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The information in this guide is correct as of April 1, 2009.
The Durban Review Conference (DRC, or Durban II), scheduled to be held in Geneva beginning on April 21, 2009, was called to provide a “follow-up” to the 2001 U.N. World Conference Against Racism (the Durban conference). The 2001 event marked the escalation in the process of politicizing human rights, and accelerated the erosion of the moral principles as established in the 1948 Universal Declaration of Human Rights. The hijacking of this mechanism by the worst human rights offenders – Iran, Libya, and Cuba – led the American and U.S. delegations to walk out of the governmental meetings, and built the foundation for the strategy of demonization adopted in the parallel NGO Forum.

But the starting conditions for the DRC are very different – some important lessons have been learned, and this time, governmental and NGO delegations that oppose this agenda have been involved from the beginning. This guide provides a summary of much of this preparation, identifying the main issues and the principle actors – including both the governments and the powerful non-governmental organizations (NGOs) – that have been active in shaping the DRC and are expected to impact the outcome of the conference itself.

As shown in this overview, the preparatory meetings pointed to another human rights catastrophe. However, the determined efforts of a few governments, and the opposition that arose within the NGO community, have created the opportunity for a reversal of the 2001 outcome. First Canada, and then Israel, the United States (under the Obama Administration), and Italy declared that they would not participate in another virulently antisemitic event that singled out Israel for attack.

Other European governments discussed a similar move unless the language preventing free speech, and giving Islam a privileged position, was removed. This would have left only the members of the Organization of the Islamic Conference and a few other countries in the room, thereby delegitimizing the DRC. This fear led to a sudden revision of the draft declaration, one month before the conference, and the removal of most of the OIC’s language. As this publication goes to press, the implications are being assessed, but at least tactically, the change in the draft – which can still be reversed – can turn into an important victory in the restoration of universality and morality to human rights.

In parallel, the role of the powerful non-governmental organizations (NGOs) in the DRC has been greatly reduced, thereby removing much of the political momentum behind the Durban strategy of boycotts and demonization, including the abuse of pseudo-legal and genocidal language aimed at Israel. In contrast to the 2001 conference, the UN has not allocated funds or facilities for an NGO Forum in Geneva, and other sponsors of mass NGO participation in Durban, such as the Ford Foundation and the Canadian government, have also changed their policies to avoid a repeat performance. In addition, more than 100 NGOs signed a “Statement of Core Principles for WCAR Follow Up,” which “thoroughly rejects hatred and incitement in all its forms, including anti-Semitism” and calls
on other NGOs to “learn from the shortcomings of the 2001 WCAR….“ Unfortunately, some of the NGOs that contributed to such “shortcomings,” and are active in demonization, such as Human Rights Watch, refused to join this call. HRW leaders also campaigned against the central Canadian decision to pull out of the DRC.

Even without an NGO Forum, the opportunity continues for NGO involvement in the governmental proceedings and in various side events in the UN. In theory, the thousands of NGOs that are accredited under the Economic and Social Council, or which received special accreditation for the 2001 conference, will be able to participate in the DRC. European government funders of non-governmental organizations, including aid agencies and the European Commission, have not restricted the use of their funds for this conference. And some newly accredited NGOs – such as the “Palestinian Grassroots Anti-apartheid Wall Coalition” – are likely to promote the virulent anti-Israel agenda.

Additionally, on the fringes of the DRC, the Palestinian National Boycott, Divestment, and Sanctions Committee is organizing the “Israel Review Conference” for April 18-19, 2009 in Geneva, “unit[ing] against apartheid, colonialism, and occupation.” The play on the official conference name (the group has also modified the DRC logo for its event) is another indication of the intention to resist efforts to undo the damage of the 2001 NGO Forum.

Thus, in addition to close examination of the policies of the participating governments and UN officials at this conference, it will be very important to analyze the role of the NGOs, and to hold their officials and the funders – including European governments – accountable. This resource guide was assembled and published in order to assist in this critical aspect of the DRC process.

Gerald M. Steinberg
Executive Director, NGO Monitor
March 22, 2009
### FREEDOM of IDEAS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Free Media (uncensored)</th>
<th>Freedom to Criticize Religion</th>
<th>Academic Freedom</th>
<th>Free Artistic Expression</th>
<th>Free Entry of Foreign Arts/Books/Press</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iran</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>PARTIAL</td>
<td>PARTIAL</td>
<td>PARTIAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libya</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saudi Arabia</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


### CIVIL RIGHTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Free Speech and Assembly</th>
<th>Fair and Open Trials</th>
<th>Religious Freedom Protected</th>
<th>Freedom House Rating* Scale 1-7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>Minimal</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iran</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td>Limited</td>
<td>Limited</td>
<td>Limited</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebanon</td>
<td>Limited</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Limited</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libya</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palestinian Authority</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Limited</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saudi Arabia</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Facts about Arabs living in Israel

- 1.2 million Arab-Israelis live within Israel.
- Arab-Israelis make up 18-20% of the total population.
- Arabic is an official language and an equal footing with Hebrew.
- Arabs hold 12 of 120 seats in the Israeli parliament.
- There are 5 official Arab parties.
- All Arab municipalities receive government funding for education and infrastructure.

For more information, see www.knesset.gov.il, www.cbs.co.il, www.yale.edu/lawweb/avalon/mideast/israel.htm, www.state.gov/g/drl/hr/c1470.htm
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Introduction

On April 20-24, 2009, in Geneva, Switzerland, the United Nations will host the “Durban Review Conference,” – a follow-up to the 2001 UN World Conference against Racism, Racial Discrimination, Xenophobia, and Related Intolerance (WCAR). As mandated by the UN General Assembly, the Human Rights Council of the United Nations (UNHRC) is responsible for organizing and convening the event “towards the effective and comprehensive implementation” of the conclusions and recommendations of WCAR, and to continue the “global drive for the total elimination of racism.”

The first Durban conference became an instrument for racism itself, particularly directed against Israel. This agenda was driven by Iran and a number of Arab states – using the pre-conference Asian Regional Session to condemn Israel for “holocausts” and “antisemitism” – and primarily by the participants in the virulent NGO (non-governmental organization) Forum. The final declaration of the NGO Forum – which labeled Israeli counter-terrorism measures as “war crimes,” revived the “Zionism is racism” slogan, and introduced the “Durban Strategy” of isolating Israel internationally, following the model of the campaign against apartheid in South Africa. This NGO-led Durban Strategy includes BDS (boycotts, divestment and sanctions) efforts, the deliberate distortion of international law, and the exploitation of human rights terminology, to demonize and delegitimize Israel.

In the preparatory process prior to the 2009 Review Conference, many of the pathologies that were displayed in 2001 are visible again. As this guide will describe, NGOs once again stand at the fore of the campaign to manipulate these UN proceedings to advance their anti-Israel political agenda.
World Conference Against Racism – Durban I

The UN’s World Conference Against Racism held in Durban, South Africa in late August and early September 2001, was designed to unite nations in the fight against “racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia, and related intolerance.” In the initial regional sessions held in advance of the conference – in France, Chile, and Senegal – remarkable progress in addressing regional manifestations of racism was achieved, without unfairly focusing on individual countries.

However, the Asian Preparatory Meeting that was convened in Tehran, Iran, in the words of US Congressman Tom Lantos, “marked a sharp departure from the spirit of tolerance that was evident at the first three regional meetings.” Israel and Jewish NGOs were effectively excluded from participating by the Iranian government, and in their absence, the Organization of the Islamic Conference (OIC) in conjunction with Arab and Islamic countries successfully introduced language into the Conference Declaration accusing Israel of perpetrating “holocausts,” “ethnic cleansing,” and “a new kind of apartheid, a crime against humanity,” and declared that Zionism “is based on race superiority.”

UN High Commissioner for Human Rights Mary Robinson, who was organizing the Durban event, had assured Israel that its representatives could attend the Tehran session, but failed to follow through on her guarantee. After the meeting, fully aware of the anti-Israel agenda, Robinson commended the Asian delegates. As opposed to preventing the racist, antisemitic groups from dominating the conference, Robinson encouraged the focus on “the situation of the Palestinians” who had suffered “the accumulated wounds of displacement and military occupation.”

The conference itself consisted of three parallel gatherings: an official diplomatic forum, a “youth summit,” and a massive NGO Forum. The diplomatic framework was affected by the direction set in Tehran, the Israeli government was poorly informed and unprepared, and the leaders of the official delegation were unable to respond in a significant manner. Ultimately, official US and Israeli delegations walked out of the government sessions in protest at the language of incitement directed at Israel.

The atmosphere and rhetoric in all three frameworks featured a high level of vitriolic antisemitism, and marked the return of the “Zionism is racism” theme, a decade after the 1975 UN resolution was repealed. However, of these three, the NGO Forum generated most of the publicity and impact from the Durban Conference, focusing on the development of a broad campaign to delegitimize Israel as a sovereign state.
An estimated 7,000 delegates from more than 1,500 NGOs participated in the three-day NGO Forum at Durban, claiming to represent the “voices of the victims” of racism, discrimination, and xenophobia. The large attendance and funding from the Ford Foundation and various governments made the NGO Forum the central focus of the entire Durban Conference. This support also reflected the dominant ideology that viewed NGOs and civil society as “authentic” voices and representatives, in contrast to those of government officials and elected representatives in democratic societies.

The Durban conference took place against the backdrop of intense violence – the “second intifada” that began at the end of September 2000 had escalated to major Palestinian mass terror attacks aimed at Israeli civilians, injuring and killing thousands, including hundreds of women and children. When Israel responded, it was consistently condemned for alleged human rights violations, and the speakers at the NGO Forum focused on the theme of Israel as the world’s singular human rights violator, stripping away the context of the conflict and Palestinian violence. Hanan Ashrawi, a prominent Palestinian official who also heads the NGO known as Miftah (a recipient of EU funding), declared to the Forum: “The Palestinians today continue to be subject to multiple forms and expressions of racism, exclusion, oppression, colonialism, apartheid, and national denial.” UN Human Rights Commissioner Mary Robinson called on participants to focus on “particular victims of racism,” noting the situation of the Palestinians as a central example (Robinson later changed her position), and Israeli-Arab Knesset member Azmi Bishara referred to Israel’s “apartheid” policy toward the Palestinians.

At the conference, the image of Muhammed al Dura – “the patron saint” of the NGO Forum, as noted by Prof. Richard Landes – who was allegedly killed by Israeli soldiers, was used to promote the virulent anti-Israel agenda. Al Dura’s father, Jamal, was flown to the conference in Yasir Arafat’s airplane, and was a featured speaker.

A session entitled “Hate Crime and Hate Groups, Ethnic Cleansing, and Genocide” focused on victims from Sudan, India and primarily the Palestinian Authority. Thousands of South African activists, including local Arabs and Muslims, marched through the conference area chanting, “What we have done to apartheid in South Africa, must be done to Zionism in Palestine.”
Jewish representatives were subjected to verbal assaults and threats of physical violence throughout the conference. Major international NGO superpowers Human Rights Watch and Amnesty International failed to speak out against the harassment and were even complicit in the exclusion of representatives of Jewish non-governmental organizations. Anne Bayefsky of the International Association of Jewish Lawyers and Jurists (IAJLJ) reported that HRW advocacy director, Reed Brody, “publicly announced that as a representative of a Jewish group [she] was unwelcome and could not attend. The views of a Jewish organization, he explained, would not be objective and the decision on how to vote had to be taken in [their] absence.”

### SEXUAL FREEDOM in the Middle East

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Homosexuality Legal</th>
<th>Legal Protection for Gays from discrimination and hate crimes</th>
<th>Honor Killing* Outlawed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>YES (But gays are prosecuted under lewd conduct laws.)</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iran</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td>YES (But reports of gays seeking asylum elsewhere)</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebanon</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libya</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palestinian Authority</td>
<td>YES (But no protection from hate crimes)</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saudi Arabia</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>NO (3 years imprisonment)</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* “Honor killing” is when a male kills a female family member who has had sex – or is rumored to have had sex – outside of marriage, either by choice or because she was raped. Some countries have no or only light penalties for this kind of killing.


Honor Killings: The Star (Amman) 11/30/99; MEMRI Special Dispatch no. 63 at www.memri.org; U.S. Department of State, 1999 Human Rights Reports at www.state.gov/g/drl/hr/c1470.htm.

courtesy of StandWithUs
NGO Forum: Final Declaration

The NGO Forum’s final declaration was a concentrated indictment directed at Israel. This document asserted that the “targeted victims of Israel’s brand of apartheid and ethnic cleansing methods have been in particular children, women, and refugees” and called for:

“a policy of complete and total isolation of Israel as an apartheid state ... the imposition of mandatory and comprehensive sanctions and embargoes, the full cessation of all links (diplomatic, economic, social, aid, military cooperation, and training) between all states and Israel.”

The NGO declaration also condemned Israel’s “perpetration of racist crimes against humanity including ethnic cleansing, acts of genocide.” It redefined antisemitism to include “anti-Arab racism.” Noticeably absent from the declaration was any reference to Palestinian incitement to genocide and terror, or to the Palestinian policy of deliberately endangering its civilians through the use of populated Palestinian areas as launch pads for attacks on Israel.

While some groups, notably the Jewish and European Caucuses, protested the adoption of the declaration, international human rights NGOs either kept quiet or actively supported it.

Later, once the NGO declaration was criticized, leaders of HRW and Amnesty attempted to distance themselves from the declaration and the antisemitic atmosphere. However, the record shows their complicity in Durban’s outcome: One journalist noted that “[a]n Amnesty press release handed out during the NGO conference cited several examples of racism and human rights abuses around the world, but mentioned only Israel by name.” In the pre-Durban preparatory conference at Geneva, the HRW delegation refused to object to “calls for violence” in the draft declaration, claiming this clause was “justified if against apartheid or on behalf of the Intifada.”

The Forum’s declaration has become an action plan – the Durban Strategy – for the radical pro-Palestinian NGOs that helped draft the document, as well as for many of the international NGOs that supported it.
Since the conference, the NGO network has applied the Durban Strategy repeatedly: in promoting the myth of the Jenin “massacre” (2002); campaigns against Israel’s West Bank security barrier (2004); the attempt to impose an academic boycott on Israel (2005); the church-based anti-Israel divestment campaigns (2006); the Israel-Hezbollah war (2006); and Gaza (2007-09).

Additionally, the “lawfare” strategy of harassing Israeli officials with civil lawsuits and criminal proceedings is part of the Durban Strategy. Rather than obtaining “justice” for victims, these cases are intended to punish Israel for its anti-terror methods, to prevent future operations, to promote a negative media image of Israel, to interfere with Israel’s diplomatic relations, and to advance boycotts and other aspects of the Durban Strategy.

From late 2007 to December 2008, the focus of the Durban Strategy was on condemning Israel’s policy regarding Hamas-controlled Gaza. Numerous NGOs active in the Arab-Israeli conflict issued reports, press releases, and “urgent calls” in condemnation of Israel (over 300 statements in 2008 alone). In general, these documents misrepresent international humanitarian law by labeling the policy “collective punishment,” and largely parrot a PLO “legal opinion” claiming that Gaza remains “occupied.”

During Israel’s 3-week operation in Gaza the Durban Strategy resulted in more than 500 statements by over 50 NGOs. These statements exhibited severe bias and double standards, focused overwhelmingly on condemning Israel, and ignored or devoted minimal attention to Israeli human rights and casualties. Under the façade of morality and universality, they exploited international legal terminology and erased Hamas’ violations of international humanitarian law, such as the extensive use of human shields. These NGOs also remained silent on Hamas’ denial of Gilad Shalit’s right to unfettered access to the Red Cross in flagrant violation of international humanitarian law.
The Road to Durban II

On December 19, 2006, UN General Assembly adopted a resolution to convene the Durban Review Conference, designating the UN Human Rights Council as the organizing body (Preparatory Committee – “PrepCom”) for the event. Later UN resolutions stipulated the establishment of regional preparatory committees and other working groups to arrange different elements of the conference.

Initial support for the Durban Review Conference came from funds left over from 2001. Voluntary donations from States, including Russia, China, Indonesia, Morocco, and “Palestine,” provided additional funds. According to UN officials, approximately an additional $3.7 million was required to implement the Review Conference. The Secretary General estimated that approximately $3 million of this would be absorbed by the regular UN budget.

The Durban Review process primarily consists of three types of meetings in preparation for the April 20-24, 2009 conference:

**PrepCom substantive sessions:** Official meetings to ensure the proper organization of the conference, implement recommendations of the Regional and Intersessional meetings, and supervise the diplomatic negotiations of the draft outcome document. Submissions from stakeholders are formally accepted, governments and NGOs discuss the conference’s agenda and the text of the outcome document, and NGO applications are accredited (or rejected). Scheduled PrepCom sessions include: April 2008, October 2008, and days before the Durban Review Conference on April 15-17, 2009.

**Regional meetings:** The Latin American and Caribbean (Brasilia, Brazil - June 2008) and African (Abuja, Nigeria – August 2008) Regions met to submit their recommendations for the Durban Review Conference and to prepare their respective contributions for the draft outcome document. The European Union, the Asian Region, the Organization of the Islamic Conference (OIC), and others submitted contributions without holding formal sessions.

Objectives of the Durban Review Conference

At the first session of the Preparatory Committee in August 2007, the four objectives of the Durban Review Conference were established:

To review progress and assess implementation of the DDPA (Durban Declaration and Program of Action) by all stakeholders at the national, regional and international levels, including assessment of contemporary manifestations of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance, through an inclusive, transparent and collaborative process, and identification of concrete measures and initiatives for combating and eliminating all manifestations of these phenomena;

To assess the effectiveness of the existing Durban follow-up mechanisms and other relevant UN mechanisms dealing with the issues of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance in order to enhance them;

To promote the universal ratification and implementation of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, and proper consideration of the recommendations of the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination;

To identify and share good practices achieved in the fight against racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance.
Preparatory Committee

The UN Human Rights Council functions as the Durban Review Conference’s Preparatory Committee (PrepCom), responsible for planning and organizing the conference. A Bureau of the PrepCom, with the Libyan representative sitting as Chair, was established to facilitate this work. Cuba, Egypt, and Iran, which also have an interest in deflecting attention from their own deplorable human rights records, are members of this Bureau.

In the May 2008 meeting of the PrepCom, the committee voted to accredit a highly political, radically anti-Israel NGO, Palestinian Grassroots Anti-Apartheid Wall Campaign (PGAAWC), “without any objection or debate.” This group is a coalition of Palestinian NGOs and popular committees focus on “mobiliz[ing] and coordinat[ing] efforts on local, national and international levels… stopping and dismantling the Apartheid Wall, and resisting Israeli occupation and colonization.” PGAAWC, a central proponent of the Durban Strategy, devotes most of its website to BDS-related activities, materials and resources.

In sharp contrast and as another example of double standards, at the same meeting, Iran frustrated an attempt at accreditation by the Canadian Council for Israel and Jewish Advocacy (CCJJA), resulting in the withdrawal of its application.

In addition to its administrative duties, the PrepCom is responsible for negotiations on the text of the conference’s Outcome Document (see page 16). As ICARE (Internet Centre Anti Racism Europe) reported from the January Intersessional Working Group meeting, in a bid to exclude language condemning Holocaust denial and framing the Holocaust as “a warning to all people of the dangers of hatred, bigotry, racism and prejudice,” a delegate from Syria claimed that “it is unclear what percentage of Jews were killed in the Holocaust, some say three million, some say one, some say even less,” and the Iranian delegate defended Holocaust denial as “freedom of speech.”

Israel has been condemned by the UN Human Right Council in 21 out of 26 country resolutions and 5 out of 10 Special Sessions. Israel is the only country with a permanent agenda item at the HRC.
Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR)

The UN High Commissioner for Human Rights, Navanethem Pillay, will pre-side as Secretary General of the conference. She has been actively trying to convince all governments, many of which are skeptical, to participate in the Durban Review Conference.

In an October 6, 2008 speech to the October Preparatory meeting, Pillay acknowledged the antisemitism of the 2001 NGO Forum, while minimizing its implications:

Seven years ago at the 2001 World Conference against Racism, the virulent anti-Semitic behaviour of a few non-governmental organizations on the sidelines of the Durban Conference overshadowed the critically important work of the Conference. Measures were taken to address this betrayal of the core principles of the Durban Conference, and the NGO document was not forwarded to the Conference.

Similarly, in an opinion piece published in the Israeli newspaper Ha’aretz (“The anti-racism debate,” December 16, 2008), Pillay dismissed the anti-Israel rhetoric of governments and NGOs in the preparatory process and protested Israel’s and Canada’s decision not to attend the Review Conference.

According to an official “Durban Review Conference Update” newsletter (January 13, 2009), the OHCHR is “encouraging NGOs to participate actively in the Review Conference and its preparatory process,” including travel support to enable attendance at the conference. Additionally, the OHCHR has been organizing meetings between representatives from NGOs and Durban Review Conference officials (such as the Chair of the Intersessional Working Group).

At the same time, UN Watch reported that the OHCHR is concerned about lacking sufficient funds to facilitate maximum NGO participation.
The Outcome Document will become the official text, expressing the vision, conclusions, and recommendations of the Durban Review Conference. As at most UN conferences, the Outcome Document is primarily a product of negotiations before the actual event, to be formally adopted by the participants during the official proceedings: regional meetings produce initial contributions, which are then compiled into a single draft document, which is itself subject to negotiations at preparatory meetings. Ideally, a final Outcome Document will be accepted by consensus by all participants (which only occurred in 2001 after the US and Israel walked out of the conference).

The draft Outcome Document is comprised of contributions from regional groups and other stakeholders. The submissions from the African and Asian Regions and the Organization of Islamic Conference introduced language that singles out Israel for condemnation and defines “defamation of religion,” especially Islam, as racial discrimination that trumps freedom of speech. The “plight of the Palestinian people” was listed as the only specific national issue, while severe human rights violations in Sudan and elsewhere were blatantly disregarded, revealing the distorted focus on Israel; that this appeared in the African submission as well, when the alleged discrimination occurred outside the region, reveals the pervasive power of the Palestinian and Islamic lobby.

The various submissions have been compiled into what the UN labels the “document accepted by the working group as the basis for negotiations towards an outcome document for the Durban Review Conference.” Diplomats in the UN have been negotiating the content of this document in PrepComs, Intersessional meetings, and working group sessions.

Until the end of March 2009, the draft versions of the Outcome Document continued to single out Israel as the only named national body that perpetrates racial discrimination. Israel's alleged “crimes” included: “prevent[ing the] return to their homes and properties”; “arbitrary closure of [] territories”; “racial policies of the occupying power”; “racially based law of return”; “unlawful collective punishment”; “torture.”

Furthermore, during the January Intersessional, on the heels of the Gaza fighting, there was a “proposal to include reference to Gaza situation – language to be provided.”

The draft Outcome Document also contained language about defamation of religion and limitations on free speech that Western governments found objectionable.

However, on March 17, 2009, after Canada, Israel, the U.S., and Italy had decided not to participate in the Review Conference, and there were strong indications that other democracies and the EU would follow suit, the UN facilitator
released a version of the draft Outcome Document without the objectionable language condemning Israel or “criminalizing” defamation of religion.

Yet, whether this draft will lead to re-engagement by the above-mentioned governments and a non-controversial Review Conference remains to be seen. The Israeli government is not satisfied with this development, since the Outcome Document reaffirms the Durban Declaration and Program of Action, which did single out Israel. The inclusion of a reaffirmation of the DDPA would also seem to violate the “red lines” set by the U.S.

Furthermore, this version is now subject to negotiations, and the OIC may attempt to restore the anti-Israel language. The discussions will continue into the final PrepCom session scheduled for one week before the conference, and final language may not be available until the very last minute. Indeed, at Durban in 2001, negotiations were ongoing throughout the conference itself.

### WOMEN’S RIGHTS in the Middle East

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>% Illiterate (Age 15 and older)</th>
<th>Travel Restrictions (Require husband’s or male relative’s consent)</th>
<th>% of Women in Labor Force</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>61.2% women</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iran</td>
<td>34.2% women</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>55% women</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td>21.6% women</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libya</td>
<td>37% women</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palestinian Authority</td>
<td>23% women</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saudi Arabia</td>
<td>49.8% women</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>44.2% women</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>7% women</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>45% (same as US statistics)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Travel Restrictions: US Dep’t of State, 1999 Human Rights Report, at www.state.gov/g/drl/hr/c1470.htm


courtesy of StandWithUs
Government Participation in the Conference

The governments of Canada and Israel have announced that they will not attend the Durban Review Conference.

Canadian Minister of Foreign Affairs, Maxime Bernier (January 23, 2008):

_Unfortunately, [the 2001 Durban] conference degenerated into open and divisive expressions of intolerance and antisemitism that undermined the principles of the United Nations and the very goals the conference sought to achieve...I had hoped that the preparatory process for the 2009 Durban Review Conference would remedy the mistakes of the past. We have concluded that, despite our efforts, it will not._

Israeli Minister of Foreign Affairs, Tzipi Livni (November 19, 2008):

_The documents which were prepared for the conference indicate that it is turning, once again, into an anti-Israeli campaign, singling out and delegitimating the State of Israel which has nothing to do with fighting racism... We have called upon the international community not to participate in this conference, which seeks to legitimize hatred and extremism and anti-Semitism under the banner of a fight against racism._

France, Denmark, the Netherlands, and Australia have threatened not to attend the conference.

In February 2009, the United States government, whose delegates walked out of the conference in 2001, elected to send representatives to intersessional negotiations in order to “evaluat[e]...whether U.S. participation in the Conference itself is warranted.” However, on February 27, 2009, the Obama administration decided that “the United States will not engage in further negotiations on this text, nor will we participate in a conference based on this text.” According to the official press release, “[s]adly, however, the document being negotiated has gone from bad to worse, and the current text of the draft outcome document is not salvageable...[a] conference based on this text would be a missed opportunity to speak clearly about the persistent problem of racism.”

Similarly, on March 5, 2009 the Italian Foreign Minister stated that Italy would not attend the conference unless “aggressive phrases of an anti-Semitic nature” were removed from the draft outcome document.

Since the negotiations over the Outcome Document may continue until the final preparatory meeting, which is scheduled for the week before the conference, it is likely that the question of participation in the Durban Review Conference by Western countries will not be determined until the last moment.
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What are NGOs?

Types of Accreditation

The Durban Strategy in the Preparatory process

The Durban Strategy at the UN

Co-opting the Gaza fighting for the Durban Review Conference

NGOs that reject the Durban Strategy

Will there be another official NGO Forum?

NGO debate on the NGO Forum

“Palestinian Civil Society”

Parallel NGO events
What are NGOs?

In theory, NGOs (non-governmental organizations) are autonomous, non-profit and politically unaffiliated organizations that claim to advance a particular cause or set of causes in the public interest and in the framework of civil society. Often termed “the third sector,” NGOs are neither part of the government nor the private sector. As such, they are seen as independent institutions able to transcend narrow, selfish interests in order to promote universal values. NGOs can contribute to civil society and democracy by using their soft power to challenge governments and promote social interests, but they themselves are not necessarily democratic institutions. NGOs are generally only accountable to their particular funding sources and activist members. Fuelled by financial support from sympathetic foundations or governments and encouraged by the “halo effect” – whereby statements made by NGOs are routinely accepted at face value and without question by journalists, diplomats, academics, and the general public – local and international NGOs exert a great deal of power.
**Types of Accreditation**

NGOs have been encouraged to participate in the Durban Review Conference and its preparatory process, but they must first receive accreditation. For the purposes of this conference, there are three types of accreditation:

1. NGOs with ECOSOC (UN Economic and Social Council) status are automatically accredited for Durban.

2. NGOs that received special accreditation for the 2001 Conference are also permitted to attend the Review Conference.

3. NGOs can apply for special accreditation for the Durban Review Conference, and must be approved by the PrepCom.

As demonstrated in the May 2008 PrepCom session, the accreditation process can be highly political and expresses a questionable commitment to human rights.
The Durban Strategy in the Preparatory Process

NGOs have lobbied at the Regional and PrepCom sessions in an attempt to predetermined the direction of the Durban Review Conference.

At the Latin American regional session held in Brasilia, Brazil, on June 17-19, 2008, a coalition of Palestinian NGOs active in anti-Israel boycotts sent an “open letter” to the “people, governments, movements, and organizations” of Latin American. As opposed to addressing Latin American human rights issues, the letter proclaims “the Palestinian people [as the] victims of the world’s last state-sponsored colonial apartheid regime,” and as such, Israel should be the definitive priority at the Durban Review Conference. The NGOs also spuriously accuse governments that have reservations about antisemitism of trying to “silence the principled voices of the victims of racism that shaped the agenda of the civil society conference at Durban in 2001.”

During the October and January meetings, NGOs attacked Israel through oral statements before the PrepCom:

**Badil - October 9, 2008:**

*The systematic ethnic cleansing for more than 750,000 indigenous Palestinians and the destruction of hundreds of their villages and is still denied the human rights of self-determination, justice, equality by the State of Israel.*

*Institutionalized racism and discrimination on the grounds of nationality, ethnicity, race and religion constitutes a root cause of consequence of the ongoing internal forcible displacement and dispossession of the Palestinian people.*

**Movement Against Racism and for Friendship between Peoples (MRAP - France) – October 15, 2008:**

*We unambiguously condemn the policy of occupation pursued by Israel and the serious violations of human rights that are being perpetrated by the Israeli authorities.*
The International Organization for the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination (EAFORD), represented by Diana Ralph from Independent Jewish Voices (Canada) – October 15, 2008:

[The Durban Declaration and Programme of Action that was issued after Durban I] devoted less than 250 words out of 180 pages to concerns of Jews and Palestinians, all of which we believe, carefully balanced recognition of the rights of Jews and Israel with those of Palestinians. There was no antisemitic content in it.

As Jews, we assert that it is entirely legitimate and not anti-Semitic, to object to Israeli policies that discriminate against Palestinians, not to mention occupying, torturing, assassinating, and collectively punishing them. Those critical of the Review hope to discredit legitimate criticism of racist Israeli policies and practices and to protect Israel, the US, Canada, and some EU countries from being pressured to redress historic and ongoing racist practices.

We hereby reclaim the tradition of Jewish support for universal freedoms, human rights and social justice and we unconditionally support the Durban Review Conference.

Badil - January 20, 2009:

Palestinians have been subjected to an unlawful collective punishment, torture, economic blockade, severe restriction of movement and arbitrary closure to their territories. ...[T]he draft declaration is silent as to … sanctions in the context of the Palestinian people. Palestinian people were omitted from the list of victims of racial discrimination. … in line with atrocities taking place in Gaza.
The Durban Strategy at the UN

As part of the Durban Strategy, NGOs make sophisticated and extensive use of the UN’s human rights apparatuses, manipulating these mechanisms to broaden and strengthen their attacks on Israel. As noted by the Palestinian NGO Al-Haq, the objective is to hold “Israel (the Occupying Power) accountable before the United Nations.”

NGOs

- initiate and support anti-Israel resolutions in the General Assembly and Security Council;

- prepare one-sided, border-line antisemitic submissions to the UN’s human rights review bodies (Universal Periodic Review and the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination), strongly condemning Israel under the guise of objectively representing the human rights situation;

- attend special sessions of the Human Rights Council, speaking against Israeli policy and holding side meetings and press conferences to promote particular agendas;

- publicize their anti-Israel reports and statements on the UN Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs’ “ReliefWeb” bulletin board for humanitarian emergencies and disasters.
Co-opting the Gaza fighting for the Durban Review Conference

The Durban Review Conference is scheduled for three months after the end of the Gaza war. As with the so-called “second intifada” during the 2001 Conference, NGOs are expected to capitalize on Gaza to propel the Palestinian agenda even further to the fore of the conference. Indeed, according to the version of the conference Outcome Document released after the January Intersessional Working Group meeting (January 23, 2009), there has been a “proposal to include reference to Gaza situation – language to be provided.”

Additionally, Badil, a Palestinian NGO that promotes the “right of return,” reportedly introduced the “atrocities taking place in Gaza” in an attempt to include the Palestinian people on a “list of victims of racial discrimination.”

This exploitation is further indicated by NGO statements to the Ninth Special Session of the UN Human Rights Council during the Gaza conflict (“The grave violations of human rights in the Occupied Palestinian Territory including the recent aggression in the occupied Gaza Strip,” January 9-12, 2009). These statements are part of the Durban Strategy of attacking Israel in international forums, and represent a prelude to potential demonization at the Durban Review Conference.

- Accusations included “war crimes,” “crimes against humanity,” “serious violations,” and “grave breaches of international humanitarian law”

- Durban accredited NGOs such as PCHR, FIDH, MRAP, Union of Arab Jurists, EAFORD, and Nord-Sud XXI use demonizing language in their attacks, including “massacres,” “apartheid” and “racism” rhetoric, “genocide,” and “first class war crimes against Palestinian civilians.”

- The NGOs erased the context of Palestinian terror and Israeli self-defense. They attempt to frame the conflict in terms of the Israeli “collective punishment,” “occupation,” “blockade,” “siege,” and “apartheid.”

- Nearly all the NGOs called for criminal prosecution of Israeli officials for the alleged human rights violations. This “lawfare” is also part of the Durban Strategy, and its primary purposes are public relations and delegitimizing Israel. In addition, the Movement Against Racism and for Friendship between Peoples (MRAP) expressed “full solidarity to the Israeli soldiers who might refuse to take part in war crimes that are now taking place.”

- The statement of the Union of Arab Jurists and The International Organization for the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination (EAFORD) justifies “resistance”: “Israeli crimes including the apartheid wall and the expansion of settlements require resistance which is a legitimate right over all peoples under occupation.”
NGOs that reject the Durban Strategy

Of course, not all NGOs involved with the Durban Review Conference advance an extreme an anti-Israel political agenda. Many groups, even those that represent a very narrow set of victims, are advocating for a conference that will truly address racism in all its forms, albeit not always as vocally or intensively as the pro-Palestinian organizations.

In fact, some have also taken a stand against the demonization of Israel and Jews that characterized the 2001 Conference and has arisen in the preparations for the Review Conference. A group of NGOs and some funders have signed the “Magenta Statement of Core Principles for WCAR Follow Up,” which “thoroughly rejects hatred and incitement in all its forms, including anti-Semitism.” The signatories also call on participants to “learn from the shortcomings of the 2001 WCAR, and to work together in a spirit of mutual respect” to “eradicate racism, discrimination, and intolerance.” Led by the Magenta Foundation (a Dutch NGO that combats racism), and signed by close to 100 NGOs, the “Magenta list” includes the influential New Israel Fund (NIF), a controversial funder of a range of NGOs in Israel; some NIF-grantees actively promote the demonization of Israel at the UN. During PrepCom meetings, several NGOs have made positive contributions to this discourse and have protested attempts to limit free speech in the name of “defamation of religion”:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Free &amp; Fair Elections</th>
<th>Opposition Parties Legal</th>
<th>Minority Participation</th>
<th>Freedom House Rating* Scale 1-7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>Minimal</td>
<td>Minimal</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iran</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Minimal</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td>Limited</td>
<td>Limited</td>
<td>Limited</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebanon</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Limited</td>
<td>Limited</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libya</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palestinian Authority</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Minimal</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saudi Arabia</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Freedom House, founded in 1940, is a non-partisan, broad-based non-profit organization that monitors and evaluates democracy and freedom around the world. It ranks nations on a scale of 1 to 7
1 is an open democratic society with fair and free political life
6 is an autocratic regime with minimal political rights
7 is an autocrat regime with severe oppression

Will there be another official NGO Forum?

The virulent NGO Forum in Durban was a severe embarrassment and moral failure for the UN. Since Mary Robinson refused to submit the Forum’s Final Declaration to the diplomatic framework in 2001, the UN has tried to distance itself from the antisemitism and racist anti-Israel rhetoric of the NGO Forum. UN officials have attempted to disassociate the NGO Forum from the “official” World Conference Against Racism, and have tried to minimize the long-term damage to universal human rights caused by that event.

Nevertheless, the possibility of an NGO Forum at the Durban Review Conference has not been dismissed by UN organizers. Certainly, the OHCHR has been pressing for NGO “participation,” although the extent of that beyond attendance at and speaking opportunities in the diplomatic conference remains unclear. For instance, during the October 2008 PrepCom session, media sources reported conflicting information on whether the UN would provide funding and logistical support for another Forum. Similarly, some reports from the January 2009 Intersessional meeting indicated that the UN was relying on NGOs to organize their own parallel event, while others suggested that the OHCHR was open to helping with an NGO Forum. Regardless, there are significant technical obstacles to an NGO Forum on the scope of 2001, including the proximity to the conference without a formal decision and a lack of funding; also, the city of Geneva, the host of the Review Conference, will not be as accommodating to the wide-spread protests and demonstrations that occurred in Durban.

One possible venue for NGO participation is the daily side events that the OHCHR is organizing during the Conference. These events will occur in the Palais des Nations, alongside the official diplomatic framework, and the provisionally scheduled topics relate to broad, general issues, not specific victim groups. Additionally, accredited NGOs can apply to organize their own side events in the UN facilities. According to OHCHR guidelines, parallel events “should provide an opportunity to review progress made in the combat against racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance and the actual implementation of the Durban Declaration and Programme of Action at the national, regional and international levels since 2001.”
NGO debate on the NGO Forum

Civil society itself is split on the value and advisability of an NGO Forum. In May 2008, a group of about 50 NGOs – including radical antisemitic organizations such as Nord-Sud XXI, EAFORD, and others – wrote to the PrepCom to promote an NGO Forum. The letter erased the antisemitism of the 2001 Forum, claiming “at the 2001 World Conference Against Racism, the NGO Forum was an important catalyst for many victim groups to come together, network, interact and build support for the work against racism and discrimination.”

A similar group held a side-meeting during the October 2008 PrepCom session, asserting the support of the UN, to establish committees to advance the prospects of an NGO Forum. The meeting, however, was marred by a “Durbanesque atmosphere,” according to participants, with anti-Israel statements and denials of the antisemitic nature of the 2001 Forum. At the January 2009 Intersessional, the pro-NGO Forum group claimed to be making progress on organizing a parallel NGO event, but did admit hesitation on the part of the Geneva municipality to accommodate such a gathering.

On the other hand, many NGOs have expressed a specific desire not to organize an official NGO Forum, in light of the problems in 2001. In October 2008, NGO Monitor sent an open letter to UN Secretary General Ban Ki-Moon calling on him to “avoid providing official sponsorship or funding for another NGO Forum that is likely to be a venue used to promote hatred and antisemitism” and “would further undermine universal human rights principles in the framework of the 2009 Review Conference.” Similar letters were published by Human Rights Watch, the Simon Wiesenthal Center, and the American Jewish Committee, and this position was voiced in opposition to the pro-NGO Forum group at the January Intersessional meeting.

NGOs will, however, organize their own events, both inside the UN venue and before and during the conference in Geneva (see Parallel NGO Events, page 30).
Palestinian activists have identified the Durban Review Conference as the successor to the NGO Forum at the 2001 Conference for promoting the coordinated demonization of Israel. Crucially, this endeavor has been endorsed by over 100 international and anti-Zionist Jewish groups.

In November 2008, “Palestinian Civil Society” – a coalition of the Boycott, Divestment and Sanctions Campaign National Committee (BNC) that includes over 100 Palestinian NGOs, such as Ittijah (a coalition including the NIF-funded Adalah), the Palestinian Grassroots Anti-Apartheid Wall Coalition (PGAAWC), the Palestinian Non-Governmental Organizations Network (PNGO), the Palestinian Campaign for the Academic and Cultural Boycott of Israel (PCABI), and others – published a “Strategic Position Paper Towards the UN Durban Review Conference.”

The paper repeats standard Palestinian propaganda, identifying Zionism as a “racist ideology” based on “late 19th century European colonialism” and delegitimizing the establishment of the State of Israel as the “Palestinian Nakba of 1948.” Additionally, false accusations of racial discrimination toward Palestinians and Israeli-Arabs are leveled against Israel, including claims that “Palestinian victims are denied due process and effective remedies by Israel’s courts”; “the Israeli parliament has passed new discriminatory laws and amended existing laws for the purpose of limiting Palestinian access to fundamental rights and remedies”; and of an “extreme form of collective punishment” in Gaza.

According to the paper, the 2001 Conference “recognized the Palestinian people as one of the groups of victims of racism and racial discrimination,” but did not go far enough in establishing a concrete plan to “end[] and revers[e]” Israel’s “regime of institutionalized discrimination/apartheid, colonization and belligerent occupation.” Therefore, “Palestinian Civil Society” recommends to the UN and the international community:

- “boycotts, divestment” of Israel, and “suspension of economic and diplomatic relations” with Israel;
- “condemn and suppress war crimes and crimes against humanity committed by Israel’s regime of apartheid, colonization and population transfer”;
- “ensure punishment of the perpetrators and adequate and effective reparation of the Palestinian victims.”

This Palestinian coalition has also organized the “Israel Review Conference,” scheduled for April 18-19 in Geneva, to fight against Israeli “apartheid, colonialism, and occupation.” Workshops on expanding anti-Israel “lawfare” and boycotts will be held.
Parallel NGO events

**Friday, April 17th – Sunday, April 19th:** Civil Society Forum for the Durban Review Conference

**Description:** To include “a Peoples input” in the preparation for the Durban Review Conference. To plan future activities and cooperative actions in support of upholding the achievements accomplished at the World Conference Against Racism and build on them. On Saturday afternoon Forum participants will join activists in a large public demonstration in support of the DRC. (www.geneva-forum2009.org)

**Location:** Maison des Associations, 15 Rue des Savoises, Geneva

**Saturday, April 18th:** “United Against Apartheid, Colonialism and Occupation, Dignity & Justice for the Palestinian People – Israel Review Conference”

**Description:** To examine how the UN anti-racism instruments apply to Israel’s policies and practices regarding the Palestinian people; and, develop practical recommendations on how to make Israel accountable to international law and protect the rights of the Palestinian people. Organized by the Palestinian Boycott, Divestment and Sanctions National Committee

**Location:** Hotel Le Grenil, Avenue Sainte-Clotilde 7, 1205 Geneva, Switzerland

**Sunday, April 19th:** Geneva Summit for Human Rights, Tolerance and Democracy

**Description:** A coalition of human rights, anti-racism and pro-democracy activists will assemble to place the most pressing situations on the world agenda, and in support of the Durban Review Conference’s aims of promoting universal human rights through the eradication of discrimination, intolerance and persecution. Organized by a coalition of 30 NGOs (www.genevasummit.org).

**Location:** “Centre International de Conference de Genève” CICG, 17 rue de Varembe, 1202 Geneva, Switzerland.

**Monday, April 20th:** Holocaust Memorial Day Commemoration

**Description:** Featuring Elie Wiesel, Bernard Henri Levy, and Irwin Cotler.

**Location:** Place des Nations, Geneva, Switzerland

**Time:** Ceremony begins at 19:15

**Wednesday, April 22nd:** Conference Against Racism, Discrimination, and Persecution

**Description:** Organized by an international coalition of groups fighting repression, racism, and antisemitism.

**Location:** TBA

During the Review Conference, the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights is organizing daily **Side Events** in the Palais des Nations. See official UN publications for more information.

**Please contact event organizers for updates and to confirm details.**
SECTION 3:

NGOs that Promote the Durban Strategy

Anti-Israel NGOs will:

- Re-define the conflict as racially motivated discrimination against Palestinians
- Present tendentious images and testimonies from the fighting in Gaza, blaming Israel alone for the harm incurred by the civilian population
- Declare that “the plight of the Palestinians” epitomizes suffering and precedes all other instances of persecution
- Promote the global boycotts, divestment, and sanctions (BDS) agenda, to isolate Israel as a pariah state
Demonizing Israel at the UN:

- “These laws form the legal basis for the systematic and institutionalized discrimination against Palestinian citizens by emphasizing the Zionist and Jewish ethnic character of the state; giving benefits or privileges solely to the Jewish population; or imposing restrictions on the civil and political rights of Palestinian citizens of Israel because of our national belonging or because we do not belong to the majority ethnic group… By withdrawing from this conference, the State of Israel has shown its contempt for victims of racism everywhere.” [Statement to World Conference Against Racism plenary, September 2001]

- “…the willful killing of civilians and the extensive destruction of civilian property. Not only is Israel responsible as a state for violating international human rights and humanitarian law, but its political and military leaders are individually criminally responsible for the commission of war crimes through grave breaches of the Fourth Geneva convention… What Israel would like you to lose sight of is its 42 year oppressive occupation of the Palestinian territory including Gaza, which has never ended contrary to Israel’s claims. Israel is now using the claim of self-defense in order to justify the killing of the very people it has oppressed through various methods, most recently a siege that has led to a humanitarian disaster and the collective punishment of 1.5 million people.” [Oral statement at 9th Special Session of the UN Human Rights Council, January 2009]

Durban Strategy:

- Active in conceiving Durban Strategy at preparatory meetings and panels in Durban
- Calls for “collective measures against the Israeli government” and for Israeli officials to be prosecuted for “war crimes.”
- Frames Israel’s security policies in terms of racial discrimination.
- Employs “apartheid” and “naqba” rhetoric.

Website: www.adalah.org

Origins: 1996, Haifa

Goals: “…serves Arab citizens of Israel, numbering over one million... works to protect human rights in general, and the rights of the Arab minority in particular… to achieve equal individual and collective rights for the Arab minority in Israel…”

Funding: New Israel Fund, EU, Ford Foundation, Oxfam, FIDH, Open Society Institute, Swiss Foreign Ministry, Christian Aid

Accreditation: ECOSOC – Special Consultative Status

[In Israel] racism exists at almost every level of society.”
Demonizing Israel at the UN Human Rights Council:

- “Israel’s current policy in relation to the Gaza Strip and its 1.5 million inhabitants constitutes an unmitigated violation of international humanitarian law including, but not limited to, Israel’s obligation as an Occupying Power… In view of the apparent impunity with which Israel consistently commits sustained violations of international human rights and humanitarian law, and the massive toll exacted on the civilian population of the Gaza Strip by Israel’s current siege, the General Assembly must consider the implementation of both economic and diplomatic sanctions against Israel.” [Submission to 6th Special Session, January 2008]

- “Not only is Israel responsible as a state for violating international human rights and humanitarian law, but its political and military leaders are individually criminally responsible for the commission of war crimes through grave breaches of the Fourth Geneva Convention. Additionally, the continuing air strikes on the Gaza Strip are being committed as part of a widespread and systematic attack directed against a civilian population, bringing them to the level of crimes against humanity.” [Joint oral statement to 9th Special Session, January 2009]
Durban Strategy:

- Lobbied on behalf of boycotts and lawfare in the Ariel Sharon-Belgium (2001) and Caterpillar (2005) cases.
- Calls for arms embargo against Israel.
- Unjustifiably accused Israel of “war crimes” and “deliberate attacks on civilians” during the Second Lebanon War (2006), relying on Lebanese “eyewitnesses” to allege that Hezbollah did not operate in population centers.
- Disproportionately singles out Israel for condemnation during the Gaza conflict (2007-2009), manipulating terms such as “collective punishment,” “occupying power” and “indiscriminate force,” and ignoring more severe human rights violations in the region.

Complicity in virulent NGO Forum in 2001:

- “An Amnesty press release handed out during the NGO conference cited several examples of racism and human rights abuses around the world, but mentioned only Israel by name.” [JTA report from the conference]
- “Contrary to some media reports, Amnesty International did not walk out of the NGO Forum, remaining at the conference throughout. Although not accepting or condoning some of the language used within the NGO Declaration, Amnesty International accepts the declaration as a largely positive document which gives a voice to all the victims of racism wherever it occurs, including those seldom heard such as Dalits and refugees.” [Press release, September 2001]

Statements to UN Human Rights Council:

- “The patterns of human rights violations carried out by the Israeli authorities against Palestinians in the OPT are deeply entrenched in the normative and institutional structure of the state. The Israeli authorities contend that measures which violate human rights of Palestinians in the OPT are necessary for Israel’s security. Within Israel, discriminatory laws and practices undermine the rights of Israeli Arabs in particular with regard to economic, social and cultural rights, and lack of due process undermines the rights of asylum-seekers and migrants.” [Submission to Universal Periodic Review of Israel, July 2008]
Demonizing Israel in the Durban process:

- “The struggle against Israel’s colonial apartheid regime is one of the cornerstones of the struggle against state-sponsored racism and ongoing colonial policies worldwide...This regime is maintained by dozens of racist laws and military orders which deprive Palestinians of their fundamental rights to their homeland, and collective punishment is applied on a massive scale in order to oppress Palestinian resistance...Both strong popular mobilization and the NGO forum in Durban ensured that the truth about Israel’s apartheid regime was exposed and space was provided for many other just struggles for justice and equality around the world. Today, Israel puts all its efforts into reversing and delegitimizing the concerted struggle against racism.” [Letter to Latin American PrepCom, June 2008]

- “The systematic ethnic cleansing for more than 750,000 indigenous Palestinians and the destruction of hundreds of their villages and is still denied the human rights of self-determination, justice, equality by the State of Israel […] Institutionalized racism and discrimination on the grounds of nationality, ethnicity, race and religion constitutes a root cause of consequence of the ongoing internal forcible displacement and dispossession of the Palestinian people.” [Statement to PrepCom Session, October 2008]
Durban Strategy:
- Employs Holocaust and apartheid rhetoric.
- Champions the “Zionism equals racism” slogan.
- Initiated a petition to create a “Special Tribunal to try Israeli War Criminals” at the UN.
- Lobbies UN officials for BDS.

Website: www.eaford.org
Origins: 1976, Libya
Current Location: Geneva, Washington
Mission Statement: “EAFORD has taken as its mandate to conduct, support and publish scholarly research on racism and conflict. In particular, EAFORD investigates racism as it relates to the Palestine conflict, South Africa and the conditions of indigenous peoples in general.”
Goals: “EAFORD has focused on the ideological systems of apartheid and Zionism, as well as the conditions of the indigenous people within colonial settler societies.”
Accreditation: ECOSOC-Consultative Status

Statements at Durban 2001:
- “[Zionism is] an ideology whose basis and consequences, for example as to the purity of the race, and distinctiveness from other people, seems to bear close resemblance to other dangerous purist ideologies as Fascism and Nazism.” [Letter to UN High Commissioner for Human Rights Mary Robinson, August 2001]
- “This [South African] victory can be repeated in Palestine if the international community stands against the rampant racism which has manifested itself throughout this land in the most despicable form. In fact, it has reached more alarming degrees of cruelty and more extensive massacring and subjugation of human beings than apartheid in South Africa.” [August 2001]

Statements to UN Human Rights Council:
- “If they [Muslims] resist [the occupation of their countries], as is expected from any people in similar situations, their resistance is called terrorism, and is taken as a justification for acts of racism and victimization by governments professing to uphold human rights.” [February 2008]

Represented by Independent Jewish Voices (Canada):
- “As Jews, we assert that it is entirely legitimate and not anti-Semitic, to object to Israeli policies that discriminate against Palestinians, not to mention occupying, torturing, assassinating, and collectively punishing them. Those critical of the Review hope to discredit legitimate criticism of racist Israeli policies and practices and to protect Israel, the US, Canada, and some EU countries from being pressured to redress historic and ongoing racist practices.” [Statement to PrepCom Session, October 2008]
“Nothing can justify the losses inflicted on the [Lebanese and Palestinian] civil populations, which are not collateral effects of legitimate actions of war but are instead a deliberate and willful punishment on the collective population, including murder. These are war crimes of exceptional gravity, knowingly organized by a democratic government.”

**Durban Strategy:**

- Call for the UN to refer the case of Israel’s “war crimes” and “crimes against humanity” to the International Criminal Court.
- Lobbies the EU to suspend enhancement of relations with Israel.
- Participates in international events promoting BDS.

**Website:** www.fidh.org  
**Origins:** 1922, Paris  
**Goals:** “...to contribute to the respect of all the rights defined in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights... obtaining effective improvements in the protection of victims, the prevention of Human Rights violations and the sanction of their perpetrators.”

**Funding:** donations from the public and private businesses  
**Key Middle Eastern members:** PCHR, Al Haq, Adalah, B’Tselem, ACRI  
Vice President, Raji Sourani, is also the Director of PCHR  
**Accreditation:** ECOSOC – Special Consultative Status

**Exploiting the Language of International Human Rights**

- “[Israel has committed] war crimes, such as willful killings, bombings of civilian areas, torture and inhuman treatment and unlawful confinement, willfully causing great suffering, unlawful deportations and transfer, arbitrary detention, siege of cities, repeated incursion, curfews, massive destruction and expropriation of property.” [Press Release, March 2004]

- “The rolling text [of the draft outcome document] should further call for the end of all forms of colonialism and foreign occupation and their consequences in the field of racism and racist discrimination, notably the closure of territories, the seizure of land, the violations of the right to self determination, of cultural rights of occupied populations, on grounds of their national, cultural, ethnic or religious grounds. [Position paper on the Durban Review Conference, March 2009]

- “The operations of the Israeli Army constitute at the least war crimes, if not crimes against humanity, according to international criminal law.” [Letter to UN Security Council, January 2009]
Durban Strategy:
- Publishes prejudicial articles on the “Zionist entity.”
- Campaigns against the charitable status of “Israel’s parastatal organizations (WZO and JNF).”
- Accuses Israel of “war crimes in Gaza.” Accuses US Congress of “endorsing war crimes in Gaza.”

Website: [www.hic-net.org](http://www.hic-net.org)
Mission Statement: “Recognition, defence and full implementation of everyone’s right everywhere to a secure place to live in peace and dignity”
Accreditation: ECOSOC – Special Consultative Status

Durban II:
- “[Paragraphs of the DDPA] have recognized the Palestinian people as one of the groups of victims of racism and racial discrimination...they have been victimized by the State of Israel...[The text] highlights manifestations of the conflict such as the settlements, collective punishment and self-determination, but not the root cause... [W]e urge that the PrepCom... clearly and definitely emphasize the core source of Israeli aggression towards the Palestinians...We want to reaffirm that institutionalized discrimination on the grounds of nationality, ethnicity, race and religion constitute a root cause and a consequence of ongoing international forcible displacement and dispossession of the Palestinian people...inherent racism within the state.” [Joint statement to PrepCom Session, October 2008]
Concerns about the Durban Review Conference:

- “Avoid a repeat of the conduct that so marred the 2001 conference. In particular, the NGO forum at the Durban Conference undermined the wider process when the forum’s concluding statement singled out one country, Israel, as the target of exaggerated and unsupported allegations and when certain forum participants made anti-Semitic statements and expressed anti-Semitic sentiments that targeted, among others, individuals participating in the conference.” [Position Paper on PrepCom, April 2008]

- “Fully justified concerns about the complex relationship between racial and religious intolerance and hatred should not be the pretext for undermining key freedoms, including freedom of speech...[T]he Conference must be careful not to privilege the protection of particular religions and instead maintaining a consistent approach to all religions.” [Statement to PrepCom Session, October 2008]
Claims of Influence at NGO Forum in 2001:

- “Ittijah’s international profile was brought under the spotlight at the Durban World Conference against Racism in 2001, where Ittijah gathered, facilitated and directed the vision and position of the Palestinian NGOs inside Israel on racism, particularly Israeli-state racism towards Palestinian citizens, and the apartheid the State practices in the West Bank and Gaza Strip.” [Statement on Ittijah’s website]

Durban Review Conference as a Repeat of Hostility toward Israel:

- “Ittijah-The Union of Arab Community Based Associations calls civil society organizations, solidarity movements worldwide, boycott campaigns and political bodies [...] to boycott Israel, to impose sanctions and to label it as a colonial racist state under the Motto: Zionism is Racism- Israel is an Apartheid, the same motto used during the world conference against Racism, 2001.” [Press release, November 2008]
We unambiguously condemn the policy of occupation pursued by Israel and the serious violations of human rights that are being perpetrated by the Israeli authorities.

**Durban Strategy:**
- Accuses Israel of “collective punishment,” “massacres,” “war crimes,” and “violations of international humanitarian law.”
- Accuses Israeli politicians and the Supreme Court of institutionalized racism.
- Calls for sanctions and lawfare cases against Israeli officials.
- Blames Israel for intra-Palestinian fighting.
- Participated in a protest where “Death to the Jews” was chanted.

**Website:** www.mrap.fr

**Origins:** 1949, Paris

**Mission Statement:** “To fight racism, xenophobia, discrimination, intolerance and exclusion, as well as to promote justice, equal rights, respect for human dignity and friendship among the nations.”

**Funding:** French government

**Accreditation:** ECOSOC – Roster Consultative Status

**Objections to Antisemitism at Durban 2001:**
- “We support the right of victims to self-determination, but we cannot accept formulations that incite to hatred, racism, discrimination, xenophobia and associated intolerance.” [Press release, September 2001*]

- “MRAP, present at WCAR, expresses its firm distancing from the formulation procedures, as well as with regard to certain statements of the Program of Action adopted by the NGO Forum.” [MRAP Declaration to the WCAR NGO Forum (September 3, 2001)*]

**Anti-Israel Statements in 2008-9:**
- “We’ve got only one solution [to the singling out of Israel at the Durban Review Conference]: the retreat of Israeli troops by the end of the year. All criticism of Israeli government policy is not antisemitic.” [Statement to UN Human Rights Council, March 2008*]

- “The massacres... over these past weeks in the Gaza strip are war crimes and crimes against humanity. We share the view expressed by the high commissioner, those responsible for these crimes must be brought to justice and the victims must be able to enjoy their right to compensation. MRAP speaks out against the xenophobic and racist policies being implemented by the government of the state of Israel which aims in the long run to make it impossible to implement the resolutions adopted by the General Assembly and by the Security Council and thus to make it impossible to have the existence of a Palestinian state.” [Statement to UN Human Rights Council, January 2009]

*Translated from the original French*
We call upon the Council to recognize that Israel is engaged in genocide.

Erasing the antisemitism of 2001:

- “We are pleased to note that the Conference had been a success in achieving one of its main objectives by setting a political and moral framework to reactivate the world efforts to combat racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance anywhere they exist.” [Statement to UN, January 2002]

- “We urge the Commission to publicly express its support for the 2009 Durban Review Conference and to ensure that the Review Conference it builds on the progress achieved in 2001.” [Statement to African Commission on Human and Peoples’ Rights, May 2008]

Demonizing Israel at the UN Human Rights Council:

- “Israel continues its foreign and oppressive occupation of Palestine implementing apartheid’ policies with such harshness that they appear to be intended to destroy the Palestinians as a people. Settlements and military posts sprinkled throughout Palestine allow the Israeli government to prevent the functioning of a Palestinian state and allow the occupiers to carry out atrocities with impunity.” [Written statement to 7th Session, March 2008]

- “…the Israeli government is arbitrarily slaughtering civilians in Palestine with excessive use of force and the Israeli government is interfering with the political independence of Palestine by arbitrary detaining several ministers of the elected government…Israel has only enhanced its ‘apartheid’ policies by repeatedly and illegally using excessive of force against Palestinians in Gaza and the West Bank, killing dozens of Palestinians.” [Statement to 5th Session, June 2007]
Demonizing Israel to UN Human Rights bodies

- “Israeli extra-judicial executions of Palestinians are one grim component of the Israeli military siege and closure of the entire Occupied Palestinian Territory, which is subjecting Palestinians to executions, deprivations, imprisonment and mass collective punishment... Israel has not only allowed a humanitarian crisis to emerge in the Gaza Strip: it has manufactured a chronic humanitarian crisis in Gaza in defiance of international law.” [Submission to UN Human Rights Council, January 2008]

- “The facts on the ground reveal that Israel is continuing to commit war crimes against the Palestinian population of the Gaza Strip, and these crimes are escalating in their severity, despite the fact they are illegal under international human rights and humanitarian law. Therefore, we reiterate our request for your immediate and effective intervention.” [Letter to High Commissioner for Human Rights, March 2008]
**Targetting Jewish Institutions:**

- “Turning utmost attention to the boycott, divestment, [sic] and sanctions campaign against Israel and its institutions [sic] and pursuing the parastata Zionists organizations worldwide. Engaging in judicial and criminal pursuit and accountability against, and applying pressure to remove the charity status and tax exemptions from, the Zionist organizations worldwide, including the World Zionist Organization, the Jewish Agency, and the Jewish National Fund, and dealing with them legally as racist, colonial institutions.” [Palestinian Civil Society Conference, October 2007]

**Statements to UN Human Rights Council:**

- “The ongoing forcible internal displacement and dispossession of the Palestinian citizens of Israel and the IHL-protected Palestinian civilian population of the OPT are also the result of the same regime of institutionalized racial discrimination, including laws, policies and practices employed by the State of Israel.” [Joint submission to Universal Periodic Review of Israel, July 2008]
Denying antisemitism at Durban 2001, promoting another NGO Forum:

- “We all have a responsibility - the UN, governments and NGOs together - to counter the smear campaigns against Durban that is being carried on in some quarters [...] we strongly urge that the Durban Review Conference and its preparations be adequately funded from the regular UN budget and call on governments to contribute generously to make this review conference a turning point in the struggle against racism.” [Statement to PrepCom Session, September 2007]

- “Also at the 2001 World Conference Against Racism, the NGO Forum was an important catalyst for many victim groups to come together, network, interact and build support for the work against racism and discrimination... In the view of the undersigned it is necessary that a positive decision is taken to enable civil society to fully contribute to a successful Durban Review Process and that financial resources are allocated to support the holding of an NGO Forum in the immediate vicinity of the official Conference site.” [Letter to PrepCom May 2008]

Demonizing Israel:

- “We recognize that the current dangerous and volatile situation is the direct result of Israel’s continued occupation of Palestinian lands and its relentless destruction of Palestinian infrastructure, particularly in Gaza where a humanitarian crisis is growing among the 1.4 million inhabitants.” [Statement during Second Lebanon War, July 2006]
Endorsing demonization in the UN Human Rights Council

- “These breaches include wilful killing and the extensive destruction of houses and other civilian property not justified by military necessity and have been carried out unlawfully and wantonly...investigate the countless gross violations of human rights and humanitarian law committed by Israel, which amount to war crimes and crimes against humanity, and to ensure that those responsible are held to account.” [Written submission of Al-Haq, Adalah, and Badil to 9th Special Session, January 2009]

**Website:** www.addameer.org

**Location:** Ramallah

**Goals:** Oppose torture as well as other instances of brutality, inhumanity, and degrading inflicted upon Palestinian prisoners; Participate in raising awareness locally and internationally regarding the issues of human rights, democracy and the rule of law in order to promote greater community participation in securing human rights.

**Accreditation:** Special accreditation to W C A R and its follow-up mechanisms

**Durban Strategy:**

- Signatory of the Palestinian Civil Society “Calls for Boycott, Divestment and Sanctions against Israel.”
- Misrepresents international humanitarian law and uses pseudo-legal rhetoric in condemning Israel.
- Lobbies the EU and European governments.

**Website:** www.caf.ca

**Origins:** 1967, Ontario, Canada

**Mission Statement:** “Through education, public awareness, media relations and non-partisan government relations, C A F raises awareness of domestic issues that affect our community [Canadian Arabs].”

**Accreditation:** Special accreditation to W C A R and its follow-up mechanisms
**Ford Foundation**

**Durban Strategy:**
- The Ford Foundation was among the main funders of the NGO Forum in 2001 and participating anti-Israel NGOs.
- In response to US Congressional hearings, Ford President Susan Berresford apologized and pledged to “cease funding of subversive groups,” including those calling for the destruction of Israel.
- Implementation of this pledge has been inconsistent, and many politicized Palestinian NGOs promoting the Durban Strategy still receive Ford Foundation support.

**Website:** [www.fordfound.org](http://www.fordfound.org)
**Origins:** 1936, New York
**Mission Statement:** “Reduce poverty and injustice, strengthen democratic values, promote international cooperation, and advance human achievement.”
**Funding:** The Foundation has assets valued at $13.7 billion (2007) and has distributed more than $15 billion in grants worldwide.

---

**Arab Association for Human Rights (HRA)**

“[I]n light of the continuing Israeli war crimes against our people in Gaza, [we] call for the formation of an international judicial team to document the war crimes and bring the war criminals, both the politicians and the military, to international justice.”

**Durban Strategy:**
- Calls for the prosecution of Israeli leaders for the “targeting of civilians” and “war crimes.”
- Calls on EU to annul the upgrade of EU-Israel relations and suspend economic agreements.
- Signatory of the Palestinian Civil Society “Calls for Boycott, Divestment and Sanctions against Israel.”

**Website:** [www.arabhra.org](http://www.arabhra.org)
**Origins:** 1988, Nazareth
**Goals:** To protect the political, civil, economic and cultural rights of the Palestinian minority in Israel and to further the domestic implementation of international human rights principles.
**Funding:** NIF, EU, Oxfam
Independent Jewish Voices

“[The Durban Declaration and Programme of Action] devoted less than 250 words out of 180 pages to concerns of Jews and Palestinians, all of which we believe, carefully balanced recognition of the rights of Jews and Israel with those of Palestinians.”

**Website:** www.ijvcanada.blogspot.com  
**Origins:** 2008, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada  
**Goals:** “Opposing the occupation”; “Developing working relationships with the Canada-Palestine Parliamentary Association”; “Helping to organize and participating in multiple Nakba events across Canada”; “Raise Palestinian concerns at the next election.”  
**Accreditation:** None [Represented EAFORD in a statement at the October PrepCom]

**Denying the antisemitism of Durban 2001:**

- “Anti-Semitism cannot be ended by jingoistic support for Israel or by the subjugation of another people.” [Statement on Durban II, June 2008]

- “Israeli policies...discriminate against Palestinians, not to mention occupying, torturing, assassinating, and collectively punishing them...We hereby reclaim the tradition of Jewish support for universal freedoms, human rights and social justice and we unconditionally support the Durban Review Conference.” [Statement on behalf of EAFORD at PrepCom Session, October 2008]

Interfaith International

“The NGO Forum was a turning point in the history of the world. There was nothing in the NGO Forum Declaration that was antisemitic or anti-Israel. There is no guarantee that the new NGO Forum will be Semitic or antisemitic.” [Charles Graves, Secretary General of Interfaith International]

**Durban Strategy:**

- Participated in a London march (2000), which demanded “an official British apology for its historic and contemporary role in dispossessing and exiling the Palestinian people.”

- Demonizes Israel in joint statements with BADIL, the Union of Arab Jurists, MRAP, WILPF, EAFORD, Al Haq, and others.

**Website:** www.interfaithonline.org  
**Origins:** 1993, Geneva  
**Founders:** Sayyed Mohammed Musawi (President of the World Islamic League – WABIL) and Charles Graves  
**Goals:** “To provide an opportunity for Sikhs, Hindus, Muslims, Buddhists, Christians, Jews, those of Indigenous religions and others to speak before the sessions of the United Nations Commission on Human Rights and its various subsidiary organs about human rights problems.”  
**Accreditation:** ECOSOC – Special Consultative Status
SECTION 4: NGOs THAT COMBAT THE DURBAN STRATEGY

Many NGOs attending the Durban Review Conference focus on issues unrelated to the Arab-Israeli conflict -- women’s rights, gay rights, Dalit, Roma, and Sinti, to name a few -- and will not allow their important agendas to be infiltrated by Palestinian propaganda.

This section does not represent a comprehensive list of “good” NGOs that contribute positively to constructive discourse on racism and universal human rights. That list would simply be too long.

Instead, NGO Monitor is highlighting NGOs that combat antisemitism and promote activities related to the Arab-Israeli conflict, and reject the Durban Strategy of demonizing Israel.
“The world needs to continue the global conversation about combating racism... To do this, though, it was clear we needed to address the very racism that marred the Durban meeting: antisemitism.”

**Website:** www.humanrightsfirst.org  
**Origins:** 1978, New York  
**Mission Statement:** “Building respect for human rights and the rule of law will help ensure the dignity to which every individual is entitled and will stem tyranny, extremism, intolerance, and violence.”  
**Goals:** “HRF protects people at risk: refugees who flee persecution, victims of crimes against humanity or other mass human rights violations, victims of discrimination, those whose rights are eroded in the name of national security, and human rights advocates who are targeted for defending the rights of others.”  
**Funding:** Open Society Institute, the MacArthur Foundation, New York University, the Ford Foundation, American Express Company, Citigroup, and the District of Columbia Bar Foundation.  
**Accreditation:** Special Accreditation to WCAR and its follow-up mechanisms.

**The Good and the Bad of 2001:**

- “Human Rights First took part in the WCAR and was among the many civil society representatives who were deeply disturbed by the hateful antisemitic atmosphere that plagued the conference and especially the NGO forum that preceded it. Nevertheless, the Conference did produce a Program of Action, which included a number of useful recommendations for states to combat racism and discrimination.” [Press Release, April 2008]

**Engaging the Durban Review Conference Process:**

- “The agenda for the review conference should be limited to a review of implementation of the 2001 Durban Declaration and Program of Action, the commitments states undertook to combat racism and protect individuals from discrimination and other human rights violations. Additional issues, such as defamation of religions and other topics outside the scope of these commitments, should not be added to an already full agenda.” [Press release, April 2008]

- “[D]eliberate mischaracterizations of apartheid, genocide, and crimes against humanity promote the very hatred that the conference is supposed to combat. Moreover, highlighting the alleged abuses of one state, while failing to mention any others, is simply not a credible process.” [Letter to UN High Commissioner of Human Rights, November 2008]
“Many civil society representatives were disappointed, when the NGO process, which raised the profile of important contemporary racism problems and the historic wounds of slavery and discrimination, was discredited. UN High Commissioner for Human Rights Mary Robinson spoke out against what she called the “hateful, even racist” antisemitic atmosphere that plagued the NGO forum. She refused to commend it to governments for their consideration. Leading international human rights organizations called some of the human rights language in the declaration inaccurate, inappropriate and even counterproductive. They regretted that progress on vital issues such as discrimination against Roma and caste discrimination was thereby diminished. Observers were shocked by violations of procedure in the preparatory and drafting processes, the racist treatment including violence, exclusion, and intimidation against Jewish participants, and the misuse of human rights terminology in the document related to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict...

1. We are united in our deep commitment to the goals of the WCAR to chart a course for future generations to eradicate racism, discrimination and intolerance in all its forms.

2. Racism, Racial Discrimination, Xenophobia and Related Intolerance afflict peoples in many Member States. We are committed to the important mission of NGOs to monitor and hold accountable those responsible for policy failures and for lack of implementation of measures to prevent and punish such acts.

3. However, the global effort to eradicate racism cannot be advanced by branding whole peoples with a stigma of ultimate evil, fomenting hateful stereotyping in the name of human rights.

4. The UN and its human rights fora must not serve as a vehicle for any form of racism, including antisemitism, and must bar incitement to hatred against any group in the guise of criticism of a particular government. We pledge to prevent this from happening again.

5. We pledge to uphold language and behavior that unites rather than divides. As NGOs we commit to use language in accordance with international human rights standards and conduct ourselves with civility and with respect for human rights standards.”

Website: www.magenta.nl/english/
Origins: 1992, Netherlands
Mission Statement: Aims to combat racism, fascism and other forms of discrimination
Project: ICARE (www.icare.to) publishes reports on proceedings in UN Human Rights Council and PrepCom sessions
Accreditation: Special accreditation to the WCAR and its follow-up mechanisms
Crossing the “red lines”

- “The lead-up to Durban in 2001 was hijacked by the 57-strong Organization of the Islamic Conference. A February 2001 preparatory meeting for Asian nations was held in Tehran. (Israelis were a priori excluded.) The preparatory committee adopted a text singling out Israel for “ethnic cleansing” and of a “new kind of apartheid, a crime against humanity.” ...The greatest enabler of the Durban debacle...was Mary Robinson, the UN’s human rights commissioner, whose diplomacy of appeasement encouraged the spoilers. This time around, the secretary general should instruct his Geneva officials to stand firm. As to Brussels, the secretary general’s representative, billed as opening the event, should send a clear message that anti-Israel propaganda and posturing are relics of the past — and hurt the cause of peace rather than help the Palestinians.” [Hillel Neuer, UN Watch Executive Director, International Herald Tribune, August 2007]

- “… the EU red lines reject (1) singling out one region of the world in particular; (2) reopening the 2001 Durban declaration by inserting a prohibition against “defamation of religion,” designed to restrict free speech and impose the censorship of Islamic anti-blasphemy laws; (3) drawing up an order of priority among victims; and (4) politicizing or polarizing the discussion. Each of these red lines is breached by the new draft... The dominant thesis of the draft Declaration...remains that the U.S., Western Europe, Israel, and other liberal democracies—their principles, institutions, policies, respective histories and national identities—are singularly racist, and, in addition, discriminatory against Islam. Free speech, wealth, globalization, security measures to combat terrorism... are attacked, expressly or by implication, as causes of racism, discrimination, and the “defamation of Islam.” Indeed, the new language seeking to distort human rights law for the purposes of Islamic censorship makes the Durban II draft even more regressive than the 2001 text.” [Report, December 2008]
Cautioning against repeating the Failure of 2001:

- "While we support in principle responsible NGO involvement in the Review Conference, we wish to caution against the repetition of the excesses of the 2001 NGO Forum. The Durban conference of 2001 was a setback to the struggle against racism and racial discrimination. Rather than uniting the international community around this noble cause, it divided it. We respectfully call on you to use your executive and moral authority as High Commissioner for Human Rights to make sure that the Durban debacle is not repeated and that the Review Conference remains true to its original principles, which we support." [Letter to UN High Commissioner for Human Rights, October 2008]

The Failure of 2001 and Opposition to the Durban Review Conference

- "At the concluding plenary of the NGO Forum, a key paragraph on anti-Semitism was stripped from the document by a unanimous vote. The ADL delegation led Jewish delegates in a chant of “shame, shame, shame” and the caucus walked out.” [Press Release, September 2001]

- “The international community must remain steadfast in opposition to giving legitimacy to a gathering of nations where hatred of Jews and scorn for the national aspirations of the Jewish people are cloaked in the vernacular of human rights…” [Press Release, September 2008]
### B’nai Brith

**Website:** www.bnaibrith.org  
**Origins:** 1843, New York  
**Goals:** B’nai B’rith International is a national and global leader in the fight against antisemitism and anti-Israel bias; provides senior housing and advocacy on issues of vital concern to seniors and their families; helps communities in crisis; and promotes Jewish identity through cultural activities.  
**Accreditation:** Special accreditation to W CAR and its follow-up mechanisms

### Challenging the focus on Israel

- “[The draft outcome documents] single out one and only one geographic issue among the thousands of issues treated by these documents, namely the problems related to the Middle East conflict involving the Palestinian people. It is our hope that this selectivity will find no place in the final outcome document this session, so as to avoid diverting the attention of the Durban Review Conference from its true and manifold problems of racism, racial discrimination and xenophobia around the world.” [Statement to PrepCom Session, October 2008]

### European Jewish Congress

**Website:** www.eurojewcong.org/ejc  
**Origins:** 1986, Paris (former branch of WJC)  
**Goals:** “give[] a unified voice to Jewish communities around Europe... [t]o combat the resurgence of anti-Semitism through education, justice and security, in cooperation with governments and European institutions... promote a balanced European policy towards Israel and the Middle East... foster inter-religious dialogue... ensure memory and education of the Shoah... contribute to a democratic European society based on peace, understanding and tolerance... assist in the revitalisation of the once rich Jewish life in Central and Eastern Europe.”  
**Accreditation:** W CAR and its follow-up mechanisms

### On Failure in 2001, Engagement in 2009

- “The United Nations Durban Conference...globalised the discourse of contemporary antisemitism and anti-Zionism, turning the UN into an arena where Jews and Israelis were accused of apartheid, genocide and crimes against humanity...We...believe that the Durban Review conference...represents a final opportunity for the UN Human Rights Council to avoid more venom aimed at Israel and the Jews...we will lead in ensuring that our Government exerts its full influence...to see that no respected democratic country is party to a flawed Durban process.” [Henry Grunwald, Vice President EJC, October 2008]
The Failure of 2001

“Present at the World Conference against Racism in Durban in 2001, we witnessed violence at the heart of the NGO Forum, unparalleled in any international conference under the auspices of the UN. The virulence of the racist and antisemitic statements, as well as the impossibility to evoke the discrimination suffered by women and certain minorities, such as the Dalit or the Roma, was a traumatic experience for our organizations, as well as for the victims we defend.” [Joint statement to PrepCom Session, August 2007*]

*Translated from the original French
Identifying the antisemitism of 2001:

"A large number of NGOs used the conference to condemn Israel and Jewish delegations [...] 'Israel's fate at this gathering is virtually sealed. It is already being labeled as a genocidal, apartheid regime,' said Rabbi Abraham Cooper, associate dean of the Wiesenthal Center, who was among the Jewish leaders who attended first Durban conference. Cooper called the conference 'the worst internationally-sanctioned public display of anti-Semitism since the Nazi era.’” [Press release, November 2008]

Combatting the Durban Strategy:

"[WJC] has criticized recent anti-Israel statements by...[the] president of the [UNGA], [who] had likened Israel's actions vis-a-vis the Palestinians to 'the apartheid of an earlier era' and called on the international community to consider stricter measures against Israel including 'boycott, divestment and sanctions'.[O]ne-sided obsession with Israel on the part of the UN Human Rights Council or the looming repeat of Israel bashing and anti-Semitism at the upcoming UN Durban Review Conference...give[s] rise to great concern.” [Press release, November 2008]
Sources used in this guide

NGO Monitor (www.ngo-monitor.org)


UN Watch (www.unwatch.org)

ICARE (www.icare.to)

Eye on the UN (www.eyeontheun.org)


Websites of the NGOs (listed in Sections 3 and 4)

Additional information on the Durban Review Conference is available on the above websites, and:

NGO Monitor’s Durban Review Conference page (www.ngo-monitor.org/article/durban_conference_0)


Geneva Summit (www.genevasummit.org)

Durban Review (www.durbanreview.org)

AJC Durban II Countdown (www.jc.org/durbancountdown)

Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights

Spokesperson: Rupert Colville
Tel: 00 41 22 917 9767
Email: press-info@ohchr.org
The Durban Review Conference can either deepen the incitement and demonization of Israel through the abuse of human rights rhetoric, or the process that was begun in 2001 can be reversed, restoring the foundation of international morality. In addition to close examination of the policies of the participating governments and UN officials at this conference, it will be necessary to analyze the role of the NGOs, and to hold their officials and the funders – including European governments – accountable.

- Prof. Gerald Steinberg, NGO Monitor

NGO Monitor’s mission is to provide information and analysis, promote accountability, and support discussion on the reports and activities of NGOs claiming to advance human rights and humanitarian agendas in the framework of the Arab-Israeli conflict.

This guide is available online at www.ngo-monitor.org/durban.pdf