June 6, 2019

Submission of NGO Monitor to the United Nations Special Rapporteur on Freedom of Religion or Belief regarding Antisemitic Incidents

Introduction

NGO Monitor, a project of the Institute for NGO Research, an organization in Special Consultative Status with UN ECOSOC since 2013, presents this submission to the Special Rapporteur on Freedom of Religion or Belief. We hope that the information in this report will aid the Rapporteur in the preparation of his report on antisemitism to the General Assembly.

For nearly 20 years, NGO Monitor has studied and analyzed the presence of antisemitism within the human rights and humanitarian NGO community. Civil society must play a critical role in combating antisemitism. Yet, we have documented hundreds of incidents of antisemitism, as well as the development, promotion, and dissemination of antisemitic tropes by NGOs claiming to promote human rights. These ideas are then mainstreamed into political discourse and within international institutions. This NGO activity is a significant contributing factor to the rise in antisemitism occurring today across the globe.

It is important to stress that just because an organization claims to advance human rights or humanitarian objectives does not mean it is immune to participating in “the oldest hatred.” Too often, these groups use the cover of “human rights” work to exempt themselves from self-criticism or independent scrutiny of antisemitic activities. It is critical, therefore, that the Special Rapporteur address in his report antisemitism emanating from the NGO sector.

1 Members of the Institute’s Advisory Board include Elliott Abrams, Senior Fellow for Middle Eastern Studies at the Council on Foreign Relations; former Canadian Ambassador to Israel, Amb. Vivian Bercovici; Amb. John Bolton, US National Security Advisor and former US Permanent Representative to the UN; Hon. Michael Danby, MP, senior member of the Australian Labor Party; Harvard Professor Prof. Alan Dershowitz; Canadian Senator, Hon. Linda Frum; best-selling author and commentator and British journalist and international affairs commentator, Tom Gross; Colonel Richard Kemp, former commander of British forces in Iraq and Afghanistan; Douglas Murray, Director of the Centre for Social Cohesion, best-selling author and commentator; former Member of Italian Parliament, Hon. Fiamma Nirenstein, UCLA Professor and President of the Daniel Pearl Foundation, Prof. Judea Pearl; US Jurist and former Legal Advisor to the State Department Judge Abraham Sofaer; Dr. Einat Wilf, former member of Knesset with the Israel Labor Party and advisor to Shimon Peres; Harvard Professor Prof. Ruth Wisse; R. James Woolsey, former US Director of Central Intelligence; and Israeli Supreme Court Justice, Justice Elyakim Rubinstein.

Per the Special Rapporteur’s Call for Written Submissions, NGO Monitor’s submission provides information on “incidents of advocacy of antisemitic hatred that constitutes incitement to discrimination, hostility, or violence” and “incidents of dissemination of antisemitic propaganda, negative stereotyping, and other forms of antisemitic hate speech, including Holocaust denial” taking place with the human rights and humanitarian NGO community. We detail such incidents within the context of examining state responses to antisemitism (Section I) and best practices by non-state actors (Section II). We conclude with recommendations.

**International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance Definition of Antisemitism**

In setting the scope of this report, NGO Monitor notes the Special Rapporteur’s reference to the International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance’s (IHRA) definition of antisemitism in his call for written submissions. As of May 2019, this working definition, launched in 2000 at the Stockholm International Forum on the Holocaust, has 32 country members, 11 observers, and 7 permanent international partners, including the Claims Conference, the European Union’s Agency for Fundamental Rights (FRA), International Tracing Service, the OSCE Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights (OSCE/ODIHR), UNESCO, the UN, and the Council of Europe. The IHRA working definition has been adopted by more than 30 countries around the world, including the UK, Austria, Australia, Bulgaria, Germany, Lithuania, Romania, and Macedonia. The United States State Department Definition of antisemitism, adopted on June 8, 2010, is virtually identical. Global Affairs Canada also recognizes the IHRA definition.

On June 4, 2019, Secretary General of the Organization for American States, Luis Almagro, voiced his support for the IHRA definition and its adoption by the OAS.

The IHRA working definition clearly articulates what is and what is not antisemitism, as well as how to distinguish between legitimate criticism of Israel and antisemitism. **We urge the Special Rapporteur to use the IHRA definition as the fundamental benchmark in his report.**

We also urge all UN frameworks to adopt and implement this working definition. Unfortunately, far too many UN agencies and officials frequently violate its principles.

---

5 The International Association of Jewish Lawyers and Jurists, *Justice*, Fall 2018, No. 61, p14: http://intjewishlawyers.org/justice/no61/#14/z
I. Information on State Responses to Antisemitism

a. Mixed Government Responses

Since the end of World War II, governments in North America, Western Europe, and Australia have repeatedly acknowledged the evil of antisemitism and pledged to take extensive efforts to combat it. The collapse of the Soviet Union and communism, where promoting antisemitism was an integral part of government policy, freed most countries in Eastern Europe to also make this commitment. For instance, as mentioned, the IHRA working definition of antisemitism has been widely adopted throughout Europe and North America (Australia adopted on June 3, 2019). These countries have appointed government officials specifically tasked with monitoring antisemitism and have devoted considerable resources to Holocaust education and preservation of Jewish historical sites.

In contrast, a number of countries that are members of the Arab League and the Organization of Islamic Cooperation have shamefully not only failed to combat antisemitism, but regularly encourage attacks on Jews and disseminate antisemitic propaganda. Claiming one is simply engaging in “criticism” of Israel is no excuse to employ virulently antisemitic imagery and tropes, nor to encourage and perpetrate harassment and violence against Jewish communities. The Special Rapporteur will be derelict if his report fails to extensively address antisemitism emanating from these sources.

b. Government Funded NGOs

Despite the significant progress in European countries of acknowledging the evil of antisemitism and the need to allocate meaningful levels of government funding and resources to combat it, some countries have fallen short in some aspects. A primary area where government commitment to combatting antisemitism has been lacking occurs in the context of NGO funding. As documented by NGO Monitor, these governments, as well as the European Union, have given hundreds of millions of dollars over the past twenty years to organizations that engage in and promote blatant antisemitism as defined by IHRA.

The governments and the EU justify such funding by claiming that the recipient organizations are engaged in advancing human rights and humanitarian objectives, or that grants are provided for projects and not for organizations. These excuses are unacceptable. A group that engages in antisemitism can in no way be said to be promoting human rights or humanitarian goals.

Furthermore, it is inconceivable that a group that attacks the LGBTQ community or expresses racist views would be funded by European governments or the EU for any reason. Nor would such a group or its officials be labeled defenders of human rights.

Yet, every year, organizations that publish and disseminate antisemitic materials, call for boycotts and harassment of Jews in Europe and Israel, and promote incitement and violence
against Jews – are given large grants by European governments and the EU. Officials from these groups are also provided platforms throughout Europe to spread their hateful messages.

Few of these actors are called to account for their antisemitic activities. And perhaps due to the prevalence of post-colonial ideology, European officials condescendingly refuse to hold these NGOs to the same standard they would demand of themselves. These attitudes allow for impunity when it comes to antisemitism and reflect a failure of these governments and the EU to protect Jewish minorities.

The following highlights several notable examples, though there are hundreds more:

**BADIL**
The Palestinian NGO BADIL promotes a so-called Palestinian “right of return” and leads international BDS campaigns. As part of its advocacy, BADIL sponsors poster and caricature contests, where antisemitic and violent imagery is prevalent.

In 2010, the 2nd-prize-winning cartoon in BADIL’s caricature competition was a blatant representation of classic antisemitic tropes, including a Jewish man, garbed in traditional Hasidic attire, with a hooked nose and side locks. He stands on top of a box adorned with Jewish stars crushing to death a child, holding keys labeled “US” and “UK” and a pitchfork stylized as a menorah dripping with blood, while skulls litter the ground.

---

In response to awarding a prize to this egregious image, in 2012, the Swiss government temporarily froze BADIL’s funding\(^\text{13}\) (which had been provided through a joint funding mechanism). However, the funding was renewed beginning in 2014. There is no public documentation that an in-depth investigation was conducted regarding the explicitly antisemitic imagery or that controls were established to prevent a further occurrence.

Others providing extensive funding to Badil – the Swedish,\(^\text{14}\) Danish,\(^\text{15}\) and Dutch\(^\text{16}\) governments and the European Union – did nothing after this incident and continued to fund this group.

Worse yet, Badil has continued its antisemitic activity, particularly imagery calling for the destruction of Israel as the homeland for the Jewish people. For example, in 2017, the first-prize-winning image of BADIL’s poster contest portrays a man tearing apart the Balfour Declaration, which is tantamount to denying the Jewish nation the right to self-determination.

\(^{13}\) NGO Monitor, “Swiss Government Funding, NGOs, and the Arab-Israeli Conflict,” May 10, 2015: https://www.ngo-monitor.org/reports/swiss-government_funding_ngos_and_the_arab_israeli_conflict/


\(^{16}\) NGO Monitor, “Netherlands,” January 16, 2019: http://www.ngo-monitor.org/funder/holland/
In 2015, BADIL published a cartoon depicting a tsunami of keys rising up and destroying what is supposed to be the “negotiation table” and two people, one of whom is wearing a kippah with a Jewish star on it.\textsuperscript{17}

Another 2015 cartoon shows a clenched fist rising up through a depiction of the State of Israel with the caption reading “Return is our Right and our Destiny.”\textsuperscript{18}

Another antisemitic image that was posted on the BADIL website, a monstrous octopus, is identified with a Star of David on its head and tentacles dripping with blood. The image of the “octopus” recalls the most virulent antisemitic imagery from the Nazi era.

Despite the sustained and repeated incidents, Spain is currently providing €268,627 to BADIL.\textsuperscript{19} Additionally, in 2018, BADIL received indirect government funding from

\textsuperscript{17} BADIL: \url{http://www.badil.org/ar/multimedia-ar/award-winners/caricature/category/99-2012.html}
\textsuperscript{18} BADIL, “Multimedia,” \url{http://www.badil.org/en/multimedia/al-awda-award/posters.html}
\textsuperscript{19} AECID, “PROPUESTA DE ADJUDICACIÓN DE LA COMISIÓN DE VALORACIÓN DE LA CONVOCATORIA DE PROYECTOS DE ONGD 2018 FINANCIADA POR LA AGÉNCIA ESPAÑOLA DE COOPERACIÓN INTERNACIONAL PARA EL DESARROLLO,” November 8, 2018: \url{https://www.aecid.gob.es/es/_layouts/15/AECID.SedeElectronica/Document.aspx?doc=dFe0YitWam1LNDZHaUJHNFVXmdm2QmRmellU5VXB5V290ZmFwcnl0aFBYRFds9uMW9wZjhRQ1FGamZKZ0J6VjhDWE9SaUZDeGHSXNUL202biQ1a1F4dHVyNVZKeH1U2VFUjczRIHRZEFxMH4yL2M5QmZ4SzJTbXhFYVJhTUtUWlpmbFdlvB0bGx3UTBxZHBVbzrcrXgyVklqadjQveG82L2EyM1pXZGNNT1h4K3pYN2tpM2EvODhOM0c5Mjat5OVZhtNKCUlQmE0Z3lKMHBZZEhXzed2090}
Women’s Centre for Legal Aid and Counseling

The Women’s Centre for Legal Aid and Counseling (WCLAC) is a Palestinian NGO that, according to its “Vision and Mission,” aims “to address the causes and consequences of gender-based violence within the Palestinian community as well as the gender-specific effects of increasing militarisation associated with the Israeli occupation...”

According to its website, WCLAC receives funding from France, Sweden, Switzerland, Denmark, the Netherlands, Norway, European Union, Germany, Canada, Iceland, Oxfam Novib (Netherlands), Dan Church Aid (Denmark), Bread for the World (Germany), Broederlijk Delen (Belgium), Caritas Switzerland, the EU, and UNDP.

Despite its lofty claims, WCLAC employs individuals who promote vile antisemitic rhetoric and imagery on social media. For instance, while employed as a WCLAC field worker,

---

20 Dan Church Aid, “Project Overview,” 2017: https://www.danchurchaid.org/content/download/20402/384213/version/1/file/Projectoverview%202017.pdf
21 Trocaire, “Occupied Palestinian Territory (OPT) and Israel,” https://www.trocaire.org/whatwedo/wherewework/opt-israel
23 Ibid.
24 Women’s Centre for Legal Aid and Counselling, “Who are we,” http://www.wclac.org/Page/8
Manal Tamimi tweeted, “I do hate Israel, i (sic) wish a third Intefada (sic) coming soon and people rais (sic) up and kills all these zionist settlers everywhere.” Other posts include:

40 Manal Tamimi, “I do hate Israel, i do hate zionism, i wish a third Intedada coming soon and people rais up and kills all these zionist settlers everywhere,” Twitter, August 1, 2015: https://web.archive.org/web/20170216010648/https:/twitter.com/screamingtamimi/status/627589229271490560
Despite these grotesque sentiments, WCLAC wrote to the United Nations calling Tamimi a “human rights defender” (in violation of the definition), and the UN “Special Rapporteur on Palestinian territories occupied since 1967”, Michael Lynk, listed her as such in a March 2017 report to the UN Human Rights Council. She was only removed from the report following an official complaint by NGO Monitor, but original versions of the report that promote Tamimi as a “defender” of human right remain on the OHCHR website.41

In September 2018, according to the Jerusalem Post, the Berlin-based Iranian Refugees Association e.v. canceled an event, “Women Under Occupation – A Talk with Manal Tamimi,” due to Tamimi’s “hardcore antifeminism.”42 Co-founder of the German Green Party Jutta Ditfurth tweeted ‘Is this Antisemite, who wants to murder all Jews, allowed to travel to Berlin and appear?”

It is unknown whether WCLAC was censured for employing Tamimi, and there is no indication that this impacted the organization’s continued receipt of extensive government funding.

EAPPI

EAPPI, the World Council of Churches’ (WCC) flagship project on Israel and the Arab-Israel conflict, has brought 1,800 volunteers to the West Bank to “witness life under occupation.” The WCC does not run similar activities in other conflict zones. By singling out Israel, EAPPI embodies antisemitism, as defined in the IHRA’s working definition.

EAPPI donors include Norway, Sweden, Canada, DanChurchAid (Denmark), Catholic Agency for Overseas Development (United Kingdom), Finn Church Aid (Finland), and HEKS (Switzerland). In 2017, WCC allocated $1.3 million to EAPPI. Of this, $803,000 was spent on activists from Austria, Australia, Germany, Switzerland, Denmark, Great Britain, Ireland, Norway, Sweden, Finland, and the United States, and in partnership with United Nations bodies.

Despite marketing itself as a human rights and protection program, EAPPI places significant emphasis on political advocacy before, during, and after the trip. When volunteers return to their home countries and churches, they engage in anti-Israel advocacy, such as BDS campaigns and offensively comparing Israel to apartheid South Africa and Nazi Germany.

Participants of EAPPI’s program have made numerous antisemitic, inflammatory and factually inaccurate statements, both during and following their participation in EAPPI. Blogs, presentations, public statements, and social media make these proclamations available to the public. During a September 2017 presentation on EAPPI given by an EAPPI activist, Gordon Timbers of the Presbyterian Church of Canada, an audience member asked, “Excuse me; I have to make a comment at this point. I don’t know how many people here have seen the model of the gas chambers … and some of these things really remind me [unintelligible] and I often wondered if any Jewish people who go in to see that model

---

50 NGO Monitor, “Finn Church Aid (FCA),” May 15, 2019: http://www.ngo-monitor.org/funder/finn_church_aid_fca_
51 NGO Monitor, “Finland,” March 8, 2018: https://www.ngo-monitor.org/funder/finland/
ever think of what is set up here” (emphasis added).57 In his answer, Timbers did not dispute the false claim, answering instead “…Thank you for that, because there are similarities. All these identity papers and restriction of movement and checkpoints and all of these things, yes, that does make people think.”

An EAPPI-Switzerland blog featured an interview with Manal Tamimi (June 10, 2017).58 (See above for examples of Tamimi’s antisemitic and violent rhetoric and imagery.)

In London, in May 2016, an EAPPI activist discussed the experience she had in Hebron.59 During her presentation, she blamed the “Jewish lobby” and its influence in the US as an explanation for “why Evangelical Christians are not as sympathetic to the Palestinian plight.” She also supported a Palestinian “right of return,” called for a complete boycott of products and services from Israel, and referred to Israeli killing of Palestinian terrorists in Hebron “that supposedly had knives, but there are videos that show they have been planted.”

Another EAPPI activist cited60 in EAPPI’s 2013 report “Education Under Occupation”61 shared the following virulently antisemitic image62 on her Facebook page:63

---

62 Adele Du Toit, Facebook, April 1, 2018: https://www.facebook.com/adele.dutoit.7/posts/1218343871601298?__tn__=-R
63 Adele Du Toit, Facebook, https://www.facebook.com/adele.dutoit.7?hc_ref=ARTN0X5jPQ9ZMO8vqC0HhEHFm4XrgYwrGTS6J_CaR5QgKobnChuWv4ctVz_Ia9rZw8
In 2016 in South Africa, EAPPI activists participated in Apartheid Week events in Pretoria and in 2017 at Nelson Mandela University. BDS South Africa’s website also stated that a leading EAPPI activist participated in its Apartheid Week events. A South African who participated in the program twice advocated for crippling the Israeli banking system, calling for “SWIFT [Society for Worldwide Interbank Telecommunication] sanctions against Israel.” He stated that, “If we can develop the momentum of sanctions against Israeli banks then all the power of the Israeli military becomes irrelevant…that’s really the basis to support the BDS program…without access to SWIFT….the whole economy would quickly collapse… the time has come to say that the victims of the Holocaust have now become the perpetrators” (emphasis added).

EAPPI’s donor governments have said and done nothing about the virulent antisemitism that emanates from participants in this program. The WCC, rather than address the antisemitism in its programming, has reacted by trying to demonize the IHRA definition (see below).

---

64 BDS South Africa, “Christian perspective on #IsraelApartheidWeek by Itani Rasalanavho,” Youtube, April 14, 2016: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=cH3qJNAe6iU
67 Intal Globalize Solidarity, “Terry Crawford Browne on SWIFT sanctions against Israel,” August 8, 2014: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=MruWTfH8nLg&list=UU9DpWftimvLOK2lcJ5QOGkQ
Medical Aid for Palestinians
Medical Aid for Palestinians (MAP)⁶⁹ is a UK based charity claiming to work “for the health and dignity of Palestinians living under occupation and as refugees.”⁷⁰ MAP promotes distorted and false narratives and demonizing rhetoric under the guise of medical expertise and scientific fact and presents political analysis, legal declarations, and speculations regarding Israel’s military operations and weaponry, far beyond the scope of any medical expertise it might possess.

According to available information, MAP donors include the United Nations (UNICEF, UN OCHA, UN occupied Palestinian territory Humanitarian Fund).⁷¹ In 2018, MAP received $1.9 million from the UN OCHA “occupied Palestinian territory Humanitarian Fund.”⁷²

In 2014, NGO Monitor exposed⁷³ that MAP founder and honorary patron Dr. Swee Ang Chai⁷⁴ disseminated a video made by American white supremacist and KKK Grand Wizard David Duke.⁷⁵ Duke has also been expelled from Italy for “allegedly trying to establish a pan-European neo-Nazi group.” The video is described on Duke’s YouTube page as “reveal[ing] how the Zionist Matrix of Power controls Media, Politics and Banking and how each Part of this Tribalist matrix supports and protects each other!” In sending out the video, Swee Ang remarked “This is a shocking video please watch. This is not about Palestine – it is about all of us!” The email also contained, in bold red lettering, “SEE THIS VIDEO BEFORE IT IS REMOVED FROM CIRCULATION – Please do pass on to others who you think would be interested and would pass on>>>The whole world needs to know.”

In February 2017, when asked about the antisemitic video at the University College of London Union, Swee Ang responded that she doesn’t “think it’s entirely anti-Jewish.”⁷⁶

MAP Chief Executive Aimee Shalan⁷⁷ is an active member of the virulently antisemitic Facebook group “Palestine Live” (see below).⁷⁸

⁶⁹ NGO Monitor, “Medical Aid for Palestinians (MAP),” December 26, 2017: https://www.ngo-monitor.org/ngos/medical_aid_for_palestinians_map/
⁷⁰ MAP, “Healthcare System Buckling in Gaza,” https://www.map.org.uk/
⁷² Financial Tracking Service, “occupied Palestinian territory,” https://fts.unocha.org/countries/171/flows/2018?%5B0%5D=destinationOrganizationIdName%3A%223247%3A%223247%3A%22Medical%20Aid%20for%20Palestinians%22%3A%223247%3A%22
⁷⁷ MAP, “Who we are,” https://www.map.org.uk/about-map/our-team
MAP did nothing to distance itself from Swee Ang or Palestine Live. None of MAP’s donors admonished the organization for the antisemitic remarks of its leadership, nor ceased funding despite the malignant antisemitism expressed.

**Palestinian Medical Relief Society**

Palestinian Medical Relief Society (PMRS) is a health organization that receives funding from the Swedish, Spanish, and French governments, and the EU.

Yet, despite its “medical” remit, PMRS also runs “Palestine Monitor,” an “independent news website” meant to “expose life in Palestine under occupation to the West.” Palestine Monitor publishes lengthy “Factbooks.” Its 2015 “Factbook” features obscene antisemitic cartoons that trivialize the Holocaust. The cartoons include a depiction of a pile of emaciated dead bodies in striped uniforms under the caption “Gaza”; a cartoon of Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu stamping Palestinian babies with the word “terrorist,” as they are transported on a conveyor belt into a smoking oven; and a drawing of an elderly Palestinian woman with a blood-dripping “1948” tattooed on her arm, invoking the numbers that were tattooed on the arms of Jewish prisoners in concentration camps.

---


85 Palestine Monitor Factbook 2015: [https://www.dropbox.com/s/2xqsmhcv7v1jc73/Factbook%202015.pdf](https://www.dropbox.com/s/2xqsmhcv7v1jc73/Factbook%202015.pdf)

86 Ibid.
Again, no donors have taken action against this dissemination of hatred.

Kairos Palestine
Kairos Palestine describes itself as a “Christian Palestinian movement, born out of the Kairos Document, which advocates for ending the Israeli occupation and achieving a just solution to the conflict.” Yet its seminal “Document” repeatedly denies the Jewish historical connection to Israel in theological terms; rationalizes and trivializes terrorism against Israelis; promotes BDS; and promotes classical antisemitic themes. For example, the Central Conference of American Rabbis declared the Kairos Palestine document as “supersessionist” and “anti-Semitic” in its nature. Select examples from the text include:

1. “We believe that the Word of God is a living Word, casting a particular light on each period of history, manifesting to Christian believers what God is saying to us here and now. For this reason, it is unacceptable to transform the Word of God into letters of stone that pervert the love of God and His providence in the life of both peoples and individuals. This is precisely the error in fundamentalist Biblical interpretation that...”

---

87 Kairos Palestine, “We are a Christain Palestinian movement,” https://www.kairos Palestine.ps/
brings us death and destruction when the word of God is petrified and transmitted from generation to generation as a dead letter. This dead letter is used as a weapon in our present history in order to deprive us of our rights in our own land” (2.2.2).

2. “Our presence in this land, as Christian and Muslim Palestinians, is not accidental but rather deeply rooted in the history and geography of this land, resonant with the connectedness of any other people to the land it lives in. It was an injustice when we were driven out. The West sought to make amends for what Jews had endured in the countries of Europe, but it made amends on our account and in our land. They tried to correct an injustice and the result was a new injustice” (2.3.2).

3. “Some (Palestinian) political parties followed the way of armed resistance. Israel used this as a pretext to accuse the Palestinians of being terrorists and was able to distort the real nature of the conflict, presenting it as an Israeli war against terror, rather than an Israeli occupation faced by Palestinian legal resistance aiming at ending it” (1.5).

4. “Palestinian civil organizations, as well as international organizations, NGOs and certain religious institutions call on individuals, companies and states to engage in divestment and in an economic and commercial boycott of everything produced by the occupation. We understand this to integrate the logic of peaceful resistance. These advocacy campaigns must be carried out with courage, openly sincerely proclaiming that their object is not revenge but rather to put an end to the existing evil, liberating both the perpetrators and the victims of injustice” (4.2.6).

Kairos Palestine received a multi-year grant (2017-2020) from the German Civil Peace Service (ZFD). The amount of funding Kairos Palestine received from ZFD was not disclosed, demonstrating a lack of transparency and accountability. And the ZFD was silent as to the antisemitic themes promoted by Kairos Palestine.

The Memory, Responsibility and Future Fund (EVZ)

The Memory, Responsibility and Future Fund (EVZ) is a German NGO that compensates the survivors of Nazi labor camps. From March-July 2011, Europeans for Peace (EFP), an educational program for high school students created by EVZ, financed an exchange program, titled “Human Rights – Rights of Occupation,” with German (Anne Frank School in Gütersloh) and Palestinian (School of Hope in Ramallah) students. During the trip, Palestinian participants questioned “whether the Holocaust had really happened to that extent,” and the main focus of the program was devoted to alleging Israeli violations and immorality, not on Holocaust education.

In July 2011, under the guise of “Holocaust education”, the Anne Frank School hosted Hajo Meyer, a Holocaust survivor and anti-Israel activist. Meyer used his presentation to refer to

---

the “criminal state of Israel.” He also “wanted to express that many Jews today feel that no one else suffered like them during the Holocaust which makes them blind for the suffering of the Palestinians under the occupation.” Not recognizing the irony of his own actions, Meyer also commented “that it is criminal to abuse the Holocaust for political goals like some people do when they oppress criticism against Israeli policy with this argument.”

From 2010-2011 the EFP donated €21,590 for The HEAR project, an exchange program between the Gerhart-Hauptmann high school in Germany and the Masar Institute for Education in Nazareth.93

The project resulted in a brochure published by EVZ, equating Israel with the defunct East German Stalinist state, and included crude drawings of Orthodox Jewish students. The document depicted Israel as a violent state with an education system that excludes and oppresses Arab pupils.”94

The brochure consistently refers to “Jews,” not Israelis. One of the drawings depicts a “Jewish School” with smiling students in a spacious and classroom, with an open window and what seems to be a map of the world in the back. It is juxtaposed with a classroom with a (broken) sign reading “Palestine School.” The room is densely filled with sad looking students, covered in cobwebs; the windows had bars on them. Another drawing shows stacks of paper labeled “Jew” are situated near similar stacks, in chains, labeled “Palestine.” The “Jew” stacks appear to be “occupying” the “territory” of the “Palestine” stacks. In response to criticism, an EVZ official admitted that the brochure contained “visual elements that could be interpreted as antisemitic stereotypes,” but denied that they were “antisemittically motivated.”95

There is no detailed description of the program, however, according to the brochure “when the Germans came to Nazareth, we visited an organization called Zokhrot [sic]. We learned a lot of new information about the lands that the Palestinians no longer possess due to the Jewish occupation” (emphasis added) – referring to territory within the State of Israel.96

Zochrot is an Israeli NGO established in order to “raise public awareness of the Palestinian Nakba…. (and) In recognizing and materializing the right of return…. the rights of the refugees to return must be accepted.”97 The group runs tours “intended to teach the country’s

history and geography in the context of what happened here in 1948” and work towards “implementing the return.” Zochrot also accuses Israel of “ethnic cleansing” and “forcible displacement and dispossession of the Palestinian people.”

In a rare case of government donor action, in February 2012, EVZ announced it would stop funding to Zochrot because it “does not support organizations that also have a political agenda.” According to EVZ director Gunther Saathoff, “Since Zochrot supports the right of return, the foundation cannot extend its cooperation with it.” Although EVZ had a contract with Zochrot to distribute 20,000 Euros per year in 2011 and 2012, at the end of 2011, it announced it would end the contract and not distribute Zochrot’s 2012 funding.

c. Retaliation

Rather than work to address NGO antisemitism enabled by taxpayer funding, many government donors seek to “shoot the messenger” instead. They exhibit an attitude of denial even when confronted with explicit and irrefutable evidence. Some governments also engage in retaliation against “watchdog” groups alerting them to cases of concern. And some of this retaliation includes the promotion of even more antisemitism.

Swedish Government Owned Magazine Promotes Classic Anti-Semitic Motifs

OmVärlden is an online magazine owned by the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (SIDA, the branch of the government responsible for international development aid). On August 30, 2018, in response to NGO Monitor’s research on government funding for civil society organizations that engage in antisemitism and/or have links to terrorism, OmVärlden published more than 20 articles (!) making numerous false accusations about NGO Monitor. The articles, wholly inappropriate for a government agency, consist almost entirely of innuendo, factual inaccuracies, and, most alarming, antisemitic motifs reminiscent of the Protocols of the Elders of Zion (spider web, conspiracy theories). In the following image, Omvarlden places NGO Monitor President, Professor Gerald Steinberg, at the center of a spider’s web absurdly involving Jewish figures and members of the US and Israeli government (all called “spiders” – a classical antisemitic trope), including US President Donald Trump.

https://www.haaretz.com/1.5173890
100 Toby Axelrod, “German fund pulls NGO cash,” The JC, February 2, 2012.
101 “Så kapade den israeliska högern biståndsdebatten om Palestina,” OmVärlden, August 30, 2018. [Swedish]
On September 3, 2018, the Institute for NGO Research filed a complaint with the Press Ombudsman of Sweden against OmVärlden and the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (Sida) for disseminating virulently antisemitic imagery and publishing false and libelous information about NGO Monitor. In response, SIDA denied any responsibility for the publication and denied NGO Monitor freedom of information requests to confirm whether their self-serving claim was accurate. NGO Monitor has had to appeal its case multiple times to the press Ombudsman. While on September 17, OmVärlden agreed to change the original title of the article that had referred NGO Monitor as “Spindlarna i nätet bakom anklagelserna mot biståndet i Palestina” (The spiders in the web behind the accusations against aid in Palestine), with Omvärlden claiming that “The title of the article [referring to NGO Monitor and professor Steinberg as a spider] has been modified to avoid misconceptions that draw attention to the content of the article.” Yet, OmVarlden refused to correct the many other antisemitic and defamatory claims made in the articles.102

On November 22, the Ombudsman ruled that OmVärlden was not in breach of the press ethical code. NGO Monitor appealed this decision on the grounds that the antisemitism concerns were not addressed. The Swedish Press Council has since let NGO Monitor know that due to a large inflow of cases, it will decide on the case in “September or October.”103
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d. Government Responses

The failure to act is widespread. Nevertheless, a number of governments have rightly instituted funding guidelines and passed legislation increasing oversight, accountability, and transparency over their NGO funding processes. While these guidelines mark positive steps, they alone are insufficient. A number of countries that have instituted guidelines and legislation are still funding NGOs that promote antisemitism, racism, BDS, and hatred, and/or have ties to Palestinian terror organizations.

Addressing Antisemitism in Germany

In March 2018, NGO Monitor identified a number of virulently antisemitic statements made by officials of the German Society for International Cooperation (GIZ) – a German government-owned agency that implements Germany’s humanitarian and development aid around the world. These statements include comparisons between Israel and the Nazis, blaming the downfall of Arab leaders on a “Hebrew spring,” and depicting Israel as a two-headed monster. GIZ members also posted messages to Facebook that justify Palestinian rocket attacks on Israeli civilians and endorse BDS efforts.

Some of the antisemitic content was promoted by GIZ officials responsible for directing German funding to Palestinian NGOs, as well as by other colleagues at the agency. Among these Palestinian groups are those that have glorified violence and terrorism.

A May 16, 2019 article in the German Bild newspaper “German Development Aid for Israel Haters?,” detailed the findings from a series of leaked GIZ documents, including grants to Palestinian NGOs that have ties to terror, spread antisemitism, and promote BDS.

In an effort to address antisemitism in Germany, including that which is promoted by NGOs, on May 17, 2019, the Bundestag passed the resolution defining BDS as antisemitic and calling for ending German government funding to groups that promote BDS. The joint resolution, “Stand Resolutely Against the BDS Movement: Combat Antisemitism,” was supported by the CDU/CSU (The Union), SPD (Social Democratic Party), FDP (Free Democratic Party), and Green parties.

Specifically, the resolution states that Germany will:
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1. “Combat every form of antisemitism, from the beginning and in all consequence and to condemn the BDS campaign and their call for a boycott of Israeli goods, businesses and of Israeli scientists, artists or athletes;
2. Not provide premises and facilities under public administration to organizations that express anti-Semitism or call Israel’s right to exist into question. The Bundestag calls on the Federal Government not to support events of the BDS movement or groups actively pursuing their goals;
3. Expresses its support of the Federal Government and the Commissioner for Jewish Living in Germany in their efforts to fight against anti-Semitism and any extremism;
4. Not financially support organizations that question Israel’s right to exist;
5. Not financially support any projects that call for a boycott of Israel or actively support the BDS movement;
6. Call on all countries, cities and municipalities and all public actors to jointly share this stance.”

The equating of BDS with antisemitism echoes the IHRA working definition of antisemitism.109 The Bundestag’s decision follows statements condemning BDS made by German municipalities, decision makers, and other local actors.

This resolution of the Bundestag is a welcome development and is a model to be followed throughout Europe, EU institutions, and globally.

Funding Guidelines Throughout Europe
In 2013-2017, Denmark, Sweden, Switzerland, and the Netherlands provided approximately $20 million in joint support to Israeli and Palestinian NGOs through the Human Rights and International Humanitarian Law Secretariat (the Secretariat).110 Many of the organizations that received funding from the Secretariat promote antisemitic rhetoric, BDS, and/or have reported links to the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine (PFLP) – a designated terrorist organization by the US, EU, Canada, and Israel.111

After years of being exposed to this information, in December 2017, the Secretariat ceased support and funding for NGOs. In June 2018, the Secretariat presented its final report and ended its activities. As of August 2018, the Secretariat website is no longer functional.\footnote{Human Rights and International Humanitarian Law Secretariat: http://www.rightsecretariat.ps/}

Furthermore, governments that had provided support to the Secretariat have now instituted clear funding guidelines and/or passed legislation to ensure taxpayer funds are not provided to groups that promote antisemitism, hatred, BDS, and/or have ties to terror.

Specifically, in June 2017, the Swiss Parliament adopted a resolution to “amend the laws, ordinances and regulations so that Switzerland can no longer subsidize, even indirectly, development cooperation projects carried out by NGOs involved in racism or incitement.”\footnote{Benjamin Weinthal, “Swiss Legislature Passes Bill to Stop Funding for Boycotts of Israel,” The Jerusalem Post, March 9, 2017. https://www.jpost.com/Diaspora/Swiss-legislature-passes-bill-to-stop-funding-for-boycotts-of-Israel-483649 see also: NGO Monitor, “Swiss Parliament to Discuss Funding for Anti-Israel NGOs,” May 26, 2016. http://www.ngo-monitor.org/swiss-parliament-to-discuss-funding-for-anti-israel-ngos/}

On October 5, 2018, the Danish Foreign Ministry announced significant new criteria for its funding of NGOs. These guidelines specifically state that projects that promote BDS, organizations that question Israel’s right to exist, and those with ties to terror will not be eligible to receive funds.\footnote{“Orientering om nye betingelser for dansk støtte til israelske og palæstinensiske civilsamfundsorganisationer,” Udenrigsministeriet, October 5, 2018. [Danish] https://www.ft.dk/samling/20181/almndel/URU/bilag/11/1955512.pdf?fbclid=IwAR2LjK88johe7qch8IlK0CtJlJyW4C4JwJStVXYBf70_iAB_ytfH5ME}

Similarly, in the Netherlands, beginning in 2018, all Dutch Activity Appraisal Documents for funding to NGOs include standard language that specifies: “The Dutch cabinet has a strict policy that the Netherlands does not finance activities that propagate BDS against Israel. Expressing support for BDS is protected by freedom of speech and expression, as enshrined in the Dutch constitution and international agreements. There is no indication whatsoever that the activities that are financed in the framework of this project propagate BDS against Israel. However, there are no absolute guarantees in this regard; the chance of a mistake (e.g. financial means not being used for agreed objectives) by any of the implementing NGOs in the course of the project cannot be entirely excluded.”\footnote{OpenaidNL, “Palestinian Working Women Society Dev.,” https://openaid.nl/projects/108427/?tab=documents}

Norway has also articulated in its Foreign Affairs Budget for 2017-2018 that it is not “in line with Norwegian policy to support of organizations that have expressed the primary purpose of promoting the BDS campaign (Boycott, Disinvestment and Sanctions)...”\footnote{“Prop. 1 S (2017 –2018) Proposisjon til Stortinget (forslag til stortingsvedtak),” Norwegian Royal Foreign Department, 2017. https://www.statsbudsjettet.no/Upload/Statsbudsjett_2018/dokumenter/pdf/ud.pdf [Norwegian]}

These government actions are all important steps but can only be effective if they are actually implemented and not simply “checking the box”. As mentioned in this submission, many of
the groups that violate these guidelines are still receiving governmental funding via alternative frameworks.

II. Non-State Actors

The promotion of antisemitism in the civil society sector is sadly not confined to fringe NGOs and the governments that inexplicably provide them with funding and support. Too often, those claiming to be at the forefront of protecting human rights and combating racism and hatred can also be involved in promoting antisemitism.

UN agencies like the Division of Palestinian Rights and UNRWA regularly countenance antisemitic events and activities, misusing precious resources in order to promote hatred rather than fostering international peace and security. Likewise, powerful international NGOs that are supposed to serve as the highest moral example frequently devolve into pernicious bigotry, adopting the antisemitic tropes and imagery of radical antisemitic extremists.

The following highlights several examples of the promotion of antisemitism via UN human rights frameworks and international human rights and humanitarian NGOs.

a. United Nations 2001 World Conference Against Racism

In September 2001, the UN held the World Conference against Racism in Durban, South Africa, consisting of three parallel gatherings: an official diplomatic forum, a youth summit, and a massive NGO Forum. An estimated 7,000 delegates from more than 1,500 NGOs participated in the three-day NGO Forum, made possible by grants from the Ford Foundation and various governments.

This conference marked a new level of involvement by NGOs to use a UN forum to actively engage in and promote acts of antisemitism.

The atmosphere and rhetoric at the NGO Forum featured an extreme level of antisemitic vitriol disguised under the cover of “criticizing” Israel. Israel was accused of perpetrating a “Holocaust,” Israeli soldiers were portrayed as Nazis, and antisemitic cartoons and images were distributed. For instance, a flyer distributed at the NGO Forum musing that if Hitler had “won” there would be “no Israel”. According to attendees, NGO extremists blocked Jewish representatives from attending meetings and NGOs actively tried to prevent condemnations of antisemitism in the NGO Forum declaration. The level of antisemitic hatred was so intense
that the United States and Israel walked out of the conference while Canada and the European Union tried to mitigate the damage.\textsuperscript{117}

Since Durban, NGO antisemitism has not abated. In many cases, it has grown more extreme and NGO perpetrators exhibit an attitude of impunity when such activities have been exposed. The UN in general, and the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights, in particular, needs to do much more to combat such acts of antisemitism occurring in UN fora.

\textbf{b. UN Officials}

**UN Special Rapporteur Michael Lynk**

NGO Monitor has documented UN Special Rapporteur “on the situation of human rights in the Palestinian Territory occupied since 1967” Michael Lynk’s regular use of antisemitic language, as well as his partnering with groups that promote antisemitism (see NGO Monitor’s report for more).\textsuperscript{118}

At the 34th Session of the UN Human Rights Council in March 2017, UN Special Rapporteur Lynk presented a report falsely labeling a virulent antisemite, BDS activists and individuals linked to terror groups – including someone currently standing trial for allegedly funneling $40 million to Hamas – as “human rights defenders.”\textsuperscript{119}

Following an official complaint sent by NGO Monitor, the United Nations Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights removed one of such individuals, Manal Tamimi, from the official version of the report, though earlier drafts still remain on the OHCHR website.\textsuperscript{120}

Tamimi frequently posts antisemitic and violent rhetoric and imagery on social media (see above).

In his March 2018 report to the UN Human Rights Council (UNHRC), Lynk utilizes the classic antisemitic trope of greedy Jews in his description of Israel and its actions. This trope has been invoked throughout history, and was particularly visible in Nazi propaganda. In his report, Lynk characterizes Israel as engaging in “rapacious decisions” and an “avaricious occupation” (paragraph 64), as if there could be no other motivations (security from Palestinian terrorism, geo-political realities, preservation of Jewish history, safeguarding


Jewish self-determination) for its policies. Both the terms “avaricious” and “rapacious” refer to excessive greed for “wealth” and “material gain.” Lynk also refers to “pathologies of power,” another antisemitic canard, ascribing “causes and effects of diseases” to the behavior of the Jewish State. Throughout history, Jews have been accused of being psychologically variant or “pathological.”

Similarly, Lynk’s March 2019 to the UNHRC refers to “occupying powers” acting in an “avaricious manner” and Israel’s “appetite for territory and settlement-implantation.” This terminology is too reminiscent of classic antisemitic tropes and propaganda. The Institute for NGO Research expressed its concerns about Lynk’s rhetoric to the 40th Session of the HRC, under agenda Item 7. Instead of addressing the concerns, Lynk defended his antisemitic terminology, stating that “if that is not an appetite for territory then that is a defiance of the English language.”

Lynk has also spoken on panels alongside NGOs with highly problematic histories of antisemitism. For example, on June 13, 2017, Lynk spoke at an event titled “Accountability and Human Rights at 50 years of Occupation,” sponsored by Medical Aid for Palestinians (MAP), Amnesty International UK, and Lawyers for Palestinian Human Rights (LPHR). Amnesty’s contact for the event, Kristyan Benedict, has promoted antisemitism (see below).

On January 31, 2019, Lynk spoke at two events – one at McMaster University and one at the Barton Stone / Mount Hope United Church – hosted by a number of prominent Canadian pro-BDS organizations, including Canadians for Justice and Peace in the Middle East (CJPME) Hamilton and Independent Jewish Voices (Hamilton). On September 6, 2018, CJPME Chair Dimitri Lascaris accused two Jewish Canadian Members of Parliament of being disloyal to Canada. As stated by the Centre for Israel and Jewish Affairs (CIJA), “This is the literal definition of antisemitism under the @IHRA definition.” Leaders from all major political parties in Canada condemned this antisemitic incident. The event at the United Church is also sponsored by Jelithin.ca -the Jewish Liberation Theology Institute, a group self-described as providing “a space for people to be able to act Jewishly without the constraints put on social justice activists by the Jewish establishment.” Jelithin also states that
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“We stand firm in our support of the Palestinian call for Boycott, Divestment and Sanctions (BDS) against the State of Israel, until it fully complies with international law and ceases its systematic violations of Palestinian human rights.”

UN Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights
NGO Monitor welcomes the May 8, 2019 statement by the spokesperson for the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights that condemns “the rise in anti-Semitic incidents taking place in a number of European countries and the United States.” The spokesperson highlights that “Under international law, people are entitled to legal protection from incitement to hatred and violence. When abuse rises to the level of incitement – whether it be on the street or on the Internet – it should be prohibited by law, while respecting freedom of expression, which has permissible restrictions in such cases.”

Yet, the Office of the High Commissioner needs to do more to enact a comprehensive program of education within OHCHR to combat antisemitism. Officials from NGO Monitor have experienced antisemitic harassment and abuse in the halls of the UN in Geneva. For instance, a very senior OHCHR official made an antisemitic joke to an NGO Monitor employee during a 2014 meeting at the offices on Motta Street. In another case, in 2017, an NGO official asked an NGO Monitor representative to show her “magical hat” because “don’t all Jews have magical hats.” In a third incident, in 2018, an NGO representative from an ECOSOC-accredited NGO mocked an NGO Monitor employee that she could not eat the food at the NGO’s side event because “it wasn’t kosher” (the same OHCHR official who made the antisemitic joke in 2014 was a featured speaker at this side event).

In addition, OHCHR has also personally targeted NGO Monitor’s work in exposing and combatting NGOs that promote antisemitism and calling for government funders of such groups to investigate and if necessary, defund. The High Commissioner’s 2019 report to the UN Human Rights Council on “Ensuring accountability and justice for all violations of international law in the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including East Jerusalem,” claims that “some organizations have been instrumental in distributing information aimed at discrediting human rights defenders and civil society actors.” The only footnote for this specious claim is a defamatory report targeting NGO Monitor’s work exposing NGO officials who are also members of terrorist organizations. In blindly citing this libelous report, the High Commissioner ignored that the so-called “human rights defenders” NGO Monitor has criticized are those who engage in incitement to violence, disseminate antisemitic tropes and imagery, or are involved in antisemitic BDS, such as Manal Tamimi.

The report also falsely accuses NGO Monitor of submitting an amicus brief in a court proceeding “highlighting the support of Human Rights Watch for the [HRC’s forthcoming BDS] database and its general advocacy work at the Council.” In fact, NGO Monitor’s amicus brief detailed HRW employee Omar Shakir’s long history of support for antisemitic
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BDS. Importantly, contrary to the denigration of NGO Monitor’s brief in the OHCHR report, the well-researched material filed with the court was not only accepted, but was heavily relied upon and cited in the court’s opinion.

c. International NGOs

Human Rights Watch (HRW) and Amnesty International are two of the largest and most prominent voices regarding human rights. These organizations should be the standard bearers for identifying and condemning antisemitism. Regrettably, however, these NGOs rarely report on or condemn acts of antisemitism. Moreover, several employees at these groups have engaged in antisemitism.129

Human Rights Watch
There are many examples where HRW’s leadership has violated the IHRA definition and engaged in antisemitic activity. The following highlights several examples.

HRW’s executive director Ken Roth often engages in antagonistic comments towards Jews and Judaism when expressing animus towards Israel. For instance, in August 2014, at the height of the Gaza conflict, Kenneth Roth promoted on social media a highly propagandistic advertisement published by the Jewish Anti-Zionist Network in The New York Times and The Guardian equating “Nazi genocide” with “the massacre of Palestinians in Gaza.” A picture of the ad was posted with the tagline “‘Never again’ must mean NEVER AGAIN FOR ANYONE!”130

This same antisemitic message was disseminated by HRW European Media Director Andrew Stroehlein and HRW EU Director Lotte Leicht.131

In September 2014, Roth issued a statement blaming attacks on Jews in Germany and the rise of antisemitism in Europe on Israel’s conduct during the Gaza War. Journalist Jeffrey Goldberg rebuked Roth for his comment:

It is a universal and immutable rule that the targets of prejudice are not the cause of prejudice. Just as Jews (or Jewish organizations, or the Jewish state) do not cause anti-Semitism to flare, or intensify, or even to exist, neither do black people cause racism, nor gay people homophobia, nor Muslims Islamophobia. Like all prejudices, anti-

Semitism is not a rational response to observable events; it is a manifestation of irrational hatred. Its proponents justify their anti-Semitism by pointing to the (putatively offensive or repulsive) behavior of their targets, but this does not mean that major figures in the world of human-rights advocacy should accept these pathetic excuses as legitimate.132

This is not a new problem for Roth. In a response to a critique on HRW’s reporting on the 2006 Lebanon war, Roth used an Old Testament reference to attack Israel that “An eye for an eye – or, more accurately in this case, twenty eyes for an eye – may have been the morality of some more primitive moment. But it is not the morality of international humanitarian law…”133 The New York Sun decried this statement as “a slur on the Jewish religion itself that is breathtaking in its ignorance… To suggest that Judaism is a ‘primitive’ religion incompatible with contemporary morality is to engage in supersessionism, the delegitimization of Judaism, the basis of much antisemitism.”134

Sarah Leah Whitson, HRW’s Director of the Middle East and North Africa Department also frequently invokes antisemitic rhetoric and baits the US Jewish community for support of Israel - something she has never done with any other ethnic minority.

In January 2015, Whitson commented on a tweet about the US Holocaust Museum’s display of “death and torture in Syria,” stating that the Holocaust Museum should “also show pics of death and destruction in #Gaza” – equating the 2014 war with Hamas to the Holocaust and the extermination of 6 million Jews.135

In February 2019, in response to a tweet alleging that antisemitism within the Labour party is manufactured, Whitson defended the post echoing classic antisemitic tropes and Jewish conspiracy theories, tweeting “Why is this #Israel interference in domestic UK politics acceptable? Is it only a problem when Russia does this?”136

In 2009, HRW’s Senior Military Analyst Marc Garlasco responsible for drafting numerous condemnatory reports relating to Israel was exposed as being an obsessive collector of Nazi memorabilia,137 a “hobby” that is highly controversial and in many European countries, is

illegal. Such trade is banned on many internet sites and from auction houses. Christies’ Chairman has stated that Nazi memorabilia, is “the only thing we categorically will not sell.” Writer Susan Sontag likens its collection to pornography and the Simon Wiesenthal Center notes it “glorifies the horrors of Nazi Germany.”

Garlasco’s Nazi obsession included authoring a 430-page “collectors” manual on Nazi combat medals, and thousands of comments on Nazi memorabilia sites including Germancombatawards (981 posts) and Wehrmacht-awards (7735 posts). His screen logo on the sites was a picture of a German badge with a swastika. In a 2005 comment, responding to a posting of a photo of a leather SS jacket, Garlasco wrote, “That is so cool! The leather SS jacket makes my blood go cold it is so COOL!” Garlasco’s screen moniker was Flak88. While this is the name of a German anti-aircraft gun (alarming on its own), the number 88 is also a code for “Heil Hitler” and is used by neo-Nazis to identify themselves. He even used Flak88 as his license plate (a practice which is banned in Germany) and as a screen name on websites unrelated to his Nazi collection.

In the aftermath of these revelations, rather than condemn Garlasco’s activities and remove his publications from HRW’s website, HRW defended him and tried to justify his actions. Garlasco left HRW in 2010 under secret terms. HRW pledged to conduct an investigation of
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how he was hired and a review of his reports on Israel, but there is no evidence that this was undertaken. Garlasco’s tainted work remains on HRW’s website with no disclaimer.

**Amnesty International**

Like HRW, Amnesty International has also had several problematic antisemitic incidents involving staff members that violates the IHRA definition.

Amnesty-UK Campaigns Manager Kristyan Benedict has displayed a strong anti-Israel obsession, fueled by global conspiracy theories involving Israel, the US, and the arms trade, as well as frequent conflations of Israel and individual Jews and Jewish communities. Two years later, in November 2014, Benedict posted a tweet comparing Israel to the Islamic State, claiming that “Israeli regimes [sic] response to our Gaza report: Amnesty is ‘a propaganda tool for Hamas & other terror groups’ (#JSIL?).” The Twitter tag “#JSIL” stands for “Jewish State in Levant” and is meant to compare Israel and Judaism with the international terrorist organization ISIL (ISIS), implying that Israel’s activities are tantamount to the mass public executions and beheadings performed by ISIL and that Judaism is equivalent to the extreme form of religion promoted by Islamic State.

Benedict was allowed to remain employed by Amnesty despite these expressions of antisemitism and considerable outcry from the UK’s Jewish community.

At least four Amnesty International employees were members of the virulently antisemitic Facebook group “Palestine Live.” Posts to this group regularly involve heinous antisemitic tropes, imagery, and language – such as conspiratorial posts blaming the Rothschild family for WWI and WWII and Jews for 9/11 and other terror attacks; images featuring Jewish people portrayed as octopuses, monsters, and pigs; and the use of neo-Nazi rhetoric such as the term “Zios.” There is also blatant Holocaust denial rampant in the group; articles regarding “The Real Holocaust of World War Two – The Genocide of +15 Million
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Germans,” “Holocaust: The Greatest Lie Ever Told,” and “The Jews and the Concentration Camps: No Evidence of Genocide” that are shared and “liked.”

Amnesty staff that are members of “Palestine Live” include Alli McCracken (Advocacy Director for MENA at Amnesty International USA), Raed Jarrar, (Amnesty International USA Middle East and North Africa Advocacy Director), Edith Garwood (Country Specialist on Israel/OPT/State of Palestine) and Alex Neve (Secretary General of Amnesty International Canada). Additionally, one of “Palestine Live’s” Admins tagged Kristyan Benedict (see above), suggesting that Benedict was once a member and/or is Facebook “friends” with a leader of this antisemitic group. None of these Amnesty staffers appear to have condemned or repudiated Palestine Live after its blatant antisemitism was exposed.

Antisemitism is also reflected in Amnesty’s campaigning. For example, in January 2019, Amnesty International published “The Tourism Industry and Israeli Settlements,” a report alleging that “the Israeli government has political and ideological reasons for developing a tourism industry in occupied East Jerusalem and Area C of the West Bank.” In the report, Amnesty denies Jewish connections to Holy Land historical sites – including in the Old City of Jerusalem – and faults Israel for preserving Jewish historical and cultural heritage, as well as places that are holy to Christians.

In the report, Israel’s interest in Jewish archaeology is belittled and delegitimized as an attempt “to make the link between the modern State of Israel and its Jewish history explicit,” while “rewriting of history [which] has the effect of minimizing the Palestinian people’s own historic links to the region.”

In Amnesty’s antisemitic narrative, the motivation for developing Jewish and Christian heritage sites in the Holy Land is cynically described as purely “political and financial”, rather than cultural or religious.
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In 2018, Amnesty conducted “an unprecedented large scale analysis of abuse against women on Twitter.”\textsuperscript{163} Amnesty’s research included sexism and racism against female journalists and politicians, but ignored antisemitism. The UK Jewish community condemned this exclusion.\textsuperscript{164}

At its annual conference in April 2015, Amnesty-UK adopted 16 of 17 motions. The only proposed resolution that was rejected called for the organization to “Campaign against anti-Semitism in the UK,” as well as “Lobby the UK Government to tackle the rise in anti-Semitic attacks in Britain” and “monitor anti-semitism closely.”\textsuperscript{165}

Similarly, an Amnesty-UK International Holocaust Remembrance Day event in January 2018 failed to acknowledge the singular suffering of Jews during the Holocaust.\textsuperscript{166}

e. Fighting the IHRA Definition

Rather than confronting the antisemitism in their midst, many international NGOs seek to demonize those combating antisemitism. One way in which this occurs is to belittle the IHRA definition against antisemitism – as mentioned above, a consensus position agreed to by dozens of countries and institutions. Moreover, these NGOs do not offer any specific alternative definitions of antisemitism nor pledge to work to remedy the bigotry within their own organizations and networks.

World Council of Churches

In January 2019, the World Council of Churches (WCC) was alerted to severe antisemitism taking place under the auspices of its flagship Ecumenical Accompaniment Program, known as EAPPI (see above). Coupled with the expression of concern, WCC was recommended to adopt the IHRA definition to prevent future antisemitic incidents in the EAPPI program.

In response, the WCC distorted the IHRA definition and minimized its significance, ignoring its adoption by dozens of countries and multilateral institutions. Specifically, WCC states that it would “welcome a sufficiently precise and sufficiently widely accepted definition of antisemitism to clearly identify instances of condemnable hatred of Jews as Jews, while protecting legitimate criticism of the actions of individuals, groups or of the government of Israel from being falsely characterized as ‘antisemitic’. However, the definition proposed by

the International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance (IHRA) does not greatly assist in meeting these purposes. Its vague and inclusive formulation unfortunately tends towards assisting those who would portray any criticism of Israeli government policies as being motivated by antisemitism.”

United Church of Canada
In February 2019, NGO Monitor published a report on Canadian funding to BDS promoting organizations, which detailed a grant to the United Church of Canada (UCC), KAIROS Canada, and its Palestinian NGO partner Wi’am. In addition to examples of the groups’ involvement in promoting BDS campaigns, the report also detailed a number of Wi’am’s antisemitic statements, activities, and violations of the IHRA working definition of antisemitism.

In response, in April 2019, the UCC published an article in the Hill Times attacking the IHRA definition and referring to “false allegations of ant-Semitism.” Given the global recognition of the urgent need to combat this hatred, UCC’s rejection of the consensus working definition is particularly disturbing. UCC also claims that “all three organizations continue to condemn hatred and anti-Semitism,” referring to itself, its KAIROS Canada program, and its financial support and partnership with the Palestinian organization Wi’am. However, a search on Wi’am’s website does not reveal any indication of any such statement.

Jewish Voice for Peace Letter
In July 2018, Jewish Voice for Peace (JVP) published a letter titled “40+ Jewish groups worldwide oppose equating antisemitism with criticism of Israel.” The organizations, extreme fringe groups with no presence or standing within the mainstream Jewish community, disregard the widely accepted IHRA definition and its components of singling out Israel and denying Israel’s right to exist under its definition of antisemitism, grotesquely referring to “false accusations of antisemitism that dangerously conflate anti-Jewish racism with opposition to Israel’s policies and system of occupation and apartheid.” JVP further states that “The International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance (IHRA) definition of antisemitism, which is increasingly being adopted or considered by western governments, is worded in such a way as to be easily adopted or considered by western governments to

---

170 Ibid.
intentionally equate legitimate criticisms of Israel and advocacy for Palestinian rights with antisemitism, as a means to suppress the former” (emphasis in original).\textsuperscript{172}

\textbf{Conclusion}

This submission has highlighted far too many cases of antisemitism within the human rights and humanitarian NGO community. It is by no means presents an exhaustive accounting. It also reveals how governments, primarily European, and international institutions like the EU and UN, aid and abet this antisemitism through funding, program support, and denial. We urge the Special Rapporteur to tackle the problem of NGO antisemitism in his report and to adopt the following recommendations:

\textbf{Recommendations}

Based on the evidence provided in this submission, NGO Monitor recommends the following:

- That all States adopt the IHRA working definition of antisemitism. In particular, this should be a requirement for countries seeking positions on international bodies related to the promotion of universal human rights.
- That the UN and the numerous organizations that exist within its system, particularly the UN Human Rights Council, adopt the IHRA working definition of antisemitism.
- States and international institutions must adopt IHRA and similar guidelines but also work to enforce them.
- The UN should appoint a coordinator on combatting antisemitism. As in the EU, this individual would coordinate with the IHRA and UN member states to encourage the adoption of the IHRA working definition and ways to implement it. This coordinator could oversee educational programs and trainings within the UN system.
- Enact a complaints mechanism at the UN where victims of antisemitism can report incidents and obtain appropriate remedies.
- The UN should encourage member states and UN organizations to include the IHRA working definition of antisemitism in contracts with NGOs. This would help ensure that NGOs that promote antisemitism would not receive future government and institutional funds.
- The UN and member states should immediately revoke all funding to groups that promote antisemitism, as defined by the IHRA working definition.
- NGOs that promote antisemitism should not be eligible for ECOSOC status. Additionally, NGOs caught promoting antisemitism should have their ECOSOC status reviewed and revoked.
- NGOs should not be eligible for UN and/or government support if they incite to hatred and/or violence and that promote racism and xenophobia, including incited to hatred and/or violence against the State of Israel, its citizens and/or Jews.
- International NGOs like HRW and Amnesty must adopt guidelines and conduct sensitivity training to prevent future incidents of antisemitism.
- Encourage the review of NGOs and their activities for antisemitism by impartial third party groups.

\textsuperscript{172} Ibid.