

**The Current State of Compensation and Restitution Concerning the German
Foundation
"Remembrance, Responsibility, and the Future"**

**Statement as part of the Polish-German-Jewish Dialogue,
Sponsored by the Bertelsmann Foundation**

**Ambassador J. D. Bindenagel
Special Envoy for Holocaust Issues,
U.S. Department of State**

March 6, 2002,
Warsaw, Poland

Over the past few years, we in the United States -- and likeminded leaders in Germany, Poland and Israel -- have worked together to engineer a most significant and successful effort to bring an additional measure of justice to Holocaust and forced labor survivors since the early 1950's. Through eighteen months of negotiation, legislative deliberations in the Bundestag and dismissal of lawsuits against German firms in the United States, a German Foundation "Remembrance, Responsibility and Future" was created to deliver dignified payments to survivors. The success of the Foundation has helped create legal peace for German companies in the United States for crimes arising from the National Socialist era and World War II.

In order to release the five billion dollars to surviving forced and slave laborers, the United States Government engaged in intensive efforts to help secure legal peace for German companies in the U.S. This included successful dismissal of some 65 lawsuits against German companies. During the months-long process, the unusual step was taken to seek a writ of mandamus to relieve a federal judge of her decision-making authority. The Second Circuit Court of Appeals ordered the dismissal of the suits against German banks. The dismissal of these final cases ended the delay and reaffirmed the power of the executive branch to set foreign policy goals in international agreements, such as in this case to reach Holocaust survivors and surviving forced laborers.

Following that court decision, the United States worked closely with Dr. Otto Graf Lambsdorff to ensure that the Bundestag would vote that "adequate legal peace had been achieved" for German companies in the U.S. On May 30, 2001 the Bundestag passed that resolution. German companies then transferred their contributions to the German Foundation, which has begun to make payments to survivors. At the most recent Board of Trustees meeting in Berlin, the Foundation Directors reported that nearly 600,000 survivors had received a total of DM 2.2 billion. Such a significant amount of money reaching individuals in such a short time is a tribute to the close cooperation among the partner organizations, notably the Foundation for Polish-German Reconciliation and the Claims Conference.

These positive results reflect the real work of the German Foundation, despite the criticism of opponents who would note the outstanding issues of additional interest, the ongoing negotiations on additional insurance claims process procedures, and the now-resolved Zloty exchange rate loss. The German Foundation Directors have reported interest earnings of DM 414 million. Negotiations are underway between the Foundation and the International Commission for Holocaust Era Insurance Claims (ICHEIC) to resolve the remaining insurance claims handling procedures, including publication of policyholder names lists, audits and administrative costs. The DM 550 million insurance allocations from the Foundation will be made available for claims and humanitarian payments as soon as agreement is reached.

There is another important aspect of the Foundation that is the subject of this Polish-German-Jewish Dialogue that deserves a prominent place in the discussion, and that is one of apology, reconciliation and the future.

Remembrance

Apology cannot come without understanding the past and removing it as an obstacle to the future. Former German President Richard von Weizsäcker recognized that the unspeakable truth of the Holocaust was, and will remain, part of German history. Nevertheless, in a speech on the fortieth anniversary of the end of the Second World War in Europe, May 8, 1985 he said: "There is no such thing as the guilt or innocence of an entire people. Guilt, like innocence, is not collective but individual."

Weizsäcker stressed however, the importance of memory when he said: "All of us, whether guilty or not, whether old or young, must accept the past. We are all affected by its consequences and held responsible for it. Young and old must and can help one another to understand why it is vitally important to keep the memory alive." Weizsäcker noted that for the victims of the Holocaust the desire to forget prolongs their exile, whereas memory is the secret of redemption.

The dimensions of the Holocaust and World War II forced labor require careful examination and recognition that historical identity is not fixed. Neither is historical interpretation of a country's past immutable. History is written as much to throw light on the present as on the past. Our understanding of the past reflects our perceptions and evaluation of the present.

In our search both for justice for survivors and reconciliation between perpetrators and victims, the parties in this process faced daunting twin problems of remembrance and responsibility. Recognition of the horrible suffering of those forced laborers who survived led the United States to two goals: justice for survivors in the form of payments, and making those payments in their lifetimes. The wrongs committed by the Nazis were so horrible in fact, so pervasive in impact, and so injurious to human dignity as to challenge the concept of obtaining justice. The very idea of achieving justice for so many, for such suffering and over such a prolonged period of time was discouraging. We knew that money alone could not compensate the victims for their suffering. It is too crass a commodity of exchange, and, in any event, there is not enough of it. Money could not be the last word on the Holocaust. Survivors told us that they were not interested in payments alone; there must also be efforts to protect the memory of the Holocaust.

Developing U.S. Policy

Remembrance of the Holocaust was not only for Germans. Leading American political figures at the end of the twentieth century also recognized that symbolically, the international community needed to reaffirm its commitment to human dignity and resolve 20th century issues before a new century began.

Revisiting the history of World War II and its aftermath came in stages from ignorance to awareness, denial to recognition, evasion to acceptance of responsibility, apology to forgiveness and reconciliation. At the beginning of this long process, ignorance -- willful or not -- of a conflict and accompanying wrongs must be replaced by facts and truth, with all parties, including victims, perpetrators and bystanders participating in the process. Truth is not easy to come by, even in the best of circumstances.

War and its aftermath obscure, destroy and misplace information. Witnesses, victims and malfasants are killed or disappear. They grow old and senile. For example, of the two dozen or so senior officials who participated in the Berlin Wannsee Conference, in which the participants reached consensus to destroy the Jews of Europe, only a few survived the War, Adolf Eichmann, being the most notable.

Nevertheless, research on the unfinished business of restitution resurfaced after the close of the Cold War when newly available archives opened hope that understanding the facts would lead to historical truth. The issues of delayed justice and reconciliation were stirred by a growing awareness that began slowly, in an unexpected way. Scholarly books, such as *The Rape of Europa* by Lynn Nicholas, were published and showed that more than 600,000 works of art had been stolen by the Nazis during World War II. While the bulk of looted art had been

returned after the war, some artworks found their way into museum collections and private hands instead of being returned to the true owners. Others wrote of unpaid dormant bank accounts and of unpaid insurance claims of Holocaust victims.

We Americans also recognized the need to understand our own history and to consider action to redress historical injustice. The 1990's were a time of apology. In America, we had already examined events in our own history and offered an apology -- and sought the victims' acceptance and reconciliation -- as well as their offer of forgiveness. In seeking reconciliation with American citizens, Congress in 1988 had passed a law [Public Law No., 100-383] that apologized on behalf of the people of the United States for the evacuation, relocation and internment of United States citizens or permanent residents of Japanese ancestry during World War II. This apology was accompanied by a payment of \$20,000 to each victim. However, good intentions to reach the truth, as Bishop Desmond Tutu, observed are not easy. He said that the truth by itself could sometimes just make people even angrier. We knew from the outset of the negotiations to create the German Foundation that revisiting the history of the Holocaust would prove to be a painful experience, especially for survivors.

Openness was a first step toward understanding and reconciliation. The 1998 Washington Conference on Holocaust-Era Assets began a new international effort, although openness is never as simple and obvious as it sounds. At the Washington Conference, an international consensus was reached on opening archives. During the Washington Conference delegates of the "Task Force for International Cooperation on Holocaust Education, Remembrance and Research" issued a declaration about the opening of archives pertaining to the Holocaust. The Conference endorsed the concept of full archival openness on the Holocaust. The delegates were determined that the Holocaust was neither to be forgotten nor distorted, and that healing is a solemn duty of all who cherish freedom and human dignity.

Historical research was occurring throughout the world when the international community gathered in Washington. One example was the Vatican's offer to open its archives for historical research of the Holocaust. The Vatican had established a joint research commission, the Jewish-Christian Reconciliation Commission of the Holy See, which was expressly charged to research the Vatican archives for the Role of the Catholic Church during World War II. In addition, the Vatican issued a 1998 statement, "We Remember: A Reflection on the Shoah" in which it acknowledged the role of individuals in the Holocaust and took responsibility for the centuries-long persecution of Jews. However, the statement was not fully accepted as an apology. The Jewish-Christian Reconciliation Commission was fraught with contention and demonstrated to us the difficulty and emotion involved in the search for reconciliation between the perpetrators and victims. Nevertheless, the commitment to continued research on this period is not in doubt.

More than 20 countries have established historical commissions to review their own countries' behavior during the Holocaust. The United States' commitment to historical research is manifest in the creation of a Presidential Advisory Commission on Holocaust Assets in the United States, which issued its report early in 2001.

A year after the Washington Conference, the Swedish government hosted the Stockholm International Forum on the Holocaust in January 2000, inviting the heads of government from European countries, Israel, Argentina and the United States to attend. They declared their commitment to plant the seeds of a better future from the soil of a bitter past. Their commitment was to remember the victims who perished, respect the survivors still with us and reaffirm humanity's common aspiration for mutual understanding and justice.

Why now, so long after the Second World War?

I am often asked why so much was left undone in the compensation programs at the end of the Second World War. Why did many Nazi victims and their families have to wait a half-century to receive the kind of recognition and tangible demonstration of remorse -- the apology-- that they so deserve? I likewise am often told that compensation was made in the early post-war period, and that chapter of history is closed.

One fundamental reason that these issues were reopened in Europe was that the Cold War that had divided Europe and set Eastern Europe free finally ended. Millions of Nazi victims who were beyond the reach of international compensation or assistance, so-called "double victims" who suffered under both National Socialism and Communism, could now be reached. In Western Europe, compensation programs were very different; they reached individuals. Survivors of the Nazi terror benefited from comprehensive efforts to return property as well as special payment and pension plans.

West German government compensation programs were quite extensive, and the Germans continue to pay for these programs today. Over 100 billion German marks, some 70 billion dollars, have been paid out directly to victims.

Memory also played an important role in postwar efforts for reconciliation. The horrible suffering of these people was recognized as such, and through education programs and memorials, successive German governments pledged themselves to bring meaning to the words, "never again." However, the survivors in Eastern Europe were not reached. Despite the fact that much effort had gone into compensation in the 1940's, by the early 1950's, when the "Cold War" was at its most dangerous, new compensation initiatives ended. Nevertheless, Americans and Germans take pride in the knowledge that the early U.S.-led compensation effort from the 1940's continued in West Germany throughout the 1960's and was largely successful in the West.

However, when the Korean War broke out, political priorities changed and multi-national initiatives to return stolen property to Holocaust victims largely ended. While the San Francisco Treaty was signed with Japan, Germany remained divided. With our allies we turned our attention from the aftermath of the terrible and destructive Second World War to deter and, if necessary, to defend ourselves in a third world war.

The situation of the double victims in Eastern Europe finally fundamentally changed with the emergence of the Solidarity movement in Poland, the fall of the Berlin Wall, the flight of young East Germans through Hungary to Austria and freedom, and with the 1989 Democratic Revolution. These events unleashed the forces that led to the unification of Germany and to the end of the Soviet Union. The 1989 Democratic Revolution in Europe led to the unification of Germany and made it possible for us to return to the unfinished business left behind in the 1950's and to reach out to the "double victims" who were trapped behind the Iron Curtain. Now we could make amends and were looking for ways to address these issues.

Protecting U.S. Interests

After leading German industrialists raised the possibility of negotiations with the newly elected government of Chancellor Gerhard Schröder to help resolve the forced labor issue and then with the United States in the fall of 1998, the U.S. Government chose to join the German effort. The U.S. actively intervened to advance broad U.S. policy objectives of pursuing justice through a number of measures, which included:

First, renewing U.S. sponsorship of justice for victims of National Socialism through a broadly based effort to return property stolen, obtain recognition of suffering, and establish education and social programs in the memory of the victims.

Second, reminding the international community that the evil forces then tearing at Yugoslavia had relatively recent antecedents and must not be ignored.

Third, engaging Eastern European countries to reach out constructively to their individual citizens, and also demonstrate in tangible ways what Western democracies -- the standard to which the newly independent states of Eastern Europe aspire -- have, at their core, fundamental precepts, most especially the sanctity of human dignity.

Fourth, demonstrating that the international community will hold accountable those who do wrong.

Fifth, creating international solidarity to address issues which go beyond a single nation's responsibility, and touch each country, including our own, that failed in some way or other to do its utmost to bring justice to the victims of Nazi terror.

And sixth, encouraging the developing relationship between Germany and the newly free and democratic nations of Eastern Europe at a time when old wounds were complicating their political relations.

Other forces were at work as well. Plaintiffs' attorneys filed lawsuits in American courts against European businesses operating in the U.S. Some cases were against Swiss banks; other lawsuits alleged that Holocaust victims or surviving forced and slave laborers had not been compensated. More lawsuits were filed against German and Austrian companies in forced labor cases and for unpaid insurance claims.

Public opinion in the United States began to be aroused and brought intervention from U.S. state banking and insurance regulators as well as state treasurers, who began to ask questions about the way foreign companies, doing business in their states, had managed banking and insurance accounts during the Holocaust period.

The growing interest in justice for Nazi victims through lawsuits posed a serious threat to U.S. national interests. Our relations with our most important partner in Europe, Germany, could be at risk if no action were taken. For example, court judgments, regulatory sanctions, public boycotts against German companies were distinct possibilities. The German and American economies are too closely linked, too mutually dependent, to ignore any potential disruption. German investment in the United States is responsible for more than 600,000 jobs in America. German industrial investments are the key businesses in several regions of the United States. The operations of more than 1,800 American companies in Germany make vitally important contributions to their economy and ours.

This litany of potentially dangerous economic consequences does not even address the effect sanctions, boycotts, and court judgments would have on U.S. political and security interests. We also faced the distinct possibility that public or private actions against Germany or its companies likely would result in retaliation against American firms by the European Union. The Federal Government began to recognize that in reinvigorating its effort to right old wrongs, the U.S. could advance both important foreign policy objectives, and also ward off a serious threat to U.S. interests.

It was in this context that in response to German industry and the German government that the United States decided to help untangle the historical injustice of forced labor from the conduct of business in the United States by German firms.

Responsibility

It did not take long to understand that facts and information alone, essential as they are, are not sufficient to resolve the conflicts that lingered among the victims because of historical injustice. The next equally important step is recognition and acceptance of responsibility. Individuals, groups and governments need to confront the past honestly, without excuses or

evasion. German industry voluntarily accepted the historical responsibility of German business. This acceptance triggered a painful complex and anguishing negotiation.

The willingness of German industry, under the leadership of Dr. Manfred Gentz of DaimlerChrysler, Dr. Rolf Breuer of Deutsche Bank and Dr. Henning Schulte-Noelle of Allianz, was quite remarkable. I participated in the meetings in the fall of 1998 when German businessmen first approached the United States and expressed willingness to accept responsibility for German industry in World War II, even when the individual companies had no legal predecessors to companies that were complicit in the National Socialist crimes. German industry's February, 1999 announcement of the "Foundation Initiative of German Enterprises" to address forced labor and other claims arising out of the National Socialist period launched negotiations among survivors, industry and governments to find a mutually acceptable solution.

The negotiations were not about money alone; we also sought reconciliation among survivors and the Europeans for injustices arising out of World War II. Holocaust survivors and Eastern European forced laborers, especially Polish and Ukrainian forced labor survivors, were joined together in this effort from the start.

The reconciliation among Germans, Poles and the Holocaust survivors was a key aspect of the negotiation and it required creative American diplomacy. In the middle of the negotiations President Clinton wrote to German Chancellor Schröder on December 13, 1999 that, "German-American relations are based on our common commitment to human dignity coming from a shared history of democracy for over fifty years. This unique German initiative, reaching out to the victims of this century's most horrible tragedy, will convey dramatically to the entire world your nation's commitment to justice and human rights. It will allow our countries to enter the new millennium together determined to protect the inviolability of human dignity."

Germany embodied its commitment to human dignity in the first article of the constitution for the Federal Republic of Germany founded in 1949. Chancellor Schröder, when he replied to President Clinton on December 14, 1999, said that "[m]ore than anything else, the understanding reached on the Federal Foundation is a significant humane gesture of our responsibility toward Nazi victims at the close of this century."

While the negotiations to establish the German Foundation focused on legal issues and monetary compensation for victims, the preservation of Germany and America's commitment to the inviolability of human dignity remained the political underpinning of the talks; reconciliation was an important goal.

The Negotiations for a German Foundation and Legal Peace for German Companies in the United States

In the negotiations ably led by Dr. Otto Graf Lambsdorff and Stuart Eizenstat, we sought payments for survivors and offered to help achieve the dismissal of the lawsuits against German business. President Rau offered the recognition of forced labor necessary for reconciliation. Agreement was reached in December 1999 on the ten billion marks to capitalize the new German Foundation and was strengthened by President Johannes Rau's eloquent apology to survivors. In March 2000 agreement was reached on the allocation of the money to the partner organizations, property issues and the Future Fund. However, before we could sign the U.S. - German Executive Agreement in July 2000, issues of legal peace needed to be decided.

The negotiations opened new avenues for communication and mutual understanding among the many involved governments, businesses and interest groups. The U.S. took on a facilitation role that followed our tradition of mediation of disputes between governments. This role is as old as Theodore Roosevelt's success in ending the Russo-Japanese War in 1905 [when the Russian Foreign Minister was Vladimir Lambsdorff], and as recent as the Middle

East peace process. However, U.S. involvement in private lawsuits, such as those brought by former forced and slave laborers against Nazi industry, was unprecedented and required a unique formulation.

In the negotiation itself we faced competing agendas from the participating parties. The large number of players made traditional diplomatic negotiations between governments unworkable. In addition to the government of Germany there were other players in the forced and slave labor negotiations: the numerous companies that employed Nazi victims; international Jewish agencies that had never stopped seeking justice; the governments where most of the unrecognized Nazi victims resided (Eastern Europe and Israel); five non-governmental organizations from Eastern Europe dedicated to assisting victims; and scores of plaintiffs lawyers. There also was the need to consult closely with our own state and local governments; they sought to impose sanctions on German companies or seek divestment by State treasurers of funds invested in Germany. We wanted their actions to advance, not retard, our efforts to reach agreement.

For the forced labor negotiations -- the centerpiece of our efforts -- we assembled an unusual inter-agency team of diplomats and lawyers from the Departments of State, Treasury and Justice capable of negotiating, simultaneously, with representatives of several foreign governments, hundreds of European companies, and a score of American class action lawyers, non-governmental organizations and survivor groups. We implemented a regular dialogue with Congress and with state-level agencies, such as treasurers, comptroller's offices and pension funds that had a stake in the result. This was a unique organizational and procedural approach to an extremely complex international negotiation.

We were clear on the criticality of the issues that faced us. We had identified the U.S. national interests at stake. Our role, however, was as a facilitator of negotiations. Since standard diplomatic practices alone would not work, we invented new ones. In addition to governments, we worked closely with Poland and the East Europeans as well as the Claims Conference and Holocaust survivor organizations. The creative process included a new role for plaintiffs' attorneys and state regulators in diplomacy. It was the state regulators, for example, who formed the International Commission on Holocaust Era Insurance Claims and in New York created the Holocaust Claims Processing Office.

Legal Peace

The challenge we faced was how to convert existing class action lawsuits by former slave and forced laborers -- which covered only a few thousand plaintiffs and would have dragged on until most of those eligible for benefits had passed away -- into an international negotiation that potentially could benefit over a million surviving victims, and to complete the negotiations within the lifetimes of the survivors.

Some of our novel solutions have subsequently sparked controversy. Writing in *Foreign Affairs*, Anne-Marie Slaughter and David Bosco assert that "U.S. courts have become a venue of choice for such [Holocaust survivor] suits because they offer plaintiffs the benefits of procedural mechanisms . . . not to mention the prospect of unparalleled media coverage and U.S. Government involvement." The authors go on to name this "Plaintiffs' Diplomacy." Indeed, they argue that class-action suits against corporations for violations of international law are likely to complicate diplomatic relations. It will also likely generate pressure on governments from powerful corporations to stop the practice.

Key to success was the resolution of the issue of "legal peace." European companies wanted assurances that all litigation and other legal action against them would cease and that they would never be sued again. Our government could not make such absolute guarantees for two reasons. Our legal system does not work that way. And our Government would not bar Holocaust survivors who were U.S. citizens from having their cases heard in their own courts.

However, we were successful in negotiating an agreement that created a new ten billion German Mark (five billion dollar) German Foundation to make payments to victims, while committing the United States to recommend dismissal of all lawsuits arising out of the National Socialist era and World War II against German firms that were pending in U.S. courts as well as any new suits as being in our foreign policy interest.

Here again these negotiations called for not just new techniques and formats for managing a complex negotiation, but new approaches to the substance of the negotiation as well. It was the request that the United States file "statements of interest" recommending the dismissal of pending and future cases that required a unique solution never before used. The U.S. agreed to submit, in each case, a "Statement of Interest," complete with an affidavit by the Secretary of State citing the important foreign policy considerations that led us to the conclusion that the German Foundation should be the exclusive remedy for these wrongs and urging the courts to agree. We have filed in numerous cases and based these filings on U.S. foreign policy interests. After long deliberation, the Europeans concluded such Statements gave them sufficient confidence the cases would be dismissed for them to agree to our proposed settlement. The courts have dismissed all cases, which have been decided.

The eventual agreement was based on a number of disparate, but key elements:

The "Initiative of German Enterprises," which accepted historical responsibility and proposed establishing a German Foundation to make dignified payments to surviving forced laborers;

U.S. assistance in achieving legal peace for German companies in the United States for crimes arising out of National Socialism and the Second World War.

German Chancellor Gerhard Schröder who, in the midst of a severe budget cutting exercise, pledged to support the agreement financially; and

German President Johannes Rau, whose eloquent words of apology to the victims were so healing and so necessary.

In the presence of Holocaust survivors, President Rau said:

"It is now therefore even more important that all survivors receive, as soon as possible, the humanitarian payment agreed today. I know that for many it is not really the money that matters. What they want is for their suffering to be recognized as suffering and for the injustice done to them to be named injustice.

I pay tribute to all those who were subjected to slave and forced labor under German rule, and, in the name of the German people, beg forgiveness. We will not forget their suffering."

The perpetrator can and should admit his wrongs and ask forgiveness, but only the victim can complete the process. Only the victim can say, "I accept your apology. I forgive you." Obviously, this is the most difficult act of all. But only then is the process complete.

Achievements Reached

The United States, the Federal Republic of Germany, Poland as well as other Eastern European countries, and in other cases Austria, France and Switzerland, have worked in close partnership to establish institutions that hold great promise, not only to do justice for past wrongs, but also to advance the cause of justice in public policy into the future. These

institutions include the German Foundation "Remembrance, Responsibility and the Future," the Austrian Reconciliation Fund, the Austrian General Settlement Fund, and the French Banks supplemental fund. Their establishment of these institutions is tangible evidence of the internationalization of these issues, and the promise that the work of justice and remembrance will continue.

In addition, these new institutions will serve to support democracy and freedom in the Central and Eastern European countries as well as to provide benefits to nearly one million of their citizens. As I noted earlier, one of our most important achievements has been to provide a measure of justice not only to Jewish victims of the Nazi era, but belated recognition and payments to the hundreds of thousands of "double victims" of two of the twentieth century's worst evils: Nazism and Communism. Moreover, by bringing together Germany, Poland, the State of Israel and others in the creation of these institutions, we created a new dimension in international cooperation.

These new institutions represent a fulfillment of the United States' postwar effort to address the consequences of the Nazi era. They will contribute substantially to U.S.-European efforts to create a stable and humane international community based on democracy, rule of law, and respect for human rights. This kind of international cooperation among the world's strongest allies is crucial to the foreign policies of our countries and to the promotion of peace and stability in Europe. The very complexity of the negotiations -- the number of issues and the number of players -- became one of its strengths. The forced labor agreement is widely accepted as fair, in large part because so many had a real hand in its resolution. Through efforts by U.S. state government officials, plaintiffs' attorneys, authors, publicists and distinguished political leaders, as well as by leaders of German enterprises and of the governments of Germany, Poland, Austria, France and others, long-delayed justice is being brought to surviving forced and slave laborers, property is being returned, and insurance policies are being paid.

Conclusion: The Future

The German Foundation seeks to remember the victims of National Socialism, accepts German responsibility for the Holocaust, and provides "a measure of justice" for survivors and heirs through modest but significant payments for former slave and forced laborers. Both financial assistance and apology were essential in the German effort. One without the other would have been insufficient. No one believed that several thousand dollars could truly compensate former slave and forced laborers for their suffering and loss, but all could agree that such payments added real meaning to the apology. Moreover, these payments provide valuable assistance to the survivors, all of whom are old and many of whom are poor. But the inability of governments to provide full compensation for the wrongs of the past -- to do the impossible -- need not prevent governments from doing what is needed and possible.

Monetary compensation need not prevent political leaders from recognizing injustices and apologizing to surviving victims. To their credit, German, Austrian and French leaders did not allow the philosophical and practical questions to prevent them from embarking on the long road to reconciliation. France created the Foundation for the Memory of the Shoah, Austria created its Austrian Reconciliation Fund, and Germany created the Future Fund of the Foundation, "Remembrance, Responsibility and the Future".

The Future Fund, endowed with DM 700 million, invests in the future by devoting resources to prevention of future human transgressions. The German Foundation's Future Fund will foster projects among the peoples affected by these events which will continue to preserve the memory of the victims of the Nazi terror and to work intensively for a more stable, peaceful and cooperative region. Through Future Fund projects, the Trustees of the German Foundation are dedicated to fighting the continuing evils of intolerance, hatred, xenophobic nationalism and anti-Semitism that led to the Second World War.

Hopefully, we have finally found a process to remove the historical obstacles standing the way of a brighter future based on respect for human dignity. A tremendous amount has been accomplished. Over the longer term, young people in the U.S. and other countries will benefit

from Holocaust education and remembrance, insofar as they will better be able to understand how and why the Holocaust occurred, the scourge of prejudice, what can happen when the rule of law breaks down as well as the importance of promoting reconciliation among racial, religious, and ethnic groups so that the persecution and violence that marred the twentieth century is not repeated.

While the U.S. will continue to be a leader in what is necessarily an ongoing effort, other nations are taking important and independent action. Hopefully, there will never be another war with the destructive impact of the Second World War, nor will nations wait so long to provide justice for the victims of conflict.

Respect for human dignity will be our guiding principle in fulfilling our pledge to give meaning to the words "Never Again." Thank you.