



**Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe
Secretariat**

CIO.GAL/164/05
15 November 2005

ENGLISH only

Conference Services

At the request of the Slovenian Chairmanship please find enclosed the 2nd Semi-Annual Reports of the Personal Representatives (PR) of the OSCE Chairman-in-Office on tolerance and non-discrimination:

- Prof. Gert Weisskirchen, PR on Combating Anti-Semitism;
- Amb. Ömür Orhun, PR on Combating Intolerance and Discrimination against Muslims;

Please be informed that the report of Ms. Anastasia Crickley, PR on Combating Racism, Xenophobia and Discrimination also focusing on Intolerance and Discrimination against Christians and Members of Other Religions will be delivered at a later stage.

11 November 2005

REPORT TO THE OSCE PERMANENT COUNCIL

Personal Representative of the Chairman-in-Office on Combating Antisemitism, Gert Weisskirchen

1. Introduction

Antisemitism, racism and discrimination against social groups and religious and ethnic minorities are unfortunately still widespread throughout the world. The 2004 report by the European Monitoring Centre on Racism and Xenophobia (EUMC) found that this also applied today to the countries of the European Union. Prejudices are implanted even in OSCE participating States with well established democratic societies. For example, a recently published study showed that 18.9 per cent of Germans believe that even today the Jews still have too much influence. "Old" antisemitism is based on deep-seated and long-established prejudices. "New" antisemitism swallows up every moment of topical relevance and turns it without any justification against Jews either as individuals or as a collective group, and especially against the Jewish State of Israel.

Although the different political and historical developments and the specific features of the various governments and regions make it almost impossible to generalize about all States, the extent to which certain groups within the population of the OSCE area as a whole are susceptible to antisemitic attitudes is apparent.

If we are to operate effectively, we need focuses and goals, which should take the form of medium-term strategies. First of all, we need to analyse the key problems so as to recognize their causes and highlight the conditions that give rise to them. Once this information has been obtained, a speedy political response should follow. The activities at the different levels need to be optimized on the basis of options; unfortunately, these options are also subject to financial constraints. I should therefore like to limit myself to outlining a few central points.

In the first few years following earth-shattering changes, xenophobic and racist parties and groups emerge as a rule in realigned societies only on the margins of the party systems. That is what happened in western Europe after the Second World War. A comparable development has been observed in the entire OSCE area since the early 1990s. Nationalistic or right-wing populist movements are trying to gain a foothold to varying degrees in all European States. Apart from bringing chauvinistic longings up to date, the common elements in their rationale are the emphasis on authoritarian thinking, the stirring up of resentment towards established parties and the mobilization of right-wing extremist attitudes in the form of xenophobia or even open racism and antisemitism.

A wealth of studies, beginning with the sociological writings of Theodor W. Adorno more than 60 years ago, demonstrate that xenophobia and modern versions of ethnic and racist sentiments with antisemitic prejudices are the most significant features of right-wing extremism and populism. Although they sometimes do without the key trappings of classic

Fascism and Nazism, they still make use of its arsenal of discriminatory and denigrating contemptuous prejudices. In accordance with the classic scapegoat mechanism, foreigners are held responsible for whatever social problems exist, such as unemployment and failing social systems, and are disparaged as social parasites who dispute the right of the native population to the country's wealth. As a group they are ostracized as "disruptive factors" who need to be removed. Behind the "new" forms of antisemitism the old core still remains. If preventive measures are not taken to combat antisemitism at its source it will turn into a "social disease" that infests society, gradually eating it up from within and finally destroying it.

2. Understanding of the mandate

The Personal Representatives were appointed because in the wake of the conferences in Vienna, Berlin, Paris and Brussels the governments of the OSCE participating States recognized that they must actively combat antisemitism, racism and other forms of discrimination.

The Personal Representative on Combating Antisemitism has been appointed by the Chairman-in-Office and together with the two other Personal Representatives implements the strategic goals that have been set by the Permanent Council.

The role of the Personal Representatives encompasses three areas:

1. They implement the decisions taken by the participating States at OSCE conferences;
2. They draw attention to both progress and setbacks in the implementation process;
3. They encourage efforts by civil society and promote national and transnational co-operation between social, parliamentary and governmental actors.

In strategic terms, the Personal Representatives also have three tasks:

1. They co-ordinate their practical work both with the Chairman-in-Office and with one another and wherever possible work in the field at the same time;
2. They make use of the OSCE's institutions — in addition to the Permanent Council primarily the Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights (ODIHR) — in order to achieve their common goals;
3. They are best able to represent the values to which the OSCE is committed by standing up visibly for tolerance, respect and recognition.

Together with Jewish organizations, the ODIHR and the EUMC have formulated a working definition of antisemitism, providing the necessary basis for an understanding of what is meant by the term. This definition should apply for all goals to be achieved in the work carried out in the OSCE area.

Work urgently needs to be continued in five areas:

1. Data collection: If they have not done so already, all participating States must establish a procedure for collecting information on incidents according to established rules and for passing this information on to the ODIHR.
2. Legislation: The use of antisemitic symbols should be prohibited. The OSCE Parliamentary Assembly should be asked to propose guidelines for an appropriate legislative initiative.
3. Law enforcement: Projects should be reinforced on the basis of the working definition so that the police officials, public prosecutors and judicial authorities concerned can act quickly. Further countries should be involved in these projects so that additional experience can be shared. It is necessary not only to improve capacities for the identification of antisemitic offences but also to penalize them more severely. The ODIHR's activities in the areas of law enforcement training for the police should be continued and intensified.
4. Education: A key topic is Holocaust education. Teaching programmes should also be reinforced so as to combat modern-day antisemitism more effectively. Co-operation by the ODIHR with Yad Vashem and with the Anne Frank House in Amsterdam have both proved to be successful. Both projects have resulted in specific tools for educators, guidelines on the observance of Holocaust Memorial Day, and teaching material to address contemporary forms of antisemitism. Both topics (Holocaust education and education to address antisemitism) should be included in teacher training curricula and in school books. In addition, greater account should be taken in the teaching syllabus of Jewish history and modern Jewish life. Exchanges between young people, including exchanges between OSCE participating States and Israel, should be particularly encouraged.
5. Media: In co-operation with authors, journalists and publishers, a professional code should be elaborated in the form of a voluntary ethical commitment based on tolerance and the recognition of minorities, which would also be continuously reviewed to ensure that no antisemitic prejudices are being expressed, even if done so unintentionally. This project should be co-ordinated with the OSCE Representative on Freedom of the Media.
6. Parliaments: The OSCE Parliamentary Assembly can be used as a laboratory for new legislation. In addition, national parliaments should be urged to strengthen their capabilities so that the results of decisions taken within the OSCE can be examined. Parliamentarians can act as excellent mediators between governments and civil societies. For that reason, they should be encouraged to act in this way so that non-governmental organizations (NGOs) can make better use of their commitment and expertise in solving problems.

3. Overview of the activities

The Personal Representatives and the Chairman-in-Office took their first steps together in 2005. The first few months showed how limited the Personal Representatives' scope for action is: they work in an honorary capacity, they have limited time because of other professional obligations and they have only a poorly financed team to support them. Nevertheless, they have accepted the job and shown that, even under difficult conditions, they can co-ordinate their efforts and complement each other's activities. The visibility of their work must be heightened in 2006.

3.1 Participation in OSCE events

9 and 10 February 2005, Warsaw

Co-ordination between the Personal Representatives and the ODIHR

24 and 25 February 2005, Vienna

Winter Session of the OSCE Parliamentary Assembly

Statement (excerpt): “I see three aims we should work for:

- Raising awareness, publicly and politically;
- Promoting better co-operation to achieve effective implementation of our decisions, formulating recommendations, offering advice;
- Following up on dangerous incidents, trends and issues and strengthening the OSCE’s response to hate crimes and violent incidents.”

3 March 2005, Berlin

Working meeting of the Personal Representative of the Chairman-in-Office on Combating Antisemitism with the ODIHR, the European Monitoring Centre on Racism and Xenophobia (EUMC), the European Commission against Racism and Intolerance (ECRI), the Center for Research on Antisemitism, at the Free University Berlin. Exchange of experiences

8 April 2005, Ljubljana

Co-ordination meeting, CiO, ODIHR, three Personal Representatives.

25 to 28 April 2005, Moscow, St. Petersburg

Unofficial meetings with NGOs, rabbis and Mr. Lukin, Representative on Human Rights of the President of the Russian Federation

Excerpts of the unofficial, confidential, unpublished report:

“President Putin stands for the fight against antisemitism, particularly in the light of his speech at Auschwitz in January 2005 and the nomination of a second Chief Rabbi, Berl Lasar. ... antisemitism increased ... during recent years ... law enforcement is not sufficient ... The main problem is overindulgence of public authorities towards fascist, nationalist and extremist groups. Official statistics do not exist ... Antisemitic literature is published relatively openly and is easily accessible. An antisemitic pamphlet was signed by 19 members of the Russian *Duma*, demanding that all Jewish organizations be banned... no consequences for the signatories. The Representative on Human Rights, Mr. Lukin, indicates that he could be the one to organize this conference” to fight against antisemitism.

I refused to make public statements.

8 May 2005, Ljubljana

Co-ordination between the CiO and the Personal Representatives

9 May 2005, Berlin,

NGO-Forum organized by the American Jewish Committee (AJC), preparatory work in view of Cordoba

10 and 11 May 2005, Warsaw

Preparatory Meeting organized by the AJC in view of Cordoba, representatives from Spain, CiO, ODIHR, Personal Representatives, NGOs

8 and 9 June 2005, Cordoba

NGO-Forum Seville; Moderator, Session 2: Education on the Holocaust and on Antisemitism.

In my report as Moderator, I stated “a comprehensive approach to education is necessary to ensure success in the fight against antisemitism and other forms of intolerance...Holocaust education has been stressed in order to underline its significance as a watershed in history... (but this) alone is not sufficient to combat present-day antisemitism in all its forms. ... Young people need to learn more about Jewish life.” It is furthermore necessary to address students with a migrant background who might have perspectives on the Holocaust which are different from those of the majority society in which they live. Parliamentary committees should be established to consider and to recommend relevant legislation and educational reforms. This was one of the eleven recommendations of this session.

23 June 2005, Vienna,

Report to the Permanent Council

In my key points, I have noted that the Cordoba meeting “made clear that many countries have not lived up to their commitments arising from the Berlin Declaration ... The OSCE still has no overarching strategy in the area of education and public awareness for dealing with the scourge of antisemitism ... The declaration ... reiterated language from the Berlin Declaration, ... that “international developments or political issues, including those in Israel or elsewhere in the Middle East, never justify antisemitism”. The ODIHR has set a good example ... by incorporating the EUMC’s and the ODIHR’s working definition (on antisemitism) into its reports. ... As for future conferences, I would propose treating the various forms of intolerance in a more focused and outcome-oriented manner, for instance through expert panels ... for each (form) deserves to be treated in its own right ... recognizing the parallels both between them and particularly between the means to combat them and of course allowing and encouraging exchanges between the experts. This would also serve the fight against discrimination and other groups. Submerging the battle against antisemitism within other forms of discrimination would be disastrous at this critical stage.”

1 to 5 July 2005, Washington,

OSCE Parliamentary Assembly, meetings with NGOs, Senators and the State Department

As one of the two main sponsors, together with Mr. Christopher Smith, Member of Congress, I drafted the resolution on combating antisemitism, which was carried unanimously. The PA ... “calls upon national governments to allot adequate resources to the monitoring of antisemitism, including the appointment of national ombudspersons or special representatives; emphasizes the need to broaden the involvement of representatives of civil society in the collection, analysis and publication of data on antisemitism and related violence; calls on the national delegations ... to ensure that regular debates on the subject of antisemitism are conducted in their parliaments and furthermore to support public awareness campaigns on the threat to democracy posed by acts of antisemitic hatred, detailing best practices for combating this threat...”

7 July 2005, Berlin,

NGO-Forum organized by the AJC, post-Cordoba evaluation

18 July 2005, Brussels,

Appointment with Mr. Karel De Gucht, Foreign Minister, to discuss co-operation during the Belgian Chairmanship in 2006

Minister De Gucht wishes the Belgian Chairmanship to be a success. The trust of all participating States is crucial for the future of the OSCE. Therefore, he sees the role of the CiO in adopting trust-building measures and keeping the OSCE balanced. Minister De Gucht hopes that all countries will see the stabilizing function of the OSCE in the region. He assured me of the interest in keeping the Personal Representatives, but it was also mentioned that closer co-operation had to be established between them. It is also clear that the Personal Representatives would need more assistance, and due to the fact that they are working on an honorary basis, the possibilities for always travelling together will remain limited.

NGO Forum, organized by the Transatlantic Institute in co-operation with the AJC Berlin. See the minutes produced by the American Jewish Committee

29 and 30 August 2005, Paris

Invitation of Ambassador Jacques Huntzinger,

The aims of this visit were:

- To learn about the current situation and the activities and measures by the French authorities to fight antisemitism,
- To raise awareness about programmes available to support the authorities and representatives of civil society in their efforts to combat antisemitism and to promote Holocaust education.

Detailed minutes, see Annex 1.

28 to 30 September 2005, Warsaw

ODIHR/Human Dimension Implementation Meeting, report on meeting with the CiO, meeting with the incoming CiO, co-ordination of the three Personal Representatives

I expressed my understanding of what form co-ordination should really take to the plenary session as follows: “Co-ordination should advance, not hinder, action. It is important for the Personal Representatives to co-ordinate as appropriate in order to avoid duplication and learn from each other’s activities. At the same time, it is essential to ensure that requests for co-ordination do not hinder the capacity to respond to the specific needs of the mandate. While co-ordination is useful and appropriate in international institutions, there is a danger that it may place constraints on action. The Personal Representatives need to be able to work — following the holistic approach — independently, and to direct their energies to where they are most needed. Antisemitism is a distinct phenomenon that needs to be addressed. It should not be treated as an issue to be balanced against others.”

17 November 2005, Vienna

Report to the Permanent Council

3.2 Participation in other events

27 January 2005, Auschwitz

Festivities marking the liberation of the concentration camp

No written statement; two interviews with a German TV channel and a Polish radio station

5 May 2005, Auschwitz

March of the living

No written statement; one interview with a German TV channel

6 May 2005, Warsaw

Ehrlich-Schwerin Human Rights Award, sponsored by the Anti-Defamation League, Abraham Foxman

Extempore speech given on this occasion

25 May 2005, Washington

Lecture, “Berlin and the Holocaust: Remembrance and Responsibility”

As a Member of the German Parliament and at the same time Personal Representative of the CiO on Combating Antisemitism I was asked to explain the meaning of the Holocaust Memorial in Berlin. “The *Bundestag* today represents the German nation. It assumes this responsibility because it understands that it stands in a moral context from which there is no

escape. Today, we can link into a moral context which had been torn apart by the National Socialist dictatorship. The aesthetics of the abstract (Peter Eisenman's work of art, the Memorial) are particularly suited to promoting remembrance of the victims. The abstract nature of Eisenman's work evokes feelings of loss, disappearance and devastation. The material used ... will last for all eternity. It corresponds to the monstrosity of the *Shoah*: Germany's name will bear the scars of the perpetrators' deeds for all time. In Berlin, victims who previously had nothing but air for their graves have now found their place."

3.3 Initiatives

25 May 2005, Washington

Exchange of views with the chair of the Holocaust Museum on the International Tracing Service (ITS), Bad Arolsen. Letter to the Foreign Minister of Germany with a view to finding a consensus between the participating States on the Bad Arolsen case. The Archives of the ITS, an institution of the International Committee of the Red Cross, supervised by a group of European States and the USA, should provide access to historical researchers, apart from the primary purpose of meeting the immediate needs of Holocaust survivors and their families. Joschka Fischer has initiated a common understanding between the US Secretary of State, Condoleezza Rice, and his colleagues Philippe Douste-Blazy, Bernard Bot and Jean Asselborn, in order to formulate a step-by-step approach to resolving this issue.

October 2005

Letter to the Chairman of the German Book Trade Association, asking him to remove publishers which display antisemitic materials at the Frankfurt Book Fair from the event, in response to the display of antisemitic books in English at the Iranian stall at this year's Frankfurt Book Fair.

3.4 Country visits

25 to 28 April 2005, Russian Federation

Before President Vladimir Putin spoke clearly and convincingly against antisemitism on 27 January at Auschwitz, an antisemitic pamphlet demanding the prohibition of all Jewish organizations in the Russian Federation was signed by 19 Members of the State *Duma*. In February, the TV channel NTW broadcast a debate on the pamphlet between the former cosmonaut Alexej Leonow — he is Jewish — and the former general Albert Makaschow — he is an antisemite. The public was asked to choose the winner and Makaschow won with 20,000 votes. A month later, the pamphlet was again published, this time with 5,000 signatories, rather than the original 500. These events were the starting point for me to look for a way to make a visit. It turned out that both NGOs agreed, and Mr. Lukin, the President's ombudsperson, did too. As the Ambassador of the Russian Federation to the OSCE has indicated, there could be a chance that in 2006 the OSCE will find a way to deal with this better.

18 July 2005, Belgium

It was my intention to find out at an early stage what the thinking of the incoming Chairman-in-Office of the OSCE was about the new Chairmanship and the upcoming tasks. I was delighted to learn that Foreign Minister Karel De Gucht and his administration were prepared to bring his outstanding creativity into the new responsibility.

29 and 30 August 2005, France

Ambassador Jacques Huntzinger invited me to France to take a look at the activities of the French Government. The French authorities have met the commitments of the OSCE and are in the process of implementing them in a thoughtful and rational way. The President, the Government and the vast majority of the *Assemblée Nationale* have shown with great energy that they are rigorously fighting against antisemitism. For them, the overriding *leitmotiv* is that all citizens of France share the same republican values, namely to live their lives in liberty and security.

3.5 Articles

23 January 2005, Interview with the *Frankfurter Rundschau*
27 February 2005, *Die Jüdische*
10 March 2005, Interview, AP
15 October 2005, Article to EUMC's *Equal Voices*
15 November 2005, Beitrag zur Simon-Wiesenthal-Festschrift

4. Recommendations

4.1 In general

The specific nature of antisemitism must be recognized. Latent antisemitic attitudes only need an outside stimulus for them to come to the surface. Antisemitism is much more than a particular form of right-wing extremism. Jews are no longer discriminated against today as a race or because of their religion. They are accused of wanting to dominate the world. Zionism and the Jewish State of Israel have replaced “the Jews” and are the “collective Jew” of today. This form of antisemitism is relatively new. It combines world conspiracy theories, Holocaust denial, anti-Zionism and exclusion and makes Jews all over the world supposedly responsible for Israel’s politics. This new syndrome is a move away from the earlier classic stereotype catalogue of right-wing extremism and racism. It is therefore incorrect to interpret antisemitism as a form of racism. The new forms of antisemitism go much further.

In western Europe, the old antisemitism has been supplemented by radical Islamism and anti-Zionist activism. In eastern Europe, chauvinistic parties are preparing the ground out of which attacks could emerge. For them, antisemitism is a way of defining themselves. Right-wing extremism has grown throughout Europe following the eastward enlargement of the European Union. Lack of integration and discrimination can be found in various forms in all OSCE participating States. Radical groups can infiltrate them, attempt to establish themselves in segments of the national societies and from there recruit insecure young people for their inhuman ideologies.

The greatest challenge for the OSCE is therefore

- (a) To develop a plan of action that combines the various levels of intervention in combating antisemitism, to make it politically binding for all participating States, helping in this way,
- (b) To strengthen the forces in society working towards social integration in the Organization's participating States so that they, in co-operation with their governments and parliaments, can act more effectively to combat the conditions that facilitate the development of antisemitism.

The OSCE is ideally suited for this task because it operates on a transnational level, and can support State authorities and encourage civil societies to network productively among themselves and beyond their borders.

4.2 In particular

- (a) The UN General Assembly's decision to designate 27 January as the annual Holocaust Remembrance Day encourages the OSCE to bear "a special responsibility to ensure that the Holocaust and its lessons are never forgotten and that this tragedy will forever serve as a warning to all people of the dangers of hatred, bigotry, racism and prejudice." Therefore the OSCE should implement this decision in a unique way, stressing that "never again" means not only remembering the *Shoah*, but preventing new genocides in the future.
- (b) The OSCE participating States should acknowledge that they have to fulfil their commitments under the decisions they have taken. They should accept the fact that the Personal Representatives are the tools available to them to assist in the implementation phase. In close co-operation with the CiO, we should try to determine what should be done in practical terms if States are somewhat hesitant to assume their political obligations. A national action plan complementary to the efforts of the OSCE should be developed in every State. The national delegations of the OSCE PA should establish committees in their parliaments and prepare an annual debate reviewing the progress in the fight against antisemitism.
- (c) Civil societies should continue to develop a much closer transnational co-operation with each other, crossing the respective traditional constituencies. Nationally, they should try to open channels in order to involve more members of parliament and to encourage them to take a more active part in the fight against antisemitism.
- (d) (a), (b) and (c) should determine how the annual event on 27 January will be used in order to mobilize the younger generation in this fight.
- (e) The media have a tremendous influence across the entire OSCE region in raising public awareness. Therefore, representatives of authors, journalists, publishing houses, and filmmakers should elaborate a code of ethics independently. The free flow of information must be guaranteed and the meaning of events that occur should be interpreted by a set of moral criteria. The CiO, the Personal Representatives and

the Permanent Representative on Freedom of the Media could extend an invitation in order to initiate such a deliberation.

5. The way forward

The following points of emphasis are envisaged:

- Establishment of a committee consisting of members of political and academic circles to advise me on my activities and to act as multipliers in their respective environments;
- Focus on combating antisemitic hate propaganda in the OSCE area, sounding out the diplomatic possibilities available to OSCE States in cases when the countries of origin of such material are outside the OSCE area;
- Preparation and holding of a congress on “antisemitism as an international phenomenon”, at which academics, journalists and politicians can discuss the causes and manifestations of antisemitism and strategies for countering them. The contributions should be made accessible to the public through the media. The congress will probably take place in Mannheim in March 2006;
- I intend to hold regular discussions with journalists who cover the OSCE’s activities;
- I shall contact representatives of Jewish communities to find out directly about their problems and needs and make use of foreign contacts to draw the attention of political representatives where necessary to antisemitic trends in the States visited. Administrative and judicial aspects of combating antisemitism will also be discussed;
- The increase in Internet activities is designed not only to provide me with information but also to enable me to engage in interactive discussions with as many people as possible in the different countries. I hope in this way to be able to support local initiatives to combat antisemitism and right-wing extremism, and to acquire and provide assistance to new co-operation partners;
- By means of a systematic compilation of material and country-specific reports on antisemitism in OSCE participating States I hope by the end of 2006 to be able to identify acute manifestations of antisemitism with empirical evidence. I shall then present the resultant political consequences in the form of a detailed and dedicated catalogue of measures;
- In 2006, I should like to continue the country visits started in 2005, ensuring a strict balance between “west of Vienna” and “east of Vienna”;
- Co-operation and communication between the various actors will be fostered through expert meetings at various venues and on various facets of combating antisemitism. This will also improve the process of Holocaust education and data collection. Two regional conferences with experts from the academic

world and NGOs are to be held in 2006. A possible focus could be combating the spread of antisemitic literature and media, a phenomenon that extends beyond the OSCE area but also directly affects the OSCE States domestically — as can be readily seen from the Hezbollah TV channel “Al-Manar”, the Turkish magazine “Vakit” and the Frankfurt Book Fair both this year and last year. The results of the conferences will be published as books and brochures.

6. Conclusions

- On 14 December I shall invite representatives of various NGOs to discuss their aims and planned initiatives for the coming year.
- In view of the different manifestations of antisemitism within the OSCE area, I should like to plan my country visits in such a way that they cover each of the manifestations locally:
 - (a) Representatives of the press, media and politics who spread or support the traditional scenario of a Jewish world conspiracy or Jewish control over economic and political events;
 - (b) The activities of skinheads and neo-Nazis for whom antisemitism is a distinct aspect of their general racist and xenophobic messages;
 - (c) The stirring up of antisemitic sentiments through anti-Israel attitudes and inaccurate representations of the Middle East conflict, particularly in Muslim and Arab migrant communities in various countries in the OSCE area.
- The Personal Representatives cannot work completely without conflict. They are deployed to defuse social conflicts and must therefore work closely with the Chairman-in-Office to implement normative goals linked with commitments that have been undertaken.

Minutes of visit, Paris 29 and 30 August 2005

29 August 2005

- 10 a.m. Ministry of Justice, Francois Capin-Dulhoste, head of the Office for Criminal Policy and Protection of Individual Liberties
Overview of the new legislation in the fight against hate crimes
- 11 a.m. German Ambassador to France, Mr. Neubert, explained his relationship to the Jewish institutions and organizations in France
- 12.30–
1.30 p.m. Lunch with Mr. Winfried Veit, Director of the Paris Bureau of the Friedrich-Ebert-Foundation. We discussed the idea of organizing a trilateral seminar in order to exchange experiences in the United Kingdom, France and Germany with respect to best practices in the fight against antisemitism.
- 2-5 p.m. NGO round-table debate, organized by the AJC Paris and Berlin
A large number of NGO representatives took part and described their work in detail. They asked especially for support regarding educational programmes. The interventions made it clear that a lot of well developed activities are emerging. It seemed to me that programmes on contemporary antisemitism were needed. I stressed that France was at the forefront in implementing its commitments, that the President and the political elite continued to stand firm and that antisemitism had to be fought. The OSCE is developing good tools to fight intolerance, and civil society has an active role to play in this endeavour.
- 5.30 p.m. Jean Khan, President of the Consistoire Central Israélite de France, brought the hate language of many satellite TV channels to my attention and expressed the wish that the OSCE would be more active in this regard.

30 August 2005

- 8.45–
9.15 a.m. Anne Marie Revcolevschi, Minister for Foreign Affairs,
Directrice of the Fondation pour la Mémoire de la *Shoah*, described her activities, *inter alia*, school visits to Auschwitz, support of different civil society organizations and research in Israel, Poland and Germany, and the funding of security measures for Jewish institutions. The focus of their activities were those parts of society which were seen as being indifferent to, and uninformed about, Judaism. Their latest programmes therefore focused mainly on information about Jewish culture, religion and history. They wanted to ensure that the Jewish population was not associated solely with the Holocaust.
- 9.15–
9.45 a.m. Elisabeth Cohen-Tannoudji, Conseil Représentatif des Institutions Juives de France (CRIF). She had recently stated that antisemitic stereotypes were becoming increasingly widespread among the majority in French society. The lack of integration of the Arab/Muslim population was leading to antisemitism. Since there were discussions about the Muslim community, the

Jewish community became its counterpart. The concept of a Jewish community was new. Jews had traditionally been seen as French citizens, their religion being strictly private. She stressed the need to encourage the Ministry of Education to co-operate more closely with NGOs and to incorporate existing programmes into the national curricula.

- 10.30–
11 a.m. Mr. Boubakeur, Director of the Muslim Institute, mosque, gave an overview of co-operation between the Muslim and Jewish communities. The Middle East conflict was in his view the background to many antisemitic incidents. The majority of Muslims were aware of Islamist trends and were opposed to them, but kept silent. The vast majority were convinced that Islam had to be adapted to European values to let Muslims become Europeans. Special issues, such as acknowledgment of the Armenian tragedy, had to be resolved before a fully-fledged membership of Turkey in the EU could be contemplated.
- 11.30 a.m. to
12.15 p.m. Ministry of the Interior, Guillaume Larrive, Ministerial Cabinet, described, the close co-operation between different ministries. Regarding data collection, the following questions were seen as most important: How to categorize different forms of hate crimes; how to ascertain criteria; how to evaluate the data. In the present situation, three forms of antisemitic incidents could be observed: 1. Neo-Nazi activities; 2. Background of the Middle-East conflict; 3. Perpetrators ready to hurt Jews because it was “cool”. It was stressed that there was a connection between the experience of racism among immigrants from the former colonies and antisemitism. The Jewish and Muslim communities faced the same exclusion as the “others”.
- 12.45–1 p.m. Ambassador-at-large for the international dimension of the *Shoah*, spoliations and the duty to remember, Mr. Jacques Huntzinger, expressed his interest in the educational programmes of the ODIHR and said that he wanted to encourage French participation. He expressed the view that two local conferences on specific issues should be organized in 2006, and another big conference on implementation in 2007. He would like the States to arrive at common standards regarding the monitoring of hate crimes and wanted common definitions in this regard. The ODIHR might be the right institution to develop such standards.
- 1 p.m. Lunch, Ambassador Huntzinger; Guy Broc, Adviser to Ambassador Huntzinger; Paul Dahan, Assistant Director of Strategic Security and Disarmament Affairs; Laurent Stefanini, religious affairs adviser; Guillaume Larrive, Cabinet of the Minister of the Interior; and Ambassador Yves Dutrioux, encouraged the Personal Representatives to stress in their reports the security aspect of the issues they were dealing with. The reports should be about the activities, but should include a political abstract which would raise these general issues. I expressed my respect for the French activities in combating hate crimes and specifically antisemitism. The awareness of the problem and the immediate reaction by the public authorities were very important and helped to create a social atmosphere of zero tolerance. The French efforts were showing results, since the numbers of incidents had been decreasing.

3 p.m. Jean-Louis Nembrini, Ministerial Cabinet, Ministry of Education. After giving a short overview on ongoing activities in the field of Holocaust education, I stressed the importance of special programmes to combat contemporary antisemitism and expressed the hope that the ministry may consider participating in the ODIHR's project with the Anne Frank House.

**Second Semi-Annual Report of
Ambassador Ömür Orhun**

**Personal Representative of the Chairman-in-Office of the OSCE on Combating
Intolerance and Discrimination against Muslims**

1. Introduction

International human rights standards and norms call for the elimination of all forms of discrimination and racism. Prohibition of discrimination is also a basic principle of the international law.

However, Muslim communities especially in Western Europe and North America are experiencing an increasingly hostile environment towards them, coupled with discrimination and intolerance in various forms.

This environment, which started to be more pronounced in the post September 11 period, is characterized by suspicion, prejudice, ignorance, negative or patronizing imaging, discrimination including in education, housing and employment, stereotyping all Muslims as “terrorist, violent or otherwise unfit”, lack of provision, recognition and respect for Muslims in public institutions, and attacks, abuse, harassment and violence against persons perceived to be Muslim and against their property and prayer places.

This phenomena is also called Islamophobia, which can be defined in short as “fear or suspicion of Islam, Muslims and matters pertaining to them”.

Discrimination and intolerance against Muslims have devastating effects not only on the daily lives of the Muslim communities, but also on the societies where they live.

To remedy this negative and disturbing phenomenon, sound strategies and educational approaches must be developed and vigorously implemented. Increasing understanding and respect for cultural and religious diversity would be the first step in identifying and developing criteria for good practices in combating intolerance and discrimination against Muslims.

2. Understanding of my Mandate

I had underlined my understanding of my mandate in my first Semi-Annual Report to the Permanent Council. (CIO.GAL/93/05) For the sake of brevity, I shall not repeat those considerations.

However, I would like to underline once again that my mandate is of a rather general nature, which necessitates improving implementation of this mandate by practice.

3. Overview of the Activities

1. Prior to my country visit to the USA, I gave an interview to the Voice of America which was broadcast on 29 and 30 June 2005. I underlined the purpose of my visit to the USA within the scope of my mandate and explained the general lines of my program. In response to a question, I also elaborated on my views on the need for change and reform in the Islamic world.
2. I attended to the Annual Session of the OSCE Parliamentary Assembly, which was held in Washington on 1-5 July 2005, upon an invitation extended by the President of the OSCE-PA. Upon suggestions by a number of parliamentarians and colleagues, and since it was not feasible to amend the draft resolution on combating Anti-Semitism, I prepared the enclosed text (Annex 1) as a Statement by the OSCE-PA on Tolerance and Non-Discrimination. The President of the OSCE-PA Congressman Hastings referred to this Statement in his closing remarks and this Statement was made available to participants.
3. On 3 July 2005 I took part at the Luncheon Forum on “Legislative Responses to Anti-Semitism” which was organized by a number of NGOs. At this Forum, which was also attended by my colleague Mr. Gert Weisskirschen, I elaborated on my mandate, the need for coordination among and support for Personal Representatives and the necessity to address different manifestations of intolerance and discrimination in a holistic manner.
4. On 5-7 July 2005 I conducted a country visit to the USA upon an invitation extended by the US Administration.

The NGO Roundtable on 5 July 2005 which was organized within the context of my visit was also attended by my colleague Prof. Weisskirschen.

The report of my visit to the USA was submitted to the Chairman-in-Office Minister Rupel and subsequently was made available to the participating States on 16 September 2005. (CIO.GAL/131/05/Rev.1) It would be seen that my report, aside from a detailed overview of my contacts and encounters with a number of government and civil society representatives, also includes observations and recommendations.

In summary, although my visit to the USA did not include contacts at higher echelons of the political apparatus, did not have a media angle and contained a rather limited opportunity in meeting Muslim civil society representatives, it was evident that in the post September 11 period the previously relatively better educated, more affluent and successful Muslim community in the USA had started encountering growing manifestations of intolerance and bias, if not that much discrimination. The US Administration seems to concentrate more on protection and promotion of civic rights, rather than protection and promotion of human rights and enhancing harmony and tolerance. On the other hand, there seems to be an overall confusion regarding the existence, reasons and remedies of the phenomena related to discrimination and

intolerance against Muslims in the USA. However, the problem is not less acute or important than in Europe.

My report refers to some good practices as well.

Due to the limitations I referred to earlier, a deeper analysis of the situation in this country might be appropriate.

5. On 7 July 2005 I delivered the key note statement at the Roundtable Discussion on Reform in the Middle East, which was jointly organized in Washington by the Brookings Institution and the Saban Center for Middle East. I underlined the necessity of change and reform in the Middle East and the Islamic world and also briefed the audience on my mandate.
6. On 12 July 2005, I issued a Press Release cautioning against tendencies to identify terrorism with Islam. This press release, which was issued after the terrorist attacks in London, was coordinated with the Chairmanship. (The text of the press release was circulated as SEC.PR/359/05).
7. On 31 July-1 August 2005 I attended to the special event in Helsinki to mark the 30th Anniversary of the Helsinki Final Act, upon an invitation by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Finland. In the margins of this event, I conducted extensive consultations on matters related to my mandate and on execution of this mandate in a satisfactory manner.
8. I attended to the Inter-Agency Meeting on Combating Racism, Racial Discrimination and Islamophobia and Related Intolerance, which was held in Paris on 1 September 2005. The Conclusions and Recommendations of this meeting was circulated on 16th September 2005 via ECRI-IAM (2005) 2 rev.

At this meeting I tried to elaborate on my mandate, my perception on the implementation of this mandate, the country visits I conducted and the general conclusions I drew from these visits. Since it was the first time that the representatives of UNHCHR, UNCERD, ECRI and EUMC were briefed on these issues, considerable interest was displayed by them, together with the wish to continue coordination of activities directed to similar objectives.

9. On 2 and 5 September 2005 I conducted a country visit to France upon an invitation extended by the French Government.

I would like to thank the French authorities for their efforts to develop a comprehensive, well-organized and balanced program, which included meetings and contacts with high level authorities, representatives of the Muslim communities, as well as experts from non-governmental organizations and specialized bodies.

Since at the time of the drafting of my report to the Permanent Council, my report on my country visit to France (which was submitted to the Chairmanship only on 4 November 2005) was not yet distributed, I will confine my remarks to some general observations.

Concern was repeatedly expressed about the existence of anti-Muslim discourse by some political leaders, about unbalanced media reporting and about structural problems like in education, housing and unemployment. Concern was also expressed on misconceptions about and stereotyping of Islam, and that discrimination against Muslims is dealt with under the general umbrella of racism. It was also evident that the situation of Muslims in France is unique both in terms of their size and also in terms of the principle of laicity.

On the other hand, I also noted a commitment on the part of the French government to improve the situation of the Muslims by taking some new initiatives and by establishing new bodies to deal with discrimination and intolerance against Muslims, which was recognized by all government representatives that I met. My report elaborates on these points in more detail. (It should be noted that the visit and its report predates the recent incidents.)

10. On 12-13 September 2005 I participated to the OSCE Police Experts Meeting held in Vienna on “Improving the Effectiveness of Law Enforcement in Preventing and Combating Hate Crimes”.

At the First Session of this meeting devoted to the role of the OSCE in combating intolerance and discrimination, I delivered one of the key note speeches, which was subsequently distributed. (Annex 2) On the other hand, at the end of the meeting I tried to make a summary of the proceedings, the key points raised and the recommendations put forth.

I believe this meeting was well constructed and served its purpose.

11. From 26 September to 30 September 2005 I participated to the second week of this year’s Human Dimension Implementation Meeting held in Warsaw. I delivered one of the key note statements at the session on 29th September that was devoted to the specifically selected topic of tolerance and non-discrimination. My statement was distributed as an HDIM document. (HDIM.DEL/434/05) A lively and interesting debate made this session a useful one.
12. Within the margins of the HDIM, a Roundtable of Selected Muslim Non-Governmental Organizations working in the field of tolerance and non-discrimination was jointly organized and hosted by the ODIHR and myself. The aim of the Roundtable, which was a first event in this field, was to facilitate discussion on the issue of intolerance and discrimination against Muslims in the OSCE region and to identify areas for action. The meeting also served as an opportunity to familiarize NGOs with the work of the Tolerance and Non-Discrimination Program of the

ODIHR, whereby discussions were held on areas of cooperation with NGOs on combating intolerance against Muslims.

At this meeting, to which more than twenty Muslim NGOs participated, I explained my role and mandate and tried to sum-up the proceedings at the end of the Roundtable.

A detailed report of the Roundtable will shortly be prepared by the ODIHR.

I would like to thank the ODIHR in helping to organize this meeting, which I believe proved to be very useful. Together with the ODIHR, we intend to organize further meetings of the same kind.

13. Within the margins of the HDIM, the three Personal Representatives were invited to a coordination and consultation meeting with the CiO Task Force, which proved to be beneficial in reviewing past practice and in exchanging views on future work.
14. Again within the margins of the HDIM, I conducted separate bi-lateral consultative meetings with the Director of the ODIHR Ambassador Strohal, with the members of the United States Commission on International Religious Freedom and with the representatives of the USA, Canada, Holland, Austria and Kazakhstan.
15. On 1-2 October 2005 I took part at the meeting of the Consortium of Research Institutes held in Alexandria, Egypt on Regional Cooperation and Security in the Middle East.
16. Following this meeting, I met in Cairo the Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs of Egypt, Ambassador Ashraf Rashed, and his colleagues. I briefed them on my mandate and activities. My counterparts expressed support to my activities and also interest to further their cooperation with the OSCE in combating intolerance and discrimination against Muslims. They also underlined their view that, if the Ministerial Council would adopt a decision on tolerance, it should not imply a hierarchy among different forms of discrimination. In Cairo, I also met the members of the civil society organization Arabs Against Discrimination.
17. During my visit to Cairo on 3 October 2005, I also visited the Secretary General of the Arab League Mr. Amr Moussa, with whom I discussed cooperation within the scope of my mandate. The report of my consultation with Mr. Amr Moussa, which has been submitted to the Chairman-in-Office, is attached to this report. (Annex 3)
18. Upon receiving information to the effect that some anti-Islamic posters have been posted in Budapest and that statements of similar content have appeared in the internet, I wrote a letter on 6 October 2005 to the Permanent Representative of Hungary to the OSCE and requested information on Hungarian Government's

response and comment on these incidents, as well as on a letter from the Hungarian Muslim community to the OSCE Chairmanship.

I hope I will be able to receive a timely and satisfactory response from the Hungarian Government. I must add that the press release issued on 16th September 2005 by the Hungarian Foreign Ministry on derogatory utterances against Islam and Muslims was noted with appreciation. However, as underlined earlier, I am awaiting an official response.

19. Between 19-21 October 2005 I conducted a country visit to the UK upon an invitation by the UK Government. The report of this visit is being prepared and I will inform the Permanent Council about my observations and recommendations at a later date.

20. On 25 October 2005 I wrote a letter to the Permanent Representative of Denmark to the OSCE, informing him that I have recently received information to the effect that serious and disturbing manifestations of intolerance and discrimination in the form of derogatory utterances against Muslims in Denmark had caused considerable resentment and anger not only on the part of the Muslim community residing in Denmark but elsewhere also. In addition I underlined that quite a number of appeals and/or critical remarks deploring these events had been forwarded to the Danish Government. I added that I would like to be informed by the Danish Government of their perception of and reaction to such manifestations, as well as of any action that might have been taken or that will be taken.

The response I received was limited to forwarding a letter that the Danish Prime Minister had sent to a group of Ambassadors in Copenhagen who had raised similar but not identical concerns. Since the letter of the Danish Prime Minister was largely devoted to issues related to freedom of expression but not to combating intolerance and discrimination against Muslims, I took the liberty of sending to Ambassador Bernhard a second letter, a copy of which is attached to this report. (Annex 4)

21. On the 1st of November 2005 I participated at and contributed to the Symposium jointly organized by the Hacettepe University and the Center for Strategic Studies in Ankara to commemorate the Thirtieth Anniversary of the Signing of the Helsinki Final Act. The keynote speech of this event was delivered by the former President of Turkey Mr. Demirel, one of the original signatories of the Final Act.

I delivered the introductory statement at the session on OSCE's Human Dimension and Democratization. After elaborating on this topic, I also explained my mandate and my activities as the Personal Representative of the CiO on Tolerance and Non-Discrimination.

At the same seminar I also delivered the concluding speech on the future of the OSCE, adaptation of the OSCE to the new security environment and OSCE's reform agenda.

The Symposium was well attended and generated a lively debate.

22. Upon the request of the publishers, I contributed a rather lengthy article on Islamophobia to the EUMC's Equal Voices magazine, which I believe will be published shortly.
23. Finally, just before going Vienna to present my Second Semi-Annual Report to the Permanent Council, I will be attending to the Second Ministerial Meeting of the Forum for the Future.

Forum for the Future is the yearly event where developments in the field of reform and change in the Broader Middle East and North Africa region are evaluated.

4. Recommendations

- a. It should be recognized that religious defamation and for that matter intolerance and discrimination against Muslims is an affront to human dignity.
- b. It should also be recognized that Islamophobia is exceptional among the political ills of the present era: Frequently it is not only the Muslims who are attacked, but also their faith.
- c. All concerned should refrain from making negative generalizations regarding Muslims and also should refrain from stigmatizing them.
- d. Dual aspect of the rise of Islamophobia; on the one hand its intellectual legitimization and on the other hand tolerance shown to this legitimization, should be well recognized and countered.
- e. Reality and seriousness of intolerance and discrimination against Muslims must be accepted. Otherwise this trend will result in the crystallization of cultural and religious differences.
- f. Discrimination and intolerance against Muslims must be dealt with through a sound strategy on three levels:
 - Personal and emotional
 - Intellectual, ideological and media legitimization
 - Political exploitation of Islamophobia
- g. In order to effectively combat intolerance and discrimination against Muslims, condemnation must be accompanied by effective legislative and judicial measures as well as with education.

5. The Way Forward

Within the limited time frame until the completion of my mandate at the end of this year, I intend to continue my activities especially in raising awareness.

6. Conclusion

We may not have all the answers to all the problems we face. This should not lead us to doing nothing. We have to start somewhere.

The first thing we must do should be reaching out across the barricades that exist or that some want to place between the Muslim communities and the rest.

We should avoid being at the wrong end of racism and Islamophobia. We should recognize that even cruel words and dismissive gestures are instrumental in creating barricades of prejudice.

Secondly, as the Secretary General of the United Nations Mr. Kofi Annan stated, we must “unlearn intolerance.” No one can or should be neutral in the fight against intolerance and discrimination.

Thirdly, we must accept the importance of compliance with already agreed norms and decisions in combating intolerance and discrimination. A culture of compliance should be created, as opposed to a culture of non-responsiveness.

We must combat with intolerance and discrimination not only with words, but also with acts of justice, campaigns of integration, harmony and respect for “the other”, and with adequate resources. In this endeavour, the light of knowledge must be our source of inspiration; not the darkness of hatred. We must forget everything we memorized concerning hatred and enmity.

Finally I would like to underline once again the following: Personal Representatives are part-time and honorary positions. Without adequate support, both logistical and also substantial, their output is bound to be limited. I am sure the participating States and the Chairmanship will address the need for adequate support and provide necessary resources.

Annexes: 4

STATEMENT BY THE OSCE PARLIAMENTARY ASSEMBLY ON TOLERANCE AND NON-DISCRIMINATION

1. Recalling the resolutions on tolerance and non-discrimination by the OSCE;
2. Referring to the commitments made by the participating States emerging from the OSCE conferences in Vienna (June 2003), Berlin (April 2004) and Brussels (September 2004) regarding legal, political and educational efforts to fight intolerance and discrimination, ensuring that all peoples in the OSCE region can live their lives free of discrimination, harassment and violence;
3. Welcoming the convening of the Conference on Anti-Semitism and on Other Forms of Intolerance in Cordoba, Spain in June 2005;
4. Commending the appointment and continuing role of the three Personal Representatives of the Chairman-in-Office of the OSCE on Combatting Anti-Semitism, on Combatting Intolerance and Discrimination against Muslims, and on Combatting Racism, Xenophobia and Discrimination, also focusing on Intolerance and Discrimination against Christians and Members of Other Religions;
5. Reaffirming the view expressed in earlier resolutions that racism, xenophobia, discrimination and intolerance, including against Muslims, constitute threats to fundamental human rights and to democratic values and hence to the security in the OSCE region;
6. Emphasizing the importance of permanent monitoring mechanisms of incidents of discrimination at a national level, as well as the need for public condemnations, energetic police work and vigorous prosecutions;

The Parliamentary Assembly of the OSCE

7. Urges OSCE participating States to adopt national uniform definitions for monitoring and collecting information about hate crimes and to familiarize officials, civil servants and others working in the public sphere with these definitions so that incidents can be quickly identified and recorded;
8. Recommends that OSCE participating States establish national data collection and monitoring mechanisms and improve information-sharing among national government authorities, local officials, and civil society representatives, as well as exchange data and best practices with other OSCE participating States;
9. Urges OSCE participating States to publicize data on such incidents in a timely manner as well as report the information to the OSCE Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights (ODIHR);
10. Recommends that ODIHR publicize its data on hate crimes on a regular basis, highlight best practices, as well as initiate programs with a particular focus in the areas of police, law enforcement and education;

11. Calls upon national governments to allot adequate resources to the monitoring of discrimination, including the appointment of national ombudspersons or special representatives;
12. Emphasizes the need to broaden the involvement of civil society representatives in the collection, analysis and publication of data on discrimination and related violence;
13. Calls on the national delegations of the OSCE Parliamentary Assembly to ensure that regular debates on the subjects of intolerance and discrimination are conducted in their parliaments and furthermore to support public awareness campaigns on the threat to democracy posed by acts of hatred, detailing best practices to combat this threat;
14. Calls on the national delegations of the OSCE Parliamentary Assembly to submit written reports at the 2006 Annual Session on the activities of their parliaments with regard to combating discrimination;
15. Calls on the OSCE participating States to develop educational material and teacher training methods to counter contemporary forms of discrimination as well as update programs on tolerance education;
16. Urges both the national parliaments and governments of the OSCE participating States to review their national laws;
17. Urges the OSCE participating States to improve security at religious sites and other locations that are potential targets of attacks, in coordination with the representatives of these communities.

**Statement by Ambassador Ömür Orhun
Personal Representative of the OSCE CiO on Combating
Intolerance and Discrimination against Muslims**

**Session 1: The Role of the OSCE in Combating Intolerance and
Discrimination**

**2nd OSCE Meeting of Police Experts, Vienna, 12 and 13 September 2005
'Improving the effectiveness of law enforcement in preventing
and combating hate crimes'.**

It is a great pleasure for me to be able to address this session on the role of the OSCE in combating intolerance and discrimination and in particular to address my mandate as the Personal Representative of the OSCE in Combating Intolerance and Discrimination against Muslims. I believe this session is significant in both theme and timing – I say timing because sadly, we have been witnessing increasingly violent manifestations of intolerance against Muslims in the last few years and indeed since the recent events of July 7, 2005. And I say timing, because now, more than ever, the OSCE must come together to name, address and fight this scourge of intolerance that threatens the liberty, security and cohesion of our communities.

The Personal Representatives of the OSCE were appointed to promote better coordination of participating States' efforts to implement commitments in the field of tolerance and non-discrimination. In particular, the Personal Representatives have been mandated to promote cooperation and coordination with OSCE institutions and relevant international organizations and NGOs in order to bring together efforts on mutually-important areas of interest, and just as importantly, to avoid duplication of efforts by independent bodies.

It is my hope that today will provide an important opportunity for members of the OSCE to discuss how to deal with the increasing manifestations of hate and intolerance throughout the OSCE region, and in particular to address and identify solutions for the particular manifestations of intolerance faced by Muslims. I hope it will also allow for members of the OSCE participating States to consider the essential task of building relations with the Muslim community – a task that while essential, requires much more effort and attention.

Muslims form an essential part of today's vibrant, diverse and multi-cultural societies. Despite their contributions to society, however, Muslims suffer significantly from various forms of discrimination including social exclusion, harassment, and violence. Intolerance against Muslims manifests itself in a number of ways from verbal abuse, lack of religious accommodation in workplaces or schools, to violent attacks on individuals and their places of worship.

This phenomenon – increasingly referred to by the term 'Islamophobia' – must be confronted, and confronted swiftly. For when discrimination becomes entrenched, we often witness the emergence of a cultural and social exclusion of groups from acceptance and participation in mainstream society. A recent OSCE Seminar on Migration and Integration addressed these very issues. A key aim of the seminar was to voice strongly the message that states recognize the importance of integrating Muslims into the fabric of their society.

Integration is not to be equated, however, with assimilation. On the contrary, the process, if it is to be successful depends on our ability to respect, celebrate and learn from diversity. We must uphold a vision of a society that finds unity in diversity and where all groups benefit mutually from each other. Facilitating the active inclusion, engagement and participation of Muslims is key to realizing this vision. Structural and civic integration – and by this I mean ensuring that the

institutions within our society include and involve all member groups and foster a sense of citizenship and civic participation – is also of vital concern now.

With the tragic events of 7/7, we have seen a spotlight emerge on issues relating to the integration of Muslims in OSCE communities, on the dangers of exclusion and marginalization of groups from the mainstream society and the manner in which both of the above can lead to disaffection. We have also seen renewed focus on age-old myths and clichés which question the compatibility of Islam with democracy and the co-existence of Muslims with other communities in the OSCE region. We have seen time and time again the identification of terrorism or radicalism with Islam. And unfortunately, we have seen a rising tide of backlash against Muslims in many parts of the world. Muslim communities have suffered from physical violence, fear and anxiety over reprisals and intentional humiliation and degradation – whether this be from random acts of violence from unthinking individuals or more sustained attacks vis-à-vis the virulently Islamophobic political discourse, unbalanced media and public debate that seems all too ‘acceptable’ these days.

A recent study reported that post 7/7, many Muslims have considered moving away from their homes or changing their way of dress in order to avoid the intensifying anti-Muslim backlash. Such developments are distressing to say the least. Democratic societies depend upon freedom, liberty and security. At this time, we must focus on fighting the senseless and violent manifestations of intolerance but also on building bridges - through engaging the Muslim community positively and through promoting intercultural understanding and respect between groups. This will require the efforts of those in the law enforcement community, the education sector and those in positions of leadership. In order to achieve lasting community cohesion and respect for all members of society we must also move away from the idea of merely tolerating differences in others.

It is my belief that the 55 OSCE participating States can work together to combat discrimination and to promote understanding and respect between groups; but it will take heart, determined commitment and renewed vigour. I, however, believe that we are up for the challenge.

Thank you.

**Meeting Between Ambassador Ömür Orhun, Personal Representative of the OSCE
Chairman-in-Office on Combating Intolerance and Discrimination Against Muslims and
H.E. Amr Moussa, Secretary General of the Arab League
(Cairo, October 3, 2005)**

I expressed to H.E. Amr Moussa my appreciation for this meeting, as I had been looking forward to informing him about my activities and discussing how we can cooperate with the prominent organization of the Arab League, as was mentioned also in his kind message upon my appointment as the Personal Representative of the OSCE Chairman-in-Office. Underlining that for the first time the OSCE had appointed thematic representatives, I briefed him about my mandate and my activities. I stated that the so-called “Islamophobia” is not a new issue, yet it has acquired new dimensions in the post-September 11 era. Therefore, my main task is fighting against misperceptions and providing better coordination of activities against discrimination. I explained that my mandate includes raising awareness, underlining the importance of educating law-enforcement officials and younger generations, assisting ensuring the implementation of international norms and domestic legislation on the issue and promoting inter-cultural and inter-faith dialogue. I am trying to implement my mandate by reaching public via the media, coordinating with other international organizations and making country visits.

I underlined that not only the receiving European countries but also the Muslim communities living there have some responsibilities, such as distancing themselves from terrorism and violence. Stressing the importance of civil society in this regard, I informed him about our efforts to create a database in ODIHR in order to coordinate the activities of Muslim civil society organizations, which are not that well-organized compared to other NGOs. I also mentioned that the political discourse by European rightist politicians, the distortion of whose statements in the media further fuels the already burning fire.

I also expressed the fact that Muslims in Europe are left out of the mainstream and tend to live in ghettos, yet they should be integrated into the societies they live in by eliminating direct or indirect restrictions in certain fields, like housing, employment and schooling. I added that rather than organizing political conferences, we should take concrete action on these issues.

I told him that I need the support of the five Mediterranean Partners for Cooperation. They should be more active in this fight against discrimination and the voice of their civil societies should be heard louder.

H.E. Amr Moussa expressed his willingness to coordinate our activities in a structured framework. He underlined that there is indeed a clash of civilizations, but it is triggered by the extremists in different societies in order to spread fear and attain recognition. Otherwise, a clash of civilizations does not exist in mainstreams but only in extremes. He stated that Bin Laden does not represent Muslims, he cannot identify himself with them nor do they identify themselves with him.

Mr. Moussa stated that European governments have adopted two different policies: They either pursue policies that harm Muslims or try to calm down these clashes. He mentioned that fighting against discrimination against Muslims in Europe is much more crucial than the fight in the USA, as this trend in the USA may change in the future, whereas in Europe this problem has deeper historical roots.

Mr. Moussa offered instituting cooperation between the Arab League and the ODIHR and asked what kind of cooperation we can pursue. I told him that the Arab League can participate more in different OSCE activities together with other similar international organizations. I also added that paying a visit to the OSCE Secretary General in Vienna or meeting with the Chairman of the OSCE would be fruitful in conveying the message that the Arabic world attaches importance to this issue. Mr. Moussa welcomed the idea of visiting the OSCE and added that he will discuss this issue when he will meet with the Belgian Minister of Foreign Affairs during the EUROMED Conference on the 10th anniversary of the EUROMED Partnership, which will be held in Barcelona in November 2005.

H.E. Mr. John Bernhard
Ambassador
Permanent Representative of Denmark to the OSCE

Ankara, 28 October 2005

Dear Mr. Ambassador,

Thank you for your e-mail of 27th October, in response to my message dated 25th October. I appreciate your timely response, which also forwards a letter by Prime Minister Rasmussen. However, it seems that I have not been clear enough in my previous message, which, while mentioning quite a number of appeals and/or critical remarks that your government received, was not only referring to the letter by a group of Ambassadors in Copenhagen, but also to, for example, the letters of the Secretary General of the Organization of Islamic Countries to the OSCE Chairman-in-Office as well as to Prime Minister Rasmussen.

The issue I raised in my previous message is related to manifestations of intolerance and discrimination against Muslims in Denmark.

In that respect I would like to direct your attention to a number of reports prepared by reputable international organizations including, but not only confined to, the following:

- a. Report by the International Helsinki Federation for Human Rights (IHF), dated March 2005, on Intolerance and Discrimination against Muslims in the EU: Section on Denmark includes observations that the social climate facing Muslims has deteriorated in Denmark during the last decade, that harassment against Muslims has increased and that there is a tendency in media to report issues related to Muslims with a stereotypical approach resulting in reports which reinforce public misconceptions. The same report also touches upon the role of political leaders and official policies. The recommendations of the IHF to EU member states includes taking effective measures to promote tolerance and to encourage debate within the media about their responsibility to avoid perpetuating prejudice when reporting on Islam and Muslim communities and to develop campaigns to foster respect for cultural and religious pluralism.
- b. Summary Report on Islamophobia in the EU after 1 September 2001, which was prepared on behalf of the EUMC, which notes, among others, a dramatic and prolonged upsurge of both verbal and physical attacks on Muslims in Denmark, while Danish media being already dranged with negative stereotypes of Islam and Muslims.
- c. Report on Religious and Cultural Diversity in the Media, again prepared on behalf of EUMC, also underlines a subtle form of racism persisting in reporting on ethnic situations in Denmark, that news are often selected and framed on the basis of prevailing stereotypes and that religious attributes are used mainly for Muslims.
- d. EUMC's National Analytical Study on Racist Violence and Crime (prepared by RAXEN Focal Point for Denmark) also mentions the dramatic rise in the numbers of reported incidents of racial violence against people of Arab and Muslim background, which must give rise to great concern.

Freedom of opinion and expression is without doubt one of the main human dimension commitments of the OSCE. In fact the 1975 Helsinki Declaration states that the participating States will respect human rights and fundamental freedoms, including the freedom of thought, conscience, religion or belief, for all without distinction as to race, sex, language or religion.

The 1990 Copenhagen document, on the other hand, speaking about the inherent dignity of all human beings, calls for non-discrimination.

What I am trying to underline, Mr. Ambassador, is not challenging the freedom of expression, but trying to protect the “inherent dignity” of Muslims within the scope of my mandate. In that respect I would also like to remind commitments by the participating States on tolerance and non-discrimination, the latest being Ministerial Decision no.12/04 adopted last December, which inter alia contains a commitment to encourage the promotion of tolerance, dialogue, respect and mutual understanding through the media, including internet. Issues related to the points I tried to underline above were also discussed in the June 2005 Cordoba Conference, and the Cordoba Declaration underscores that the primary responsibility for addressing acts of intolerance and discrimination rests with participating States.

I would also like to bring to your kind attention that my two part article on tolerance, non-discrimination and harmony, which was published immediately before the Cordoba Conference, was circulated on 8th June 2005, PC.DEL/512/05.

I sincerely hope that your authorities would care to re-examine my appeal in view of the considerations that I tried to emphasize above.

Yours sincerely,

Ömür Orhun
Ambassador

Personal Representative of the
Chairman-in-Office of the OSCE
on Combating Intolerance and Discrimination
against Muslims