaign reached new strength in wake of the Arab oil embargo of 1973, when many African states were pressured into severing relations with Israel. In 1975, following a steady drumbeat of anti-Israel declarations pushed through the International Women's Year Conference in Mexico and then the Organization of African Unity, the majority of the General Assembly adopted the “Zionism is Racism” resolution. At the same time, it instituted a series of related measures that together installed an infrastructure of anti-Israel propaganda throughout the UN. It was not until 1991, after strenuous efforts by democratic forces—led in part by John Bolton, who was then at the U.S. State Department—that the infamous resolution was repealed.

However, in many ways the legacy of 1975 remains fully intact: a plethora of UN committees, annual resolutions, bureaucratic divisions, permanent exhibits in New York and Geneva headquarters—all dedicated to a relentless and virulent propaganda war against the Jewish state.

There are several special UN entities ostensibly dedicated to the Palestinian cause. The oldest is the “Special Committee to Investigate Israeli Practices Affecting the Human Rights of the Palestinian People and Other Arabs of the Occupied Territories,” created in 1968. In 1975, the General Assembly added the “Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People.” Supporting its work is the Division for Palestinian Rights, which boasts a 16-member staff and a budget of millions, which it devotes to the constant promotion of anti-Israel propaganda throughout the world.

The busiest corridor of the *Palais des Nations*, the European headquarters of the UN in Geneva, displays no fewer than ten larger-than-life panels devoted to the Palestinian cause. The clear message is that the Palestinians are the world's greatest human

rights victim, Israel the world's greatest human rights abuser. There are no other such exhibits treating any other country or cause.

Taken together, this campaign has turned the UN into Ground Zero for the delegitimization of Israel in the forum of international law and politics. The anti-Israel measures incite hatred against Israel as well as Jews worldwide who are willy-nilly identified with it and have contributed not a thing to help the Palestinian situation. On the contrary, they give strength and succor to extremists. Paradoxically, one of the greatest violators of the UN Charter's equality guarantee has been the UN body charged with establishing and enforcing international human rights, the Human Rights Council.

None of this means Israel should be above the law. Every country, including every democracy, commits human rights violations, and states should be held to account, both domestically and internationally. Yet Israel does have the right to be treated equally under the law. The UN Charter and the rules of natural justice demand no less. It is legitimate for UN bodies to criticize Israel, but not when they do so unfairly, selectively, massively, sometimes exclusively, and often obsessively.

Likewise, it is perfectly legitimate to call attention to the rights of the Palestinian people and their often difficult conditions. But it is something else entirely to abuse their cause for the sole objective of scapegoating Israel.

Amnesty International recently released a 31-page report urging the Lebanese government to end its discrimination against hundreds of thousands of Palestinian refugees—who are denied the right to work or leave their areas—and to respect their human rights.<sup>145</sup> It is telling that with all the UN time and resources ostensibly devoted to Palestinian rights, this issue has never even once been raised—not by the General Assembly, the Human Rights Council, or any other UN body. The same is true for the plight of many dozens of Palestinians in Gaza who, in the Hamas-Fatah bloodletting of this past year, were thrown off rooftops, shot as they lay wounded in hospital beds, or murdered while their colleges were firebombed. Where Israel cannot be blamed, the UN bodies that claim to speak for Palestinians have without exception chosen a deadly silence. Like much else at the UN, action “for the rights of Palestinians” proves to be a euphemism; a euphemism for targeting Israel.

|||||||

145 Amnesty International, *Exiled and Suffering: Palestinian Refugees in Lebanon*, October 2007, available at <http://web.amnesty.org/pages/refugees-161007-feature-eng>.

## EXAMINING THE UN RECORD OF 2004-2007: CASE STUDIES

To examine the record of UN agencies between 2004 and 2007 in the demonization of Israel, one could examine numerous bodies. The World Health Organization, for example, meeting at its annual assembly in 2005, passed but one resolution against a specific country—Israel was charged with violating Palestinian rights to health. Similarly, the International Labour Organization, at its annual 2005 conference, carried only one major country report on its annual agenda—a lengthy document charging Israel with violating the rights of Palestinian workers. The list goes on.

For reason of space, in this section we focus on only two bodies, the GA and the Human Rights Council, and focus on the past year, 2006-07, as case studies for the phenomenon as a whole.

Did the actions of the GA and the Council toward Israel amount to demonization?

### GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Let us first consider the GA. Every year at the GA, Israel is condemned in more resolutions than any other country. In a typical year, four or five of the worst human rights abusers are criticized by one resolution each. Israel, however, was singled out, in 2004-05, by *eighteen resolutions*—all one-sided. In 2005-06, there were another eighteen.

These texts tend to keep the same language from year to year, sometimes maintaining language originally penned in the 1970s. Positive actions by Israel do not generally result in the withdrawal of the condemnations and are, in fact, rarely even noted in the text. The reverse, however, does not apply, and negative events in the Middle East usually bring new resolutions.

For 2006-07, therefore, after the 2006 Israeli-Hezbollah War and other developments, there were four new resolutions criticizing Israel, bringing the total to twenty-two for the year. For summaries of each of the twenty-two resolutions criticizing Israel adopted by the 2006-07 GA—as well as analyses of why each one holds Israel to a separate set of standards—see **Table 1: UN GA Resolutions Criticizing Israel**.

There are several fundamentally irrational elements common to many of the twenty-two resolutions. One is the deliberate exclusion of necessary context, whereby Israel is condemned for a situation but other parties are not assigned any responsibilities. For example, the resolution blaming Israel for the 2006 Lebanon War does not even mention that Hezbollah initiated the hostilities by crossing an internationally recognized border, killing eight soldiers, and kidnapping two others, a textbook *casus belli*. By simply ignoring other parties' responsibilities, these resolutions portray Israel as an aggressor whose actions cannot be justified, a form of demonization that is absent in resolutions addressing other countries.

Another common theme is to discriminate, or to value certain lives and property more than others. For example, several resolutions criticize Israel for the loss of Palestinian lives caused by Israeli incursions, which are often defensive. These resolutions fail to criticize Palestinian sponsors of terrorism, such as Hamas and the Al-Aqsa Martyrs Brigade, who cause the loss of life of innocent Israelis, and they are equally silent about Palestinians murdered by Palestinian groups.<sup>146</sup>

A third theme is redundancy, an irrationality that is tolerated on no other issue. One of the reasons so many resolutions criticize Israel is that there are so many UN institutions that have been set up to monitor and criticize Israeli actions—without looking at Palestinian actions—and each institution has its own resolution. All of this is deliberate, of course. There is no rational purpose in endlessly repeating the same condemnations.

The countless anti-Israel resolutions and related debates consume an astonishing proportion of the UN community's precious resources. This year, during the 61st Session of the General Assembly (2006-07), the time spent by ambassadors on enacting the twenty-second anti-Israel resolution of the year was time not spent on passing a single resolution on

■■■■■■■■■■

146 The June 2007 annual report by the Palestinian Independent Commission for Citizens' Rights found that from January 2006 through May 2007, 616 Palestinians were killed by other Palestinians. According to Reuters, the number of Palestinians killed by Israelis in the same time period was quite close—only seven percent higher. Yet the GA and the HRC have not even once criticized the Palestinians for causing hundreds of deaths of their own, much less for causing the deaths of Lebanese soldiers this May-June in Lebanon or of Israeli soldiers or civilians in Israel. See Mohammed Assadi, "Factional battles kill 616 Palestinians since 2006," *Reuters*, 6 June 2007.

Sudan’s genocide in Darfur. Diplomats at foreign ministries or UN missions have a limited amount of time to devote to any particular UN session. Because every proposed UN resolution is subjected to intensive review by various levels and branches of government, a direct result of the anti-Israel texts is a crippling of the UN’s ability to tackle the world’s ills.

### HUMAN RIGHTS COUNCIL

We now come to the Human Rights Council. Its predecessor, the Commission on Human Rights, condemned Israel in four resolutions in 2004, and five in 2005—in each case, representing a full 50 percent of all of the commission’s country censures. In the new Council’s first year of operations, beginning from its inauguration in June 2006, the number went up to 100 percent. No other country in the world was condemned once, leaving Israel as the world’s only official human rights violator, and a repeat offender at that. If that is not demonization, then nothing is.

Some background is in order. The Council was created by the GA in March 2006 to replace the Commission as the UN’s main human rights body. The Commission in its early years gave the world the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights and the system of independent UN human rights experts that still exists today. However, the Commission became discredited over time by its poor membership and performance. In its later years, its members included such notorious human rights violators as Cuba, Saudi Arabia, and Sudan. In 2003, Libya was elected as chair. Its annual meetings ignored most of the world’s worst abuses while focusing selectively on a handful of countries. As indicated, in the Commission’s last few years, a full 50 percent of its resolutions condemning specific states were against Israel.<sup>147</sup>

The situation had so deteriorated that, in March 2005, Secretary-General Annan, following a report by a high-level panel of eminent figures, declared the Commission to be suffering from a fatal “credibility deficit”—one that was

147 At the Commission, over a forty-year period, 30 percent of the resolutions condemning specific states for human rights violations were against Israel—and in its last years, the figure rose to 50 percent. In 2005, for example, the Commission adopted four resolutions against Israel and four resolutions against all other states in the world. Belarus, Cuba, Myanmar (Burma), and North Korea were the subject of one resolution each.

casting “a shadow on the reputation of the United Nations system as a whole.” Mr. Annan cited the Commission’s declining professionalism and decried a reality where countries sought membership of the Commission “not to strengthen human rights but to protect themselves against criticism or to criticize others.” The Commission, said Annan, was undermined by the “politicization of its sessions” and the “selectivity of its work.”<sup>148</sup> Accordingly, Mr. Annan proposed far-ranging reform and the replacement of the Commission with a new body. When the Council began its inaugural year, Mr. Annan explicitly urged the Council not to focus on Israel alone.<sup>149</sup>

Regrettably, the Council has failed to meet the basic standards set by Mr. Annan and its own founding resolution. The membership still includes persistent violators like China, Cuba, Russia, and Saudi Arabia. And unlike the Commission’s and the GA’s heavy focus on Israel, the Council in its first year focused *exclusively* on Israel. From June 2006 to June 2007, 100 percent of its condemnatory resolutions were against Israel, making it the only country in the entire world to have been criticized by the Human Rights Council.<sup>150</sup> For summaries and analyses of each of the nine resolutions criticizing Israel adopted by the HRC in its first year, see **Table 2: UN HRC Resolutions Criticizing Israel**. Moreover, Israel was singled out for permanent indictment under a special agenda item. Finally, the Council investigator into Israeli actions in the Palestinian territories—whose mandate precludes his consideration of Palestinian terrorism, and presumes Israel’s guilt in advance—was renewed forever.

All of the resolutions were one-sided, condemning Israel only, and ignoring the bloody murders, kidnappings and other provocations by Hamas and Hezbollah. Even the situation in Sudan, where a brutal regime sponsors mass killings, has been treated by the Council with consideration of the actions of all sides, government and rebel alike. Not so with Israel.

|||||||

148 Explanatory Note by the Secretary General, Addendum 1 to the Report of the Secretary-General, “In arger freedom: towards development, security and human rights for all,” May 23, 2005 (A/59/2005/Add.1).

149 Secretary-General Kofi Annan, Statement at Press Conference, June 15, 2006.

150 For a fuller analysis of the performance of the Human Rights Council in its first year, see UN Watch, “Dawn of a New Era? Assessment of the UN Human Rights Council and its Year of Reform,” Geneva, 2007.

### MEMBER STATES: ANTI-SEMITIC STATEMENTS IN UN PROCEEDINGS

Statements by UN member states in official debates of the organization are significant and deserve scrutiny. The following pronouncements, examples of what is routine at the Human Rights Council, portray Israelis as Nazis, the epitome of evil, or even as non-human:

- “The Holocaust is going on, and it is an Israeli Holocaust against the Palestinian people.” — *Palestinian Observer Mohammad Abu-Koash, Dec. 12, 2006*
- “There is an Israeli Holocaust against Palestinian people on a daily basis for more than sixty years, which was already noted by three special sessions.” — *Iranian delegate Forouza Ndeh Vadiati, Dec. 12, 2006*
- “Civilian people were killed, massacred, by the invading forces, who have come from the planet Mars which they now call the Israeli occupier.” — *Syrian delegate, June 23, 2006*<sup>151</sup>

Regrettably, hateful statements such as these typically go without any reaction by the presiding officers or by other member states, and enter the permanent UN record. So, too, there was no objection made by any UN or government official when Alireza Moayeri, Iranian ambassador to the UN in Geneva, sent an official letter to the Council president, circulated to all envoys on January 11, 2007, that called the Holocaust merely a “historical claim,” asserting that “the number of perished” was a particularly “legitimate question,” and that there are “serious opposing ideas over the issue.” The above statements bear distinct anti-Semitic tones and create a hostile and racist atmosphere within a key UN body—in this case, the very UN body that is meant to combat racism.

|||||

<sup>151</sup> See UN Human Rights Council plenary statements on video at [www.unwatch.org/invective](http://www.unwatch.org/invective).

## EFFECT OF ONE-SIDED UN RESOLUTIONS AGAINST ISRAEL

There are those who recognize that the incessant General Assembly and Human Rights Council resolutions against Israel are biased, yet wonder: Do they really matter? Among friends of Israel, for example, there are some, especially in the U.S., who believe that the UN as a whole is not credible—or even outright ridiculous—and that its pronouncements are therefore absolutely irrelevant, unworthy of a moment’s attention. Similarly, it is not uncommon for diplomats at the UN, after voting to support the ritual batch of anti-Israel resolutions, to privately defend their actions as just a requirement of the job, and to dismiss the texts as silly and ultimately meaningless.

The reality, however, is that the UN, as outlined at the beginning of this report, is regarded by many in the world as a unique source of international legitimacy. If by “silly” one means that the obsessive resolutions singling out Israel are objectively absurd, that is one thing. But if by silly one means that these declarations are harmless and irrelevant, that is a mistake. The resolutions are not harmless—they are pernicious. They have meaning and they have effect.

### DIRECT USE OF UN RESOLUTIONS TO DENY ISRAEL’S LEGITIMACY

The UN resolutions against Israel are meaningful not least to the forces of extremism—the mullahs of Iran, the Assad regime of Syria, the terrorist groups they sponsor, including Hamas and Islamic Jihad, and others—who celebrate such texts as proof that international opinion is on their side. As documented below, they trumpet the resolutions among their constituencies in the Middle East and abroad as a means to justify their intransigence and their methods, and use the resolutions as weapons in the campaign to strip the Jewish state of its legitimacy. Indeed, a recurring theme in the published articles and speeches citing such UN pronouncements is precisely that Israel, in their words, is a country that stands outside “international legitimacy.”

Sometimes the use and effect of UN pronouncements against Israel is moral encouragement for statements containing classically anti-Semitic statements and imagery. When Syria’s state-sponsored *Tishrin* newspaper published a September 24, 2007 article about “Israeli lust for Palestinian blood”—accusing the “usurper, colonialist” entity of “violating sanctities and laws,” of desecrating “the cradle of

Jesus Christ and the point of the Prophet’s heavenly journey,” and of perpetrating “a new war of genocide” against the Palestinians—it cited a Brussels conference organized a month earlier by the UN Division for Palestinian Rights.<sup>152</sup> “The racism of U.S. and Israeli policy is not an Arab media invention,” declared *Tishrin*, because it was none other than “the UN conference of NGOs, which met at the EU parliament, [that] called for boycotting Israel after comparing it to the racist regime in South Africa, and it is time to do it again to a second racist regime, which is Israel.”<sup>153</sup>

Similarly, as discussed above, when Iran published an official letter to the UN justifying President Ahmadinejad’s Holocaust denial and his calls to destroy Israel, his government pointed to statements by the UN’s own Human Rights Council as proof of the diabolical character of Zionism. “Various documents in the United Nations and its Human Rights machinery, including Special Mechanisms [the independent experts],” said Iran, “unambiguously attest to the atrocities perpetuated in the occupied territories by the Zionist Regime.”<sup>154</sup>

Tehran’s mullahs have made use of UN statements on Israel to justify all manner of extremist statements. At Iran’s annual mass rally for “Al-Quds Day”—a Khomeini-created festival for Jerusalem whose main feature is the “Death to Israel” chant—Ayatollah Rafsanjani announced that, “Today the Palestinian scene is the setting for the struggle of Islam against infidelity. It is the scene for the Jihad of the Muslims.”<sup>155</sup> To prove that the world supported his cause, he dedicated the largest part of his sermon to a detailed recitation of UN resolutions against Israel, including those “urging Israel not to be present at Al-Quds.”<sup>156</sup> Yet the Jewish state continued its conspiracies, such as the building of tunnels to cause “the

|||||||

152 B. Sha’ban, “The Post-Lobby Stage,” *Tishrin*, Sept. 24, 2007, translated in *BBC Monitoring Middle East*, “Syrian Paper Views ‘Joint Israeli-US decision’ to Declare Gaza ‘Enemy Entity,’” Sept. 26, 2007.

153 *Ibid.*

154 *Ibid.*

155 Ayatollah Akbar Hashemi Rafsanjani, cited in *Islamic Republic of Iran News Networks*, Oct. 20, 2006, translated in *BBC Monitoring Middle East*, “Rafsanjani Says Iran Will not Give up Nuclear Rights, Seeks Talks,” Oct. 21, 2006.

156 *Ibid.*

collapse of the whole [Al Aqsa] mosque.”<sup>157</sup> Each one of these UN resolutions “has so many rightful points, and Israel has ignored them all.”<sup>158</sup>

The ayatollah—accused last year by Argentine prosecutors of ordering the 1994 bombing of a Jewish center in Buenos Aires that killed 85 and wounded 300—draws inspiration from more UN agencies than just the General Assembly. “Commissions and sessions held in Vienna, Geneva, UNESCO and many other places have issued resolutions [against Israel],” he said.<sup>159</sup> “You can compile a big encyclopedia out of those resolutions so that the people in the future will realize who is ruling the world, how they are . . . depriving a nation from salvation by ignoring these resolutions.”<sup>160</sup>

Sometimes the resolutions are cited by anti-Israel forces to show that the world is with them. Terrorist groups, for example, routinely cite the UN resolutions against Israel. When Hamas and Islamic Jihad condemned the Fatah-led government in 2002 for supporting a “Gaza-first” plan and thereby becoming a “subordinate agent of the Israeli occupation,” they justified their call for intransigence by invoking “the UN stand,” citing the latest GA resolution.<sup>161</sup>

When the GA passed a resolution in 2003 in defense of Yasser Arafat, the Palestinian leader issued a special statement on his *Wafa* news agency, to declare that “the passing of the resolution by a majority of 133 votes means these countries are telling those who are occupying this holy land that it is a Palestinian land.”<sup>162</sup> The votes, said Chairman Arafat, were “an indication of their friendly and fraternal position” for Palestinians suffering “under a racist occupation.”<sup>163</sup>

But the most common use of the anti-Israel resolutions is the attempt to strip Israel of legitimacy. In December 2006, the Palestinian Islamic Jihad terrorist group accused “the state of the occupation, terrorism, and aggression” of showing

157 *Ibid.*

158 *Ibid.*

159 *Ibid.*

160 *Ibid.*

161 “The National and Islamic Forces Reject the Gaza First Plan, Stress it is a Maneuver by the Israeli Occupation Coupled with US Pressure,” *Al-Hayat al-Jadidah*, Aug. 9, 2002, translated in *BBC Monitoring Middle East*, “Palestinian National, Islamic Forces Reject Gaza First Plan,” August 10, 2002.

162 Yasir Arafat, cited in *Palestinian News Agency Wafa*, September 20, 2003, translated in *BBC Monitoring Middle East*, “Palestinian President Says UN Resolution ‘extremely important’”, September 20, 2003.

163 *Ibid.*

“contempt . . . for international law” and of “the international legitimacy resolutions,” citing a GA resolution that had just been adopted, with “almost international unanimity.”<sup>164</sup>

Damascus also makes frequent propaganda use of these resolutions. In a statement published in 2003 by its SANA news agency, the Assad regime cited the UN, accusing Israel of being “an example of the countries that depart from international legitimacy and defy its resolutions.”<sup>165</sup> Later that year, when the GA passed one of its annual resolutions criticizing Israel over the Golan—but saying nothing of Syria’s past use of the heights to shell Israeli farmers, or of its present sponsorship of terrorist causes throughout the region—Damascus excitedly proclaimed that “this reflected Israel’s isolation and proved that our causes are just and enjoying broad international support.”<sup>166</sup> Syria’s UN ambassador was quoted as applauding the countries who voted for the resolution, explaining to his audience that “this sends a clear message to Israel that it must comply with the resolutions of the international legitimacy.”<sup>167</sup>

Similarly, when Egypt Radio in 2002 sought to paint Israel in the colors of pure evil, accusing the Jewish state of launching a “racial genocide war,” it cited UN resolutions for the claim that “Israel is the first country in the world in challenging the resolutions of international legitimacy.”<sup>168</sup> In 2004, the state-controlled broadcaster informed Egyptians that Israel was “turning a deaf ear to the resolutions of the United Nations . . . challenging the principles of international legitimacy.”<sup>169</sup>

In a word, the evidence demonstrates that UN resolutions on Israel serve as a powerful propaganda arsenal for Iran’s ayatollahs, as for others in the region, with which to cast Israel as an international outlaw.

■■■■■■■■■■

164 Islamic Jihad Movement website, December 29, 2006, translated in *BBC Monitoring Middle East*, “Palestinian Islamic Jihad Denounces Israeli Plan for New Settlement,” December 30, 2006.

165 SANA News Agency report, Aug. 14, 2003, in *BBC Monitoring Middle East*, “Syrian Mission Sends Message to UN Head over Israeli Documents,” August 15, 2003.

166 SANA News Agency report, Dec. 4, 2003, translated in *BBC Monitoring Middle East*, “Syrian Agency Reports UN Resolution on Israeli Withdrawal from Golan,” Dec. 4, 2003.

167 *Ibid.*

168 Mamduh Ismail, “The Time Race Between Peace And War,” *Arab Republic of Egypt Radio*, translated in *BBC Monitoring Middle East*, October 11, 2002.

169 Ahmad al-Qasir, “Discussion before UN General Assembly exposed Israel before the entire world”, *Arab Republic of Egypt Radio*, translated in *BBC Monitoring Middle East*, July 17, 2004.

In addition, appeal to the alleged moral authority of such resolutions is routinely made by anti-Israel voices in the West. For example, Israel’s “defiance of UN resolutions” was cited in an August 2006 op-ed in Britain’s *Independent* arguing that “Israel is out of control,” with its “craving for physical security” fueled by “the Jewish fundamentalist belief of being God’s chosen people.”<sup>170</sup> According to John McCarthy, a former hostage in Lebanon, all of this “has allowed Israel to believe it can do as it will.”<sup>171</sup> Similarly, an op-ed in *The Guardian* by Jonathan Steele urging acceptance for the notion that “Israel is no longer distinguishable from a terror organization”—with its “ultimate agenda [being] to starve all Palestinians into fleeing”—asserted that “Israeli policy mocks every UN resolution on the conflict.”<sup>172</sup> Articles arguing for boycotts against Israel—but not any other country—also routinely justify their claims by citing UN resolutions.<sup>173</sup>

INDIRECT EFFECT

In addition to the express use of the UN’s anti-Israel resolutions as described above, there are also indirect effects. When the world’s highest forum of international law and human rights singles out the Jewish state for overwhelming or exclusive condemnation, this has a necessary impact throughout the world, including in the West.<sup>174</sup> Though it cannot be precisely measured, the constant UN censure of Israel surely plays a role behind that country’s perception as “the greatest threat to world peace,” and as having “the most negative influence in the world.”<sup>175</sup>

Anti-Israel attitudes, in turn, can influence anti-Semitic actions. In his latest 2007 report, UN expert on racism Doudou Diène writes that “present expressions of anti-Semitism predominantly stem from political rather than religious or racial motives, relating Judaism to Israel and its policies regarding Palestinians.”<sup>176</sup> Speaking of Britain, for example, the European Monitoring Center on Racism and Xenophobia reported that “surges of anti-Semitic incidents may be visible manifestations of political violence, perpetrated against British Jews in support for the Palestinians.”<sup>177</sup>

Numerous other incidents around the world show this to be a global phenomenon. When the library of a Montreal Jewish school was firebombed in 2004, a note left at the scene described the attack as retaliation for Israel’s assassination of Hamas leader Sheikh Ahmed Yassin, and said that Jews should be punished for Israeli actions. “Here is

■■■■■■■■■■

174 See *supra* at note 7. According to a 2005 opinion poll conducted in 20 countries, the UN has a trust level of 55 percent—a figure that is second only to NGOs (at 61 percent), and ahead of large national companies, national government and global companies. UN resolutions or reports will therefore tend to be treated as fact. See [http://www.globescan.com/rf\\_ir\\_first.htm](http://www.globescan.com/rf_ir_first.htm).

175 According to a November 2003 EU opinion poll, 59 percent of Europeans view Israel as a “threat to world peace”—the highest percentage of all countries, more than Iran, Syria and North Korea. *Flash Eurobarometer 151*, European Commission, Nov. 2003, at 81. A 2007 BBC World Service poll showed that this perception is shared by citizens around the world, not just in Europe. The study found that 56 percent of people from 27 countries thought Israel had “mainly negative” influence in the world—the highest in the list—while only 17 percent thought it had “mainly positive” influence, the lowest among the countries polled. *BBC World Service*, March 6, 2007.

176 Doudou Diène, *Report on the manifestations of defamation of religions and in particular on the serious implications of Islamophobia on the enjoyment of all rights*, UN Doc. A/HRC/6/6 (2007).

177 European Monitoring Center on Racism and Xenophobia, *Antisemitism: Summary Overview of the Situation in the European Union 2001-2005*, EUMC Working Paper, December 2006, at 20.

■■■■■■■■■■

170 “Why would Hamas recognize Israel? Why should Hamas bow before the guns of Israel and say they will stop fighting for their freedom? Israel has been occupying Palestinian land, in defiance of UN resolutions, for almost 40 years.” John MacCarthy, “Israel and the Art of Sophistry,” *Independent on Sunday*, August 6, 2006.

171 *Ibid.*

172 Jonathan Steele, “Europe’s response to the siege of Gaza is shameful,” *The Guardian*, July 6, 2006.

173 See, e.g., Raymond Dean, “Boycott of Israel Needed to Stop the Wall,” *The Irish Times*, July 9, 2005, citing a GA resolution, and the GA-orchestrated 2004 advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice on Israel’s security barrier, in advocating “a massive boycott campaign [against Israel] modeled on that which brought South African apartheid to its knees.”

---

## CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

---

the consequence of your crimes and your occupation,” read the note. “Here is the riposte of your assassinations. Here is where terrorist Ariel Sharon has led you.”<sup>178</sup> Coincidentally or not, the incident came less than two weeks after the UN Commission on Human Rights convened a special session on the matter, where Yassin was eulogized as a “spiritual leader,” and a resolution adopted to condemn Israel. Similarly, on July 11, 2007, when a Holocaust memorial at a Berlin train station site was vandalized, an Israeli flag was also burned.<sup>179</sup> Two years prior, when a Holocaust memorial was vandalized in the Paris suburb of Drancy on February 20, 2005, a handwritten note found at the scene referred to the “Islamic group for Palestine.”<sup>180</sup>

The connection between anti-Israel and anti-Semitic attitudes is further substantiated by the research of Edward Kaplan and Charles Small of Yale University. According to their findings, “Anti-Israel sentiment consistently predicts the probability that an individual is anti-Semitic, with the likelihood of measured anti-Semitism increasing with the extent of anti-Israel sentiment observed.”<sup>181</sup> Their polling found that 56 percent of those voicing the most extreme anti-Israel sentiments also held anti-Semitic leanings. Though it may be difficult to determine which of the two attitudes comes first, it does suggest that the UN’s considerable contribution to anti-Israel sentiment in the world may also contribute to an increase in anti-Semitic leanings.

To summarize, the UN campaign to delegitimize Israel has its desired effect. Sworn enemies of Israel or Jews brandish the resolutions as evidence of international support and legitimacy. Others who may have held no previous bias become convinced that the Jewish state is an international outlaw, with similarly negative views about those seen as its supporters.

|||||

178 Center for Policing Terrorism, *Analysis: Firebombing of Jewish Elementary School in Montreal in 2004*, available at [http://www.cpt-mi.org/pdf\\_secure.php?pdfilename=jewishschool1](http://www.cpt-mi.org/pdf_secure.php?pdfilename=jewishschool1).

179 Anti-Defamation League, *Global Anti-Semitism: Selected Incidents Around the World in 2007*, available at [http://www.adl.org/Anti\\_semitism/anti-semitism\\_global\\_incidents\\_2007.asp](http://www.adl.org/Anti_semitism/anti-semitism_global_incidents_2007.asp).

180 Anti-Defamation League, *Global Anti-Semitism: Selected Incidents Around the World in 2005*, available at [http://www.adl.org/Anti\\_semitism/anti-semitism\\_global\\_incidents\\_2005.asp](http://www.adl.org/Anti_semitism/anti-semitism_global_incidents_2005.asp).

181 Edward H. Kaplan & Charles A. Small, “Anti-Israel Sentiment Predicts Antisemitism in Europe,” *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, Vol. 50, No. 4, August 2006, at 548-561.

This report is the first to assess the record of the United Nations in fulfilling its 2004 promise to fight the scourge of anti-Semitism, and to answer former Secretary-General Annan’s request that civil society “keep us to the mark.” Progress at the UN in several areas, including Holocaust commemoration, and rebuking the incitement to hatred by Iran’s president, was encouraging. The leadership of Mr. Annan played a key role in these efforts. Early indicators show that his successor, Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon, is similarly willing to speak out against anti-Semitism, though no major initiatives have yet been undertaken.

However, our report also revealed insufficient attention and even inaction by certain UN officials. Worse, the report found a campaign at the UN to undermine the fight against anti-Semitism by corroding the word of its very meaning. All of this is cause for concern.

Most worrying of all, the UN’s record between 2004 and 2007 shows an intensification of one-sided, redundant and irrational measures that, taken together, form an infrastructure to demonize and delegitimize the Jewish state. In 2006-07, for example, the extraordinary amount of annual General Assembly resolutions singling out Israel for condemnation were increased still further, intensifying an insidious double standard. Even worse, the inaugural year of the Human Rights Council saw the new body descend to unimaginable lows, with no less than one hundred percent of its condemnatory resolutions passed against Israel—at the expense of tackling all of the world’s worst abusers, and of protecting victims in 191 other countries. This in turn is supported by vitriol in UN debates describing Israelis as Nazis and the epitome of evil. The report documents how UN pronouncements are used by Middle East extremists to justify intransigence and to challenge the legitimacy and existence of Israel. Evidence also shows that, whether by intent or in effect, the anti-Israel campaign at the UN, devouring vast amounts of the organization’s precious time and resources, is a significant contributing factor to perceptions of the Jewish state and Jews by association as uniquely criminal if not diabolical.

For the UN to live up to its promises in the fight against anti-Semitism, leading figures must commit themselves to action.

---

---

**WE URGE SECRETARY-GENERAL  
BAN KI-MOON TO:**

- Assume leadership for UN efforts in the global fight against anti-Semitism;
- Convene a conference to review follow-up and implementation of former Secretary-General Annan's June 2004 action plan for fighting anti-Semitism, and to chart new strategies and goals;
- Continue to protect the principles of the UN Charter and speak out vigorously against Holocaust denial and genocidal threats by Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad and others;
- Continue to condemn violations by the Human Rights Council and other UN bodies of the principles of non-selectivity, impartiality and objectivity;
- Exercise supervision of members of the UN Secretariat, including the Division for Palestinian Rights, to ensure that they are not engaged in demonization of a member state in violation of the UN Charter guarantee of equal treatment to all nations, large and small.

**WE URGE HIGH COMMISSIONER FOR  
HUMAN RIGHTS LOUISE ARBOUR TO:**

- Begin to speak out publicly and take action against anti-Semitism;
- Condemn, publicly and expressly, the ongoing Holocaust denial and incitement to genocide by the president of Iran;
- Exercise her power as secretary-general of the new Durban Review process to ensure that the 2009 conference, and the lead-up to it, will not repeat the fiasco of the 2001 World Conference Against Racism, which saw overt anti-Semitic incitement;
- Follow the example set by Mr. Annan as well as Mr. Ban, and publicly confront the demonization of Israel within the UN human rights apparatus, including the Human Rights Council's one-sided resolutions, agenda, investigatory mandate, and its continuing exclusion of Israel from all regional groups.

**WE URGE INDEPENDENT EXPERT  
DOUDOU DIÈNE TO:**

- Continue to hold Iran fully accountable under international law for its anti-Semitic incitement, by filing regular allegation letters and reports to the Human Rights Council;
- Continue to address anti-Semitism in all reports despite attempts by the Islamic and Arab states to preclude its consideration;
- Reflect the views of leading scholars and activists fighting anti-Semitism, instead of relying on those of marginal figures not associated or hostile to the cause.

**WE URGE INDEPENDENT EXPERT  
ASMA JAHANGIR TO:**

- Investigate anti-Semitism around the world, and ensure that her missions and reports treat it with no less priority than Islamophobia;
- Fully address the dangerous inculcation of children with hatred in state-sponsored textbooks in Egypt, Saudi Arabia and other countries, that teach intolerance of Judaism, Christianity and other non-Islamic religions, and of their adherents.

**WE URGE UN MEMBER STATES TO:**

- Follow the call of former Secretary-General Annan and adopt a definition of anti-Semitism based on the OSCE's Berlin Declaration, which condemns all manifestations of anti-Semitism and declares that political developments, including those in the Middle East, can never justify anti-Semitism;
- Protect the values of the UN Charter by speaking out forcefully against every anti-Semitic statement expressed during official UN debates;
- Hold Israelis and Palestinians alike accountable for their human rights records, while opposing the repeated adoption of one-sided resolutions that grant impunity to terrorist organizations such as Hamas and Hezbollah;
- Help Palestinians by building medical, educational and judicial facilities in the West Bank and Gaza with the millions of dollars that member states currently spend on funding the various UN mechanisms dedicated to castigating Israel.

**Table 1: UN GA Resolutions Criticizing Israel**  
*61<sup>st</sup> UN General Assembly Session (2006-07): 22 One-Sided Resolutions*

<b>RESOLUTION</b>	<b>SPONSOR</b>	<b>SUMMARY</b>	<b>ANALYSIS</b>
<p><b>A/RES/61/103</b> The risk of nuclear proliferation in the Middle East</p> <p><i>Adopted 166-5-6, on 12/06/06.</i></p>	18 OIC (Islamic) countries	Urges Israel’s “accession to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and placement of all its nuclear facilities under comprehensive International Atomic Energy Agency safeguards...”	Resolution singles out Israel while ignoring menacing actions of other states, including Iran’s illegal efforts to acquire nuclear weapons in defiance of Security Council and IAEA resolutions. Ignores overt and repeated threats against the existence of Israel by neighboring states in the region.
<p><b>A/RES/61/184</b> Permanent Sovereignty of the Palestinian People over their natural resources</p> <p><i>Adopted 164-6-9, on 12/20/06.</i></p>	20 OIC countries, Cuba, Namibia	Condemns Israel for list of crimes. Israel “pollutes the environment” and “negatively affects the natural resources of the Palestinian people.”	One-sided resolution denies Israel’s right to self-defense by describing every preventative measure as conspiracy against Palestinian resources. Omits mention of Palestinian terrorism or of any Palestinian obligation. Also omits Palestinian destruction of Gaza greenhouses delivered intact by Israel.
<p><b>A/C.2/61/L.23/REV.1</b> The Oil Slick on Lebanese shores</p> <p><i>Adopted 170-6-0, on 12/20/06.</i></p>	South Africa on behalf of the G77 and China	“Deep concern over the adverse implications of the Israeli military attacks on the achievement of sustainable development in Lebanon...”	One-sided resolution completely ignores Hezbollah’s role in launching hostilities, firing 4,000 rockets and burning 500,000 trees in Northern Israel. Ignores Lebanon’s non-compliance with SC Resolutions on dismantling Hezbollah. Singles out Israel as only country to be censured under Sustainable Development agenda item.
<p><b>A/C.3/61/L.13/REV.1</b> The human rights situation arising from the recent Israeli military operations in Lebanon</p> <p><i>Adopted 112-7-64, on 12/19/06.</i></p>	Cuba on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement, and Qatar on behalf of the Arab Group	“Israeli attacks and unwarranted killing of innocent civilians and the destruction of houses, property and infrastructure in Lebanon are a breach of the principles of the Charter...”	One-sided resolution omits Hezbollah killing of Israeli civilians, both Jewish and Arab. Ignores Hezbollah responsibility for starting the war and systematic use of civilians as human shields in breach of international humanitarian law. Effectively denies Israel’s right to self-defense under international law. Refuses to acknowledge right to life for Israelis or rights of Israeli children.

<b>RESOLUTION</b>	<b>SPONSOR</b>	<b>SUMMARY</b>	<b>ANALYSIS</b>
<p><b>A/C.3/61/L.51</b> The right of the Palestinian people to self-determination</p> <p><i>Adopted 176-5-5, on 12/19/06.</i></p>	<p>Egypt with 28 other OIC countries, 17 EU countries, and 11 other countries</p>	<p>“Urges all States and the specialized agencies and organizations of the United Nations system to continue to support and assist the Palestinian people in the early realization of their right to self-determination.”</p>	<p>Redundantly asserts a principle that Israel has already recognized. Out of hundreds of self-determination claims worldwide, resolution singles out one: the claim against Israel. Omits Palestinian obligation under the Road Map to dismantle terrorist infrastructure before a state is to be created.</p>
<p><b>A/RES/61/112</b> Assistance to Palestine refugees</p> <p><i>Adopted 173-1-10, on 12/14/06.</i></p>	<p>25 EU countries, 26 OIC countries, Cuba, Namibia, South Africa</p>	<p>“Expressing grave concern at the especially difficult situation of the Palestine refugees under occupation, including with regard to their safety, well-being and living conditions...”</p>	<p>Resolution serves Arab states that seek to preserve Palestinians as pawns in political campaign to delegitimize Israel. Intent and effect of singling out Palestinian from all refugee claims in the world is to isolate and demonize Israel. No reference to egregious Lebanese discrimination against refugees, as documented by Amnesty International report. Redundant to resolutions 61/113, 114 and 115.</p>
<p><b>A/RES/61/113</b> Persons displaced as a result of the June 1967 and subsequent hostilities</p> <p><i>Adopted 170-6-8, on 12/14/06.</i></p>	<p>27 OIC countries, Cuba, Namibia, South Africa</p>	<p>“Reaffirms the right of all persons displaced as a result of the June 1967 and subsequent hostilities to return to their homes or former places of residence in the territories occupied by Israel since 1967...”</p>	<p>Resolution is redundant to 61/112, 61/114 and 61/115. Purpose and effect are to single out Israel for censure.</p>
<p><b>A/RES/61/114</b> Operations of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East</p> <p><i>Adopted 169-6-8, on 12/14/06.</i></p>	<p>26 OIC countries, Cuba, Namibia, South Africa</p>	<p>“Urges the Government of Israel to speedily compensate the Agency for damage to its property and facilities resulting from actions by the Israeli side...”</p>	<p>Perpetuates anomaly whereby Palestinians are only people not served by UNHCR but instead by special agency. Resolution makes one-sided condemnations of Israeli actions, but silent on Palestinian terrorism against Israelis and abuses of Palestinian forces against their own citizens. Ignores UNRWA admission that members of Hamas, a terrorist organization, were on its payroll.</p>

<b>RESOLUTION</b>	<b>SPONSOR</b>	<b>SUMMARY</b>	<b>ANALYSIS</b>
<p><b>A/RES/61/115</b> Palestine Refugees' Properties and their Revenues</p> <p><i>Adopted 170-6-8, on 12/14/06.</i></p>	<p>26 EU countries, 27 OIC countries, Cuba, Namibia, South Africa</p>	<p>“Reaffirms that the Palestine refugees are entitled to their property and to the income derived therefrom, in conformity with the principles of equity and justice...”</p>	<p>One-sided resolution ignores claims of 900,000 Jewish refugees displaced from Arab lands. Repeats statements previously established for purpose of censuring Israel and is redundant to other 2006 resolutions. Prejudges negotiations.</p>
<p><b>A/RES/61/116</b> Work of the Special Committee to Investigate Israeli Practices Affecting the Human Rights of the Palestinian People and Other Arabs of the Occupied Territories</p> <p><i>Adopted 90-9-81, on 12/14/06.</i></p>	<p>27 OIC countries, Cuba, Namibia, South Africa, Venezuela</p>	<p>“Deplores those policies and practices of Israel that violate the human rights of the Palestinian people and other Arabs of the occupied territories, as reflected in the report of the Special Committee covering the reporting period...”</p>	<p>Perpetuates committee with blatantly biased mandate of examining only Israeli actions, but ignoring Hamas, Islamic Jihad and Fatah terrorism. Welcomes election of Hamas. Contrary to international law and resolution 242, claims that occupation is itself a violation. History of 2000 events censors out suicide bombings in Israeli restaurants and civilian areas.</p>
<p><b>A/RES/61/117</b> Applicability of the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, of 12 August 1949, to the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including East Jerusalem, and the other occupied Arab territories</p> <p><i>Adopted 165-7-10, on 12/14/06.</i></p>	<p>27 OIC countries, Cuba, Namibia, South Africa, Venezuela</p>	<p>“Demands that Israel accept the de jure applicability of the Convention in the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including East Jerusalem, and other Arab territories occupied by Israel since 1967, and that it comply scrupulously with the provisions of the Convention...”</p>	<p>One-sided demands on Israel only. Ignores systematic violation of international humanitarian law by Hamas government, granting impunity to Palestinian firing of Kassam missiles on Israeli cities and other terrorist attacks.</p>
<p><b>A/RES/61/118</b> Israeli settlements in the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including East Jerusalem, and the occupied Syrian Golan</p> <p><i>Adopted 168-8-10, on 12/14/06.</i></p>	<p>26 OIC countries, Cuba, Namibia, South Africa, Venezuela</p>	<p>“Reaffirms that Israeli settlements in the Palestinian territory, including East Jerusalem, and in the occupied Syrian Golan are illegal and an obstacle to peace and economic and social development...”</p>	<p>Adopts Palestinian position on issues that Oslo Accords left to negotiations. Deliberately downplays Israel’s concession of forcibly evacuating 10,000 Israelis from their homes in Gaza. Israel treated with disdain in comparison to praise and deference to governments shown by UN resolutions on Sudan and Myanmar.</p>

RESOLUTION	SPONSOR	SUMMARY	ANALYSIS
<p><b>A/RES/61/119</b> Israeli practices affecting the human rights of the Palestinian people in the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including East Jerusalem</p> <p><i>Adopted 157-9-14, on 12/14/06.</i></p>	<p>27 OIC countries, Cuba, Namibia, South Africa, Venezuela</p>	<p>“Expressing grave concern about the continuing systematic violation of the human rights of the Palestinian people by Israel, the occupying Power, including that arising from the excessive use of force, the use of collective punishment, the reoccupation and closure of areas, the confiscation of land, the establishment and expansion of settlements, the construction of the wall...”</p>	<p>Seeks to strip Israel of its inherent right to self-defense by classifying every such action as violation of international law. In isolated references to attacks against Israel, neither the Palestinians nor any other responsible party is named. Condemns Israel for tragic incident in Beit Hanoun without acknowledging Palestinian rocket fire from the area, or distinguishing between deliberate and unintentional acts. Redundant to A/RES/ES-10/16. Demonizes Israel for defending itself from suicide bombings.</p>
<p><b>A/RES/61/120</b> The occupied Syrian Golan</p> <p><i>Adopted 163-2-16, on 12/14/06.</i></p>	<p>27 OIC countries, Cuba, Namibia, South Africa, Venezuela</p>	<p>“Determines that all legislative and administrative measures and actions taken or to be taken by Israel, the occupying Power, that purport to alter the character and legal status of the occupied Syrian Golan are null and void...”</p>	<p>Ignores Syria’s systematic shelling of Israeli communities from positions on Golan Heights, its leader’s calls for a “war of annihilation” against Israel, and Syria’s 1967 aggression that led to its loss of the territory. Neglects Israel’s offers to trade the Golan for peace, Syria’s sponsorship of the enemies of the peace process, and its support for terrorism.</p>
<p><b>A/RES/61/22</b> Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People</p> <p><i>Adopted 101-7-62, on 12/1/06.</i></p>	<p>27 OIC countries, Cuba, Madagascar, Malta, Namibia, South Africa, Venezuela, Zimbabwe, Laos</p>	<p>“Requests the Committee to continue to exert all efforts to promote the realization of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people, to support the Middle East peace process and to mobilize international support for and assistance to the Palestinian people...”</p>	<p>Biased committee is one of the veteran pillars of the UN’s anti-Israel infrastructure, the only GA human rights committee devoted to a single cause. Its reports systematically turn a blind eye to Palestinian suicide bombings and other acts of premeditated violence against innocent men, women, and children. Committee’s mandate is only to look at Israeli action and is inherently prejudiced and one-sided.</p>

RESOLUTION	SPONSOR	SUMMARY	ANALYSIS
<p><b>A/RES/61/23</b> Division for Palestinian Rights of the Secretariat</p> <p><i>Adopted 101-7-62, on 12/1/06.</i></p>	<p>27 OIC countries, Cuba, Madagascar, Malta, Namibia, South Africa, Venezuela, Zimbabwe</p>	<p>“Requests the Secretary-General to continue to provide the Division with the necessary resources and to ensure that it continues to carry out its programme of work [including] the widest possible dissemination of publications and information materials on various aspects of the question of Palestine and the provision of the annual training programme for staff of the Palestinian Authority...”</p>	<p>The DPR serves the biased special committee and is dedicated to spreading anti-Israel propaganda the world over. Its 16-member staff is grossly disproportionate, comparable to the other four divisions that cover enormous regions. Its work is counter-productive to the peace process and seeks to coordinate international boycotts against Israel instead of seeking bridges for peace. Excludes from its events any group that declines to swear fealty to its hardline politics.</p>
<p><b>A/RES/61/24</b> Special information program on the question of Palestine of the Department of Public Information of the Secretariat</p> <p><i>Adopted 157-7-9, on 12/1/06.</i></p>	<p>27 OIC countries, Cuba, Madagascar, Malta, Namibia, South Africa, Zimbabwe</p>	<p>“Considers that the special information programme on the question of Palestine of the Department is very useful in raising the awareness of the international community concerning the question of Palestine and the situation in the Middle East...”</p>	<p>The program is one more example of how the neutral UN secretariat is forcibly co-opted by the anti-Israeli forces at the UN. The program eschews a balanced approach by overtly choosing the Palestinian over the Israeli narrative, ignoring terrorism against Israeli men, women and children and other daily realities of Israeli life. Resources devoted to anti-Israel propaganda are taken away from other worthy causes.</p>
<p><b>A/61/L.34</b> (original text) Peaceful settlement of the question of Palestine</p> <p><i>Adopted 157-7-10, on 12/1/06.</i></p>	<p>28 OIC countries, Cuba, Madagascar, Namibia, South Africa, Zimbabwe</p>	<p>“Deeply concerned about the continued imposition by Israel, the occupying Power, of closures and severe restrictions on the movement of persons and goods throughout the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including East Jerusalem... which are destroying the territorial contiguity of the Territory, causing serious humanitarian hardship and severely undermining efforts to rehabilitate and develop the Palestinian economy...”</p>	<p>Blames Israel only for lack of peace. Expresses “concern” that 59 years have passed since the 1947 partition plan, suggesting Israel is at fault—when it was the Arab states and their Palestinian allies that uniformly rejected that resolution and initiated hostilities the day after its adoption. Text is redundant to several other resolutions and serves no effect other than demonization. In section that condemns terror, the responsible parties— Hamas, Islamic Jihad, the Palestinian Authority—are left anonymous, whereas Israel is named and blamed throughout. Prejudges negotiations by adopting Palestinian positions.</p>

RESOLUTION	SPONSOR	SUMMARY	ANALYSIS
<p><b>A/RES/61/26</b> Jerusalem</p> <p><i>Adopted 157-6-10, on 12/1/06.</i></p>	<p>27 OIC countries, Cuba, Namibia, South Africa, Venezuela</p>	<p>“Reiterates its determination that any actions taken by Israel, the occupying Power, to impose its laws, jurisdiction and administration on the Holy City of Jerusalem are illegal and therefore null and void and have no validity whatsoever...”</p>	<p>Implies that Israeli administration of Jerusalem hinders freedom of religion when in fact the opposite is true—before 1967, Jordan destroyed Jewish holy sites and denied access to Jews, while under Israel all faiths have access to the city and enjoy full freedoms. Uses harsh language against Israel that is not used even against regimes like North Korea. Repeated passage of annual resolution to address acts from 1980, or matters already covered in other similar resolutions, serve no purpose other than demonization.</p>
<p><b>A/RES/61/27</b> The Syrian Golan</p> <p><i>Adopted 107-6-60, on 12/1/06.</i></p>	<p>27 OIC countries, Cuba, Namibia, South Africa, Venezuela</p>	<p>“Determines once more that the continued occupation of the Syrian Golan and its de facto annexation constitute a stumbling block in the way of achieving a just, comprehensive and lasting peace in the region...”</p>	<p>Entirely redundant to A/RES/61/120 on “the Occupied Syrian Golan”—see above for equally applicable analysis. Demonstrates utter irrationality and absurdity of devoting precious GA time and resources to anti-Israel resolutions.</p>
<p><b>A/RES/ES-10/16</b> (amended text) Illegal Israeli actions in Occupied East Jerusalem and the rest of the Occupied Palestinian Territory</p> <p><i>Adopted 156-7-6, on 11/17/06, in Resumed 10<sup>th</sup> Emergency Special Session.</i></p>	<p>Qatar with 31 other OIC countries, 20 other countries</p>	<p>“Deeply deploring also the killing of many Palestinian civilians, including children and women, by Israel, the occupying Power, that took place in Beit Hanoun on 8 November 2006...”</p>	<p>Adopted under the abusive Tenth Emergency Special Session, convened against Israel in 1997 and resumes whenever the anti-Israel alliance decides. Despite rare reference to Palestinian obligations to stop violence, resolution overwhelmingly lopsided against Israel. Distorts defensive nature of Israeli actions in Beit Hanoun and fails to distinguish between deliberate attacks against civilians and accidents when responding to Hamas rocket fire from civilian areas. Irrationally sets up mission redundant to one established by Human Rights Council two weeks earlier.</p>

RESOLUTION	SPONSOR	SUMMARY	ANALYSIS
<p><b>A/RES/ES-10/17</b> Establishment of the United Nations Register of Damage caused by the Construction of the Wall in the Occupied Palestinian Territory</p> <p><i>Adopted 162-7-7, on 12/15/06, in Resumed 10<sup>th</sup> Emergency Special Session.</i></p>	<p>Cuba on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement, Palestine</p>	<p>“Establishes the United Nations Register of Damage caused by the Construction of the Wall in the Occupied Palestinian Territory...in documentary form, of the damage caused to all natural and legal persons concerned as a result of the construction of the wall by Israel, the Occupying Power...”</p>	<p>Ignores the Palestinian terrorism under Yasser Arafat that plagued Israeli civilian centers and that led to construction of the defensive barrier— and its proven success in stopping suicide attacks and saving lives. Register would allocate \$3 million from the UN budget to duplicate a complaints mechanism that already exists in Israel for Palestinians. The world court advisory opinion was solicited through a political exercise orchestrated by PLO envoy and Arafat nephew Nasser Al-Kidwa.</p>

**Notes on listing sponsors:**

- When countries sponsored resolutions on behalf of a larger UN grouping of countries, our listing reads “Country X on behalf of Group 1.”
  - Ex. Res. #3 A/C.2/61/L.23/Rev.1: “South Africa on behalf of the G77 and China.” Here there is one sponsor, South Africa, and South Africa sponsors on behalf of what is known as the G77 and China, a group of some 130 developing nations.
  - Ex. Res. #4 A/C.3/61/L.13/Rev.1: “Cuba on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement, and Qatar on behalf of the Arab Group.” Here there are two sponsors, Cuba and Qatar, each sponsoring on behalf of a larger group to which it belongs.
- When the number of sponsors is too large to be listed in the chart, the sponsors are grouped, and the number of sponsors from each group is listed. Unlike above, in this case these countries do *not* sponsor on behalf of their group; groups are only cited for clarity.
  - Ex. Res. #1 A/RES/61/103: “18 OIC (Islamic) countries.” Here there are 18 sponsors, all of which are members of the Organization of the Islamic Conference (OIC), a group of 57 Islamic-identifying countries. None of these 18 countries is sponsoring the resolution on behalf of the OIC, but all 18 are members of the OIC so they are grouped as such on the chart.
  - Ex. Res. #6 A/RES/61/112: “25 EU countries, 26 OIC countries, Cuba, Namibia, South Africa.” Here there are 54 sponsors, which is too many to list in this chart for ease of viewing; however, of the 54, 25 belong to the EU and 26 belong to the OIC, so they are grouped as such, and 3 are not in either of these groups, so they are listed individually.
- Main sponsors. Some resolutions have a sponsor designated as a “main sponsor.” On this chart, main sponsors are listed first and individually, and they are left out of groupings.
  - Ex. Res. #5 A/C.3/61/L.51: “Egypt with 28 other OIC countries, 17 EU countries, and 11 other countries.” Here there are 57 sponsors, of which 29 are members of the OIC and 17 are members of the European Union. However, Egypt is the resolution’s main sponsor, so it is listed first and separately from the other OIC countries.
  - Ex. Res. #21 A/RES/ES-10/16: “Qatar with 31 other OIC countries, 20 other countries.” Here there are 52 sponsors, of which 32 are OIC countries, but Qatar is listed separately because it is the main sponsor.
- For full list of sponsors, please see the online version of this chart at [www.unwatch.org](http://www.unwatch.org), and click the links in the “Sponsors” column.

**Table 2: UN Human Right Council Resolutions Criticizing Israel**  
*1<sup>st</sup> Council Year (2006-07): 100% of Council's condemnations were against Israel*

<b>RESOLUTION</b>	<b>SPONSORS</b>	<b>SUMMARY</b>	<b>ANALYSIS</b>
<p><b>A/HRC/1/106:</b> Human rights situation in Palestine and other Occupied Arab Territories</p> <p><i>Adopted 29-12-5, on 6/30/06.</i></p>	11 OIC members and Cuba	<p>“Requests the relevant special rapporteurs to report...on the Israeli human rights violations in occupied Palestine”</p> <p>“Decides to undertake substantive consideration of the human rights violations...of the Israeli occupation of Palestine and other occupied Arab territories”</p>	<p>Condemns Israel but ignores Palestinian violations</p> <p>Calls for expert reports with Israel prejudged as guilty</p> <p>Forces focus on Israel’s conduct at every future Council meeting</p>
<p><b>A/HRC/S-1/1:</b> Human rights situation in the Occupied Palestinian Territory</p> <p><i>Adopted 29-11-5, on 7/6/06.</i></p>	14 Islamic Group members and Cuba	<p>“Express[es] deep concern at the breaches by Israel...of international humanitarian law and human rights law”</p> <p>“Expresses grave concern at the violations of the human rights of the Palestinian people caused by the Israeli occupation...Decides to dispatch an urgent fact-finding mission”</p>	<p>Condemns Israel for military actions in Gaza but ignores Hamas attack precipitating crisis</p> <p>Ignores ongoing Palestinian attacks on Israeli civilians</p> <p>Demands fact-finding mission to examine only Israeli conduct</p>
<p><b>A/HRC/S-2/1:</b> The grave situation of human rights in Lebanon caused by Israeli military operations</p> <p><i>Adopted 27-11-8, on 8/11/06.</i></p>	12 Islamic Group members and Cuba	<p>“Condemn[s] Israeli military operations in Lebanon, which constitute gross and systematic human rights violations of the Lebanese people”</p> <p>“Appalled at the massive violations of the human rights of the people of Lebanon by Israel resulting in the massacre of thousands of civilians...Outraged at the continuing senseless killings by Israel, with impunity, of children, women, the elderly and other civilians”</p>	<p>Condemns only Israeli conduct; ignores Hezbollah’s incursion into Israel, firing of rockets at Israeli civilians, and use of Lebanese civilians as human shields</p> <p>Creates inquiry commission to investigate only Israeli conduct</p> <p>Complicates Security Council peace effort</p>

RESOLUTION	SPONSORS	SUMMARY	ANALYSIS
<p><b>A/HRC/S-3/1:</b> Human rights violations emanating from Israeli military incursions in the Occupied Territory, including the recent one in Northern Gaza and the assault on Beit Hanoun</p> <p><i>Adopted 32-8-6, on 11/15/06.</i></p>	<p>13 Islamic Group members, Cuba, and South Africa</p>	<p>“Israeli military incursions in the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including the recent incursion in northern Gaza and the assault on Beit Hanoun, constitute a collective punishment...Israeli willful killing of Palestinian civilians, including women and children, constitutes a gross violation of human rights law and international humanitarian law... Decides to dispatch urgently a high-level fact-finding mission...to travel to Beit Hanoun...to protect Palestinian civilians against any further Israeli assaults”</p>	<p>Neglects to mention that Hamas was the aggressor by launching Kassam rockets against Israeli civilian centers, using its fellow citizens as human shields by attacking from urban areas</p> <p>Omits to mention Israel had fully withdrawn from Gaza only to be attacked from the territory it left</p> <p>Dispatches fact-finding mission to investigate Israel only; makes no distinction between intentional killings and accidents of war</p>
<p><b>A/HRC/2/3:</b> Human rights in the Occupied Syrian Golan</p> <p><i>Adopted 32-1-14, on 11/27/06.</i></p>	<p>8 Islamic Group members and Cuba</p>	<p>Expresses “deep concern at the suffering of the Syrian citizens in the occupied Syrian Golan”</p> <p>“Calls upon Israel to desist from its repressive measures against them”</p>	<p>One-sided, ignores Syrian rejectionism and sponsorship of terrorism</p> <p>Redundant to 2 resolutions adopted this year by the General Assembly</p>
<p><b>A/HRC/2/4:</b> Israeli settlements in the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including East Jerusalem and in the Occupied Golan</p> <p><i>Adopted 45-1-1, on 11/27/06.</i></p>	<p>11 Islamic Group members and Cuba</p>	<p>“Express[es] grave concern about the continuing construction, contrary to international law, by Israel of the wall inside the Occupied Palestinian Territory”</p>	<p>Unbalanced text ignores Palestinian terrorism and other violations</p> <p>Redundant to resolutions adopted this year by the General Assembly</p>
<p><b>A/HRC/3/1:</b> Human rights situation in the Occupied Palestinian Territory: Follow-up on Res. S-1/1</p> <p><i>Adopted 34-1-12, on 12/8/06.</i></p>	<p>11 Islamic Group members and Cuba</p>	<p>“Calls for the speedy implementation of its resolution S-1/1” (see A/HRC/S-1/1 above)</p>	<p>Requires Israel to comply with one-sided fact-finding mission</p>

RESOLUTION	SPONSORS	SUMMARY	ANALYSIS
<p><b>A/HRC/3/3:</b> Report of the Commission of Inquiry on Lebanon</p> <p><i>Adopted w/o vote on 12/8/06.</i></p>	<p>Pakistan for the Islamic Group</p>	<p>“Recall[s] resolution S-2/1...on ‘The grave situation of human rights in Lebanon caused by Israeli military operations’” (see A/HRC/S-2/1 above)</p>	<p>Adopts and requires follow-up action on one-sided report</p>
<p><b>A/HRC/4/2:</b> Human rights situation in the Occupied Palestinian Territory: follow-up to the Human Rights Council Res. S-1/1 and S-3/1</p> <p><i>Adopted w/o vote on 3/27/07.</i></p>	<p>Algeria for the Arab Group and Pakistan for the Islamic Group</p>	<p>“Regret that Israel, the occupying Power, has not implemented to date these two resolutions and hindered the dispatching of the urgent fact-finding missions”</p>	<p>Criticizes Israel for refusing to cooperate with fact-finding missions that were deemed one-sided by major democracies and human rights groups</p>
<p><b>A/HRC/5/1:</b> Institution-building of the UN Human Rights Council</p> <p><i>Purportedly adopted by consensus on 6/18/07.</i></p> <p><i>(Note: Canada requested to vote against the resolution, on the basis of its selective treatment of Israel and other grounds, but was denied the right to vote. See “Timeline: How the UN Human Rights Council Was Born,” at <a href="http://www.unwatch.org">www.unwatch.org</a>.)</i></p>	<p>Human Rights Council President Luis Alfonso de Alba, following consultations with Council members</p>	<p>“[Agenda] Item 7: Human Rights Situation in Palestine and other occupied Arab territories. Human rights violations and implications of the Israeli occupation of Palestine and other occupied Arab territories. Right to self-determination of the Palestinian people.”</p> <p>“Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in the Palestinian territories occupied since 1967. (The duration of this mandate has been established until the end of the occupation.)”</p>	<p>Singles out Israel for permanent indictment as the only country subjected to a standing agenda item, at every Council session. Adoption of this item was criticized by S-G Ban Ki-moon on 6/20/07.</p> <p>Extends indefinitely the one-sided mandate of the Special Rapporteur on Palestine, which investigates only Israeli actions, all of which are presumed in advance to be violations. The only geographic mandate of the Council not subjected to regular review.</p>

---

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This report was written and edited by Hillel Neuer, UN Watch Executive Director, based on a first draft researched and written by Caroline Gross, Richard and Rhoda Goldman Fellow at UN Watch for 2006-07, and with significant contributions in research and writing by Leon Saltiel, UN Watch Director of Communications, Toby W. Frankenstein, current Richard and Rhoda Goldman Fellow at UN Watch, and Ophélie Namiech, Legacy Heritage Fellow at UN Watch. The cover design and layout are the work of John Funk.

## SUPPORT UN WATCH

To support the vital work of UN Watch with your U.S. tax-deductible donation, please visit us at [www.unwatch.org](http://www.unwatch.org) to make an online contribution via our secure server, or send a check made out to American Friends of UN Watch to:

UN Watch, Case postale 191, 1211 Geneva 20, Switzerland  
Tel: +41.22.734.1472  
Fax: +41.22.734.1613  
Website: [www.unwatch.org](http://www.unwatch.org)

Chair: Alfred H. Moses  
Co-Chair: David A. Harris  
European Co-Chair: Per Ahlmark  
Executive Director: Hillel C. Neuer

## ABOUT UN WATCH

UN Watch monitors the UN according to the principles of its Charter and promotes human rights for all. Headquartered in Geneva, UN Watch is accredited to the UN as a non-governmental organization and is affiliated with the American Jewish Committee. UN Watch is a leading advocate for UN reform and testifies before UN bodies on behalf of broad NGO coalitions. It speaks out for victims around the world, supporting the rights of women, advocating freedom of speech and religion, and combating racism and anti-Semitism. UN Watch is regularly featured by networks such as CNN, BBC, Al Jazeera, and FOX News, and cited by the *New York Times*, *Le Figaro*, *Reuters*, and other major media organizations. Achieving numerous successes in the past year, UN Watch:

- Led a coalition of more than sixty human rights NGOs to advocate robust action against the atrocities in Darfur, helping to pressure and prevent the UN Human Rights Council from rejecting a report that documented Sudan's crimes.
- Educated a global audience on the failure of the Human Rights Council to address the plight of victims in 191 countries, with a plenary speech that received over 300,000 hits on the Internet and was written up by the *Wall Street Journal* and dozens of other newspapers and blogs around the world.
- Exposed UN Expert Jean Ziegler's ties to Libyan dictator Muammar Khaddafi.
- Testified on human rights and UN reform before the U.S. Congress and at the Canadian Parliament, and appearing regularly before the Human Rights Council.

# UN Watch

---

Case postale 191, 1211 Geneva 20, Switzerland  
Tel: +41.22.734.1472 Fax: +41.22.734.1613  
[www.unwatch.org](http://www.unwatch.org)

# UN Watch

Case postale 191, 1211 Geneva 20, Switzerland  
Tel: +41.22.734.1472 Fax: +41.22.734.1613  
[www.unwatch.org](http://www.unwatch.org)