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Introduction
Since 2000, the European Union (EU) has engaged in a pro-active campaign in response to the challenges posed by a new and virulent form of anti-Semitism associated with the violence in the Middle East. The policy framework adopted by the EU to tackle this new wave of anti-Semitism, as well as the older version, exemplifies the EU’s recent efforts to promote a pluralistic and tolerant transnational identity for its member states. This paper will examine what strategies have been put into place by the European Union to address the issues surrounding the “new wave” of anti-Semitism, as well as the older version. In order to do so, a nuanced and thorough understanding of the EU’s campaign to fight anti-Semitism must be achieved. It will be demonstrated how the campaign fits within the EU’s overall aim at shaping a common European identity, a project that has expanded significantly in recent years. While the EU assertively seeks to promote a new European narrative, it is simultaneously working at eradicating anti-Semitism—a phenomenon with deep roots in Europe’s history—from the institutional identity of a new integrated Europe. The fight against anti-Semitism and xenophobia in general, has become a major priority on the EU’s political agenda as it seeks to establish common fundamental values among its member states.

The question of what a government entity can do about hate-inspired attitudes and activities is a valid one. In fact, one could argue that the need to protect its citizens from these types of activities and attitudes is one of the key duties and responsibilities of a polity. The steps taken by the EU to combat anti-Semitism can provide an interesting insight into the effectiveness of its response to a perceived and real threat to its Jewish citizenry, and in a sense can provide commentary on the usefulness of the EU itself as a ruling entity. After all, the EU is an interesting construct of the twentieth century—an assemblage of nation states deciding to work together toward the fulfillment of certain political aims. If the EU purported to be merely an economic union, then its response to anti-Semitism or any other anti-social manifestations would be irrelevant. However, since the EU strives to be more than a grouping of trading partners, its response in legal, economic, political, and ideological areas to a perceived threat such as anti-Semitism must be effective and clear-cut to justify its existence as a political entity.

The theoretical framework adopted for this paper is based on Christopher Hood's *The Tools of Government*. Hood views government policy implementation as a problem-solving process and believes that all government units posses the tools needed to achieve their goals. Hood describes four categories of tools available to a government wishing to implement changes. The first category, modality or communication, is defined as the ability to traffic in information. The second category refers to the treasury, or to the financial tools, that facilitate the ability to exchange. The third category described by Hood refers to the authority tools, defined as the ability to determine in the legal sense. The last category encompasses the tools used toward organization and resource support (Hood 1983, 4-6). Regardless of the factors beyond the control of bureaucrats—the size of the population, for example, or the form of the government itself or even the wider social context involved—the same four categories are available to all governmental agents, including those in the EU. Within the context of the present paper, these four categories will be used to develop an understanding of the EU's choices as it combats the 'New' rise of anti-Semitism.
Rise in Anti-Semitism

During a 2004 conference, the President of the European Commission, Romano Prodi, declared the European ideal as one of “peace, tolerance, respect for human rights and minorities.” He continued his speech by emphasizing that “racism, xenophobia and anti-Semitism are a clear violation of all the Union stands for” (Prodi 2004, 4). Prodi went on to explain that “today’s Europe has unreservedly condemned the anti-Semitism of the 1930s and 1940s and continues to condemn any fresh manifestations of anti-Semitism” (Prodi 2004, 4). Prodi’s speech does not reflect mere platitudes: under his leadership, the EU took concrete practical steps to combat anti-Semitism. As it will be demonstrated, the EU has created political bodies designed to encourage dialogue and promote co-existence between the diverse religious and minority groups in Europe in addition to legislation that criminalizes discriminatory acts. A thorough analysis of the recent strategies taken by the EU to combat the new wave of anti-Semitism offers a useful case study of the policy framework implemented by the EU to promote a transnational pluralistic and tolerant European identity.

In 2002, the European Union Monitoring Centre on Racism and Xenophobia (EUMC) produced a working definition of anti-Semitism that it used as a guide for identifying incidents, collecting data and supporting the implementation and enforcement of legislation. According to the EUMC’S definition, “anti-Semitism is a certain perception of Jews, which may be expressed as hatred toward Jews. Rhetorical and physical manifestations of anti-Semitism are directed toward Jewish or non-Jewish individuals and/or their property, toward Jewish community institutions and religious facilities” (EUMC, 2002, working definition of anti-Semitism). The EUMC subsequently commissioned a report, “Manifestations of Anti-Semitism in the European Union 2002,” to assess the rates of anti-Semitism in member states, pursuant to the new institutional definition of the phenomenon. (EUMC-Manifestations of anti-Semitism in the EU 2002-2003, Forward). The 2002 working definition would continue to be used in the preparation of several follow-up reports that revealed an overall rise in anti-Semitic sentiments and attacks (EUMC 2002, working definition of anti-Semitism).

While the anti-Semitic incidents in EU countries did not demonstrate a common pattern, some commonalities in the nature and timing of incidents did manifest themselves. A study, carried out by EUMC’s successors, the European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights (FRA) established that there was an overall increase in anti-Semitic activity between 2001-2002, between 2003 and 2004 and again in 2006 (Anti-Semitism: FRA’s Summary overview in the EU 2001-2007, 18). Furthermore, member states with relatively smaller Jewish communities (such as in Finland, Ireland, Luxembourg and Portugal) recorded very few anti-Semitic incidents in comparison to countries with larger Jewish populations (EUMC synthesis report 2003, 6). Indeed, countries such as France, home to 491,500 Jews, and the United Kingdom, with its 297,000 Jews, witnessed more serious anti-Semitic incidents, such as physical attacks and vandalism (Anti-Semitism: FRA’s Summary overview in the EU 2001-2007, 15). It should be noted, however, that the FRA study might have been distorted by the fact that some countries, such as Germany, France, the Netherlands and the United Kingdom, have a very effective data and monitoring systems compared with other EU countries. Thus, as a result, there is a strong possibility that those countries with the best systems of collecting data on anti-
Semitic incidents might be mischaracterized as having the greatest problems. (Anti-Semitism: FRA’s Summary overview in the EU 2001-2007, 19).

Defining old and new anti-Semitism

Although the EUMC’s study was able to demonstrate an overall rise in anti-Semitic incidents, it was the changing nature of these incidents that experts feel to be the most revealing. The EUMC demonstrated that anti-Semitic attacks can be correlated to events in the Middle East (EUMC synthesis report 2003, 20). The EUMC’s 2002-2003 report identified perpetrators as being, for the most part, right-wing extremists and radical Islamists or young Muslims. As well, the report notes that some anti-Semitic statements came from the pro-Palestinian left, as well as politicians and citizens from mainstream society (EUMC synthesis report 2003, 7).

The EUMC, in its report “Manifestations of anti-Semitism in the EU 2002-2003,” concluded that this new wave of anti-Semitism differed significantly from the classical anti-Semitism, which was most apparent in the pre-Second World War period (EUMC-Manifestations of anti-Semitism in the EU 2002-2003, 13). The information enabled the EUMC to present the EU with data on anti-Semitism using, for the first time, common guidelines for each member state. (Anti-Semitism: FRA’s Summary overview in the EU 2001-2007, 13).

Specifically, the EUMC’s Report found a correlation between the outbreak of the Palestinian al-Aqsa Intifada in late September 2000, the ensuing dramatic escalations of violence during April and May 2002, and the rise of anti-Semitism across the European continent (EUMC synthesis report 2003, 5). Indeed, mounting incidents of anti-Semitism have been observed in most EU states since the beginning of the Intifada. Moreover, a telling example of the new face of Anti-Semitism in Europe is the fact that the frequency and intensity of anti-Jewish incidents closely mirrored the escalation of conflict in the Middle East in April/May 2002 (EUMC synthesis report 2003, 6). Offensive references to Jews, which were taboo in the wake of World War II, have grown increasingly common within Europe’s elite social and political circles (Stephen Roth Institute, General Analysis 2002-2003).

Coupled with violent attacks was the dissemination of virulent anti-Semitic stereotypes and the increasing tendency to question the legitimacy of the State of Israel. (EUMC synthesis report 2003, 8). This was demonstrated during many large anti-war and anti-Israel rallies held in various parts of the world in 2002-2003. These rallies were used by various groups to legitimize the support of violence and terrorist organizations as well as the use of anti-Semitic expressions (Stephen Roth Institute, General Analysis 2002-2003). In attempting to de-legitimize Israel and challenge its right to exist, members of organizations that publicly (engaged in acts of bigotry) against Jews were tolerated along with the equating of Zionism with Nazism at such events. In speeches, placards, and chants, Israel’s actions in the territories were regularly likened to the Nazis’ systematic extermination of Jews. Not surprisingly, these comparisons gave way to calls for the destruction of Israel (EUMC synthesis report 2003, 18).

Following concerns from many groups, including Jewish groups, national governments as well as the agencies within the EU, over the serious increase in acts of anti-Semitism in some parts of Europe—especially in March and April 2002—the EUMC asked the 15 National Focal Points (NFPs) of its Racism and Xenophobia Network
(RAXEN) to direct special focus on anti-Semitism in its data collection activities (EUMC-Manifestations of anti-Semitism in the EU 2002-2003, Forward). The NFPs are organizations contracted to provide empirical data on incidences of racism, xenophobia and related intolerance and to develop policies and initiatives designed to promote equality and diversity. The materials collected are used for the Agency’s Annual Report and other reports (FRA, RAXEN).

Professor Matti Bunzl of the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign argues that the changing identity and perception of European Jewry is at the heart of the difference between “old” and “new” forms of European anti-Semitism. Bunzl depicts “old” or classical anti-Semitism, as a phenomenon that portrays Jews as unwanted outsiders in Europe (Bunzl 2005, 502). Taking into account that the perpetrators of recent attacks are overwhelmingly youth of Arab and Muslim background, new Europeans who are often sadly seen as (unwanted immigrants) outsiders, Bunzl contends that these individuals resent Jews who they perceive to be European elites rather than outsiders (Bunzl 2005, 503). These attackers associate Jews with the white European hegemony that marginalizes Muslims in the EU, but which, more importantly, is perceived as being responsible for conflict in the Middle East. Bunzl demonstrates how, in the Arab worlds, Israel is perceived first and foremost as a European colony (Bunzl 2005, 504). Whereas the “old” anti-Semitism sought to exclude Jews from the nation-states of Europe, the “new” anti-Semitism targets Jews precisely because of their support for Israel, which is perceived as a bastion of European colonialism. Deborah Hertz disagree with Bunzl that “old” anti-Semitism sought to exclude Jews from the nation-states of Europe. She points out that affluent Jews, such as those that followed the courts of Europe became victims of Judeophobia, namely because there were seen as being a highly influential component of the European elite (Hertz 2007, 18) (and thus became victims of political in-fighting).

Other scholars reject the notion that the recent rise in anti-Semitism constitutes anything new. Although they do not dispute the fact that there has been a rise in anti-Semitism, they believe that what we are witnessing is a shift to a more fundamentalist anti-Semitism with fundamentalist groups mixing old anti-Semitic ideas with new myths (EC’s and EUMC’s 2003, 10). According to Former Israeli Prime Minister Ariel Sharon, the “new” anti-Semitism was a revival of old hatreds. “What we are facing in Europe is an anti-Semitism that has always existed and it really is not a new phenomenon,” the prime minister said in a December 2003 interview with EUpolitix.com, an online newswire dedicated to EU affairs (McGreal, 2003).

According to Robert Wistrich, Director of the Vidal Sassoon International Center for the Study of Anti-Semitism, there is a continuity of the “old” anti-Semitism on the level of the stereotyping of Jews and of Israelis as Jews collectively. Viewpoints abound that state that America is dominated by Jews and that a Jewish “cabal” operates today in favor of Israel - classic stereotypes of the history of anti-Semitism that originated in Christian Europe. Today, Jews are seen to dominate the capitalist system including banking and the media, and to be prime movers in what is called globalization. Therefore, the vituperation of anti-globalists toward anti-Zionism and anti-Semitism is often linked to anti-Americanism because, of course, America is seen to be the “fountain-head” of globalization (Rubin, 2007).
EU initiatives to combat “new” anti-Semitism:

While the EU and its predecessor, the European Community (EC) have condemned anti-Semitism and xenophobia in the past, anti-Semitism has more recently been challenged by means of EU political, legislative and financial reforms. Indeed, the founding ‘Treaties of the EC/EU’ contained no specific references to racism and xenophobia (European Union, The Amsterdam Treaty) and even a decade ago, the EC/EU treaties did not earmark any budgetary resources toward the purpose of fighting racism and xenophobia. Accordingly, no funds were available to deal preventively or curatively with xenophobia and racism (Monar 2004, 7).

In the mid-1990s, there was a consensus that Europe was experiencing a shocking outbreak of anti-Semitic incidents. The year 1997 marked an interesting up-tick in violent anti-Semitic activities including arson, shootings, and the use of explosives. Indeed, in 1996, 32 acts were recorded worldwide while the statistic for 1997 rose to 38. The rise of anti-Semitic attacks was even more pronounced in Western Europe: it rose from 9 to 16 in a year (Stephen Roth Institute, General Analysis 1997-1998).

As a result of serious concerns over racism and anti-Semitic sentiments within member states, the EU created a watchdog European Monitoring Centre on Racism and Xenophobia (EUMC), established by Council Regulation 1035/97 EC in 1997 (Former EUMC website, Background). The EUMC’s role was to monitor racist, anti-Semitic and xenophobic attitudes and actions on behalf of the Union. Its Management Board was made up of independent experts, nominated by member states, the European Parliament, the European Commission and the Council of Europe (EUMC: Perceptions of Anti-Semitism in the EU 2002-2003, 3). As of March 1, 2007, the EUMC became known as the EU Agency for Fundamental Rights (FRA), established by Council Regulation (EC) No 168/2007 (FRA, About us).

The role of the FRA is to track incidents of discrimination in Europe, including anti-Semitism. With a broader mandate than that of its predecessor, the FRA’s Regulations place more emphasis on two dimensions: raising public awareness and cooperation with civil society (EU’s Justice and Home Affairs, The creation of a European Union Agency for Fundamental rights).

In addition the FRA has extended its mandate beyond the eradication of racism and xenophobia to include other human rights areas that are within the scope of the Law of the European Union. In keeping with this new direction, the FRA published a booklet entitled ‘Homophobia and Discrimination on Grounds of Sexual Orientation in the EU Member States Part I – Legal Analysis’ in June 2008, analyzing the problems of discrimination faced by Lesbians, Gays, Bisexuals and Transsexuals (LGBT) in everyday life in the EU countries. The analysis points out that current EU’s directives dealing with discrimination on the grounds of sexual orientation are limited to only employment. There is growing debate over the possible extension of more comprehensive protection via the Race Equality Directive (43/2000) to cover other grounds including sexual orientation, disability, age and religion (FRA, in focus).

The EU has worked very closely with Jewish interest groups including the European Jewish Congress as well as the Organization on Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) since 2000 to develop better understanding of the causes and manifestations of anti-Semitism.
A EUMC report, “Manifestations of anti-Semitism in the EU 2002-2003,” listed important initiatives that needed to be put into place to combat anti-Semitism including a strong legal framework to support policy actions in all member states. Targeted policies have to be developed to establish efficient data collection systems that accurately report incidents of anti-Semitism. Teachers and other professionals have a crucial role to play in combating racism and anti-Semitism. Intercultural and interfaith dialogue should be encouraged in order to create harmonious community relations based on the respect for Human Rights, individual dignity and the role of law (European Union@ United Nations, 2004).

Moreover, since 2000 the EU has strongly condemned, and in some cases expelled, EU parliamentarians who had publicly expressed anti-Semitic, racist or highly inappropriate comments (European Jewish Congress, February 2008). Anti-discrimination legislation and directives have been passed to eliminate discrimination in the workplace and ensure equal treatment of individuals of different racial or ethnic origins.

One of the aims of drafting the Treaty of Amsterdam was to give formal recognition to human rights. The implementation of article 13 of the Treaty of Amsterdam in 1999, has given the EU the legislative tools to fight racism and xenophobia (Monar 2004, 10), enshrining the fight in a treaty obligation (Monar 2004, 12). The fight against racism and xenophobia can now be based on an explicit legal basis both under the first (EC) and the third (intergovernmental) pillar (Monar 2004, 10).

According to Joerg Monar of the University of Leicester, the implementation of a common anti-discrimination regime is consistent with the member states’ continuous integration process, and with the EU’s explicit goal of creating a political union based on common values (Monar 2004, 8). The establishment of common human rights standards was part of the natural evolution of an integrated transnational system that had already adopted integrated political and economic standards (Monar 2004, 9). Moreover, the increasing integration of the EU has heightened the continent’s ability to pool resources and utilize common institutions in the struggle of anti-Semitism. Thus, for example, EU integration has allowed for improved European police cooperation both within the Europol and through bilateral cooperation that has increased the EU’s capacity to tackle racist groups that cooperate across borders (Monar 2004, 9-10).

In 2000, two important directives aimed at combating discrimination were passed by the Council of the European Union, namely the Race Equality Directive in June 2000 and the Employment Framework Directive in November of the same year. The Race Equality Directive covers direct and indirect discrimination in the fields of employment, education and social protection and requires all member states to establish Race Equality Bodies to support victims and carry out research on discrimination. The Employment Framework Directive has become a general framework for equality in the workplace with an emphasis on combating workplace religious discrimination. These directives are important because they led the EU to create an action program to address discrimination with a budget of €100 Million (EC’s Delegation to Israel Newsletter, January 2004).

In addition to the establishment of European human rights standards and improved transnational policing, the recent proliferation of anti-Semitism has prompted Europe’s political leadership to heighten its cooperation with non-governmental Jewish groups, such as the European Jewish Congress (EJC). Thus, in February 2004—following
the publication of an EU-spearheaded Eurobarometer poll showing that the majority of Europeans believed Israel to be the greatest threat to world peace (BBC, 2003). (See Figure 1)—the European Commission decided to join the EJC in co-sponsoring a conference entitled “Europe, against anti-Semitism and for a Union of Diversity” (Prodi 2004, 2).

Figure 1 European perception of sources threatening world peace. Source: Anti-Defamation League (Anti-Defamation League, 2003)

The seminar’s sessions covered themes addressing modern European values, anti-Semitism, relations between Israel and the EU, the interfaith dialogue and the historical and cultural identity of European Jewry. Public and political figures such as Phillippe Xavier Ignace, Cardinal Barbarin, the Archbishop of Lyon, the Primate of Gaul, Dalil Boubakeur, the Rector of the Great Mosque of Paris, former German Minister of Foreign Affairs, Joschka Fischer, and Israeli Minister for Jerusalem and Diaspora Affairs, Natan Sharansky addressed seminar participants (EU’s Delegation of the EC to the USA, 2004).

On January 27, 2005, the European Parliament passed Resolution PE. 354.156, calling upon member states to create an annual European Holocaust Memorial Day on that date. The Resolution included a series of articles, which were, in and of themselves, important contributions to the fight against anti-Semitism. Article D. of the Resolution acknowledged that the Jews of Europe are experiencing a growing sense of insecurity as a consequence of anti-Semitism disseminated on the Internet. The Resolution acknowledges that anti-Semitism has become increasingly prominent with the increased incidents of vandalism of synagogues, cemeteries, schools and cultural centers.

Another section of the Resolution called upon member states to implement Holocaust Education programs, recommending that such programs be integrated into school curricula throughout the EU. According to PE.354.156, the fight against racism, xenophobia, and anti-Semitism should be set against the backdrop of mandatory Holocaust education (The European Parliament 2005). The European Parliament reasserted its commitment to Holocaust education when, in January 2006, it inaugurated an exhibition on the Auschwitz-Birkenau extermination camp. Three high-profile
Members of the European Parliament (MEPs) including the then-President of the European People’s Party, Hans-Gert Poettering, were present at the opening ceremony. The exhibition was another example of the growing partnership between government and civil society in the fight against anti-Semitism in Europe and was jointly organized by the European Parliament and the International League Against Racism and Anti-Semitism (LICRA). LICRA, a French organization created in 1927, has as its President Patrick Gaubert, who also currently serves as an MEP representing the European People’s Party and the European Democrats EPP-ED (European Jewish Congress, 2006).

In February 2007, Germany, then holding the EU presidency, proposed an EU-wide law that would make denying past genocides or war crimes an imprisonable offence. This type of legislation making Holocaust denial a criminal act (Lazaroff, 2007), was proposed following the Iranian President’s repeated claims at an International conference hosted by Islamic Republic in December 2006, that the Holocaust was a myth (BBC, 2006). The legislation, which had been initiated in 2001, but had failed to pass the council in both 2003 and 2005, reflected one of the proposals delineated in the 2004 European Commission’s “Framework Decision” (Lazaroff, 2007). The Framework Decision in combating racism and xenophobia called upon EU states to amend their criminal laws so as to implement effective and proportionate criminal penalties for acts of racism and xenophobia, as well as encouraging greater inter-state judicial collaboration and extradition cooperation in the prosecution of hate crimes (European Union, Framework decision on combating racism and xenophobia).

Several EU member states, including Germany, France, Spain, Austria and Belgium, already had legislation criminalizing Holocaust denial (European Jewish Press, 2007). The legislation, ultimately failed to pass in the EU Parliament, due to the objection of such countries as the UK, Sweden and Denmark, whose strong free speech protection conflicted with the proposed bill (Castle, 2007). The legislation sparked a great deal of opposition from civil libertarian MEPs, such as Stavros Lambrindis, who disputed this proposed legislation saying:

“I wonder if sending some people to jail for their words would have saved us from the Holocaust” (European Parliament, 2007).

The tension between free expression and hate played itself out in a subsequent highly publicized incident in which Polish MEP Maciej Gietrych published a history booklet that was denounced as anti-Semitic and xenophobic by the public and some EU Parliamentarians alike. Indeed, even the Parliament’s President delivered a public rebuke to Mr. Gietrych in the Chamber condemning the booklet, entitled “Civilizations at War in Europe,” in which the Polish MEP claimed that Jews are biologically different from gentiles. Gietrych also claimed that Jews are predisposed to isolate themselves from non-Jewish communities (Ha’arezt News, 2007).

The fact that Gietrych’s booklet was denied Parliamentary funding on the basis that the content of the work did not comply with the fundamental values of the European Union is a testament to the fact that in spite of divisions among Parliamentarians concerning limitations on free expression, the institution remains a strong bastion against hate and intolerance (The Parliament, 2007).

In another of its efforts to combat anti-Semitism, the EU has addressed anti-Semitism concurrently with other forms of intolerance by implementing projects with the aim of bringing Jewish and Muslim groups together to discuss their common challenge of
overcoming xenophobia. In so doing, the EU’s campaign against anti-Semitism has served a secondary purpose of promoting reconciliation between the Muslim and Jewish communities of Europe. One such initiative carried out by the EU - under the auspices of the European Commission and the European Monitoring Centre on Racism and Xenophobia (EUMC) – was a series of three roundtable meetings entitled “The fight against Anti-Semitism and Islamophobia – Bringing Communities Together” held in 2002/2003. Roundtable participants included leading experts, EU Parliamentarians and government representatives. Their objectives were to examine ways of combating discrimination and encouraging dialogue between ethnic and religious groups. The goal of the roundtable discussion was to bring political and religious community leaders together in order to establish common grounds, from which concrete plans for cooperation and understanding between the different groups in society could develop (EC’s and EUMC’s 2003, i).

The conclusion reached at the roundtables was that strategies to prevent anti-Semitism and Islamophobia should be reached together since a degree of similarity exists between both forms of discrimination and since both forms of intolerance are, in essence, rooted in unfair stereotypes emanating from conflicts from in the Middle East. All the participants in the forums agreed that education ministries across the EU had not yet caught up with the multicultural reality of modern Europe. There was strong agreement that an EU-wide campaign against hatred and violence should be initiated and consensus that the EU must address the unfair accusations that Europe is endemically anti-Semitic. At the same time, panelists encouraged the EU governments to become more vocal in speaking out against anti-Semitism and Islamophobia (EC’s and EUMC’s 2003, 10).

The EU has encouraged and provided funding for NGO’s such as the European Jewish Information Centre (CEJI), to focus on fostering dialogue and understanding between Muslim and Jewish communities (EC’s Delegation to Israel Newsletter, January 2004). CEJI is at the forefront of new European initiatives to promote Jewish-Muslim cooperation (CEJI, Jewish Muslim Dialogue and Co-operation).

Another NGO that has benefited from the new budget has been the European Network Against Racism (ENAR) which represents 600 NGO’s across the Union, including those active in fighting anti-Semitism (EC’s Delegation to Israel Newsletter, January 2004). One of its major projects has been to lobby for the adoption of the Framework Decision on Racism and Xenophobia. Since the Framework Decision was proposed in 2001 by the European Commission, the European Council has spent years discussing the detailed provisions without actually implementing it. The ENAR believes implementation of this directive continent-wide is essential and is concerned that some member states are not taking the challenge of racism in their societies as seriously as they should (ENAR, 2007). In addition, the ENAR has encouraged EU member states to establish a more effective mechanism of consultation and partnership with NGOs (ENAR, Campaigns). Over the past two years, the ENAR has been instrumental in leading such campaigns as the 2007 European Year of Equal Opportunities and the 2008 European Year of Intercultural Dialogue (ENAR, Campaigns).

These initiatives were made possible by the European Commission. The European Commission adopted a proposal from the European Parliament and the Council to declare 2008 the European Year of Intercultural Dialogue. An overall budget of €10 Million for
The European Year was put toward this project (European Commission, European Year of Intercultural Dialogue).

The enlargement of the European Union on 1st May 2004 has bought a historical shift for the Union in political, geographic and economic terms, offering both the EU and Israel an opportunity to develop a closer relationship which would include economic integration and deepening political co-operation. Aside from the ongoing EU enlargement, the European Neighborhood Policy of the EU has served to intensify cooperation between EU and Israel (EU/Israel Action Plan 2004, 1). This policy aims to complement commitments in the Association Agreement and in the Euro-Mediterranean regional context. In April 2005 the EU-Israel ENP Action Plan was implemented (Europea Press Release, 2008).

The growing partnership between EU and Israel can be seen in the fact that Israel is one of the biggest trading partners in the Euro-Mediterranean area, with total trade with the EU amounting to more than €23.5 billion in 2006. In the same year, the EU ranked number 1 in Israel’s imports and Israel number 2 in the EU’s exports (EU Commission, Trade Issues). With the intensification of dialogue between the EU and Israel, concerns from both partners have been expressed with regard to the rise of anti-Semitic rhetoric in the media, among European politicians and among the masses expressing hatred towards Israel and singling out Israel as an evil state (Touval 2006, 246). This concern and the determination to work together to combat anti-Semitism is reflected in the EU-Israel Action Plan. In the context of the ENP, Israel and the EU have decided to include a special paragraph in the EU-Israel Action Plan detailing the means and ways of combating anti-Semitism, including some of the following recommendations:

• the establishment of a special unit charged with combating anti-Semitism that will work through network of professionals in all EU Member States
• full implementation of the 2001 Framework Decision on Racism and Xenophobia
• reform the penal code of all EU Member States in order to toughen penalties on anti-Semitic crimes
• work to ensure law enforcement
• develop television programs aimed at increasing awareness of anti-Semitism, racism and xenophobia among the EU citizens (Touval 2006, 256-257).

Conclusion
Since the advent of the European Community, European states have been trying to develop an overriding set of common values whose primary commonality is the respect for human rights and pluralism. This study of the European Union’s efforts to address the challenges of anti-Semitism offers an effective case study of the European Union’s efforts to promote these values, demonstrating as well that the EU’s campaign to address the challenges of anti-Semitism has not been limited to the legislative sphere. Indeed, the EU has strengthened its Holocaust education, youth initiatives, interreligious dialogue seminars and intercultural awareness campaigns as well as its human rights monitoring and research capabilities to confront the roots and rise of anti-Semitic assaults in Europe in the last eight years.
The EU initially directed its efforts in combating anti-Semitism by focusing on research into the causes of anti-Semitism and providing figures and analysis on the increase of anti-Semitic incidents. Once assumptions were made from the findings, the EU began to attempt combating anti-Semitism by providing funding for projects aimed at fostering mutual understanding among the diverse cultural groups and religions in Europe. The EU then facilitated conferences, discussions and debate on all levels about anti-Semitism and racism, which triggered a push among the MEP’s and national governments to implement certain laws that would help fight the rise of anti-Semitism.

Returning to Hood’s theories, it can be seen that EU’s first utilized the ‘Organization tool’ to identify the issues, followed by the ‘Communication’ and ‘Treasury tool’ simultaneously. The ‘Authority tool’ is still not being used effectively by the EU as the Framework Decision on Racism and Xenophobia still has not been put in place.

The Challenges remain. A sharp escalation in physical, verbal and visual manifestations of anti-Semitism was recorded in 2006, marking a peak since 2000. The EU has to continue to expand its effort to combat anti-Semitism. While Europe’s Jews will always have a special position in European history and memory, state and societal support may be overshadowed by attention to more immediate concerns over Muslim integration. The European Jewish communities are not static – their special status not guaranteed. The relatively pro-active support from the EU and the national governments toward its Jewish communities can be dampened by the constant escalations in the Middle East.
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