



**Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe
Permanent Council**

PC.DEL/924/05
23 September 2005

ENGLISH only

Slovenian Chairmanship

OSCE CONFERENCE ON ANTI-SEMITISM AND ON OTHER FORMS OF INTOLERANCE

Cordoba, 8 and 9 June 2005

CONSOLIDATED SUMMARY

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction.....	1
(A) Annotated agenda.....	3
Opening ceremony	3
Opening session: Fighting anti-Semitism and other forms of discrimination, and promoting tolerance: from recommendations to implementation	3
Session 1: Anti-Semitism and the media: <i>inter alia</i> , the press, TV, Internet, radio, the film industry	4
Session 2: Education on the Holocaust and on anti-Semitism	5
Session 3: Responding to anti-Semitic and hate-motivated crimes: the role of governments, institutions, legislation, law enforcement and civil society	6
Session 4: Fighting intolerance and discrimination against Muslims: facilitating integration and respecting cultural diversity	8
Session 5: Fighting intolerance and discrimination against Christians and members of other religions: respecting religious identity in a pluralistic society	9
Session 6: Fighting racism, xenophobia and other forms of intolerance and discrimination: <i>inter alia</i> , the role of education, the media and law enforcement	11
Closing session	12
Closing ceremony	12
(B) Agenda of the workshops.....	13
(C) Agenda with the timetable	15
(D) Reports of the plenary sessions	19
Opening ceremony	19
Opening session: Fighting anti-Semitism and other forms of discrimination, and promoting tolerance: from recommendation to implementation	20

Session 1:	Anti-Semitism and the media: <i>inter alia</i> , the press, TV, Internet, radio, the film industry	24
Session 2:	Education on the Holocaust and anti-Semitism	26
Session 3:	Responding to anti-Semitic and hate motivated crimes: the role of governments, institutions, legislation, law enforcement and civil society	28
Session 4:	Fighting intolerance and discrimination against Muslims: facilitating integration and respecting cultural diversity	30
Session 5:	Fighting intolerance and discrimination against Christians and members of other religions: respecting religious identity in a pluralistic society	33
Session 6:	Fighting racism, xenophobia and other forms of intolerance and discrimination: <i>inter alia</i> , the role of education and the media.....	35
	Closing session and closing ceremony.....	39
(E)	Annexes	
Annex 1:	The Cordoba Declaration of the Chairman-in-Office.....	42
Annex 2:	Sophia Ministerial Council Decision No. 12/04 Tolerance and Non-Discrimination (MC.DEC/12/04)	46
	Permanent Council Decision No. 607 Combating Anti-Semitism (PC.DEC/607)	48
	Permanent Council Decision No. 621 Tolerance and the Fight against Racism, Xenophobia and Discrimination (PC.DEC/621).....	50
	Permanent Council Decision No. 633 Promoting Tolerance and Media Freedom on the Internet (PC.DEC/633)	53
Annex 3:	Permanent Council Decision No. 669 Agenda, Timetable and other Organizational Modalities of the OSCE Conference on Anti-Semitism and on other Forms of Intolerance	55
Annex 4:	Statements	61
Annex 5:	Side events	185

INTRODUCTION

The Sofia Ministerial Council Decision on Tolerance and Non-Discrimination decided to intensify efforts for the implementation of these three decisions PC Decision Nos. 607, 621, and 633 which include commitments in the fields of, *inter alia*, education, media, legislation, law enforcement, migration and religious freedom,” and “to follow up the work started in 2003 and continued with the OSCE Conference on Anti-Semitism (Berlin on 28 and 29 April 2004), the OSCE Meeting on the Relationship Between Racist, Xenophobic and Anti-Semitic Propaganda on the Internet and Hate Crimes held in Paris on 16 and 17 June 2004, and the OSCE Conference on Tolerance and the Fight against Racism, Xenophobia and Discrimination, (Brussels on 13 and 14 September 2004). Also welcomes the offer by Spain to host in Cordoba in June 2005 the OSCE Conference on Anti-Semitism and on Other Forms of Intolerance,” (see Annex 2 for the text of the decision), which was held on 8 and 9 June.

The agenda of the Conference was adopted by decision of the Permanent Council, (see Annex 3). On this basis the Annotated Agenda of the OSCE Conference on Anti-Semitism and on Other Forms of Intolerance was developed in Vienna in close co-operation with the ODIHR, and with close co-operation and consultation among a representative group of participating States. The sustained attention from participating States to organizing the Conference resulted in high-level expert keynote speakers, introducers and moderators. They set the tone for a very engaged discussion among the over 900 participants from governments, international organizations, civil society and the media. In particular, there were 32 delegations from participating States represented at Ministerial level, including 13 Ministers and 19 Deputy Ministers. The media coverage was also substantial, with more than 130 articles devoted to the Conference both in the Spanish and the international press.

The report of this meeting consists of the following parts:

- (A) The annotated agenda, comprising the names of the speakers and the conceptual background on which the discussions of the plenary sessions were based.
- (B) The agenda of the workshops, including the names of speakers, and the list of side events, which is annexed (see Annex 5).
- (C) The agenda with the timetable, including the names of speakers and the timetable of workshops.
- (D) A report on the plenary sessions, an overview of interveners, a summary of general recommendations, as well as additional recommendations made by delegations, either during the sessions or after the sessions in writing. The text of the interventions by the keynote speakers, introducers and moderators is attached to each of the sessions (see Annex 4).
- (E) The annexes contain the declaration by the Chairman-in-Office concluding the Conference which he called the “Cordoba Declaration”, the Sofia Ministerial Council Decision on Tolerance and Non-Discrimination (MC.DEC/12/04), the Permanent Council Decision on the Agenda, Timetable and Other Organizational Modalities of the OSCE Conference on Anti-Semitism and on Other Forms of Intolerance PC.DEC/PC.DEC/669), the opening speeches, the speeches of the keynote speakers in the opening session, and the

speeches from the moderators and introducers in the plenary sessions. The list of side events is also included.

As the interventions by the introducers for each session are attached, the summaries of the discussions are limited to the debate following the introducer's interventions. In accordance with standard OSCE human dimension meeting reporting, the recommendations are addressed either to OSCE participating States or to the OSCE structures. Although most recommendations were addressed to OSCE participating States, it goes without saying that NGOs, other international organizations and the media also have an important role to play in ensuring the implementation of some of these recommendations. Finally, the list of participants and remaining statements handed in to the Secretariat were posted on the official website of the OSCE.

(A) ANNOTATED AGENDA

Opening ceremony

- Formal opening of the Conference and keynote speeches;
- Presenting the problems posed by anti-Semitism and by other forms of intolerance.

As host, the Minister for Foreign Affairs and Co-operation, H.E. Miguel Angel Moratinos will address the Conference and declare it opened, followed by the OSCE Chairman-in-Office, H.E. Dr. Dimitrij Rupel, Minister for Foreign Affairs of Slovenia. Subsequent keynote addresses will be given by Ms. Simone Veil and Mr. Edgar M. Bronfman.

Opening session: Fighting anti-Semitism and other forms of discrimination, and promoting tolerance: from recommendations to implementation

Moderator: OSCE Chairman-in-Office, Dr. Dimitrij Rupel

Note-taker: Eltje Aderhold, Counsellor, Permanent Mission of Germany to the OSCE

The opening session is intended to give delegations the opportunity to deliver their formal statements before the beginning of the Working Sessions. Delegations are kindly asked to limit their statements to a maximum of 3 to 4 minutes.

In order to facilitate an orderly flow of interventions, delegations are kindly asked to inform beforehand about their request to intervene in this Opening Session by contacting the Conference Service (Mr. Yerzhan Birtanov) at the following address:
yerzhan.birtanov@osce.org.

In accordance with the title of this Session, statements can deal with the following topics:

- Implementation of the 2004 OSCE Ministerial Council Decision No. 12/04 on Tolerance and Non-Discrimination;
- Presentations and discussions on measures to implement OSCE recommendations to promote tolerance and respect, and to combat anti-Semitism and other forms of intolerance.

Session 1: Anti-Semitism and the media: *inter alia*, the press, TV, Internet, radio, the film industry

This session will focus on implementation of the OSCE Permanent Council Decisions on Combating Anti-Semitism (PC.DEC/607) and on Promoting Tolerance and Media Freedom on the Internet (PC.DEC/633). This session will examine to what extent the media, *inter alia*, the press, TV, Internet, radio, the film industry have strengthened their role in promoting tolerance and preventing anti-Semitism, while still protecting the right to free expression. This session could contribute to operationalizing existing OSCE commitments relating to the role of the media in promoting tolerance and preventing anti-Semitism. Representatives of the media could discuss how best to avoid anti-Semitic messages in the media as well as best practices to promote tolerance and community cohesion through the media.

Moderator: Andrew Baker, Director of International Jewish Affairs (American Jewish Committee)

Introducers: Petra Liedschreiber, Editor-in-Chief, Host of the German TV Programme “Kontraste”
Carlo Saletti, Historian, Expert on the treatment of the Shoah by the film industry

Note-taker: Knut-Are Sprauten Okstad, Second Secretary, Permanent Delegation of Norway to the OSCE

Topics may include, *inter alia*:

- The role of the media in fighting anti-Semitism and in promoting tolerance;
- How best to avoid anti-Semitic messages in the media and the Internet;
- The role of the media as part of a comprehensive strategy for actions at the national level;
- The role of the OSCE, its institutions and field presences.

Luncheon given by the Minister for Foreign Affairs and Co-operation of Spain and the Mayoress of Cordoba in honour of the Ministers and Heads of Delegations under the Presidency of His Majesty the King of Spain (at the Salon de los Mosaicos at the Palace of the Alcazar) (on invitation).

Lunch by the Delegates participating in the Conference at the “El Bandolero” Restaurant (for all participants).

Workshops (in parallel):

- Anti-Semitism and the media
- Implementation of the ODIHR's Taskings in the Field of Tolerance and Non-Discrimination

Session 2: Education on the Holocaust and on anti-Semitism

In the year of the sixtieth anniversary of the liberation of Auschwitz-Birkenau, there is no question about the importance of the commitment to promote remembrance of the Holocaust. This remembrance should be part of the memory of each and every country. In addition to Holocaust education, we need to consider other themes to include in education programmes designed to combat today's anti-Semitism within the OSCE region.

During the OSCE Conference on Anti-Semitism, held in Berlin in April 2004 and in the OSCE Permanent Council Decision (PC.DEC/607) on Combating Anti-Semitism, the OSCE participating States made commitments to promote educational programmes for combating anti-Semitism, as well as to promote remembrance and education about the tragedy of the Holocaust. In order to chart the progress of participating States in implementing these two commitments, it is important to assess and evaluate efforts and initiatives undertaken during 2004 and to propose further actions needed to ensure effective implementation of the commitments under the OSCE Permanent Council Decision on Combating Anti-Semitism. In which countries is Holocaust education part of the curriculum? Where do Holocaust remembrance days and/or Holocaust memorial museums exist? To what extent is this commitment to promote Holocaust education implemented throughout the whole OSCE region? What would be the next steps in order to enhance the development of special programmes to combat today's anti-Semitism? What is the role of international organizations and non-governmental organizations in order to implement these commitments? How can States co-operate in the implementation of these programmes? What role could the ODIHR play in providing assistance and support to participating States in their efforts to strengthen the implementation of Holocaust education and develop programmes to combat anti-Semitism?

A side event will be organized on Holocaust education where an ODIHR report on education on the Holocaust will be presented along with other educational publications on the Holocaust and anti-Semitism. Participation of relevant NGOs as well as other actors would be most welcome.

Moderator: Professor Gert Weisskirchen, Personal Representative of the OSCE
Chairman-in-Office on Combating Anti-Semitism

Introducers: Cobi Benatoff, President of the European Jewish Congress
Karen Polak, Chair of the Education Working Group of the Task Force on
International Co-operation on Holocaust Education, Remembrance and
Research
Yehuda Bauer, Adviser to the International Task Force for Holocaust
Education, Remembrance and Research

Beate Winkler, Director, European Monitoring Centre on Racism and Xenophobia (EUMC)

Note-taker: Selver Yumer, Attaché, Permanent Mission of the Republic of Bulgaria to the OSCE

Topics may include, *inter alia*:

- Implementation of the OSCE Permanent Council Decision on Combating Anti-Semitism (PC.DEC/607), in particular regarding the role of education;
- The promotion of educational programmes for combating anti-Semitism as well as the remembrance and education about the Holocaust and all its victims;
- Key elements in the development of school curricula and teacher education programmes regarding the Holocaust;
- Using both Holocaust education and other means in combating today's anti-Semitism;
- How the OSCE, its institutions and field presences, in co-operation with other international organizations and actors, can assist participating States in developing educational programmes.

Session 3: Responding to anti-Semitic and hate-motivated crimes: the role of governments, institutions, legislation, law enforcement and civil society

This session will be used as an opportunity to highlight specific “best practices” of government, national institutions and civil society in their joint efforts to monitor and respond to anti-Semitic and hate-motivated crimes. A particular focus will be placed on assessing the implementation by OSCE participating States of their commitment to collect and keep reliable information and statistics on hate crimes and on identifying ways to further strengthen data collection efforts within the OSCE area. The role of law enforcement officials in identifying, investigating and responding to anti-Semitic and hate crimes will also be discussed and the first results of the ODIHR’s Hate Crime Training Programme for Law Enforcement Authorities in the OSCE Region will be presented. The necessity of strong partnerships between governments, institutions and civil society in responding to and preventing anti-Semitic and hate-motivated crimes will also be discussed. How do OSCE States define “hate-motivated” crimes? How can participating States increase their capacity to monitor, respond to and report on hate-motivated crimes? How can effective partnerships be established between government, national institutions, law enforcement authorities and civil society? What national institutional mechanisms exist to collect reliable data and information on hate-motivated crimes? What steps can be taken to increase the consistency and comparability of data and statistics submitted by participating States? How can successful models of joint government and civil society action in combating anti-Semitic and hate crimes, be promoted and disseminated throughout the OSCE area?

A workshop on the ODIHR’s Programmes in the Field of Tolerance and Non-Discrimination will be held where its 2004 report on hate crimes information and

statistics collected from OSCE participating States will be presented. A side event will also be organized on the implementation of the ODIHR's Law Enforcement Officer Training Programme for Combating Hate Crimes. Participation of relevant NGOs as well as other actors would be most welcomed.

Moderator: Enrique Múgica, Spanish Ombudsman

Introducers: Edward O'Donnell, U.S. Department of State
Alexander Brod, Director, Moscow Bureau for Human Rights
Dina Porat, The Stephen Rot Institute for the Study of Contemporary Anti-Semitism and Racism, University of Tel Aviv
Paul Goldenberg, the ODIHR Law Enforcement Officer Training Programme for Combating Hate Crimes, National Public Safety Strategy Group, American Jewish Committee

Note-taker: Robin Brooks, Political Officer, United States Mission to the OSCE

Topics may include, *inter alia*:

- Implementation of the OSCE Permanent Council Decisions on Combating Anti-Semitism (PC.DEC/607), on Tolerance and the Fight against Racism, Xenophobia and Discrimination (PC.DEC/621) and on Promoting Tolerance and Media Freedom on the Internet (PC.DEC/633);
- Collecting and keeping reliable information and statistics on anti-Semitic and hate motivated crimes. Further strengthening the data collection efforts within the OSCE area;
- Good practices of governments, institutions and civil society in their joint efforts to monitor and respond to anti-Semitic and hate-motivated crimes;
- The role of law enforcement officials in preventing, identifying, investigating and responding to anti-Semitic and hate-motivated crimes;
- Strengthening partnerships between governments, institutions and civil society in responding to and preventing anti-Semitic and hate-motivated crimes.

Dinner given by the President of the Andalusian Regional Government in honour of the Ministers and Heads of Delegations at the Palacio de la Merced, Headquarters of the Provincial Deputation (on invitation).

Reception — Buffet dinner offered to participants at the Gardens of the Alcazar (for all participants).

Cultural event offered by the municipality at the Gardens of the Alcazar.

Session 4: Fighting intolerance and discrimination against Muslims: facilitating integration and respecting cultural diversity

Throughout the OSCE area, biased portrayal of Muslims in the media and negative political rhetoric have resulted in prejudiced attitudes towards Muslims and have often served to fuel hostility towards Muslims. Concerns about religious fundamentalism have often been used to justify efforts to prohibit religious practices and deny religious accommodation. While many Muslims are born and raised in the countries where they reside and are citizens of these countries, they are still often perceived as “foreigners.” Many Muslims face challenges in being accepted as full and equal members of their societies while retaining their particular ethnic, religious and cultural identities. In order to facilitate the full inclusion and participation of Muslim communities, it is therefore important that programmes and policies are in place that foster respect and appreciation for a culturally diverse society and that facilitate the full inclusion and participation of Muslim communities. This session will serve to showcase good practices in order to demonstrate how the promotion of inter-cultural and inter-religious understanding can facilitate a respect for diversity within national identity (for example religious accommodation in the workplace and in schools). A focus will also be placed on strategies for tackling social/political exclusion and promoting respect for diversity through representation of Muslims in public roles, representative bodies and institutions. Finally, the session will explore ways in which the media can challenge prejudices and misrepresentations of Muslims through the inclusion of Muslims in programming and highlighting positive contributions to society.

Moderator: Ambassador Ömür Orhun, Personal Representative of the OSCE
Chairman-in-Office on Combating Intolerance and Discrimination against Muslims

Introducers: Abduljalil Sajid, Imam and Adviser to the Commission on British Muslims
Gemma Martín Muñoz, Professor of Sociology of Muslim and Arab Countries at the Universidad Autonoma de Madrid
Barbara John, Former Commissioner for Integration of Foreigners, Berlin, Germany
Ambassador Saad Eddine Taib, Advisor to the Secretary General of the Organization of the Islamic Conference

Note-taker: Mustafa Osman Turan, First Secretary, Permanent Mission of Turkey to the OSCE

Topics may include, *inter alia*:

- Raising awareness about intolerance and discrimination against Muslims in the OSCE area;
- The importance of dialogue in facilitating the integration of Muslims while respecting cultural diversity and religious manifestations within limitations as are provided by law and are consistent with national obligations under international law and with international commitments;
- Combating and countering prejudices and misrepresentation of Muslims, through education and the media;

- Combating hate speech and discrimination against Muslims in the media, on the Internet, at workplaces and through governmental policies;
- Promoting integration and respect for diversity by encouraging Muslim participation in public life, representative bodies and institutions;
- Follow-up to the 2005 Human Dimension Seminar on Migration and Integration with a special focus on the integration of Muslims.

Session 5: Fighting intolerance and discrimination against Christians and members of other religions: respecting religious identity in a pluralistic society

Across the OSCE region, Christians and members of other religions face restrictions on their religious freedom. Problems include discrimination against individuals in the workplace and public services, defamation campaigns against minority religious groups, improper denial of legal status, the disruption or prohibition of worship even in private homes, censorship of religious literature, and imprisonment of those who object to military service on religious grounds. These restrictions may be a direct result of State legislation and policies, or, in other cases, they may arise as a result of a lack of protective action from State authorities, often in the face of a dominant religious majority.

Since the 1975 Helsinki Final Act, freedom of thought, conscience, religion or belief has been one of the core commitments that each of the OSCE's 55 participating States has agreed to respect. Over the past 30 years, these commitments have been considerably expanded and were reiterated in 2004 in the Permanent Council Decision (No. 621) on Tolerance and the Fight against Racism, Xenophobia and Discrimination. Under this Decision, participating States reiterated their commitment to promote and facilitate open and transparent interfaith and intercultural dialogue and partnerships towards tolerance, respect and mutual understanding and to ensure and facilitate freedom of the individual to profess and practice a religion or belief, alone or in community with others. How can efforts to promote freedom of thought, conscience and religion support actions to combat religious-based discrimination against Christians and members of other religions? What role can the ODIHR's Panel of Experts on Freedom of Religion or Belief play in offering technical assistance to participating States on efforts to combat religious-based discrimination against Christians and members of other religions and in protecting freedom of religion while respecting religious identity in a pluralistic society?

Moderator: Ombretta Fumagalli Carulli, Professor of Canon and Ecclesiastical Law at the Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore

Introducers: Ambassador Mercedes Rico, Director General of Religious Affairs, Spanish Ministry of Justice
Jacob Finci, President, Jewish Community of Bosnia and Herzegovina, Chairperson of Inter-religious Council
Father Dr. Elias Chacour, President of Mar Elias Educational Institutions

Note-taker: Patrizia Falcinelli, Counsellor, Permanent Mission of Italy to the OSCE

Topics may include, *inter alia*:

- Raising awareness about intolerance and discrimination against Christians and members of other religions in the OSCE area;
- Presenting and discussing good practices of governments, institutions and civil society in guaranteeing the conditions of freedom for a presence of religion in public and private life within limitations as are provided by law and are consistent with national obligations under international law and with international commitments;
- Combating discrimination against Christians and members of other religions in the media, on the Internet, at workplaces and through governmental policies;
- Combating and countering religious-based prejudices and misrepresentations, including against Christians and members of other religions, through education and the media;
- The importance of inter-religious dialogue in the promotion of tolerance, respect and mutual understanding;
- Models of dialogue and partnership to promote tolerance, respect, and mutual understanding among Christians, members of other religious communities, civil society and governments;
- Accommodating the contribution of Christians and members of other religions in public life; the role of governments, institutions and civil society;
- The role of the Advisory Panel of Experts on Freedom of Religion or Belief of the Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights (ODIHR) in offering technical assistance to participating States regarding legislation or governmental policies in order to overcome intolerance and discrimination against Christians and members of other religions.

Press Conference

Lunch given by the Spanish Minister for Foreign Affairs and Co-operation to Ministers, Heads of Delegations and Participants at the Bodegas Campos.

Workshops (in parallel):

- Promoting Tolerance and Ensuring Rights of Religion and Belief
- Combating Racism and Discrimination against Roma and Sinti: Implementation of Chapter III of the OSCE Action Plan on Roma and Sinti

Session 6: Fighting racism, xenophobia and other forms of intolerance and discrimination: *inter alia*, the role of education, the media and law enforcement

Education and the media are powerful tools for influencing public opinion and shaping societal attitudes and values. In this regard, the media and educational systems can have a tremendous impact on a society's willingness to reject or embrace cultural and religious diversity. Efforts to foster an appreciation for the positive contribution of diversity to society, such as awareness-raising campaigns, inter-cultural educational initiatives and inter-religious dialogue play a key role in maintaining social cohesion and mutual understanding.

This session will highlight educational and media practices within participating States that aim to create an appreciation and value for cultural and religious diversity. Ways to evaluate the effectiveness of such programmes in altering attitudes, challenging stereotypes and prejudices and promoting intercultural dialogue and understanding will be discussed as well as measures to multiply identified good practices throughout the OSCE area. How can educational, training, and awareness-raising programmes be promoted and further strengthened in order to foster an appreciation and respect for diversity. What media strategies and educational programmes can enhance audience receptiveness and sensitivity to cultural diversity and tolerance? What tools can be used to track the potential development of racist, xenophobic and extremist attitudes expressed through the media? What strategies exist to combat such attitudes? How can the growing phenomena of discrimination against the Roma and Sinti populations in Europe be effectively addressed and countered through the media? What are the best strategies of minority media to provide opinions, views and representations that are being omitted by the dominant media? How can journalistic practices, media strategies and educational programmes (formal and informal) be better promoted throughout the OSCE region? What role could the OSCE play in the field of promoting tolerance and diversity in the media and educational systems?

Special attention will also be given, within the session and in a separate workshop, to the Action Plan on Improving the Situation of Roma and Sinti within the OSCE Area, particularly Chapter III.

Moderator: Anastasia Crickley, Personal Representative of the OSCE Chairman-in-Office on Combating Racism, Xenophobia, Discrimination, also focusing on Intolerance and Discrimination against Christians and Members of Other Religions

Introducers: Doudou Diène, UN Rapporteur on Racism and Xenophobia
Ambassador Christian Strohal, Director of the OSCE Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights
Turgut Tarhanli, Professor of Public International Law and Human Rights Law at the Istanbul Birgi University

Note-taker: Ferderic de Touchet, Counsellor, Permanent Representation of France to the OSCE

Topics may include, *inter alia*:

- Implementation of the OSCE Permanent Council Decision on Tolerance and the Fight against Racism, Xenophobia and Discrimination (PC.DEC/621);
- The role of government officials and elected officials in publicly denouncing acts of intolerance and discrimination;
- Good practices by governments, institutions and civil society in fighting racism, xenophobia and other forms of intolerance and discrimination;
- The role of the media, including the Internet, in combating hate speech and in promoting tolerance and respect for diversity. The role of minority media in promoting tolerance and respect, as well as in providing opinions, views and representations that are being omitted by the regular media;
- The role of education, training and awareness-raising programmes in promoting tolerance and respect for diversity;
- The role of law enforcement in preventing, identifying, investigating and responding to manifestations of intolerance and discrimination.

Closing session

Moderator: Juan Fernando Lopez Aguilar, Spanish Minister of Justice

- Reports by the plenary session moderators;
- Conclusions and recommendations. The way ahead: Evaluating implementation.

Closing ceremony

Minister for Foreign Affairs and Co-operation of Spain, H.E. Miguel Angel Moratinos
OSCE Chairman-in-Office H.E. Dr. Dimitrij Rupel, Minister for Foreign Affairs of Slovenia

- Formal closing of the Conference.

(B) AGENDA OF THE WORKSHOPS

DAY 1 8 June 2005

Workshops (in parallel)

The Media and anti-Semitism (at the Sala Val del Omar, Press Centre)

Convened by the Association of European Journalists.

Moderator: Diego Carcedo, Spanish Journalist, Vice-President of the Association of European Journalists

Introducers: Michael Massing, New York Review of Books, United States of America
 Miklos Haraszti, OSCE Representative on Freedom of the Media
 Juraj Alner, Slovakian Representative of the Association of European Journalists
 Jon Juaristi, Spanish writer
 Carlos Luis Álvarez “ Cándido”, President of the Association of European Journalists
 Miguel Ángel Gozalo, Former President of the News Agency EFE
 Mr. Lawrence Franceschini, Deputy Director of the Cabinet of the French Minister for Culture and Communication, France
 Elisabeth Chemia, Director of Proche-Orient.info

Implementation of the ODIHR’s taskings in the field of tolerance and non-discrimination (at the Sala Ambrosio Morales, Congress Palace)

Moderator: Ambassador Christian Strohal, Director of the ODIHR

Introducers: Jo-Anne Bishop, Acting Head of the Tolerance and Non-Discrimination Programme, ODIHR
 Dr. Kathrin Meyer, Adviser on Anti-Semitism Issues, Tolerance and Non-Discrimination Programme, ODIHR
 Paul Goldenberg, Programme Implementing Partner and Chief Executive Officer of the National Public Safety Strategy Group

DAY 2 9 June 2005

Workshops (in parallel)

Promoting tolerance and ensuring rights of religion and belief (at the Sala Julio Romero de Torres, Congress Palace)

Moderator: Dr. Jeremy Gunn, Member of the Advisory Council to the ODIHR Panel
Experts on Freedom of Religion or Belief

Introducers: Dr. Roman Prodoprogora, Member of the Advisory Council to the ODIHR
Panel of Experts on Freedom of Religion or Belief
Dr. Javier Martínez Torrón, Member of the ODIHR Panel of Experts on
Freedom of Religion or Belief
Dr. Malcom Evans, Member of the ODIHR Panel of Experts on Freedom of
Religion or Belief
Dr. Silvio Ferrari, Member of the ODIHR Panel of Experts on Freedom of
Religion or Belief

**Combating racism and discrimination against Roma and Sinti: Implementation of the
Chapter III of the OSCE Action Plan on Roma and Sinti (at the Sala Ambrosio de
Morales, Congress Palace)**

Moderator: Anastasia Crickley, Personal Representative of the OSCE Chairman-in-Office
on Combating Racism, Xenophobia and Discrimination, also focusing on
Intolerance and Discrimination against Christians and Members of Other
Religions

Introducers: Valeriu Nicolae, Deputy Director, European Roman Information Office
(ERIO)
Nicolae Georgue, the ODIHR Contact Point for Roma and Sinti issues

(C) AGENDA WITH THE TIMETABLE

Wednesday, 8 June 2005

9–9.45 a.m.

Opening ceremony

Minister for Foreign Affairs and Co-operation of Spain,
H.E. Miguel Angel Moratinos

OSCE Chairman-in-Office, H.E. Dr. Dimitrij Rupel, Slovenian
Minister for Foreign Affairs

Keynote addresses: Simone Veil
Edgar M. Bronfman

9.45–10 a.m.

Break

10–11.30 a.m.

Opening session: Fighting anti-Semitism and other forms of discrimination, and promoting tolerance: from recommendations to implementation

Moderator: OSCE Chairman-in-Office Dr. Dimitrij Rupel

11.30–11.45 a.m.

Coffee break

11.45 a.m. – 1.30 p.m.

Session 1: Anti-Semitism and the media: *inter alia*, the press, TV, Internet, radio, the film industry

Moderator: Andrew Baker, Director of International Jewish
Affairs (American Jewish Committee)

Introducers: Petra Liedschreiber, Editor-in-chief, Host of the
German TV programme “Kontraste”
Carlo Saletti, Historian, expert on the treatment
of the Shoah by the film industry

1.30–3 p.m.

Workshops (in parallel):

- Anti-Semitism and the media
- Implementation of the ODIHR’s taskings in the field of tolerance and non-discrimination

2–3.30 p.m.

Luncheon given by the Minister for Foreign Affairs and
Co-operation of Spain and the Mayoress of Cordoba in honour
of the Ministers and Heads of Delegations under the Presidency
of His Majesty the King of Spain at the Salon de los Mosaicos
at the Palace of the Alcazar (on invitation)

Lunch by the delegates participating in the Conference at the “El Bandolero” restaurant (for all participants)

3.30–5.15 p.m.

Session 2: Education on the Holocaust and on anti-Semitism

Moderator: Professor Gert Weisskirchen, Personal Representative of the OSCE Chairman-in-Office on Combating Anti-Semitism

Introducers: Cobi Benatoff, President of the European Jewish Congress
Karen Polak, Chair of the Education Working Group of the Task Force on International Co-operation on Holocaust Education, Remembrance and Research
Yehuda Bauer, Adviser to the International Task Force for Holocaust Education, Remembrance and Research
Beate Winkler, Director, European Monitoring Centre on Racism and Xenophobia (EUMC)

5.15–5.30 p.m.

Coffee break

5.30–7.15 p.m.

Session 3: Responding to anti-Semitic and hate-motivated crimes: the role of governments, institutions, legislation, law enforcement and civil society

Moderator: Enrique Múgica, Spanish Ombudsman

Introducers: Edward O’Donnell, United States Department of State
Alexander Brod, Director, Moscow Bureau for Human Rights
Dina Porat, The Stephen Rot Institute for the Study of Contemporary Anti-Semitism and Racism, University of Tel Aviv
Paul Goldenberg, the ODIHR Law Enforcement Officer Training Programme for Combating Hate Crimes, National Public Safety Strategy Group, American Jewish Committee

9 p.m.

Dinner given by the President of the Andalusian Regional Government in honour of the Ministers and Heads of Delegations at the Palacio de la Merced, Headquarters of the Provincial Deputation (on invitation)

Reception — Buffet dinner offered to participants at the Gardens of the Alcazar (for all participants)

11.15 p.m. Cultural event offered by the Municipality at the Gardens of the Alcazar

Thursday, 9 June 2005

9.30–11.15 a.m. **Session 4: Fighting intolerance and discrimination against Muslims: facilitating integration and respecting cultural diversity**

Moderator: Ambassador Ömür Orhun, Personal Representative of the OSCE Chairman-in-Office on Combating Intolerance and Discrimination against Muslims

Introducers: Abduljalil Sajid, Imam and Adviser to the Commission on British Muslims
Gemma Martín Muñoz, Professor of Sociology of Muslim and Arab Countries at the Universidad Autonoma de Madrid
Barbara John, Former Commissioner for Integration of Foreigners, Berlin, Germany
Ambassador Saad Eddine Taib, Advisor to the Secretary General of the Organisation of the Islamic Conference

11.15–11.30 a.m. Coffee break

11.30 a.m. – 1.15 p.m. **Session 5: Fighting intolerance and discrimination against Christians and members of other religions: respecting religious identity in a pluralistic society**

Moderator: Ombretta Fumagalli Carulli, Professor of Canon and Ecclesiastical Law at the Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore

Introducers: Ambassador Mercedes Rico, Director General of Religious Affairs, Spanish Ministry of Justice.
Jacob Finci, President Jewish Community of Bosnia and Herzegovina, Chairperson of Inter-Religious Council
Father Elias Chacour, President of Mar Elias Educational Institutions.

1–1.30 p.m. Press conference

1.30–3 p.m. Workshops (in parallel):

— Promoting tolerance and ensuring rights of religion and belief

— Combating racism and discrimination against Roma and Sinti: Implementation of the Chapter III of the OSCE Action Plan on Roma and Sinti

1.30–3 p.m. Lunch given by the Spanish Minister for Foreign Affairs and Co-operation to Ministers, Heads of Delegations and Participants at the Bodegas Campos

3–4.45 p.m. **Session 6: Fighting racism, xenophobia and other forms of intolerance and discrimination: *inter alia*, the role of education, the media and law enforcement**

Moderator: Anastasia Crickley, Personal Representative of the OSCE Chairman-in-Office on Combating Racism, Xenophobia, Discrimination, also focusing on Intolerance and Discrimination against Christians and Members of Other Religions

Introducers: Doudou Diène, United Nations Rapporteur on Racism and Xenophobia
Ambassador Christian Strohal, Director of the OSCE Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights
Turgut Tarhanli, Professor of Public International Law and Human Rights Law at the Istanbul Birgi University

5–6 p.m. **Closing session**

Moderator: Juan Fernando Lopez Aguilar, Spanish Minister of Justice

— Reports by the plenary session moderators

6–6.30 p.m. **Closing ceremony**

Minister for Foreign Affairs and Co-operation of Spain,
H.E. Miguel Angel Moratinos OSCE Chairman-in-Office,
H.E. Dr. Dimitrij Rupel

(D) REPORTS OF THE PLENARY SESSIONS

Opening ceremony

Summary and general recommendations¹

The Conference was opened by H.E. Miguel Angel Moratinos, Minister for Foreign Affairs and Co-operation of Spain, who underlined that if coexistence was possible in the past, as demonstrated by the experience of Cordoba, we could not resign ourselves to thinking that it was impossible today. He stressed the need to renew the struggle against anti-Semitism in all its forms. Respect and tolerance did not flower spontaneously, but required specific measures and genuine commitments. What was needed was not declarations but rather specific decisions in the field of education, in the use of the media or in the study of history. He also proposed the creation of an alliance of civilizations between the West and the Arab world and Islam. He further more called for more extensive use of the channels of effective multilateralism.

The address given by H.E. Miguel Angel Moratinos was followed by an address by the OSCE Chairman-in-Office, H.E. Dr. Dimitrij Rupel. He pointed out that the issue of tolerance and non-discrimination had become one of the OSCE's priorities. He stressed that implementation was to be the key word of the Conference. There had been structural changes in the OSCE, including the appointment of three Personal Representatives of the Chairman-in-Office on Tolerance and Non-Discrimination, and the launching of the ODIHR Tolerance and Non-Discrimination Programme. He emphasizes that we should celebrate the richness of diversity. He concluded that in the fight for a common cause, the main responsibility lay with participating States — they had to have effective legislation, enforce the law, and speak out against racism, xenophobia and discrimination. The ultimate test would be whether or not communities at risk felt safer, if potential perpetrators of hate crimes were deterred by the full force of the law, and if the message “zero tolerance for intolerance” truly took root in our societies

Opening addresses by H.E. Moratinos and H.E. Rupel were followed by the keynote speeches of Simone Veil and Edgar M. Bronfman. They set the context for the subsequent discussions in the plenary sessions and workshops. Bronfman stressed that we were continuing to experience anti-Semitic brutality and that the road to hate, which takes us to violence, had to be stopped. Mutual respect and understanding between all faiths and peoples was the key to ending hatred and to creating a better world. Desecration of the Koran, the Torah, or the Christian Testament, or any religious site, should be offensive to all of us. He urged the OSCE to further the path outlined in 2004 in Berlin, to teach mutual respect in schools. He stressed that it was also in the interest of all NGOs to join forces in the fight against anti-Semitism, xenophobia and racism.

1 For the statements of the opening ceremony see Annex 4.

Opening session: Fighting anti-Semitism and other forms of discrimination, and promoting tolerance: from recommendation to implementation

After the opening ceremony (see Annex 4), the following delegations participated in this discussion (in speaking order): Luxembourg (on behalf of the European Union and the acceding countries Bulgaria and Romania and the candidate countries Turkey and Croatia), Israel, Morocco, United Kingdom, United States of America, Holy See, Bulgaria, Romania, Croatia, Serbia and Montenegro, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Germany, Ireland, Belarus, OSCE Parliamentary Assembly, Greece, Italy, Russian Federation, Belgium, Turkey, Poland, Ukraine, Czech Republic, Lithuania, Estonia, Hungary, Slovakia, Kazakhstan, Sweden, Cyprus, Canada, France, Switzerland, Armenia, Algeria, Tunisia, Norway, B'nai Brith, League of Arab States.

Summary and general recommendations

It was agreed that intolerance and discrimination were not only a violation of human dignity but also a threat to open and democratic societies and thereby to their stability. Delegations came together to confirm their commitments to combat anti-Semitism and other forms of intolerance and discrimination and to increase their ability to do so by exchanging information and best practices. An overwhelming participation in the opening session highlighted progress in implementing tasks set in 2004 in Berlin, Paris and Brussels. However, delegations recognized that the promotion of tolerance, mutual understanding and respect for diversity within societies and across societies was an ongoing task.

Delegations had an exchange on best practices in promoting awareness and respect between the cultural communities of the OSCE region, in enacting laws and policies to combat discrimination and intolerance, and in enforcing those laws and policies.

Delegations reaffirmed that the issues of tolerance and non-discrimination would remain high on their agenda. They commended the ODIHR for setting up the new Tolerance and Non-Discrimination Programme. They commended the work of the three Personal Representatives of the Chairman-in-Office. They also appreciated the increased and co-ordinated activities of other OSCE institutions and bodies: the OSCE High Commissioner for National Minorities, the OSCE Representative for Freedom of the Media, and the OSCE Parliamentary Assembly.

Delegations emphasized that the main responsibility for combating racism, xenophobia, anti-Semitism and other acts of intolerance and discrimination lay with the participating States.

Delegations commemorated the Holocaust as one of the darkest chapters of human history. The Holocaust taught one lesson: silence and inaction is no solution. Delegations made a pledge for the present and the future to prevent, to condemn and to resist. They spoke out for not closing eyes to the reappearance of anti-Semitism within the OSCE area. They emphasized that like all other forms of intolerance, anti-Semitism had to be fought by each individual and all groups, not only by Jewish people, but also by Muslims, Christians and those of other faiths.

Inspired by the spirit of Cordoba, delegations engaged in inter- and intra-religious dialogue on how to achieve a better understanding of the requirements of religious freedom, how to ensure that members of all religions or beliefs can enjoy their religious freedom without any form of discrimination, and contribute to a culture of tolerance.

Delegations recognized that in promoting tolerant societies, they had to ensure respect for the rights of persons belonging to national minorities and to adopt, where necessary, special measures for this purpose.

Migration and integration was highlighted as one of the major challenges of the twenty-first century. As societies throughout the OSCE region became increasingly multi-cultural, we should not be afraid of “otherness”. Tolerant societies celebrated the richness of diversity; delegations encouraged all those striving for integration while respecting diversity. Delegations thanked the Chairman-in-Office for having chosen migration and integration as one of the key concepts of his activities in 2005.

Delegations presented in detail the status of implementation of commitments in the field of tolerance and non-discrimination. Looking forward, delegations refined a roadmap for the full implementation of their commitments. While some delegations proposed to bring together governmental actors and civil society on national level in order to review implementation of commitments undertaken in Berlin, Paris, and Brussels, and refined in Cordoba, it was also proposed that the OSCE should hold a follow-up conference on “mutual respect and understanding as aspects of the realization of intercultural, interethnic and interreligious dialogue”.

As a general theme in the fight against intolerance and discrimination, delegations recognized that some forms of intolerance and discrimination had unique characteristics and origins, and this required distinct definition and treatment. Sixty years after the end of the Second World War, Cordoba was also a conference of remembrance dedicated to the unique and revolting history of anti-Semitism. In remembering the Holocaust, delegations recalled that intolerance could lead to crimes against humanity and that all generations had to oppose prejudice and discrimination “here and now”.

Additional recommendations

To OSCE participating States

European Union

- The European Union is firmly resolved to fight all forms of intolerance, racial discrimination, xenophobia and anti-Semitism;
- Facing the painful question of the resurgence of anti-Semitism, participating States should underline their determination to mobilize governments and civil society to combat this abomination without hesitation;
- Participating States should resolve to combat discrimination against Muslims, Christians and members of other religions and convictions as well as discrimination based on sex, sexual orientation, age and disability as enshrined in Article 13 of the Amsterdam Treaty.

United Kingdom

- To make commitments which came out of the OSCE Conferences at Berlin, Paris and Brussels a reality, it is important that participating States recognize the problem, then they can take steps to deal with it.

United States of America

- Participating States should follow a three-pronged approach — promoting awareness, appreciation and respect between their many cultural communities, enacting tough laws and policies to combat acts of discrimination and hate, and enforcing those laws and policies aggressively and constantly;
- Participating States should define, discover, quantify, study and eradicate anti-Semitism and all forms of ethnic and religious intolerance and violence whenever and wherever they are discovered.

Holy See

- Intolerance against Christians and members of other religions must be overcome with the same determination with which the struggle against anti-Semitism and discrimination against Muslims is carried out;
- The OSCE should commit itself to establish effective tools and mechanism to fight against prejudice and misrepresentations of Christians and members of other religions in the media and through education. The OSCE should also promote the effective contribution of Churches and religious communities to the public life.

Romania

- Participating States should recognize the substantial contributions of the NGOs to addressing the issue of intolerance.

Croatia

- Participating States should promote active co-operation with non-governmental organizations in the area of human rights and allocate funds for projects to NGOs directly from the State budget, in particular those whose programme promotes human rights and tolerance.

Bosnia and Herzegovina

- Participating States should reject the identification of terrorism and extremism with one religion, culture, ethnic group, nationality or race.

Russian Federation

- Participating States have a duty to continue to pay respect to the memory of all the soldiers who died liberating Europe from Fascism and saving not only the Jewish but also many other people from total destruction.

Turkey

- Respecting diversity does not mean creating “parallel societies” separated by walls of indifference, ignorance and hostility. Multiculturalism or “cultural diversity” should not be used as an excuse for ignoring the fundamental human rights.

Czech Republic

- Participating States should look at the relationship between tolerance and identity. A reflection of one’s own identity is one of the ways to cure not only the consequences, but also the causes of anti-Semitism.

Kazakhstan

- New threats and challenges, in particular, rise in number of regional conflicts because of religious, racial and interethnic confrontations, growth of international terrorism and extremist activities, demand co-ordination of joint efforts in order to be able to address such complex problems.

Sweden

- Participating States should examine the mechanisms of exclusion and discrimination that may be built into the official structures and institutions of society.

B’nai B’rith International

- We should adopt, within the OSCE, the European Monitoring Centre on Racism and Xenophobia’s working definition of anti-Semitism, and provide for the utilization of that EUMC standard in the monitoring efforts of the ODIHR;
- We must maintain our commitment to the specialized treatment of the roots and manifestations of anti-Semitism, even as we fittingly deplore and take firm steps to address intolerance in its many forms.

Jacob Blaustein Institute

To the OSCE

- Extend the mandate of the newly appointed OSCE personal representatives and those in the ODIHR who are tasked to collect information on intolerance, especially those addressing anti-Semitism, which is a distinct phenomenon;
- Provide support for the personal representatives so they can work independently and direct their energies to where they are most needed, in accord with their mandates;

- Use a human rights response and methodology to address anti-Semitic acts, in accord with the OSCE's leading role in responding to human rights problems.

World Jewish Congress

- The challenge to the OSCE is to continue to give teeth to the monitoring programmes designed to expose and stamp out expressions of anti-Semitism.

Session 1: Anti-Semitism and the media: *inter alia*, the press, TV, the Internet, radio, the film industry

After the speeches of the introducers (see Annex 4), the following delegations participated in this discussion (in speaking order): Switzerland, Russian Federation, Media Monitoring Agency, Finland, European Roma Information Office, Jewish Community of Armenia, United States of America, World Union of Jewish Students, Institute of the Holocaust and the Law, Council of Jewish Institutions in France — CRIF, United Kingdom, Lithuanian Human Rights League.

Summary and general recommendations

Several delegates pointed out that offences, racism and anti-Semitism were often linked with general frustration and irritation over the development of a certain society. The media had to cover and report on both phenomena without setting the one up against the other, and without creating stereotypes. Anti-Semitism was an ancient hatred based upon rumour, fabrications, and falsehoods, but had become part of so-called modernity.

However, as mentioned by the introducers and some delegates, there was no such thing as objective reporting on intolerance and anti-Semitism. Journalists were always influenced by their own opinions and feelings — however, developing a strong personal ethic and taking a stand were crucial in this context. This presented a special challenge to the media to provide its audience with material suitable as a basis for an informed opinion.

The media, such as the film industry and broadcasters, had an essential role to play in helping us to understand the personal stories behind the broad lines. It was agreed that in understanding the Holocaust or any other modern forms of repression and intolerance, we must remember the past and use it in our common fight against new or old forms of intolerance. Thus, as one of the introducers said, remembrance was our duty!

Now that people throughout the world are able to access information on the Internet quickly and easily, much of which serves a very positive purpose, among other things in countering anti-Semitism, it was unfortunate, as many delegates pointed out, that it could also serve the purposes of those wishing to continue to purvey hatred. Several delegates therefore suggested that participating States should find legal ways to restrict the ability of right-wing extremists to broadcast their views, and systematically prosecute those who go “over the line”. On the other hand, States must be willing to channel enough resources into education, and to develop new tools in the fight against all forms of hate propaganda.

Additional recommendations

United States of America

To OSCE participating States

- OSCE participating States should encourage their national media to provide balanced reporting and should condemn anti-Semitic slants;
- Political and religious leaders in OSCE participating States should also follow the Vatican's lead by clearly and publicly condemning "anti-Zionism as a more recent manifestation of anti-Semitism".

To the OSCE

- OSCE might provide training for journalists, filmmakers, and NGOs that promotes balanced reporting on Israel and Jewish issues;
- The ODIHR or the Office of the Representative for Freedom of the Media could hold expert meetings with Internet Service Providers, editors, news and film producers emphasizing the need for balanced portrayals of Israel.

World Union of Jewish Students

- The participating States should work together in the fight against discrimination;
- The participating States should seek active co-operation with local and international NGOs. Co-operation will strengthen the fight against discrimination;
- The participating States and the OSCE Chairman-in-Office should strengthen the role of the personal representatives of the Chairman-in-Office and should give them the tools and resources to start working actively on the implementation of the "Berlin Declaration".

Council of Jewish Institutions of France

- The participating States should revise their practices regarding the problem of racist and anti-Semitic content of certain satellite televisions;
- The participating States should mutual reinforce their resources in observing medias which are broadcasting racist and anti-Semitic contents;
- The participating States should, through the framework of their national legislation, ensure that those responsible, inter alia cable or satellite providers, are given a direct responsibility for any illegal or compromising content that are being broadcasted.

Session 2: Education on the Holocaust and anti-Semitism

After the speeches of the introducers (see Annex 4), the following delegations participated in this discussion (in speaking order): Switzerland, United States of America, Austria, European Centre for Antigypsism Research, Center Aver of Research and Action against all Forms of Racism, Russian Federation, OSCE/ODIHR, Fondation pour la mémoire de la shoah, Azerbaijan, Netherlands, Latvia, Israel, Institute on Holocaust and the Law, OSCE/ODIHR Advisory Panel of Experts on Freedom of Religion and Belief.

Summary and general recommendations

At this session participants reiterated the pivotal role of education in promoting tolerance and respect for diversity. A comprehensive approach in education was necessary to succeed in the fight against anti-Semitism and other forms of intolerance. Several participants stressed that Holocaust education was not sufficient to combat present-day anti-Semitism in all its forms. It was therefore important that the history of the Holocaust and present-day anti-Semitism should be treated as distinct subjects. Teaching materials should not focus solely on anti-Semitism, but on the role that stereotypes and prejudices play in societies and on the nature and consequences of prejudices about Muslims, Jews, homosexuals, Roma and Sinti, and other minorities. Jewish history and its contribution to European societies should also be included in these materials. Participants touched upon the importance of teacher-training programmes and upon the need for teachers to be aware of their role in the formation of their student's identities and in the development of children's values. Several speakers stressed the importance of remembering the Holocaust and establishing of Holocaust memorial museums.

The OSCE Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights talked about its plan to hold an expert forum in co-operation with Yad Vashem and the Anne Frank House to develop modules for teacher-training programmes and practical guidelines for teachers.

One of the speakers suggested that we should link the educational struggle against anti-Semitism with that against Islamophobia. It was also stressed that we should devise educational strategies that emphasized the connection between the Islamic, Christian-European and Judaic civilizations, their achievements and their problems, as a practical, rather than an abstract, way of teaching mutual understanding, and of encouraging not just tolerance, but acceptance.

Another speaker recommended that dialogue should be encouraged as an important requisite of successful educational programmes, especially dialogue between groups in our societies that were confronted with different forms of intolerance and discrimination and could benefit from working together in education. Teachers needed to be given the opportunity to discuss the problems they face in teaching about the Holocaust and anti-Semitism. This meant that at a national and international level it was important to make teachers' conferences possible. It was added that the exchange of best practices should form a central element in these conferences, as it was an effective way to contribute to successful teaching methods. It was emphasized that NGOs and educational authorities should work together in creating teaching materials that are easily available to teachers and appropriate for teaching at all levels. One speaker suggested that the OSCE and its participating States should develop educational programmes aiming at an improved and deeper knowledge of the history, traditions and culture of the Jewish people in Europe.

One of the participants recommended that the OSCE should encourage parliaments of all participating States to have parliamentary committees consider and recommend legislation on educational reforms to deal with hate crimes, and to work for other educational reforms at all levels.

Another speaker proposed that a different approach in our societies is necessary: an approach of inclusion, of valuing, of respect for difference; an approach which includes the past and our memory; a memory which enables us to work for a culture of respect, dignity and justice, and for a culture of healing; a healing which celebrates diversity in all its different shades and tones and makes for a colourful Europe.

It was further recommended to reinforce Permanent Council Decision No. 607 concerning the fight against anti-Semitism, taken prior to the 2004 OSCE Conference on Anti-Semitism in Berlin, the OSCE and its participating States should develop projects to promote initiatives in the field of education that can be shared by the Organization's participating States in fields such as education in European citizenship.

Finally, one speaker recommended that school programmes of European States should devote more time to the history of Israel, and to the origin and birth of the modern State of Israel as an integral part of European history. There should be more promotion of academic and training exchanges aimed at improving and deepening knowledge of Israel's current history. This would contribute significantly to the fight against anti-Semitism. The governments and institutions from the OSCE region should formally commit themselves to taking action against anti-Semitic teachings and education in the schoolbooks of some countries of the Mediterranean basin and the Middle East.

Additional recommendations

United States of America

To the OSCE

- To encourage the establishment of a major museum/resource centre in every country to help educate and focus people on these vital issues;
- To establish an OSCE lending library of films and DVDs on intolerance in various languages for distribution to schools and religious centres;
- To create a poster series on the Holocaust for distribution to all OSCE participating States;
- To hold a future conference at a location that houses such a major facility in order to encourage discussion and help stimulate new material for use in educational programmes;
- To post an OSCE compliance record sheet that would track each country's implementation record.

Russian Federation

- There is a need for concerted efforts, however, to draft a joint European strategy to combat manifestations of ethnic and religious intolerance and xenophobia and to step up the exchange of monitoring material regarding intolerance, both within Russia and in the European community;
- There should be no double standards, as is the case, for example of some recent members of the European Union, where there is discrimination against the Russian-speaking minority (not only ethnic Russians but also Russian-speaking Jews);
- The OSCE Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights and the High Commissioner on National Minorities, Mr. Rolf Ekéus, should intensify monitoring in the OSCE area, including the Baltic States, with particular account taken of the decisions adopted at the third Council of Europe summit in Warsaw.

Jacob Blaustein Institute for the Advancement of Human Rights (JBI)

To OSCE participating States

- Link educational programmes, including both Holocaust education and general tolerance education, to focus on fighting contemporary anti-Semitism.

Session 3: Responding to anti-Semitic and hate-motivated crimes: the role of governments, institutions, legislation, law enforcement and civil society

After the speeches of the introducers (see Annex 4), the following delegations participated in this discussion (in speaking order): SOVA — Centre for Information and Analysis, Federal Jewish National Cultural Autonomy of the Russian Federation, La voix des Roms — The Voice of Roma, Jacob Blaustein Institute for the Advancement of Human Rights, United States of America, ILGA Europe — International Lesbian and Gay Association Europe, Netherlands, Russian Federation, European Roma Rights Centre, Magen League, World Association of Belarusian Jewry, France, Consistoire Centrale Israélite de France, United Kingdom — Community Security Trust, Switzerland, Ukraine, OSCE/ODIHR.

Summary and general recommendations

Speakers in this session emphasized the need for a concerted effort between governments, law enforcement agencies, civil society and NGOs. Unanimously, they highlighted the important role of legislation — in particular of laws criminalizing hate crimes, discrimination, and incitement to acts of anti-Semitism and intolerance. The tragic history of anti-Semitism and the Holocaust pointed to a need for particular attention to training law enforcement officers and educating young people to combat this evil and to promote tolerance and respect for diversity.

Speakers stressed that these tasks required OSCE participating States to move beyond declarations and political commitments to implementation of concrete programmes and

projects. Several national best practices were recommended, and Paul Goldenberg presented a set of the ODIHR training and data-collection projects that had proved extremely effective in Spain and Hungary. Ambassador O'Donnell, Dina Porat, and Alexander Brod all gave examples of the crucial need to collect and maintain data and statistics, and all offered concrete tools for doing so effectively. Several speakers — both from the podium and the floor — urged participating States to make full use of the assistance available through the ODIHR and NGO projects.

Session introducers explained the benefits of partnerships between and among NGOs and government — and also between and among members of all religious and ethnic groups in society — to ensure the passing and enforcement of appropriate legislation to combat anti-Semitism and hate crimes. Legislation was a key not only to responding to hate crimes, but also to preventing them. Legislation also helped vulnerable groups feel safe in their communities.

Speakers explained that law enforcement officers had to be properly trained to take hate crimes seriously, even when these crimes were non-violent. Graffiti, cemetery desecration, and desecration of synagogues and places of worship were to be investigated with the same vigour as assaults and murders. Victims were to be made to feel comfortable reporting hate crimes, which would require the training of police officers, ombudsmen, and social workers. In this regard, speakers explained that training could help officers be sensitive to the particular forms of evidence, and to the sensibilities of victims of anti-Semitic, homophobic, anti-Roma, and other hate crimes. Civil society organizations could be of particular assistance to victims in need of counselling.

Finally, speakers emphasized that legislation alone was not enough. Political will was required to ensure that crimes and discrimination were properly prosecuted and perpetrators held accountable. This, too, required a concerted effort on the part of all government agencies, and partnerships with civil society.

Additional recommendations

Ukraine

To the OSCE

- To expend the ODIHR's Hate Crime Training Programme for Law Enforcement Authorities, which would contribute to the development of the OSCE participating States' capacities in preventing, identifying, investigating and responding to anti-Semitic and hate-motivated crimes.

Jacob Blaustein Institute for the Advancement of Human Rights (JBI)

To the participating States

- Comply with their OSCE Commitments to combat anti-Semitism and discrimination at Copenhagen and since then, by adopting domestic legislation and enforcing it vigorously.
- Establish systems of monitoring incidents of anti-Semitism in each country.

ILGA Europe

To OSCE participating States

- To amend the draft Cordoba Declaration as circulated to include harassment and incitement to hate crime motivated by sexual orientation, gender identity and gender expression;
- To adopt and use the working definition of hate crimes developed by the ODIHR;
- To include sexual orientation and gender identity in the definition of hate crimes;
- To develop police training so that no crimes based on homophobic violence go unreported out of subsequent fear;
- To participate in the pilot training developed by the ODIHR for law enforcement on hate crimes;
- To develop awareness of, and support tolerance in all societies, in particular with regard to social and cultural events by minority groups.

To the OSCE

- States and institutions should support the further development of the recording and monitoring of hate crimes.

Session 4: Fighting intolerance and discrimination against Muslims: facilitating integration and respecting cultural diversity

After the speeches of the introducers (see Annex 4), the following delegations participated in this discussion (in speaking order): Union des Organisations Islamiques de France, Turkey, UNESCO, United States of America, OSCE Parliamentary Assembly, National Council for Canada, Denmark, OSCE/ODIHR, Russian Federation, Switzerland, Leadership Conference on Civil Rights, Austria, France, Ukraine, Sweden.

Summary and general recommendations

At this session, participants addressed intolerance and discrimination against Muslims as well as their integration into societies where they reside while respecting their cultural identity. Different approaches to the challenges posed by this phenomenon were discussed on the basis of country-specific examples and best practices.

There was general agreement among the participants that intolerance towards Muslims, discrimination against Muslims, and the stigmatization and marginalization of Muslims were on the rise throughout the OSCE area, but particularly in countries where Muslims were immigrants rather than established minority religious groups. Some participants used the concept “Islamophobia” when referring to discrimination and hostility against Muslims and Islam, and proposed the term to denote a new form of racism based on

religion comparable to anti-Semitism. One speaker suggested that wherever anti-Semitism was mentioned, “Islamophobia” should also be mentioned because they were two sides of the same coin.

It was also stressed that although manifestations of intolerance and discrimination against Muslims had increased in the post 9/11 period, biased portrayal of Muslims and prejudiced attitudes towards them had prevailed even before. However, after 9/11, concern about religious fundamentalism and the fight against terrorism had introduced elements of greater complexity into addressing issues related to intolerance and discrimination against Muslims and their integration.

Particular consideration was given to the necessity of a legal framework to protect Muslims against discrimination and of a monitoring mechanism to report incidents of discrimination and hate crimes against them, and to the importance of devising strategies to integrate Muslims into societies where they reside. It was suggested that acknowledging the fact that Muslim immigrants would remain in the receiving countries was an essential first step for any sound integration strategy. Integration would also be facilitated if the Muslim contribution to European civilization and to the societies where they live today was highlighted, and the stereotypes about them dismantled. The media had an important role and responsibility in this regard. Political leaders, opinion leaders, community leaders and most importantly religious leaders had a responsibility to condemn all forms of intolerance and discrimination and to promote tolerance and diversity. Inclusion and participation of Muslims in decision-making processes was cited as a key component of integration. Many participants pointed out that promoting inter-cultural and inter-faith dialogue based on commonly shared values was important for the promotion of mutual understanding and respect among communities.

An assessment was made of the role of the Personal Representative of the OSCE Chairman-in-Office in raising awareness, and of the ODIHR in data collection and analysis regarding intolerance and discrimination against Muslims, and their activities in this field were commended. Activities and reports of other international agencies such as the European Monitoring Centre on Racism and Xenophobia (EUMC) were also referred to by the participants. It was considered particularly important that the relevant actors should establish closer co-operation and formulate joint responses.

Further the following recommendations were made:

- There should be no hierarchy among the various forms of discrimination. A comprehensive approach to address anti-Semitism, discrimination against Muslims, Christians and other religions should be developed, but without losing sight of their respective unique characteristics and origins;
- The roles of the Personal Representatives of the Chairman-in-Office and of the ODIHR Tolerance and Non-Discrimination Unit should be expanded, with more resources being made available to them, and co-operation between them being promoted;
- The ODIHR’s capacity to collect and disseminate data on hate crimes against Muslims should be improved;

- Participating States should recognize the need for integration and positive interaction, and special responsibility of leaders in these areas;
- Participating States should reject extremism, racism and xenophobia in all their forms and manifestations;
- A multilateral and concerted plan of action, engaging as many segments of society as possible, must be put into operation. To that end, those responsible should take a comprehensive approach to tackling the challenges faced;
- A mapping exercise on what has been achieved in the implementation of OSCE commitments regarding the fight against intolerance and discrimination against Muslims should be carried out;
- A national monitoring system should be put in place in order to collect data on acts of discrimination and hate-motivated crimes against Muslims;
- In countries where a substantial Muslim minority exists, structures should be established to facilitate relations between Muslims and the State, similar to those existing for Christians and Jews;
- In education, efforts to tackle anti-Semitism should also be related to “Islamophobia”;
- In countries where a substantial Muslim minority exists, Islam should be officially recognized.

Additional recommendations

To OSCE participating States

Turkey

- Genuine Islamic thought and the contributions it has made to European civilization should be included in education programmes;
- Distinction between criticizing and condemning a faith, including Islam, should be made clear and emphasized;
- Standards and principles for responsible journalism should be developed to prevent dissemination of racist ideas and hate-speech against Muslims and other religious groups, without jeopardizing freedom of expression and of the media;
- In taking security measures in the fight against terrorism, universal principles of human rights and fundamental freedoms should be taken into account.

United States

- Mosques and other sites of religious significance should be visited by political leaders as a sign of solidarity.

ODIHR

- Co-operation should be established between the representatives of Muslim community and the law enforcement agencies not only to understand the specificities of crimes committed against them but also to enhance their capacity and willingness to report those crimes.

Session 5: Fighting intolerance and discrimination against Christians and members of other religions: respecting religious identity in a pluralistic society

After the speeches of the introducers (see Annex 4), the following delegations participated in this discussion (in speaking order): Holy See, United States of America, OSCE/ODIHR, Italy, Russian Federation — Orthodox Church, Kazakhstan, Malta, OSCE/ODIHR Panel of Experts on Freedom of Religion or Belief, Kazakhstan Ombudsman, Jewish Cultural Centre of Armenia, Shiromani Akali Dal, Family Europe, Switzerland.

Summary and general recommendations

Participants discussed difficulties and restrictions faced not only by Christians and members of other religions, which do not affect only individuals, but also by religious confessions, in their institutional dimension and in their social role. It was repeatedly noted that in the OSCE participating States these problems nowadays concerned not only minority but also majority religions and could be detected both east and west of Vienna. Secularism and ethical relativism also at times generated discrimination and intolerance against Christians and members of other religions. Examples of best practices regarding relations between religious groups and public authorities were provided, and also examples of national laws on religious freedom in accordance with OSCE standards.

It was noted that when religious groups expressed concerns regarding legislative measures or administrative decisions, this should not be considered as a manifestation of intolerance by those groups.

- Concern was expressed about some interference in the self-organization of Christian and other religious confessions that prevents them from acting in accordance with their own moral convictions. It was consequently recommended that participating States should refrain from these interferences;
- It was also recommended that training and educational programmes that lack due respect for the identity and principles of Christianity and of other religions should be reformed;
- In some areas tensions were registered regarding the recognition of the public role of religions. In this regard, it was stressed that the distinction between religious communities and State institutions did not entail estrangement, indifference, and lack of communication, but dialogue and sharing in the promotion of human dignity as a cornerstone of all human rights. Some delegations therefore recommended that the OSCE should make, and encourage participating States to make concerted efforts to promote the participation of religious confessions in public life;

- Several delegations noted the occurrence in the media of stereotyping, episodes of intolerance and even of denigration and hate speech against Christians and members of other religions. Many delegations recommended that the OSCE should raise the awareness of participating States, and develop measures in order to fight prejudice, intolerance and discrimination against Christians and members of other religion in the media and education. It was also recommended that the OSCE could consider establishing specific mechanisms or tools to assist participating States in taking appropriate action to protect Christians and members of other religions as it does in other fields.

One delegation stressed that there was no longer a need to focus on high-level political conferences, but rather on meetings at expert level aimed at sharing best practices and assessing the implementation of commitments. Another delegation expressed concerns about restrictions, in some participating States, on the use of religious symbols and attire.

Additional recommendations

Holy See

To the OSCE

- The OSCE should promote the presence and the effective contribution of Churches and religious communities to the public life of participating States, guaranteeing their specific identity and recognizing their fundamental contribution to society.

To the OSCE participating States

- The participating States should recognize the right of Christians and members of other religions to participate in every dimension of public life without discrimination.

United States of America

To the OSCE participating States

- The participating States should encourage the media to offer balanced coverage of religious faith;
- The participating States should take action to ensure that educational systems teach the value of faith in people's lives.

Italy

To the OSCE

- The OSCE should elaborate common criteria and effective actions to eradicate ethnic and religious prejudices as well as intolerance in the media and education.

Kazakhstan

To the OSCE

- The OSCE was invited to give a follow up in Kazakhstan to the Cordoba Conference, so as to share with participating States the best practices concerning inter-religious dialogue.

The ODIHR Panel of experts on Freedom of Religion or Belief

To the OSCE

- OSCE/ODIHR should encourage the organization of meetings of NGOs and civil society in problematic areas and in order to focus on the implementation of religious freedom;
- The OSCE should establish tools and mechanisms in order to fight discrimination in the media.

Session 6: Fighting racism, xenophobia and other forms of intolerance and discrimination: *inter alia*, the roles of education and the media

After the speeches of the introducers (see Annex 4), the following delegations participated in this discussion (in speaking order): Azerbaijan, United States, Russian Federation, Netherlands, France, Italy, Armenia, Turkey, UNHCR, Helsinki Federation/Roma Human Rights Centre, European Roma Information Office, Centre Aver of Research and Action against all Forms of Racism, Israel, ILGA Europe, Open Society Justice Initiative, Voice of the Roma.

Summary and general recommendations

Participants stressed that manifestations of racism, xenophobia and discrimination constituted some of the most insidious violations of human rights. It was noted that these phenomena were on the increase throughout the OSCE, and included a dramatic rise in physical assaults. Speakers insisted on the need for a robust response to these persistent problems, to be promoted by the strengthening of ongoing co-operation between relevant international organizations. Speakers called for an equal treatment of all forms of racism, xenophobia and discrimination, and proposed that this should be done firstly — naming and shaming all of them. Co-ordinated, focused and specific responses were required to address these incidents. Participants highlighted the importance of promoting inter-ethnic, inter-faith and inter-cultural dialogue to counter both old and new forms of racism, xenophobia and discrimination.

A special emphasis was put on the role of education and the media. Several speakers insisted on the importance of raising the awareness of the media with a view to better combating the kind of bias and prejudice that was still too often disseminated by the press. One delegation mentioned efforts undertaken to combat racism, xenophobia and discrimination on the Internet.

Participants also stressed the role to be played by government agencies and local authorities in combating discrimination on a daily basis through programmes aimed at providing equal job opportunities, and at promoting mutual understanding among the various communities. A particular emphasis was laid on the role of civil society. Appropriate training programmes to address hate crimes should be made available for the police and other law enforcement bodies, in particular to preclude such detrimental practices as racial profiling. Legal frameworks should also be duly adapted so as to allow for a more efficient fight against racism, xenophobia and discrimination.

Some speakers mentioned the problems faced by persons belonging to national minorities and called for more efforts to combat nationalist ideologies. Many participants expressed their concern about the state of implementation of the 2003 OSCE Action Plan on the Improvement of the Situation of Roma and Sinti within the OSCE area.

- Education: It was recommended that training and educational programmes should be reformed, and it was stressed that school curricula should cover cultural diversity, and that special programmes should be launched to promote the integration of newcomers. In the classroom the child should be protected against all kinds of propaganda;
- Media: The issue of hate speech and the continuing dissemination of prejudices, in such media as TV programmes, the Internet and the press should be addressed by raising awareness among journalists and media professionals, by encouraging the adoption of codes of conduct, by fostering co-operation between all stakeholders — the media, relevant government agencies, civil society and representatives of minority communities — with a view to promoting best practices, and by ensuring reporting on expression of bias in the press. Participating States and other participants were invited to make full use of programmes implemented by the OSCE/RFOM, such as the Freedom on the Internet Cookbook. There was a need for a media handbook of best practices;
- Law enforcement: There was a need for more systematic co-operation among relevant bodies in participating States, training programmes should be made available OSCE-wide, and partnerships with NGOs and representatives of minorities should be developed;
- Civil society: NGOs should be granted support for the establishment of appropriate reporting mechanisms in order to monitor incidents and to promote mutual understanding.

Additional recommendations

Azerbaijan

- The OSCE should enhance its efforts to combat nationalist ideologies and promote relations of good neighbourhood and tolerance among participating States.

Russian Federation

- The OSCE should promote initiatives aimed at promoting a comprehensive and multi-faceted approach in the fight against racism, xenophobia and discrimination.

Special emphasis should be put on the fight against discriminations against persons belonging to national minorities.

Turkey

- In combating racism, xenophobia and discrimination, we should go beyond intercultural education, citizenship education or the teaching of international human rights instruments. The OSCE/ODIHR should develop a concept of “ethical education of human rights” based on the spirit which has produced the “Universal Declaration of Human Rights”.
- The OSCE/RFOM should assist participating States in identifying problems related to racist, xenophobic and anti-Semitic propaganda or biases in the media and support efforts aimed at developing codes of conduct for journalists and media professionals in this field.

UNHCR

- The OSCE/ODIHR should develop a concept of ethical education on human rights as a key to social integration.

Centre AVER of Research and Action against all Forms of Racism

- Participating States should take action to counter bias against Roma and Sinti, in particular through education and awareness raising of journalists and media professionals;
- Calls for representation on government advisory, administrative and other councils in order to understand better and to meet more adequately the needs of the Roms in France;
- Calls for the creation of awareness programmes within the educational system as well as those geared to mainstream society as a whole;
- Asks for the creation of documentation centres and databases on the positive values of the Romani people in Europe, but which also speaks out against discrimination of Romani individuals and groups;
- Calls on supporting the promotion of Romani cultural events in order to reduce intolerance, hostility and overt racism towards the Romani community;
- Stresses the need for a special support to be addressed to young Roms wishing to graduate from middle and high school in order to get involved in all levels of public life, as a means of assuring for more participation and representation of the Roms on governmental, administrative, academic and institutional levels;
- Calls for a better integration of the Roms.

ILGA Europe

To OSCE participating States

- To abolish discriminatory legislation in relation to lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender rights, in particular in relation to discriminatory age of consent in some of the member States;
- To develop educational tools for promotion of tolerance in schools and other educational institutions, inclusive for all minority issues, including sexual orientation, gender identity and gender expression;
- To ensure the ODIHR has sufficient resources to work on tolerance and anti-discrimination initiatives;
- To provide resources for NGOs to ensure proper partnerships between the ODIHR and civil society, as well as possibility to implement joint projects, for example in the field of data collection on hate crimes;
- To ensure continuity, strengthen and fully resource the offices of the three Personal Representatives of the Chairman-in-Office.

European Roma Information Office

To the OSCE

- A monitoring body focusing on antigypsyism is missing despite many reports proving the need for such a body. OSCE should include antigypsyism in its monitoring initiatives;
- Encourage States to adopt a media law or lobby the European Commission for a media directive able to regulate the promotion of equality of opportunities and equal access to broadcasting facilities for minorities (including Roma);
- The OSCE-Council of Europe Conference on Antigypsyism should target specifically big media outlets for its media segment;
- Recommendations for the governments to adopt general laws able to prevent antigypsyism are needed. The OSCE should recommend to its European participating States to adopt the European Commission's proposal for a framework directive on racism and xenophobia from December 2001, which offers a powerful device against racist media slandering and transpose it into national law;
- OSCE should actively promote inclusion of Roma in its structures, as the number of Roma experts is very small. Efforts in this direction, as recommended by the OSCE Action Plan to the national governments should be taken within the organization in order to employ Roma in relevant departments especially in those dealing with monitoring and anti-discrimination;
- Incentives for journalist targeting pro-tolerance initiatives in mass media are needed and OSCE should take an active role in establishing such incentives (prizes or media productions financed by OSCE combating antigypsyism);

- Common trainings for non-Roma journalists and Roma with an explicit target not just in training but delivery of media products should be encouraged under the OSCE.

To OSCE participating States

- Specific recognition of existing antigypsyism and its major contra-effect in achieving social inclusion and stability is needed at the national level. Conferences and public debates hosted by media but also national parliaments about the effects of antigypsyism should be encouraged;
- Participating States should urgently establish national bodies at the governmental level to design, steer, assess and monitor the initiatives, action plans or policies targeting Roma. These bodies should be responsible for monitoring the antigypsyism and design measures to combat it. Facilitating a good working relation with the Roma NGOs should be a priority for those bodies;
- Adoption of the international legislation dealing with protection of minorities and slandering in mass media should be a must. The existing national media councils should include in their management Roma and people from other discriminated minorities;
- Active promoting inclusion of Roma in the relevant national ministries has to be a priority and positive measures have to be taken in order to achieve an acceptable quota of Roma paid from the budget.

Closing session and closing ceremony

After the closing speeches and reports of the moderators of each session (see Annex 4) the following delegations participated in the session: Luxembourg (on behalf of the European Union), United States of America, the Russian Federation.

Summary and general recommendations

Delegations reaffirmed their responsibility for implementing existing OSCE commitments in the field of tolerance and non-discrimination. They acknowledged the recommendations made during the working sessions related to the role of the media in fighting anti-Semitism, to education on the Holocaust and anti-Semitism, to the responses to anti-Semitic and hate-motivated crimes, to the role of governments, institutions, legislation, law enforcement bodies and civil society, to the fight against intolerance and discrimination against Muslims, to the fight against intolerance and discrimination against Christians and members of other religions, and to the fight against racism, xenophobia, and other forms of intolerance and discrimination, through such channels as education and the media.

In his concluding speech, the Spanish Minister for Foreign Affairs and Co-operation, Miguel Ángel Moratinos, thanked all participants and all those who had made possible the successful completion of the Conference. In particular, he extended a word of gratitude to the authorities and citizens of Cordoba for their warm reception and efficiency, in accordance with the city's renown tradition of hospitality. The spirit of Maimonides, he said, had inspired

and presided over the deliberations. The fight against anti-Semitism had received a new impetus, with the presentation of concrete results in the implementation of commitments adopted in previous conferences. After all, the motto of the Cordoba Conference was “from recommendations to implementation”. He mentioned in particular the actions taken by Spain in fighting anti-Semitism. In the same vein, the fight against other forms of intolerance had received adequate treatment in Cordoba. Discrimination against Muslims, Christians and members of other religions was also dealt with in what constituted one of the main innovations of the Conference. In this regard, the Cordoba Conference resulted in a mixture of continuity and change, overcoming previous and fruitless debates about how to deal with intolerance. Looking towards the future, Mr. Moratinos affirmed that the “Cordoba Declaration” to be adopted at the end of the Conference would be followed by an action plan with a concrete deadline.

Finally, at the end of the Conference, the Chairman-in-Office summed up the proceedings of this Conference in what he called the “Cordoba Declaration,” (see Annex 1).

Additional recommendations

United States of America

- Future conferences, if any, should focus on implementation, and should be at the expert level. Participating States should use every opportunity, such as those presented by human dimension implementation meetings and supplementary human dimension meetings, to review progress, gaps and next steps;
- The incoming Chairmanship in 2006 should reappoint the three Personal Representatives on Tolerance under their existing titles. Once the ODIHR programme is fully institutionalized, we envision that the Representatives will no longer be needed. As this conference has clearly demonstrated, however, there remain serious gaps in implementation. The assistance of the Personal Representatives in raising awareness and spreading best practices will still be needed in 2006. Both the current and incoming Chairmanships should facilitate the independent work of the Personal Representatives;
- OSCE work on tolerance and non-discrimination must continue on the basis of the understanding that some forms of intolerance and discrimination have unique characteristics and origins and require a distinct focus in order to be properly addressed. Anti-Semitism — as the Chairman indicated — has a uniquely horrible history. As was evident from the outpouring of statements here in Cordoba, there is still much to be done in the field of combating anti-Semitism, a scourge with a unique and tragic history, the inexplicable recurrence of which in the twenty-first century is unacceptable;
- We also stress the importance of continuing the fight against discrimination towards Muslims, towards Christians and other religions. We urge participating States to ensure that all religious groups are able to practice their faiths freely, alone, or in community with others, through non-discriminatory laws, regulations, policies and practices;

- The OSCE must continue to institutionalize its work in the fields of tolerance and non-discrimination, not only through the ODIHR and every available institution, but also through the field missions. Moreover, States should make full use of the resources and assistance available through the outstanding ODIHR Tolerance Programme;

- Political will is the essential ingredient for eliminating intolerance. Success in implementation of OSCE commitments requires a concerted effort by governments, parliaments, civil society, and members of all religions, races, and ethnic groups. We can talk, we can co-ordinate through the OSCE, but the primary responsibility ultimately rests with participating States.



**Slovenian Chairmanship
Chairman-in-Office**

**CORDOBA DECLARATION
by the Chairman-in-Office**

Distinguished delegates,

Let me sum up the proceedings of this Conference on Anti-Semitism and on Other Forms of Intolerance in what I would like to call

“Cordoba Declaration”.

Based on consultations I conclude that OSCE participating States,

Inspired by the spirit of Cordoba, the City of Three Cultures;

Recognising that respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms, democracy and the rule of law is at the core of the OSCE comprehensive concept of security;

Reaffirming that acts of intolerance and discrimination pose a threat to democracy and, therefore, to overall security in the OSCE region and beyond;

Recalling that participating States have committed themselves to ensure human rights and fundamental freedoms to everyone within their territory and subject to their jurisdiction without distinction of any kind and will therefore provide to all persons equal and effective protection of law;

Recalling the decisions of the OSCE Ministerial Councils at Porto (MC.DD/6/02), Maastricht (MC.DEC/4/03) and Sofia (MC.DEC/12/04), and the need to promote implementation of commitments and operational follow up to the work started in 2003 and continued with the OSCE Conference on Anti-Semitism, (Berlin on 28 and 29 April 2004), the OSCE Meeting on the Relationship Between Racist, Xenophobic and Anti-Semitic Propaganda on the Internet and Hate Crimes, held in Paris on 16 and 17 June 2004, and the OSCE Conference on Tolerance and the Fight against Racism, Xenophobia and Discrimination, (Brussels on 13 and 14 September 2004);

Acknowledging that the purpose of this Conference was to analyse the status of implementation of these commitments and operational follow up at the national level throughout the OSCE region, highlighting progress and best practices with respect to said implementation, including, but not limited to, promotion of interfaith and intercultural dialogue, and the areas of monitoring, data collection, legislation, law enforcement, education and the media;

Commemorating the sixtieth anniversary of the end of the battles of World War II and mourning the tens of millions of people who lost their lives as victims of the war, the Holocaust, occupations and acts of repression, and condemning all forms of ethnic cleansing and recalling our commitments to take every possible action to ensure that attempts to commit genocide are prevented today and in future as well as our commitments to combat these threats, including through the OSCE, and our rejection of any attempts to justify them;

1. Recall the importance of promoting and facilitating open and transparent interfaith and intercultural dialogue and partnerships towards tolerance, respect and mutual understanding and ensuring the freedom of the individual to profess and practice a religion or belief, alone or in community with others through transparent and non-discriminatory laws, regulations, practices and policies;
2. Condemn without reserve racism, xenophobia, anti-Semitism, and other forms of intolerance and discrimination, including against Muslims and Christians, as well as harassment and incitement to hate crimes motivated, *inter alia*, by race, colour, sex, language, religion or belief, political or other opinion, national or social origin, birth or other status; and reaffirm their existing OSCE commitments in this field;
3. Recognise that some forms of intolerance and discrimination may have unique characteristics and origins and require proper definition, but the methods to fight against them are, in many fields, similar and include efforts in monitoring, data collection, legislation, law enforcement, education, the media and promotion of dialogue;
4. Reiterate that international developments or political issues never justify racism, xenophobia, or discrimination, including against Muslims, Christians and members of other religions; and that international developments or political issues, including in Israel or elsewhere in the Middle East, never justify anti-Semitism;
5. Reject the identification of terrorism and extremism with any religion, culture, ethnic group, nationality or race;
6. Underscore that the primary responsibility for addressing acts of intolerance and discrimination rests with participating States, and recognize the importance of implementation, through competent authorities by participating States of the commitments agreed to by the Ministerial Councils in Porto, Maastricht and Sofia, as well as other relevant international instruments in the field of tolerance and non-discrimination, and in this regard:
 - Recall the commitment to develop effective methods of collecting and maintaining reliable information and statistics about anti-Semitic and all other hate motivated crimes and following closely incidents motivated by intolerance in order to develop appropriate strategies for tackling them;

- Recall that legislation and law enforcement are essential tools in tackling intolerance and discrimination and that the authorities of participating States have a key role to play in ensuring the adoption and implementation of such legislation and the establishment of effective monitoring and enforcement measures;
 - Recall the importance of education, including education on the Holocaust and on anti-Semitism, as a means for preventing and responding to all forms of intolerance and discrimination, as well as for promoting integration and respecting diversity;
 - Recall the important role of the media including the Internet in combating hate speech and promoting tolerance through awareness-raising and educational programmes as well as highlighting positive contributions of diversity to society;
7. Commend ODIHR for setting-up the new Tolerance and Non-Discrimination Programme, and in this regard:
- Encourage ODIHR's activities offering advice to participating States on Holocaust education and remembrance, on establishing programmes offering assistance to participating States, in the fields of legislation, law enforcement, and data collection, and on sharing best practices on the issues of racist, xenophobic and anti-Semitic propaganda on the Internet;
 - Recognise the importance of enhancing the co-operation of participating States with ODIHR with respect to the effective implementation of these programmes and activities;
 - Encourage ODIHR to continue co-operation with other OSCE institutions and other organisations, such as the United Nations Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination (CERD), the European Commission against Racism and Intolerance (ECRI), the European Monitoring Centre on Racism and Xenophobia (EUMC), and Task Force for International Co-operation on Holocaust Education, Remembrance and Research;
8. Encourage the ongoing activities of the three Personal Representatives on Combating Racism, Xenophobia and Discrimination, also focusing on Intolerance and Discrimination against Christians and Members of Other Religions, on Combating Anti-Semitism, and on Combating Intolerance and Discrimination against Muslims, and welcome their ongoing role in raising awareness of the overall fight of the OSCE to combat discrimination and promote tolerance;
9. Underline the crucial role national parliaments play in the enactment of the necessary legislation as well as serving as a forum for national debate, and commend the work done by the Parliamentary Assembly of the OSCE in raising awareness in the implementation of the OSCE commitments regarding racism, anti-Semitism, xenophobia and other forms of intolerance and discrimination;
10. Recognise that civil society is a key partner in the fight against discrimination and intolerance and that enhanced communication and dialogue between participating States

and civil society can advance implementation of commitments and operational follow up at the national level.



**Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe
Ministerial Council
Sofia 2004**

MC.DEC/12/04
7 December 2004

Original: ENGLISH

2nd day of the Twelfth Meeting
MC(12) Journal No. 2, Agenda item 8

**DECISION No. 12/04
TOLERANCE AND NON-DISCRIMINATION**

The Ministerial Council,

Recognizing that respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms, democracy and the rule of law are at the core of the OSCE comprehensive concept of security,

Recalling its commitments in the field of the human dimension, enshrined in the Helsinki Final Act, the Charter of Paris for a New Europe, the Charter for European Security (Istanbul Summit, 1999) and all other relevant OSCE documents and decisions,

Recalling Decision No. 4/03 on Tolerance and Non-Discrimination, adopted at the Eleventh Meeting of the Ministerial Council in Maastricht on 2 December 2003,

Welcoming the work done by the OSCE during 2004 in promoting tolerance and non-discrimination,

1. Appreciates the Declaration made by the OSCE Chairman-in-Office at the OSCE Conference on Anti-Semitism held in Berlin on 28 and 29 April 2004 — “Berlin Declaration” and the Declaration made by the OSCE Chairman-in-Office at the OSCE Conference on Tolerance and the Fight Against Racism, Xenophobia and Discrimination held in Brussels on 13 and 14 September 2004 — “Brussels Declaration”;
2. Endorses the Permanent Council Decisions on Combating Anti-Semitism (PC.DEC/607) and on Tolerance and the Fight against Racism, Xenophobia and Discrimination (PC.DEC/621) and the Permanent Council Decision on Promoting Tolerance and Media Freedom on the Internet (PC.DEC/633), annexed to this decision;
3. Further decides to intensify efforts for the implementation of these three decisions, which include commitments in the fields of, *inter alia*, education, media, legislation, law enforcement, migration and religious freedom;

4. Decides to follow up the work started in 2003 and continued with the OSCE Conference on Anti-Semitism, (Berlin on 28 and 29 April 2004), the OSCE Meeting on the Relationship Between Racist, Xenophobic and Anti-Semitic Propaganda on the Internet and Hate Crimes, held in Paris on 16 and 17 June 2004, and the OSCE Conference on Tolerance and the Fight against Racism, Xenophobia and Discrimination, (Brussels on 13 and 14 September 2004). Also welcomes the offer by Spain to host in Cordoba in June 2005 the OSCE Conference on Anti-Semitism and on Other Forms of Intolerance;

5. Welcomes the intention of the Chairman-in-Office to appoint, in accordance with Porto Ministerial Council Decision No. 8, three personal representatives as part of the overall fight of the OSCE in combating discrimination and promoting tolerance. The personal representatives will have their costs covered by extra-budgetary contributions.



**Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe
Permanent Council**

PC.DEC/607
22 April 2004

Original: ENGLISH

504th Plenary Meeting
PC Journal No. 504, Agenda item 4

DECISION No. 607 COMBATING ANTI-SEMITISM

The Permanent Council,

Taking into account the forthcoming OSCE Conference on Anti-Semitism in Berlin on 28 and 29 April 2004,

Reaffirming the participating States' existing commitments related to combating anti-Semitism, and

In order to reinforce our common efforts to combat anti-Semitism across the OSCE region,

Decides,

1. The participating States commit to:
 - Strive to ensure that their legal systems foster a safe environment free from anti-Semitic harassment, violence or discrimination in all fields of life;
 - Promote, as appropriate, educational programmes for combating anti-Semitism;
 - Promote remembrance of and, as appropriate, education about the tragedy of the Holocaust, and the importance of respect for all ethnic and religious groups;
 - Combat hate crimes, which can be fuelled by racist, xenophobic and anti-Semitic propaganda in the media and on the Internet;
 - Encourage and support international organization and NGO efforts in these areas;
 - Collect and maintain reliable information and statistics about anti-Semitic crimes, and other hate crimes, committed within their territory, report such information periodically to the OSCE Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights (ODIHR), and make this information available to the public;

- Endeavour to provide the ODIHR with the appropriate resources to accomplish the tasks agreed upon in the Maastricht Ministerial Decision on Tolerance and Non-Discrimination;
 - Work with the OSCE Parliamentary Assembly to determine appropriate ways to review periodically the problem of anti-Semitism;
 - Encourage development of informal exchanges among experts in appropriate fora on best practices and experiences in law enforcement and education;
2. To task the ODIHR to:
- Follow closely, in full co-operation with other OSCE institutions as well as the United Nations Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination (UNCERD), the European Commission against Racism and Intolerance (ECRI), the European Monitoring Centre on Racism and Xenophobia (EUMC) and other relevant international institutions and NGOs, anti-Semitic incidents in the OSCE area making use of all reliable information available;
 - Report its findings to the Permanent Council and to the Human Dimension Implementation Meeting and make these findings public. These reports should also be taken into account in deciding on priorities for the work of the OSCE in the area of intolerance;
 - Systematically collect and disseminate information throughout the OSCE area on best practices for preventing and responding to anti-Semitism and, if requested, offer advice to participating States in their efforts to fight anti-Semitism;
3. To ask the Chairman-in-Office to bring this decision to the attention of the participants of the upcoming Conference in Berlin and to incorporate it into his declaration concluding the Conference;
4. To forward this decision to the Ministerial Council for endorsement at its Twelfth Meeting.



**Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe
Permanent Council**

PC.DEC/621
29 July 2004

Original: ENGLISH

520th Plenary Meeting
PC Journal No. 520, Agenda item 3

**DECISION No. 621
TOLERANCE AND THE FIGHT AGAINST RACISM,
XENOPHOBIA AND DISCRIMINATION**

The Permanent Council,

Taking into account the forthcoming OSCE Conference on Tolerance and the Fight against Racism, Xenophobia and Discrimination in Brussels on 13 and 14 September 2004,

Recalling the Maastricht Ministerial Council Decision on Tolerance and Non-Discrimination (MC.DEC/4/03), the OSCE Conference on Anti-Semitism in Berlin on 28 and 29 April 2004 as well as the OSCE Meeting on the Relationship between Racist, Xenophobic and Anti-Semitic Propaganda on the Internet and Hate Crimes in Paris on 16 and 17 June 2004 and their results,

Reaffirming the participating States' existing commitments related to the promotion of tolerance and non-discrimination, and

In order to reinforce our common efforts to fight manifestations of intolerance across the OSCE region,

Decides,

1. The participating States commit to:
 - Consider enacting or strengthening, where appropriate, legislation that prohibits discrimination based on, or incitement to hate crimes motivated by, race, colour, sex, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, property, birth or other status;
 - Promote and enhance, as appropriate, educational programmes for fostering tolerance and combating racism, xenophobia and discrimination;
 - Promote and facilitate open and transparent interfaith and intercultural dialogue and partnerships towards tolerance, respect and mutual understanding and ensure and

facilitate the freedom of the individual to profess and practice a religion or belief, alone or in community with others, including through transparent and non-discriminatory laws, regulations, practices and policies;

- Take steps to combat acts of discrimination and violence against Muslims in the OSCE area;
- Take steps, in conformity with their domestic law and international obligations, against discrimination, intolerance and xenophobia against migrants and migrant workers;
- Consider undertaking activities to raise public awareness of the enriching contribution of migrants and migrant workers to society;
- Combat hate crimes, which can be fuelled by racist, xenophobic and anti-Semitic propaganda in the media and on the Internet, and appropriately denounce such crimes publicly when they occur;
- Consider establishing training programmes for law enforcement and judicial officials on legislation and enforcement of legislation relating to hate crimes;
- Encourage the promotion of tolerance, dialogue, respect and mutual understanding through the Media, including the Internet;
- Encourage and support international organization and NGO efforts in these areas;
- Collect and maintain reliable information and statistics about hate crimes motivated by racism, xenophobia and related discrimination and intolerance, committed within their territory, report such information periodically to the OSCE Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights (ODIHR) and make this information available to the public;
- Examine the possibility of establishing within countries appropriate bodies to promote tolerance and to combat racism, xenophobia, discrimination or related intolerance, including against Muslims, and anti-Semitism;
- Endeavour to provide the ODIHR with the appropriate resources to accomplish the tasks agreed upon in the Maastricht Ministerial Decision on Tolerance and Non-Discrimination;
- Work with the OSCE Parliamentary Assembly to determine appropriate ways to review periodically the problems of racism, xenophobia and discrimination;
- Encourage development of informal exchanges among experts in appropriate fora on best practices and experiences in law enforcement and education;

2. To task the ODIHR to:
 - Follow closely, in full co-operation with other OSCE institutions as well as the United Nations Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination (UNCERD), the United Nations Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights (UNHCHR), the European Commission against Racism and Intolerance (ECRI), the European Monitoring Centre on Racism and Xenophobia (EUMC) and other relevant international institutions and NGOs, incidents motivated by racism, xenophobia, or related intolerance, including against Muslims, and anti-Semitism in the OSCE area making use of all reliable information available;
 - Report its findings to the Permanent Council and to the Human Dimension Implementation Meeting and make these findings public. These reports should also be taken into account in deciding on priorities for the work of the OSCE in the area of intolerance;
 - Systematically collect and disseminate information throughout the OSCE area on best practices for preventing and responding to racism, xenophobia and discrimination and, if requested, offer advice to participating States in their efforts to fight racism, xenophobia and discrimination;
 - Support the ability of civil society and the development of partnerships to address racism, xenophobia, discrimination or related intolerance, including against Muslims, and anti-Semitism;
3. To ask the Chairman-in-Office to bring this decision to the attention of the participants of the upcoming Conference in Brussels and to incorporate it into his declaration concluding the Conference;
4. To forward this decision to the Ministerial Council for endorsement at its Twelfth Meeting.



**Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe
Permanent Council**

PC.DEC/633
11 November 2004

Original:ENGLISH

532nd Plenary Meeting
PC Journal No. 532, Agenda item 5

**DECISION No. 633
PROMOTING TOLERANCE AND MEDIA FREEDOM
ON THE INTERNET**

The Permanent Council,

Reaffirming the commitments made at the Ministerial Council Meeting in Maastricht to combat hate crimes, which can be fuelled by racist, xenophobic and anti-Semitic propaganda on the Internet,

Reaffirming the importance of fully respecting the right to the freedoms of opinion and expression, which include the freedom to seek, receive and impart information, which are vital to democracy and in fact are strengthened by the Internet,

Recalling the commitments to collect and maintain reliable information and statistics about hate crimes motivated by racism, xenophobia, anti-Semitism and related discrimination and intolerance, to report such information periodically to the OSCE Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights (ODIHR) and to make this information available to the public, as contained in the Permanent Council Decisions on Combating Anti-Semitism (PC.DEC/607) and on Tolerance and the Fight against Racism, Xenophobia and Discrimination (PC.DEC/621),

Stressing the importance of promoting tolerance, mutual respect, dialogue and understanding, including through the Media and the Internet within strategies based on a variety of measures,

Decides that:

1. Participating States should take action to ensure that the Internet remains an open and public forum for freedom of opinion and expression, as enshrined in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and to foster access to the Internet both in homes and in schools;

2. Participating States should investigate and, where applicable, fully prosecute violence and criminal threats of violence, motivated by racist, xenophobic, anti-Semitic or other related bias on the Internet;
3. Participating States should train law enforcement agents and prosecutors on how to address crimes motivated by racist, xenophobic, anti-Semitic or other related bias on the Internet and should share information on successful training programmes as part of the exchange of best practices;
4. The OSCE Representative on Freedom of the Media will continue an active role in promoting both freedom of expression and access to the Internet and will continue to observe relevant developments in all the participating States. The Representative will advocate and promote OSCE principles and commitments. This will include early warning when laws or other measures prohibiting speech motivated by racist, xenophobic, anti-Semitic or other related bias are enforced in a discriminatory or selective manner for political purposes which can lead to impeding the expression of alternative opinions and views;
5. Participating States should study the effectiveness of laws and other measures regulating Internet content, specifically with regard to their effect on the rate of racist, xenophobic and anti-Semitic crimes;
6. Participating States should encourage and support analytically rigorous studies on the possible relationship between racist, xenophobic and anti-Semitic speech on the Internet and the commission of crimes motivated by racist, xenophobic, anti-Semitic or other related bias;
7. The OSCE will foster exchanges directed toward identifying effective approaches for addressing the issue of racist, xenophobic and anti-Semitic propaganda on the Internet that do not endanger the freedom of information and expression. The OSCE will create opportunities, including during the annual Human Dimension Implementation Meeting, to promote sharing of best practices;
8. Participating States should encourage the establishment of programmes to educate children and youth about expression motivated by racist, xenophobic, anti-Semitic or other related bias they may encounter on the Internet. Also, as appropriate, participating States and Internet service providers should take steps to increase parental awareness of widely available filtering software that enables parents to exercise greater supervision and control over their children's use of the Internet. Materials on successful educational programmes and filtering software should be widely disseminated as part of the exchange of best practices;
9. Participating States should welcome continued and increased efforts by NGOs to monitor the Internet for racist, xenophobic and anti-Semitic content, as well as NGOs' efforts to share and publicize their findings.



**Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe
Permanent Council**

PC.DEC/669
28 April 2005

Original: ENGLISH

553rd Plenary Meeting

PC Journal No. 553, Agenda item 3

**DECISION No. 669
AGENDA, TIMETABLE AND OTHER ORGANIZATIONAL
MODALITIES OF THE OSCE CONFERENCE ON ANTI-SEMITISM
AND ON OTHER FORMS OF INTOLERANCE**

(Cordoba, 8 and 9 June 2005)

I. Agenda

1. Opening of the Conference
2. Opening plenary: Keynote interventions
3. Discussions in plenary sessions and workshops
4. Closing plenary: Summing up and closing of the Conference

II. Timetable and other organizational modalities

1. The Conference will open in Cordoba on Wednesday, 8 June 2005. It will close on Thursday, 9 June 2005. The Government of Spain will host the Conference at the Cordoba Congress Palace (Palacio de Congresos).
2. All plenary sessions and workshops will be open.
3. Standard OSCE rules of procedure and working methods will be applied at the Conference.
4. Discussions in the plenary sessions will be interpreted from and into all six working languages of the OSCE.

Opening ceremony

- Formal opening of the Conference and keynote speeches;
- Presenting the problems posed by anti-Semitism and by other forms of intolerance;

Opening session: Fighting anti-Semitism and other forms of discrimination, and promoting tolerance: from recommendations to implementation

- Implementation of 2004 OSCE Ministerial Council Decision No. 12/04 on Tolerance and Non-Discrimination;
- Presentations and discussions on measures to implement OSCE recommendations to promote tolerance and respect, and to combat anti-Semitism and other forms of intolerance.

Session 1: Anti-Semitism and the media: *inter alia*, the press, TV, Internet, radio, the film industry

Topics may include, *inter alia*:

- The role of the media in fighting anti-Semitism and in promoting tolerance;
- How best to avoid anti-Semitic messages in the media and the Internet;
- The role of the media as part of a comprehensive strategy for actions at the national level;
- The role of the OSCE, its institutions and field presences.

Session 2: Education on the Holocaust and on anti-Semitism

Topics may include, *inter alia*:

- Implementation of the OSCE Permanent Council Decision on Combating Anti-Semitism (PC.DEC/607), in particular regarding the role of education;
- The promotion of educational programmes for combating anti-Semitism as well as the remembrance and education about the Holocaust and all its victims;
- Key elements in the development of school curricula and teacher education programmes regarding the Holocaust;
- Using both Holocaust education and other means in combating today's anti-Semitism;
- How the OSCE, its institutions and field presences, in co-operation with other international organizations and actors, can assist participating States in developing educational programmes.

Session 3: Responding to anti-Semitic and hate-motivated crimes: the role of governments, institutions, legislation, law enforcement and civil society

Topics may include, *inter alia*:

- Implementation of the OSCE Permanent Council Decisions on Combating Anti-Semitism (PC.DEC/607), on Tolerance and the Fight against Racism, Xenophobia and Discrimination (PC.DEC/621) and on Promoting Tolerance and Media Freedom on the Internet (PC.DEC/633);
- Collecting and keeping reliable information and statistics on anti-Semitic and hate motivated crimes. Further strengthening the data collection efforts within the OSCE area;
- Good practices of governments, institutions and civil society in their joint efforts to monitor and respond to anti-Semitic and hate-motivated crimes;
- The role of law enforcement officials in preventing, identifying, investigating and responding to anti-Semitic and hate-motivated crimes;
- Strengthening partnerships between governments, institutions and civil society in responding to and preventing anti-Semitic and hate-motivated crimes.

Session 4: Fighting intolerance and discrimination against Muslims: facilitating integration and respecting cultural diversity

Topics may include, *inter alia*:

- Raising awareness about intolerance and discrimination against Muslims in the OSCE area;
- The importance of dialogue in facilitating the integration of Muslims while respecting cultural diversity and religious manifestations within limitations as are provided by law and are consistent with national obligations under international law and with international commitments;
- Combating and countering prejudices and misrepresentation of Muslims, through education and the media;
- Combating hate speech and discrimination against Muslims in the media, on the Internet, at workplaces and through governmental policies;
- Promoting integration and respect for diversity by encouraging Muslim participation in public life, representative bodies and institutions;
- Follow-up to the 2005 Human Dimension Seminar on Migration and Integration with a special focus on the integration of Muslims.

Session 5: Fighting intolerance and discrimination against Christians and members of other religions: respecting religious identity in a pluralistic society

Topics may include, *inter alia*:

- Raising awareness about intolerance and discrimination against Christians and members of other religions in the OSCE area;
- Presenting and discussing good practices of governments, institutions and civil society in guaranteeing the conditions of freedom for a presence of religion in public and private life within limitations as are provided by law and are consistent with national obligations under international law and with international commitments;
- Combating discrimination against Christians and members of other religions in the media, on the Internet, at workplaces and through governmental policies;
- Combating and countering religious-based prejudices and misrepresentations, including against Christians and members of other religions, through education and the media;
- The importance of inter-religious dialogue in the promotion of tolerance, respect and mutual understanding;
- Models of dialogue and partnership to promote tolerance, respect, and mutual understanding among Christians, members of other religious communities, civil society and governments;
- Accommodating the contribution of Christians and members of other religions in public life; the role of governments, institutions and civil society;
- The role of the Advisory Panel of Experts on Freedom of Religion or Belief of the Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights (ODIHR) in offering technical assistance to participating States regarding legislation or governmental policies in order to overcome intolerance and discrimination against Christians and members of other religions.

Session 6: Fighting racism, xenophobia and other forms of intolerance and discrimination: *inter alia*, the role of education, the media and law enforcement

Topics may include, *inter alia*:

- Implementation of the OSCE Permanent Council Decision on Tolerance and the Fight against Racism, Xenophobia and Discrimination (PC.DEC/621);
- The role of government officials and elected officials in publicly denouncing acts of intolerance and discrimination;
- Good practices by governments, institutions and civil society in fighting racism, xenophobia and other forms of intolerance and discrimination;

- The role of the media, including the Internet, in combating hate speech and in promoting tolerance and respect for diversity. The role of minority media in promoting tolerance and respect, as well as in providing opinions, views and representations that are being omitted by the regular media;
- The role of education, training and awareness-raising programmes in promoting tolerance and respect for diversity;
- The role of law enforcement in preventing, identifying, investigating and responding to manifestations of intolerance and discrimination.

Closing session

- Reports by the plenary session moderators;
- Conclusions and recommendations. The way ahead: Evaluating implementation.

Closing ceremony

- Formal closing of the Conference.

5. The plenary sessions will take place in accordance with the work programme below.

ANNEX 4

PC.DEL/504/05
8 June 2005

ENGLISH
Original: SPANISH

OSCE CONFERENCE ON ANTISEMITISM
AND OTHER FORMS OF INTOLERANCE
(CÓRDOBA 8-9 JUNE, 2005)

H.E. MIGUEL ANGEL MORATINOS

MINISTER'S SPEECH,

OPENING CEREMONY

MR. PRESIDENT¹,
MINISTERS,
LADIES AND GENTLEMEN,

IT IS A PARTICULAR PLEASURE FOR ME TO EXTEND **CORDIAL GREETINGS** TO ALL MINISTERS, DELEGATES, GUESTS AND THOSE ATTENDING THIS CONFERENCE, AND **TO WELCOME YOU TO CÓRDOBA.**

I SHOULD ALSO LIKE TO EXPRESS DUE **ACKNOWLEDGEMENT** OF ALL THOSE WHO HAVE **MADE IT POSSIBLE** WITH THEIR WORK AND IN THEIR VARIOUS FIELDS SO THAT THE **OFFER I MADE LAST YEAR IN BERLIN MIGHT TAKE FORM IN THIS CONFERENCE ON ANTISEMITISM AND OTHER FORMS OF INTOLERANCE.**

¹ Acting OSCE President, the Slovene Minister for Foreign Affairs Dr. Rupel).

I AM PLEASED TO NOTE THE **BROAD PRESENCE** IN **CÓRDOBA** OF **MANY REPRESENTATIVES OF SOCIETY AND OF NUMEROUS NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANISATIONS** AND OTHER **INTERNATIONAL ORGANISATIONS**. WE ALL HAVE A **COMMON OBJECTIVE** IN THE **FIGHT AGAINST ANTISEMITISM AND ALL OTHER FORMS OF INTOLERANCE AND DISCRIMINATION**, WITHOUT EXCEPTIONS. WE MUST COMBINE ALL POSSIBLE EFFORTS. WE ARE ALL NECESSARY. WE HAVE SEEN OVER HISTORY HOW, OFTEN, WHEN THE MAJORITY BOWED ACTIVELY OR PASSIVELY TO BARBARITY AND ATROCITY, ALL THAT WAS NEEDED WAS THE VOICE AND ACTIONS OF A FEW, A MINORITY, TO WAKEN CONSCIENCES AND RESTORE THE DIGNITY AND HUMANITY WE THOUGHT LOST.]

TODAY, THE THREATS TO OUR COEXISTENCE ARE FAR MORE GLOBAL, AND WE NEED ORGANISED COLLABORATION IN CONFRONTING THEM, THE FIGHT AGAINST INTOLERANCE AND DISCRIMINATION GOING BEYOND THE OSCE'S BORDERS. IT IS TO BE HOPED THAT THE **MESSAGE OF TOLERANCE AND RESPECT WHICH I AM CERTAIN WILL COME FROM THIS CONFERENCE** WILL CONTRIBUTE TO EFFORTS FOR A CONSOLIDATION OF WELL-FOUNDED HOPES FOR PEACE WHERE THEY ARE MOST NEEDED. **IF COEXISTENCE WAS POSSIBLE IN THE PAST, AS DEMONSTRATED BY THE EXPERIENCE OF CÓRDOBA, WE CANNOT RESIGN OURSELVES** TO THINKING THAT IT IS IMPOSSIBLE TODAY. WE NEED TO BE COURAGEOUS, AND FOLLOW THE EXAMPLE OF THOSE WHO, IN THE SPAIN OF THE THREE CULTURES, WERE ABLE TO RECONCILE THEIR DIFFERENCES AND OFFER AN EXAMPLE OF COEXISTENCE IN DIVERSITY.

A YEAR AGO, THE CITY WHICH WELCOMES US NOW COMMEMORATED THE **800TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE DEATH OF MAIMONIDES**, THE JEWISH PHILOSOPHER WHOSE LIFE AND WORK REPRESENT THE PEAK OF CULTURAL AND RELIGIOUS COEXISTENCE IN THE SPAIN OF THAT TIME. IN THIS VERY PLACE, IN THE TIMES OF MAIMONIDES, THE **CALL TO PRAYER** SOUNDED FROM THE NEIGHBOURING MOSQUE, IN HARMONY WITH THE **RABBI'S PSALMODY** FROM THE SYNAGOGUE AND THE **PRAYER OF THE PRIEST** FROM THE CHURCH. AT THAT TIME, JEWISH PHILOSOPHERS, LIKE MAIMONIDES HIMSELF, WROTE THEIR TREATISES IN ARABIC, USING BEAUTIFUL HEBREW

CHARACTERS. POETS PRAISED BEAUTY IN VERSES WHERE THE CADENCES OF ARABIC, HEBREW AND ROMANCE COULD BE PERCEIVED. MERCHANDISE WAS EXCHANGED IN THE MARKETS OF CÓRDOBA FROM THE MOST REMOTE CORNERS OF THE WORLD. THE CITY'S STREETS, MONUMENTS AND GARDENS, ILLUMINATED AT NIGHT BEFORE THOSE OF ANY OTHER CITY IN EUROPE WERE, JUSTLY, ORNAMENT OF THE WORLD.

AND YET THAT EXCEPTIONAL MOMENT CAME TO AN END. AS SO OFTEN, INTRANSIGENCE AND THE WISH TO ELIMINATE THE OTHER PREVAILED. IN OUR HISTORY, **LOSS OF THAT SPIRIT OF COEXISTENCE** WAS A TRAGEDY WHICH CULMINATED WITH THE **EXPULSION OF THE JEWS IN 1492** AND, LATER, OF THE MOORS. IN THAT CRUSADE OF THE MODERN WORLD, **SPAIN** OPENED OTHER PATHS TO THE WEST, TOWARD AMERICA, BUT ALSO **LOST AN ESSENTIAL PART OF ITSELF.**

FORTUNATELY, AFTER A LONG AND COMPLEX MARCH, TODAY'S SPAIN HAS LEARNED FROM THE PAST AND HAS BEEN ABLE TO CONNECT WITH THE DEEP CURRENT OF TOLERANCE IT SHOULD NEVER HAVE ABANDONED. AT THE SAME TIME, RECONCILIATION AMONG SPANIARDS HAS BEEN ACCOMPANIED BY **RECOVERY OF HIDDEN OR LOST FACETS OF OUR HISTORY**, AMONG THEM **ONE OF THE MOST BELOVED BEING THE JEWISH DIMENSION.**

SPAIN, SEPHARDI, ARE SYNONYMS. FOLLOWING THE EXPULSION, MANY JEWS REMAINED IN THEIR MOTHERLAND, AT THE PRICE OF CONVERSION. WE OWE TO SOME OF THEM **WORKS WHICH ARE THE PEAK OF OUR CULTURE** IN LITERATURE, MYSTICISM, PHILOSOPHY OR IN LAW. REMEMBER FRAY LUIS DE LEÓN, LUIS VIVES, BARTOLOMÉ DE LAS CASAS. MANY OTHERS WENT INTO EXILE AND BECAME PART OF PILGRIM SPAIN, TAKING WITH THEM THE BLOOD OF THEIR SPIRIT – SPANISH JEWRY – THEIR CUSTOMS AND THEIR NOSTALGIA, WHEREVER THEY SETTLED, AND AN INTIMATE PART OF OURSELVES SURVIVED. THE SPAIN WHICH HAD RECOVERED ITS TOLERANCE RECOGNISED THIS WHEN, IN **1990, THE PRINCE OF ASTURIAS PRIZE FOR CONCORD WAS AWARDED TO THE SEPHARDIC COMMUNITIES.**

HOWEVER, OUR VIEW AND OUR ACTION NEEDS TO GO BEYOND THE LINK WHICH, SINCE TIMES PAST, CONNECTS US

WITH THE JEWISH WORLD THROUGH SEPHARDI. ACCOUNT MUST ALSO BE TAKEN OF PAINFULLY MORE RECENT EVENTS. AS PART OF THE DIASPORA, THE SEPHARDIS, LIKE THE REST OF THE JEWS, SUFFERED THE INDESCRIBABLE HORROR OF THE **HOLOCAUST**. AS WE ALL KNOW, SHOAH WAS THE CULMINATION OF CENTURIES OF HATRED OF THE JEWS. ANTISEMITISM, EXPRESSED IN MANY WAYS THROUGH HISTORY, FOUND ITS MOST APPALLING EXPRESSION IN THE PREMEDITATED EXTERMINATION OF MORE THAN SIX MILLION JEWS, SOMETHING UNPRECEDENTED IN THE HISTORY OF MANKIND.

PRECISELY AT A TIME WHEN THE WORLD COMMEMORATES THE **60TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE LIBERATION OF AUSCHWITZ-BIRKENAU** AND OTHER EXTERMINATION CAMPS, THE CORDOBA CONFERENCE OFFERS US A UNIQUE OPPORTUNITY TO **RENEW OUR STRUGGLE** AGAINST ANTISEMITISM IN ALL ITS FORMS. IN DOING SO, WE MUST START ON THE BASIS OF A REALITY WHICH DISMAYS US: UNFORTUNATELY, FAR FROM HAVING ULTIMATELY CLEANSED OUR SOCIETIES, **EXPERIENCE AND THE MEMORY OF THE HOLOCAUST HAVE NOT BEEN SUFFICIENT** TO END ATTITUDES AND MANIFESTATIONS WHICH CLEARLY ASSAULT THE DIGNITY OF JEWS.

RESPECT AND TOLERANCE DO NOT FLOWER SPONTANEOUSLY. **THEY REQUIRE SPECIFIC MEASURES AND GENUINE COMMITMENTS**. WE DO NOT NEED DECLARATIONS BUT RATHER SPECIFIC DECISIONS IN THE FIELD OF EDUCATION, IN THE USE OF THE MEDIA OR IN THE STUDY OF HISTORY. IT MAKES NO SENSE TO CONDEMN AND REGRET IF THERE ARE NO FURTHER MEASURES MAKING IT IMPOSSIBLE TO REPEAT CRIMINAL OR SHOCKING ACTS. AN INSULT AGAINST A PERSON'S RACE, RELIGION OR ETHNIC ORIGIN DOES NOT JUST SERIOUSLY OFFEND ONE PERSON, BUT SOWS THE SEED OF INJUSTICE AND POSSIBLE EXTENSIONS OF THE AFFRONT.

IN THIS SENSE, I AM PLEASED TO SEE THAT THE **CONFERENCE AGENDA WILL MAKE IT POSSIBLE** TO EXAMINE PRACTICAL ASPECTS OF THE **MEASURES BEING TAKEN TO FIGHT ANTISEMITISM**, USING AMONG OTHER TOOLS **EDUCATION, THE MEDIA AND THE WORK OF THE PUBLIC POWERS**.

MR. PRESIDENT,

THE FIGHT AGAINST ANTISEMITISM WILL FORM A MAJOR PART OF THE WORK OF THESE TWO DAYS. HOWEVER, THE **CÓRDOBA CONFERENCE** WILL ALSO ENABLE PARTICULAR ATTENTION TO BE GIVEN TO **OTHER FORMS OF INTOLERANCE AND DISCRIMINATION**. THAT SHOULD NOT BE INTERPRETED AS AN INTENTION TO CREATE HIERARCHIES. **ALL FORMS OF INTOLERANCE AND DISCRIMINATION ARE TO BE CONDEMNED** AS ASSAULTS ON THE PRINCIPLE OF THE EQUALITY OF ALL HUMAN BEINGS. NONETHELESS, **EACH CATEGORY OF INTOLERANCE IS UNIQUE IN TERMS OF ITS ORIGIN AND EXPRESSIONS, AND MAY REQUIRE PARTICULAR ATTENTION, DEPENDING ON CIRCUMSTANCES.**

DISCRIMINATION AGAINST CHRISTIANS AND THE MEMBERS OF OTHER RELIGIONS WILL FOR THE FIRST TIME TAKE UP ONE OF OUR WORKING SESSIONS. I TRUST THAT MEASURES AND RECOMMENDATIONS WILL EMERGE TO ACCOMMODATE THE +RELIGIONS FACET OF OUR DEMOCRATIC SOCIETIES AND GUARANTEE ITS PUBLIC OR PRIVATE EXPRESSION IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE LAW.

THE SAME COULD BE SAID OF THE STRUGGLE AGAINST RACISM, XENOPHOBIA, INTOLERANCE AND DISCRIMINATION. ANY DISCRIMINATION FOR REASONS AMONG OTHERS OF RACE, SEX, LANGUAGE, IDEOLOGY OR SOCIAL STATUS, IS UNACCEPTABLE. I WISH IN THIS SENSE TO RESTATE HERE **MY GOVERNMENT'S COMMITMENT TO THE FIGHT AGAINST INEQUALITY FOR REASONS OF GENDER.** THE MEASURES TAKEN IN SPAIN AGAINST GENDER VIOLENCE AND TO FAVOUR THE PROMOTION OF WOMEN IN WORK AND IN SOCIETY ARE AT THE FOREFRONT OF INTERNATIONAL EFFORTS, AND I THINK CAN PROVIDE A REFERENCE FOR OTHER SOCIETIES IN OUR SHARED DRIVE TO ERADICATE AN AGE-OLD AND PARTICULARLY PERNICIOUS FORM OF DISCRIMINATION AFFECTING MORE THAN HALF OF MANKIND.

BECAUSE OF THE CONTEXT IN WHICH WE FIND OURSELVES, I WISH TO HIGHLIGHT ESPECIALLY THE CONSIDERATION GIVEN IN A FORMAL SESSION, FOR THE FIRST TIME AT AN OSCE CONFERENCE TO **DISCRIMINATION AGAINST MUSLIMS.** THIS IS AN **EMERGING PROBLEM** ASSOCIATED WITH THE GROWING PRESENCE OF COMMUNITIES OF MUSLIM IMMIGRANTS IN MANY OF OUR SOCIETIES. FACILITATING THEIR

INTEGRATION, RESPECTING CULTURAL DIVERSITY, IS ONE OF THE MOST RELEVANT CHALLENGES AND OPPORTUNITIES WE MUST TAKE ON AT PRESENT. UNFORTUNATELY, OFTEN, THE CURRENT INTERNATIONAL SITUATION DOES NOT FACILITATE THAT TASK. **IT IS TOO EASY FOR SOME TO FALL INTO THE TRAP OF IDENTIFYING ISLAM AND ITS ADHERENTS WITH INTOLERANCE, AND EVEN WITH THE TERRORISM WHICH ASSAULTS US.**

ONCE AGAIN, CÓRDOBA AND MAIMÓNIDES OFFER US AN EXAMPLE AND A FRAME OF REFERENCE. TO THOSE ASSERTING THAT ISLAM IS INCOMPATIBLE WITH THE VALUES OF TOLERANCE AND DIALOGUE, **THERE IS NO BETTER RESPONSE THAN TO RECALL THAT SPAIN OF THE THREE CULTURES, WHOSE LIVING LEGACY TODAY RECEIVES US.**

IN THIS SENSE, A MAJOR CHALLENGE AWAITS THIS COUNTRY: ACCUSTOMED TO EMIGRATE IN THE SEARCH FOR BREAD TO SECURE THE FAMILY, IT IS NOW OUR TURN TO RECEIVE IMMIGRANTS WHO, FOR THE SAME REASON, HAVE ESTABLISHED THEMSELVES IN OUR SOCIETY. THE TRUTH IS THAT, ON THE FIRST MAJOR OCCASION WHEN IT WAS UNHAPPILY PUT TO THE TEST, **SPANISH SOCIETY HAS, FOLLOWING THE TERRIBLE ATTACKS OF 11 MARCH 2004, DEMONSTRATED GREAT MATURITY.** FAR FROM A MASSIVE REJECTION OF MUSLIM IMMIGRANTS OR ISLAM, THE SPANISH PEOPLE WERE ABLE TO REACT WITH THE ADOPTION OF MEASURES TO ENHANCE THEIR INTEGRATION, BASED ON MUTUAL RESPECT AND OUR SHARED STANDARDS OF COEXISTENCE.

IN THIS SAME SPIRIT, INTERNATIONALLY THIS GOVERNMENT IS PROMOTING AN INITIATIVE DESIGNED TO CREATE AN **ALLIANCE OF CIVILISATIONS** BETWEEN THE WEST AND THE ARAB WORLD AND ISLAM. THIS INITIATIVE HAS BEEN WELCOMED BY THE UNITED NATIONS SECRETARY-GENERAL AND BY THE ARAB LEAGUE, AND IS AT THE STAGE WHERE IT IS BEING MADE MORE SPECIFIC.

ALONG THE SAME LINES, OF USING THE CHANNELS OF **EFFECTIVE MULTILATERALISM**, MAY I REMIND YOU THAT THIS YEAR WE CELEBRATE THE **X ANNIVERSARY OF THE EUROMEDITERRANEAN CONFERENCE OF BARCELONA.** THIS IS

A MOST **FORTUNATE COINCIDENCE**, BECAUSE THE BARCELONA PROCESS IS LARGELY DRIVE BY THE VERY EXPERIENCE OF THE CONFERENCE ON SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE, THE ORIGINS OF THE OSCE, AND IN THE HELSINKI CHARTER, WHOSE 30TH ANNIVERSARY IS ALSO CELEBRATED THIS YEAR.

MR. PRESIDENT,

I CANNOT END WITHOUT MENTION OF ANOTHER EXCEPTIONAL COMMEMORATION. AS YOU KNOW, THIS YEAR IS THE **400TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE PUBLICATION OF DON QUIXOTE**, THE SUMMIT OF SPANISH AND UNIVERSAL LITERATURE. IN THIS WORK, CERVANTES' IMMORTAL CHARACTERS FEEL FOR THEMSELVES THE PAINS AND LOSSES OF THE JEWISH POPULATION AND YEARN FOR SPAIN, THE LOST NATURAL MOTHERLAND OF THE MOORS AND OTHER DISCRIMINATED OR EXPELLED PEOPLES. TODAY, SPAIN AND CÓRDOBA BECOME ONCE MORE THE NATURAL LAND OF THOSE WHO, THROUGHOUT ITS HISTORY, HAVE CONTRIBUTED TO ITS ENRICHING DIVERSITY.

THUS, THE **SPANISH GOVERNMENT HAS MADE TOLERANCE, NON- DISCRIMINATION AND DIALOGUES ITS MAIN ENSIGNS**. IT IS PARTICULARLY PLEASING TO SEE THAT THESE VALUES AND PRINCIPLES ARE SHARED IN FULL BY THE ORGANISATION WE BELONG TO. HOWEVER, IT IS NOT ENOUGH TO PROCLAIM THEM. WE MUST BE VIGILANT, AND FIGHT EACH DAY FOR THEM. I HOPE WE WILL DO SO IN CÓRDOBA.

MANY THANKS, AND I NOW GIVE THE FLOOR TO MR. PRESIDENT.



OPENING STATEMENT

**by the OSCE Chairman-in-Office,
H.E. Dr Dimitrij Rupel,**

**at the OSCE Conference on Anti-Semitism
and on Other Forms of Intolerance**

Cordoba, 8 June 2005

Ministers,
Excellencies,
Ladies and Gentlemen

It is my great pleasure to be here in the historic city of Cordoba – a city of three cultures – whose rich tradition of tolerance and respect provides an appropriate backdrop for this Conference. I would like to thank the Government of Spain and especially my friend Miguel Angel for hosting this event and congratulate it on its excellent organisation.

Integrating Diversity for the Sake of Human Dignity

The 60th anniversary of the end of the Second World War, celebrated earlier this year, gives us an extra reason to reflect on the importance of preventing the spread of intolerance and discrimination, religious and ethnic hatred, racism, anti-Semitism, xenophobia, violent extremism and aggressive nationalism. Never again should people have to live in fear on the streets of our cities because of differentiation of any kind.

Security is not only about weapons, army and police. It is about feeling safe where one lives, and about human dignity. Therefore, we should more often be aware of addressing the issues of security from the human security perspective. As our societies become increasingly multi-cultural, we should not be afraid of “otherness”. Nor should we merely “tolerate” each other. We should celebrate the richness of diversity, and ensure the protection and promotion of

minority rights and identities. We should not say “no” to integration, but we should say “no” to division and disintegration. As this beautiful city shows, the inter-action of cultures leads to innovation, growth and renewal. There is a need for mutual respect between minority and majority cultures. There should be a widespread wisdom, that majority can easily become minority and vice versa. This process is called democracy.

We must be vigilant against discrimination and show no tolerance for intolerance. We therefore need to find ways of accommodating diversity while maintaining social cohesion.

Focusing on Implementation

Implementation is the key word of this Conference. We should therefore exchange our experience about best practices, identify areas where implementation is lacking, and seek remedies to recurrent problems.

Last year's OSCE Conferences on Anti-Semitism in Berlin and on Tolerance and the Fight against Racism, Xenophobia and Discrimination in Brussels as well as the Meeting on the Relationship between Racist, Xenophobic and Anti-Semitic Propaganda on Internet and Hate Crimes in Paris resulted in Declarations and Permanent Council Decisions, which were endorsed by the OSCE Ministerial Council in Sofia in 2004.

The famous French philosopher Pascal has said: what is true on this side of the Pyrenees is not true on the other side of the Pyrenees. And one famous bank knows why it advertises the importance of local knowledge.

The Conferences also culminated in structural changes in the OSCE, including the appointment of three Personal Representatives of the Chairman-in-Office: Ms. Crickley, Ambassador Orhun and Professor Weisskirchen. I would like to commend all three Representatives for their efforts to raise awareness about the need for the implementation of commitments and encourage them to pursue their work with a renewed vigour in the months leading up to the Ministerial Council meeting.

The OSCE is about reconciliation of the truths I have mentioned and about local knowledge.

Another major structural change that took place within the OSCE in the past year was the launching of a Programme on Tolerance and non-Discrimination under the Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights. The aim of the Programme is to provide technical support to OSCE participating States and civil society in order to help ensure that commitments are implemented.

Allow me to highlight some of the work that has been done so far.

- In 2004, OSCE participating States made commitments to collect and keep reliable information and statistics on hate crimes and to provide the ODIHR with this information as well as information on relevant legislation to combat such crimes. The ODIHR has now prepared a public report summarizing the information compiled. Unfortunately, the findings fall short of expectations as only 29 States provided statistical information relevant to hate-motivated crimes. Despite this information deficit, the report offers concrete recommendations and refers to specific ODIHR programmes and tools available to OSCE participating States. We may want to discuss the OSCE role in data collection, and what should be done with these data.

- At the Berlin Conference, states were called upon to strengthen education on the Holocaust and on anti-Semitism. As a follow-up, the ODIHR has produced a report, based on a questionnaire it sent out to all OSCE states, which provides an assessment and evaluation of existing educational approaches. The findings from the report will be presented during this conference, along with concrete actions that the ODIHR will undertake, in co-operation with the International Task Force for Holocaust Education, to increase capacity of teachers and educators to teach about the Holocaust and anti-Semitism.
- Regarding commitments to combat acts of intolerance against migrants and migrant workers, a Human Dimension Seminar on Migration and Integration was held last month, which resulted in several key recommendations, many of which were reinforced at the recent OSCE Economic Forum.
- Concrete programmes have been developed and implemented by the ODIHR in order to provide technical support to states in training law enforcement officials in how to identify, investigate and record hate crimes. Pilot projects were carried out in Hungary and Spain. The results of this programme will be presented at the OSCE Police Expert Meeting in September.
- Finally, the ODIHR is actively engaged in assisting and monitoring the implementation of the *Action Plan for Improving the Situation of the Roma and Sinti within the OSCE Area*. Workshops were held in Romania and Poland in order to identify good practice in improving Roma-police relations. The practices will be disseminated across the OSCE region in a *Guidance Manual* as recommended by the chapter of the OSCE Roma and Sinti Action Plan on Combating Racism and Discrimination.

Several other good practices in the field of tolerance and non-discrimination were undertaken by OSCE states last year. While we will hear about many of these positive initiatives during the next couple of days, the ODIHR is also in the process of finalizing the development of a database containing information, reports and a collection of good practices on promoting tolerance and non-discrimination in order to make these practices available to governments and NGOs.

The issues of tolerance and non-discrimination have become one of the priorities for the OSCE. In this regard, I would like to commend the activities undertaken in this field by OSCE High Commissioner for National Minorities, OSCE Representative for Freedom of the Media, OSCE Special Representative on Combating Trafficking in Human Beings and OSCE Parliamentary Assembly.

I would also like to mention the NGO Conference held yesterday in Seville. I am told that the Conference resulted in a significant number of concrete recommendations which will be presented and discussed here today.

The OSCE is also highly appreciative of the enormous work performed by other organizations in this field, particularly the European Commission against Racism and Intolerance, the European Monitoring Centre on Racism and Xenophobia, the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination and the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights. I believe that we need to maintain close co-operation in order to make most effective use of our respective strengths and comparative advantages.

While fighting a common cause, the main responsibility lies with participating States – they must have effective legislation, enforce the law, and speak out against racism, xenophobia and discrimination. The ultimate test will be whether or not communities at risk feel safer, if

potential perpetrators of hate crimes are deterred by the full force of the law, and if the message “Zero tolerance for intolerance” truly takes root in our societies.

I hope for a successful conference with effective follow-up, inspired by the spirit of Cordoba.

Thank you for your attention.

**OSCE Conference on Anti-Semitism and
on Other Forms of Intolerance,
Cordoba, 8 and 9 June 2005**

PC.NGO/16/05
8 June 2005

ENGLISH only

Statement by

Edgar M. Bronfman, World Jewish Congress

Foreign Minister Moratinos

Foreign Minister Rupel

My good friend Governor Pataki.

The OSCE has played an important role in the establishment of human rights in Europe. This organization was critical in protecting Soviet dissidents thirty years ago. Then Foreign Minister Sheveradnadze told me and Israel Singer of the freedoms the Soviet Union was about to grant Soviet Jews to live in dignity and to be able to practice their religion, which he was about to announce at a meeting of the OSCE.

Last year in Berlin, the conference began to fight a perplexing new challenge, the revival of anti-Semitism. This anti-Semitism, the oldest hate, has reemerged in the aftermath of the Holocaust where the world witnessed how horribly low man's inhumanity to man could descend. For over half a century, we have experienced a bloody struggle between Israel, created by the United Nations as a result of the Holocaust, and the Palestinians, who also have rights in the Middle East.

That struggle has become an excuse for a revival of anti-Semitism in the last few years. We have seen many incidents of Jew hatred. There certainly can be legitimate criticism

of Israel. But let us not forget that as a state under constant siege since its inception, it must protect its citizens and fight to survive as the Jewish state.

But whatever mistakes Israel may make, it is not a reason for the burning of a synagogue in Lugano, or the bombing of a Jewish owned pastry shop in Paris, or the stabbing of a Jewish teenager on a street in Antwerp, or the assault against a Jewish family returning home from Sabbath services in Essex.

The Middle East struggle has re-energized a millennia old anti-Semitism. It is illegitimate and it has to stop; it has to be stopped.

The Holocaust and the attempted extermination of the entire Jewish population of Europe was not a German affair alone. There were other willing executioners. Now, we continue to experience repeats of anti-Semitic brutality – Ukraine and Russia stand out for our most immediate concern. Just two days ago, a Moscow court acquitted Victor Kor CHA ginn, who has propagated the blood libel myth and accused the Jews of killing five boys for ritual purposes. The road of hate takes us to violence – and it must be stopped.

I am at a loss to understand why vicious anti-Israel rhetoric exists when Israel's Prime Minister, Ariel Sharon, is making such a decisive effort to bring peace to the region. We all know that a vast majority of Israelis want to end the conflict, to have a democratic Palestinian state living side by side with Israel, and are at one with the Prime Minister.

In Berlin last year, U. S. Secretary of State Colin Powell put it succinctly. He said: "It is not anti-Semitic to criticize the state of Israel, but the line is crossed when Israel or its leaders are demonized or vilified, for example by the use of Nazi symbols and racist caricatures."

That line is crossed when Ariel Sharon is depicted in a newspaper cartoon as a monster devouring Palestinian babies. That line is crossed when an otherwise respectable academic organization such as the U.K.'s Association of University Teachers, boycotts Haifa and Bar Ilan Universities. That decision has been reversed, but the sting remains! It is reminiscent of the Neurenberg laws and Hitler's actions with Guttenburg University. Haifa University has some 25% Arab students. Both Universities are places where freedom of

expression is practiced daily and where mutual respect and understanding between Arabs and Jews is encouraged and is lived.

Mutual respect and understanding between all faiths and peoples is the key to ending hatred and to creating a better world. And while I'm on that subject, I consider desecration to any holy book an insult to me. Desecration of the Koran, the Torah, or the Christian Testament, or any religious site, for that matter, should be offensive to all of us. Mutual respect means just that; you respect me and what I stand for, and I respect you and that which you stand for.

I urge the OSCE to further the path outlined last year in Berlin, to teach mutual respect in schools. Distinguished scholars and educators should create curricula which will be both exciting and effective in teaching not only the awful results of hatred and bias, but also the benefits that would accrue to all of us.

Much has been achieved through the dialogue between the Jews and the Catholic Church. We have also made significant progress with the Orthodox Church. We must extend those dialogues to include the Protestant churches and Islam. We, all children of Abraham, should learn what we have in common. After that, our differences will look quite insignificant.

Last year in Berlin, 55 nations singularly and unambiguously condemned anti-Semitism and committed to specific practical steps to combat it. They included co-ordinated monitoring and reporting, stronger legislation and enforcement, and importantly, education. Many nations have taken partial steps to fulfill these commitments; others have failed miserably to do so.

In the United States last year, the Congress passed and President Bush signed a bill that not only condemned anti-Semitism in all its ugly forms and manifestations, but also ordered the United States Department of State to create an office specifically to monitor anti-Semitism and publish its results.

The challenge to the OSCE is to continue to give teeth to the monitoring programmes designed to expose and stamp out expressions of anti-Semitism; to co-ordinate such efforts

with other organizations and agencies; and to share information and best practices to increase effectiveness. It is the responsibility of this body to hold accountable those nations that do not fulfill their commitments to combat anti-Semitism and protect the rights of Jews and Jewish communities.

The World Jewish Congress stands ready to partner with the various bodies of the OSCE to accomplish these tasks. The Jewish communities of the world will work to hold nations accountable. It is in the interest of all NGO's at this conference to struggle together to fight anti-Semitism, xenophobia and racism.

Last year the OSCE declared that "International developments or political issues, including those in Israel or elsewhere in the Middle East, never justify anti-Semitism." This year I hope OSCE will take the further steps needed to hold nations accountable.

Thank you.

OSCE Conference on Anti-Semitism and Other Forms of Intolerance

Plenary Session on Anti-Semitism and the Media June 8, 2005

Introductory Remarks

Rabbi Andrew Baker

The historian Paul Johnson, writing in the current issue of *Commentary Magazine* (“The Anti-Semitic Disease”) describes anti-Semitism as “an intellectual disease, a disease of the mind, extremely infectious and massively destructive.”

There are no cases in recorded history where a wave of anti-Semitism can be identified as being provoked by a real Jewish threat (as opposed to an imaginary one), he says. In fact, this particular hatred has even caused societies to do things that are self-detrimental. Our presence here in Cordoba might remind us that the Spanish expulsion of Jews (and the persecution of converted and secret Jews during the Inquisition) came at a time when a growing empire could have used the talents that many Jews possessed in the economic and mercantile fields. Spain’s loss proved to be a gain for those countries, such as the Netherlands and England, which provided a haven to these refugees.

Anti-Semitism has defied what we have understood to be the normal definitions of racism and xenophobia. Jews are simultaneously criticized for being too clannish and too assimilated, for being the proponents of international capitalism and world communism, for being too religious and too secular. Anti-Semitism has flourished in places where Jews have had large and prominent communities and where virtually no Jews have lived.

In the last century no single document served to foment anti-Semitism more than the forgery of the Czarist secret police known as the *Protocols of the Elders of Zion*, which purported to reveal a worldwide Jewish conspiracy to secure power and control. Despite the fact that shortly after it surfaced the *London Times* published the results of an exhaustive investigation that

thoroughly discredited it, *The Protocols* has lived on. It has been translated and circulated throughout Europe, the Americas and the Arab world and has confirmed the hatreds of figures as diverse as Adolf Hitler, Henry Ford and the Jerusalem Grand Mufti Amin al-Husseini.

Of course, *The Protocols* lives on in this century, too. And with the aid of television, the Internet, and cable satellite—a dramatized version was produced in Egypt a few years ago—its venom can spread even faster.

We know that media—film and television and the written word—can be a positive force for combating prejudice. Media allows us to understand, to empathize with, and even to experience what others do. The horror of September 11, 2001--the explosions, the collapse of the two towers, the deaths of so many innocents, the flight of would-be victims, the valor and fatigue of firemen and rescue squads—was immediately conveyed around the world, and people thousands of miles from New York could understand and share the pain and the anger. They also could, we thought, recognize that this new scourge of international terrorism was their battle too.

Yet, within a few days of 9/11 other messages were also being sent around the world. Though not headline news on CNN, they traveled swiftly and efficiently on the Internet, via email and through the underground press. Jews who worked in the World Trade Center were warned ahead of time, they claimed, to stay away. The suicide pilots were not terrorists from Saudi Arabia; they were agents of the Mossad and Israel was behind the attacks. Once again, it was a Jewish conspiracy.

At last year's conference in Berlin, OSCE's Representative on Freedom of the Media, Miklos Haraszti, suggested that, "instead of perpetually defending the press from suggestions that it has given in to prejudices" it would be in order to offer a checklist on "possible shortcomings." This included the following questions:

- Does our coverage of Israel obscure the fact that the Israeli Government, like any other democratically elected government, is not only deserving of criticism but is actually living with it...[in a] passionately pluralistic political and media scene?
- In light of [this]...the allegation that...the "Jews" reject every criticism of Israel as anti-Semitism could safely be identified as one of the "new" forms of anti-Semitic prejudice.

He went on to state that, "None of Israel's numerous faults could lead to a labeling of Israeli democracy as totalitarianism, nor to relating its present day violence to genocide, or, as too often happens, to 'a' or to 'some' Holocaust."

How should the media handle this problem? Haraszti suggests that this could be addressed as “simply...a matter of style and taste” with editors applying “the tools which the modern liberal press has developed to use when handling minorities.”

Has the media adopted these suggestions? Do they work? Perhaps this session’s panelists or later the Representative on Freedom of the Media will be able to tell us. However, since last year’s conference, both the European Union Monitoring Centre and ODIHR have developed working definitions of anti-Semitism that seek to acknowledge and define the problem of its “new” forms as Haraszti and others have described it.

OSCE Conference on Anti-Semitism and on Other
Forms of Intolerance, Cordoba, 8 and 9 June 2005

CIO.GAL/96/05
22 June 2005

ENGLISH only

Introductory statement for panel on Holocaust education

Moderator Gert Weisskirchen

*“The postulation that Auschwitz shall never be
again is the first to education.”*

Theodor W. Adorno¹

Dear Ladies and Gentlemen,

It is a great honor for me to host this special panel on Holocaust education. I strongly believe that this is a critical topic of concern to all of us. A better understanding of the impact of teaching about the Holocaust can help us all in our efforts to combat hatred and plant the seeds of respect and pluralism.

As the generation of the survivors gradually disappears, education about the Holocaust becomes ever more important. However, this is in contrast to the findings of recent surveys that show that growing numbers of young people place National Socialism and the Nazi persecution of the Jews firmly in the past, considering it to be irrelevant to the present. Correspondingly, knowledge about basic facts of the Holocaust is declining, according to a 7-country survey recently conducted by TNS Sofres in Paris, commissioned by The American Jewish Committee². Therefore, educational experts have started stressing the importance of programmes that connect the past, present and future.³

There is still a checkered approach throughout the OSCE region to dealing with the history of the Holocaust. While Holocaust education is an obligatory part of school curricula in some countries, little is taught systematically in other countries. It is important to update our approaches to Holocaust education in those countries where the era is widely taught and establish basic curricula in those places where it is lacking altogether.⁴

1 Theodor W. Adorno: *Erziehung zur Mündigkeit*. (Frankfurt am Main, 1971, suhrkamp), p. 88.

2 AJC: *Thinking about the Holocaust 60 Years Later. A Multinational Public-Opinion Survey* (2005).

3 Taskforce Education on anti-Semitism & AJC: *Results of the European Workshop: Education on anti-Semitism*, (Berlin, April 18-20, 2004), p. 10.

4 Taskforce Education on anti-Semitism & AJC: *Results of the European Workshop: Education on anti-Semitism*, (Berlin, April 18-20, 2004), p. 7.

In addition to re-thinking approaches to Holocaust education, it is important to recognize its limits as an antidote to dealing with contemporary anti-Semitism. This is also the main point of a highly commendable new report by ODIHR that surveys the status of Holocaust education and programs to combat anti-Semitism in the OSCE region.⁵ In order to create more awareness of the historical and current manifestations of anti-Semitism, it is critical to distinguish between the distinct patterns of anti-Semitism and issues of racism. Such programmes also need to confront the dilemma that some members of marginalized groups who are themselves victims of discrimination may nonetheless make anti-Semitic arguments. This makes it hard to delineate between victims and perpetrators. One approach is to familiarize students studying history with decisions and moral dilemmas in everyday life, in order for them to better understand parallels to their own experiences.⁶

It is clear that while it is essential to our post-war societies to study the heinous crime of the Holocaust, such education should be complemented by programs that teach about current forms of anti-Semitism. It is important that we do not lose sight of the particularity of the Holocaust. While such education contains important universal lessons regarding discrimination, genocide and other crimes against humanity, it is important to present this material in such a way that avoids de-contextualizing the Holocaust. A recent example in Germany was the phrase “bombing Holocaust” coined by the far right-wing party NPD to describe the WWII allied bombardment of Dresden.⁷ Such phrases are in fact even more dangerous than outright Holocaust denial – the latter remaining a frightening phenomenon in its own right⁸ – because they chip away at the foundations of memory, destabilizing our common understanding of the basic values on which our postwar societies have been built.

A growing danger in recent years has been the shifting patterns of anti-Semitism. Scholars have identified the so-called ‘secondary anti-Semitism,’ which shifts blame for anti-Semitism to the victims. For instance, there is an uncomfortably widespread view that Jews are exploiting the memory of the Holocaust for their own purposes, that Israel is treating the Palestinians in the same way in which the Nazis treated the Jews, or that Jews are themselves to be blamed for anti-Semitism.⁹ Moreover, conspiracy theories and overly simplified views of world politics often correspond to anti-Semitic patterns of thought.¹⁰ Examining such patterns is complicated by the fact that their very elaboration may serve to anchor

5 ODIHR: Education on the Holocaust and on Anti-Semitism: An Overview and Analysis of Educational Approaches (Juni 2005) <http://www.osce.org/odihr/documents.html>.

6 Taskforce Education on anti-Semitism & AJC: Results of the European Workshop: Education on anti-Semitism, (Berlin, April 18-20, 2004), p. 8.

7 Der Stern, 21. Januar 2005, Jörg Schurig/dpa: „Bombenholocaust von Dresden.“

8 Deborah Lipstadt: Denying the Holocaust: The Growing Assault on Truth and Memory (London, 1993, The Free Press/Macmillan).

9 Aribert Heyder, Julia Iser & Peter Schmidt: Israelkritik oder Anti-Semitismus? Meinungsbildung zwischen Öffentlichkeit, Medien und Tabus. In: Wilhelm Heitmeyer u.a.: Deutsche Zustände 3. (Frankfurt am Main, 2004, suhrkamp), pp. 144-165; Henryk M. Broder: Ein moderner Antisemit. Möllemanns Aussagen verraten ihn selbst. In: Tobias Kaufmann & Manja Orlowski (Hg.): „Ich würde mich auch wehren...“ Anti-Semitismus und Israel-Kritik – Bestandsaufnahme nach Möllemann (Potsdam, 2004, weber), pp. 27-29; Yves Pallade: Medialer Sekundäranti-Semitismus und das Versagen gesellschaftlicher Eliten. In: Klaus Faber (Hg.): Altneuer Anti-Semitismus (Potsdam, forthcoming, Verlag für Berlin-Brandenburg).

10 Tobias Jaecker: Antisemitische Verschwörungstheorien nach dem 11. September (Münster, 2004, Lit).

anti-Semitic stereotypes instead of working against them.¹¹

These stereotypes and clichés are identified in a detailed manner in the excellent EUMC Working Definition of Anti-Semitism.¹² I will adopt this working document to provide a definitional basis for my work as personal representative on the issue of combating anti-Semitism.

Another important aspect of teaching about the Holocaust today is to avoid the danger of reducing Jewish history to a history of victimhood. In most countries, existing schoolbooks and curricula urgently need revision to incorporate more information about their country's Jewish history, as well as information about large centers of Jewish life today, including the U.S. and Israel. The framework guidelines on this issue developed by the Leo Baeck Institute in Frankfurt could serve as a model for revisions.¹³

Training educators and student leaders is a critical element in revising curricula on the Holocaust and designing new educational material on combating anti-Semitism. Given that teachers are a reflection of society at large, inevitably bringing problems such as secondary anti-Semitism into the classroom, it is important to deal with this problem openly. The fact that there are no easy solutions is no reason to stop us from beginning to find the solutions. Education must also be understood in a broader sense. It takes place not only at educational institutions but in the public sphere, including in the media. Here we need to be aware of anti-Semitic propaganda in Arab and Turkish-language extremist literature, which is increasingly finding its way into mosques and private schools within the OSCE region.¹⁴

The Task Force on Anti-Semitism and Education of the American Jewish Committee's Berlin Office has identified a growing conflict for teachers trying to teach the Holocaust to students with migrant backgrounds, for whom national history may not be their sole frame of reference.¹⁵ This is no reason to stop teaching about the Holocaust, but good reason to be sensitive to the varying frames of reference of the students in a classroom.

We have on our panel a group of world-renowned experts. I would like to ask them to help us better understand how Holocaust education can be used in combating today's anti-Semitism, its possibilities and limits, and additional educational approaches for tackling the pernicious issue of anti-Semitism.

11 Susanna Harms: Mit Shoa Education gegen aktuellen Anti-Semitismus? Interview mit Gottfried Kößler. In: "Vor Anti-Semitismus ist man nur noch aus dem Monde sicher. Anti-Semitismus und Antiamerikanismus in Deutschland" (Klett, 2004, Leipzig), pp. 104; Taskforce Education on anti-Semitism & AJC: Results of the European Workshop: Education on anti-Semitism, (Berlin, April 18-20, 2004), p. 5.

12 EUMC: A Working Definition of Anti-Semitism
<http://www.hagalil.com/anti-Semitismus/2005/01/definition.htm>.

13 Taskforce Education on anti-Semitism & AJC: Results of the European Workshop: Education on anti-Semitism, (Berlin, April 18-20, 2004), p. 6.

14 Claudia Dantschke: Islamistischer Anti-Semitismus. In: "Vor Anti-Semitismus ist man nur noch aus dem Monde sicher. Anti-Semitismus und Antiamerikanismus in Deutschland" (Klett, 2004, Leipzig), pp. 24-34.

15 Taskforce Education on anti-Semitism & AJC: Results of the European Workshop: Education on anti-Semitism, (Berlin, April 18-20, 2004), p. 9.

German Bundestag: Spokesman on Foreign Affairs for the SPD Group OSCE: Personal Representative of the Chairman-in-Office of the OSCE on Combating Anti-Semitism Vice-President of the Parliamentary Assembly Platz der Republik 1, 11011 Berlin / Germany phone +49-30-227-73503, fax +49-30-227-76503

Email: gert.weisskirchen@bundestag.de, Internet: <http://www.gert-weisskirchen.de/>

**OSCE Conference
On Anti-Semitism and On Other Forms of Intolerance
Cordoba, 8 and June 2005**

Session 2: Education on the Holocaust and on anti-Semitism

Cobi Benatoff

President of the European Jewish Congress

Your Majesty,
Honourable Ministers,
Excellencies,
Ladies and Gentlemen,

I should like to begin by thanking the OSCE Organisation and the Spanish Foreign Minister for allowing me to speak at this round table in my capacity as President of the European Jewish Congress.

Cordoba - the "Mother of Philosophers". This was Cordoba, the Muslim Caliphate, where the Jewish, Christian and Muslim communities lived side by side peaceably from the 9th to 12th centuries.

The diversity of each community was integrated into the common life of the city. Differences were tolerated in the spirit of openness held by Andalusian Islam.

Far from being an Irenist flight or idealisation on our part, it is rather an intense memory of the experience of those who for a few centuries knew how to live under the rule of moderation and tolerance for the specificity of each community.

This is surely the reason why Cordoba was chosen to host this OSCE conference on Tolerance, and I thank the organisers for bringing us back to the actual setting where it was once, and hopefully still, possible to live together in our differences.

The theme of this working session is "Education on the Holocaust and on anti-Semitism". In the very title several notions are interwoven, as if aligned along a Cartesian axis: on the one hand we have education, on the other there is the Holocaust and anti-Semitism – moving back and forth between education and memory.

The transformation of our local realities towards a global society makes it particularly timely to discuss the role of education systems in the context of rising intolerance. Thus it is even more painful and anachronistic, as we commemorate the liberation of Auschwitz, that we

must speak of anti-Semitic attacks. It is also particularly heart-rending to see that the classroom has now also become a theatre for intolerance.

PC.NGO/17/05

8 June 2005

ENGLISH only

We observe with surprise and pain that universities are losing their "intercultural agora" dimension to turn into "campuses of ignorance", of fighting and violence.

In French universities such as Lyon III and Paris VII, lecturers make revisionist statements. In hallowed Italian universities such as Pisa, Florence and Turin events with Israeli authorities could not be organised due to the antagonism of groups of agitators. In England they are talking about boycotting academic and scientific relations with Israeli universities, as if this would foster the process of peace in the region. Moreover, not even the prestigious Columbia University has been able to escape anti-Semitic polemics.

Boycotts and intimidation, prejudice and sectarianism in environments where one should learn that academic and scientific research also – and especially – calls for respect of others, respect for freedom of speech, both spoken and heard. Dangerous, perilous signs of intolerance, of an anti-Semitism that is perpetuated changing the way it is expressed, feeding on revisionism, prejudice, hate and moral delegitimation of the State of Israel, denying European Jews the right to express their own diversity like any other European citizen.

We cannot, we wish not and we must not accept any of these acts, in any sector of our society. We will be neglecting our role and our duty as citizens if we fail to sound the alarm to the whole society, because it is together that we wish to find an answer to these acts, and together make dialogue and tolerance prevail. This is a common duty, the moral responsibility of us all, working for better conditions not only for Jewish citizens but for all members of society.

Can any society calling itself democratic accept that its academic institutions affirm exclusion as a basis for ideas, thinking that one section of society is wrong simply because they are Jewish, and another section right simply because they are not?

It is education's role to assume and promote the specific nature of cultural mediation: mediation understood not as levelling out each person's specific contribution, but as the ability to seek what is new in the other and to bring diversity into our mutual dialogues.

In our opinion, all this enhances even more the meaning and value of "democracy" because "cultural diversity" becomes a beneficial resource for the increasingly complex process of exchange, of growth in people and societies, a true bolstering of European democracy.

If education is a system that promotes peaceful coexistence, how can it accept to harbour intolerance and new social conflicts instead of searching the ways and means to clear the air?

None of our societies has anything to gain from negationist or revisionist theories of the Shoah. Nor can they gain from acts of anti-Semitism, or from the delegitimisation of the State of Israel.

It is certainly unnatural to forget, 60 years after the extermination camps were liberated, that Europe was freed from the horror of the Shoah, that it was freed from Nazism and Fascism. Neither is it time to forget, nor give way before any act of anti-Semitism, nor even to explain how Europe managed to move from the simple utopia of a Europe without war, to the as yet imperfect reality of a common institution like the European Union, together creating intergovernmental platforms such as the OSCE and the Council of Europe.

Now more than ever, with the loss of a number of direct witness of these horrors, education has a role to fulfil in teaching the values of tolerance and pointing out the risks of fanaticism. This is because a monocultural world, such as the one sought by the Nazi and Fascist dictators, would surely be worse – uglier, less stable and more dangerous. Remembering to be vigilant is not a favour or an indulgent kindness to Jewish citizens, it is a conscious choice for the growth of democracy throughout Europe.

We call for education to open itself even more to encounters between cultures, because education against anti-Semitism, racism and xenophobia starts in nursery school. And early childhood is the time to begin learning the values of tolerance, solidarity, respect for others and esteem for each human, in a climate of dialogue and openness.

We should like to suggest a few lines of action that we would like to see concretised in schools and in Europe's educational systems.

Our organisation has initiated a process of collaboration with the European Union and the Member States to set up educational programmes that aim for an improved and deeper knowledge of the history, traditions and culture of the Jewish people in Europe in order to attenuate prejudices and preconceptions. Examples include courses on the Shoah, so as to learn about the ideological and criminal mechanisms that enabled the persecution to occur.

To reinforce the OSCE Permanent Council Decision 607 concerning the fight against anti-Semitism, taken during the last Conference of Berlin in April 2004, we should like to propose to the OSCE and its Member states that they be in a position to develop such projects, to promote initiatives in the field of education that could be shared by the Organisation's member states in fields such as education in European citizenship. In this regard we declare that we are fully available to collaborate in elaborating and participating in such programmes.

Along the same lines we suggest that school programmes of European states devote more time to the history of Israel, to the origin and birth of the modern State as an integral part of European history. We also ask for greater promotion of academic and training exchanges with teaching experiences in Israel in order to improve and deepen knowledge on current history, a gesture we deem important to combat anti-Semitism. We also ask for a formal commitment from the governments and institutions of Europe, thus from the OSCE, to fight against anti-Semitic teachings and education in the schoolbooks of some countries of the Mediterranean basin and the Middle East.

In conclusion, I should like to return the experience of Caliphate of Cordova, the birthplace of Maimonides, a philosopher so dear to the Jewish tradition. Often unjustly forgotten in

European education, European culture owes much of its present knowledge in medicine and philosophy to this man. Maimonides's adolescence coincided with the final days of the Caliphate of Cordova as a city of tolerance, and he left Cordova to finish his days in Egypt. The climate of tolerance he experienced in youth formed the basis for his most important philosophical work, "Moreh Nevuchim" ("Guide to the Perplexed"). This work, on which Maimonides worked for years, in the search not only for philosophical paradigms, but possibly for his own self as well, in order to define rules for co-existence, which he called the "right measure".

Maimonides sought to propose a theory of moderation and harmony that distanced human existence from the dangerous risk of extremist oppositions.

In a contemporary world in which extremisms seem to prevail over reason, the teachings of Maimonides appear in all their lucidity and with a surprising timeliness, not only for ourselves but also for generations to come.

The priority of us all is to bear witness like Maimonides that each man's life is guided by the search to live his own diversity and that of others in justice and equanimity and to avoid the pitfalls of extremism and fanaticism.

**OSCE Conference on Anti-Semitism and on Other Forms of Intolerance,
Cordoba, 8 and 9 June 2005**

**Chair of the Education Working Group of the Task
Force on International Co-operation on Holocaust Education,
Remembrance and Research Introducer Session 2**

**International Cooperation in Education on the
Holocaust and on Anti-Semitism**

Karen Polak

OSCE conference on anti-Semitism, Cordoba 2005

Your Excellencies, ladies and gentlemen,

It is an honor to speak to you on the educational challenges that we face in teaching about the Holocaust and teaching against anti-Semitism. It is in the classrooms, where teachers are in daily contact with their students, that a difference can be made. I work at an institution, the Anne Frank House, where hundreds of school groups come each year and where we are in continual contact with teachers. In recent years I have had many personal encounters and organized meetings with teachers – in the Netherlands, but also across Europe, in which they brought forward their experiences, their request for help and their own strategies in dealing with many different forms of anti-Semitism. It is from this perspective, of the ordinary teacher in an arbitrary town in Europe, teaching your average 14 to 16 year old, that I will speak. That will, I hope, inspire all present to take action to ensure the implementation of the commitments made by the OSCE at previous conferences.

Is anti-Semitism common among young people in Europe? Most teachers

would say it isn't and they are probably right. Nevertheless the media regularly show images which are a cause for concern and many teachers *are* faced with antisemitic remarks in the classroom. These remarks are often made in relation to lessons about the Holocaust. Anti-Jewish comments are also frequent in response to the conflict in the Middle East. Some teachers avoid difficult situations with their students and don't teach about the Holocaust or spend as little time as possible on it. They justify this by either saying that it is simply impossible to teach this subject, or by diminishing the importance of the Holocaust, by trivializing it as 'just one chapter in history'.

These teachers are not being fair to their students. Students have the right to learn, and they have the right to be corrected if they are in the wrong. There are many examples of teachers working in difficult circumstances that have overcome their reluctance to teach about the Holocaust or about anti-Semitism and that have been rewarded by their student's unexpected interest and changed perspectives. This is not to say that it is always easy – we must invest in the exchange of best practices and find ways to support teachers that feel insecure in what they should teach and how they should teach these themes. I want to stress how important it is that all students in Europe learn about the Holocaust. It is a watershed event in history and without knowledge and some understanding of what happened you cannot comprehend the world as it is today. The Holocaust took place in Europe but it had, and has, an importance beyond all national boundaries. The concepts of genocide and of universal human rights are just two issues that evolved from the Holocaust.

Remembering the Holocaust is a complex matter. It has a special meaning for me to speak on these subjects here in Spain. I grew up with my father's war time stories in which Spain played a prominent role. My father left the Netherlands as a nineteen year old in the autumn of 1943. His mother had been imprisoned on account of anti-German comments, his father, a Jew, was at that time still in hiding. My father was involved as a student in different pockets of resistance and feared for his safety, so he decided to make his way to England. Traveling for many months through Belgium and France under a false name, he made his way over the snowbound Pyrenees in the winter of 1943 and arrived in the safe haven Spain. Although he was safe, he was also frustrated, mainly on the account of the inactivity of the Dutch diplomats that were not helping him to move on to England. For me hearing these stories as a teenager in the nineteen seventies it was confusing that Spain under Franco had been prepared to let refugees into the country whilst its own record of liberty and democratic rights was so tarnished. My father's experiences brought forward how not just Spain, but every country, and in a way every town, village and many families, have their own history of both complicity, inactivity and of opposition to persecution.

This story is just an arbitrary illustration of the complexity of history that students need to be able to wrestle with. Now, just as I did then. Teaching the Holocaust is of necessity also a complex matter. Today, the Netherlands, like Spain and so many countries in Europe, is a multicultural country. Two thirds of the young children in our main cities have a non-Dutch family background. This makes it all the more important to bring across the relevance of the Holocaust for all of humanity. An interesting example of how teachers in the Netherlands engage their students with a Moroccan background in the history of the Holocaust is by bringing forward the important role that Moroccan soldiers, fighting in the French army, played in the liberation of Europe from the Nazis. Again, the complexity of history demands that the students learn about the position of the Moroccan Sultan, Mohammed V, within the French protectorate. Inspiring is also the way, in which Mohammed V personally protected the Jews of Morocco, refusing to deliver them into the hands of Vichy France that would have had the Jews deported. But Jews were safe in Morocco during the Second World War.

I have encountered similar approaches in teaching practice in Germany, where relevant historical facts from the history of Turkey were included in the lessons on the Holocaust and the Second World War.

The *Task Force on International Cooperation on Holocaust Education, Remembrance and Research* (known as the ITF) was set up in 1998 to support initiatives in Central and Eastern Europe and to offer assistance from countries and institutions with experience in this field. The history of each country is very different and it demands mutual understanding to be able to work together in this field. When the ITF was just starting out, the first ten member countries sent educational experts to participate in the Educational Working Group. As a member of this group I was engaged in the process of writing guidelines for Holocaust Education that would serve governments and NGO's in all the member countries – now counting twenty. The discussions on *Why* we must teach the Holocaust, *What* we must teach and *How* this can be taught were inspirational and have led to very useful guidelines, that the Polish Chair of the ITF has made available here in a booklet. And more importantly these texts are also available to educators everywhere on the internet and are in the process of being translated into many languages.

The ITF has in the past three years funded 66 projects of which 35 were teacher training seminars, mostly in Eastern European countries. Maybe investing in the teacher's expertise through seminars is the important way to support Holocaust Education. The ITF member countries have this last year each made a report on the status and practice of Holocaust Education and indeed the ITF and the

OSCE Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights have worked together to make the report that is now available on *Education on the Holocaust and on anti-Semitism* in all the OSCE participating States. These country reports are a good starting point for more in-depth reflection on how we are teaching the Holocaust and what we are doing to combat anti-Semitism and other forms of intolerance and discrimination. The reports have shown that in many countries in fact very little is known about how the Holocaust is taught. More time must be invested in finding out what is taught in classes. In some countries there are indications that there is resistance to teaching and learning about the Holocaust. To understand better why teachers are sometimes reluctant to give lessons about the Holocaust a survey will be undertaken among history teachers. It is essential for all students to learn about the Holocaust in school – however, this is not THE way, and certainly not the only way in which to respond to forms of anti-Semitism in our cultures today. Anti-Semitism is not a problem among the youth alone. This needs to be recognized and confronted.

Anti-Semitism is also not an isolated phenomenon in our schools. Many teachers point out that it is part of a wider pattern of intolerance amongst students. The increase in xenophobic, anti-Muslim, anti-Western homophobic and antisemitic incidents needs to be addressed. Although all forms of discrimination, racism and intolerance should be forcefully opposed in any educational setting, it is also necessary to speak out against anti-Semitism directly. In my meetings with teachers the lack of adequate teaching materials that deal with anti-Semitism in both its historical and current forms is a major problem. Anti-Semitism is a complex phenomenon. A book recently published by the Anne Frank House, *'50 Questions on Anti-Semitism'*, covers just 50 questions and in this way aims to give teachers and a general public a better understanding of what anti-Semitism is. But such books is not teaching material. What is needed are materials that focus not only on anti-Semitism, but also on Jewish history and its contribution to European societies. And materials not focusing solely on anti-Semitism, but on the role that stereotypes and prejudices play in societies: the function and consequences of prejudices about Muslims, Jews, homosexuals, Sinti and Roma and other minorities. The Tolerance and Non-Discrimination programme of ODIHR (Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights) and the Anne Frank House will work together to develop such teaching materials, that will be piloted in several OSCE participating States. It is important that a diversity of materials are developed as each teaching environment is different –depending on the subject that is being taught, on the background of the students and on the teacher. Some students will need to discuss their own experiences with discrimination before focusing on anti-Semitism in society today. Some teachers will want to teach about the history of anti-Semitism before looking at its current forms. And for some it will be more relevant to take the present as the starting point, before

going into the historical roots of anti-Semitism.

Anti-Semitism should be understood as a human rights abuse, and it should be seen as a threat not only to Jews, but also to society as a whole. Combating anti-Semitism is a task for all democratic forces in society. I will conclude with three short recommendations:

- Dialogue should be encouraged as an important requisite to successful educational programs. Especially the dialogue between groups in our societies that are confronted with different forms of intolerance and discrimination and that can benefit from working together in education.
- Teachers need to be given the opportunity to discuss the problems they face in teaching about the Holocaust and in teaching about anti-Semitism. This means that at a national and international level it is important to make teachers conferences possible. The exchange of best practices should form a central element in these conferences, as it is an effective way to contribute to successful teaching methods.
- NGO's and educational authorities should work together in making teaching materials that are easily available to teachers and appropriate for teaching at all levels. Again, it is important for there to be an international exchange of successful programs.

I am hopeful that the increased international cooperation will contribute to new initiatives and the expansion of successful projects in many countries.

PC.NGO/5/05
6 June 2005

ENGLISH only

**OSCE Conference on Anti-Semitism and on Other Forms of Intolerance,
Cordoba, 8 and 9 June 2005**

**Adviser to the International Task Force for Holocaust Education,
Remembrance and Research Introducer Session 2**

The Educational Challenge of European Anti-Semitism

Yehuda Bauer

We have had a great deal of excellent analyses of current anti-Semitism: global, Moslem, and more specifically, European, and the OSCE has met before to discuss how to combat the current wave of anti-Semitism, specifically in Europe. There is a growing consensus among analysts of the problem that, in Europe, we are dealing with three forms of the disease: one, the right-wing anti-Semitism of Neo-Nazis, skinheads, etc.; two, the anti-Semitism of a minority of radicalized, marginalized, frustrated, unemployed and non-integrated, largely second-generation immigrant Moslem youth, who follow radical Islamist teachers; three, the anti-Semitism of the so-called 'chattering classes', mainly some of the liberal-leftist intelligentsia and media. Up till now, the OSCE is committed to deal mainly with the first type, through legislation, activation of police and other security organizations, perpetual vigilance, and which concerns us here above all, education. This is important but unfortunately insufficient. Rightist anti-Semitism results in violence, verbal, written, or physical, which is newsworthy, and can be dealt with by political forces. It is a dangerous phenomenon, and the OSCE deserves credit for its commitment to face it, but in the end, it is marginal. Racist anti-Semitism of the Nazi type is not the main danger.

To deal with Islamic radicals is largely politically incorrect, because we do not want to be accused of islamophobia. The background to this is the demographic catastrophe now

facing Europe, as a result of a steep decline of the birth-rate in almost all European countries, from Russia to Spain. There will be many millions less Europeans in another 20-30 years, than today. There are now over 20 million Moslems in Europe, though from widely different regions of the Moslem world, with different traditions and attitudes, and in order to maintain its standard of living, an ageing population of Europeans will have to take in more Moslem immigrants, despite all the measures to limit immigration, and the high birth-rate of this population will add to the increasing numbers. There has been a failure in European countries to integrate these multitudes, the result being increasing Moslem alienation, disappointment and frustration. The antisemitic outrages are, to a not inconsiderable degree, a part of the rebellion of these youths, and their adult supporters, against their host societies. For historical, political and economic reasons, Israel and, by extension, local Jews are the easiest and most convenient scapegoats. The young people responsible for many of the anti-Jewish outrages are fired by radical Islam and its explicit demand to kill all Jews. The trigger of their actions is the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, though their knowledge of that conflict is minimal. There, too the educational dimension is of central importance.

The anti-Semitism of the chattering classes cannot and should not be dealt with by governments and the democratic political world, because the right to freedom of even extreme expression of political opinion, which is a corner-stone of democracy, must be protected. This liberal intellectual anti-Semitism sees Israel as the collective Jew, and attacks its very existence behind the guise of an anti-Sharon stand; its treatment of the collective Jew today parallels closely the discriminatory treatment of the individual Jew in pre-emancipation times, but under the banner of a protection of human rights, of the perceived underdog, and in the name of a liberal, egalitarian approach. Opposing the policies of the present Israeli government is of course perfectly legitimate – attacks on those policies in the outspoken Israeli media are in substance much harsher than the wild accusations and the nasty caricatures in some of the media. However, identifying Israel with Nazism, and regarding its establishment a historic mistake, as many of these people do, is another matter altogether, as mistakes have to be corrected, and the implication is that Israel, a member of the United Nations, should disappear – which is the content of the Hamas Charter - and the targets are the Jews of Israel, and by extension, Jews outside it. This is clearly an antisemitic, potentially genocidal, approach. Opposing this is the task of an educational effort that would present a balanced picture and place it within a democratic context.

We have to move beyond analysis, though, and see what works and what does not in educational attempts to counter these trends. Thus, for instance, showing antisemitic and radically anti-Israeli caricatures equating Israel with Nazism, identifying Jews everywhere with this supposedly neo-Nazi state, and getting furious at the antisemitic usage of Holocaust imagery, does not work very well. We expect students to get indignant about such equations – but they don't. At the historical base of European anti-Semitism lies the identification of the Jews with the devil, and the modern devil is Nazi Germany. If the Jews are the devil, are they not like the Nazis? To many, this may look quite reasonable. Polls have shown that anti-Jewishness runs very deep in European historical consciousness, though I think that they also show that this attitude is largely latent, and may even be diminishing. It is a major error to view anti-Semitism as a prejudice – it isn't; it is part of the European cultural heritage, and we cannot fight it by repeating how great the Jewish contribution to European culture – Einstein, Freud, and so on – was.

Islam also has an antisemitic heritage, on which present-day radical Islam builds. The Koran contains passages in which Jews are called apes, and they are accused of radical iniquities, but there are also passages of a positive attitude to Jews. Historically, there were persecutions and pogroms in Moslem countries, such as Morocco, Yemen, and elsewhere, as well; but there were also eras, here in Spain as we all know, in which Jewish culture prospered in a Moslem civilization, the most advanced of its time.

We have to devise educational action against anti-Semitism within this complicated context. The slogan that anti-Semitism attacks the Jews first, and then the others, is undoubtedly correct, but stated like that it is a sermon, and moral sermonizing is ineffective. First of all, we should definitely link the educational struggle against anti-Semitism with the educational struggle against islamophobia. Islamophobia is based not just on opposition to Islamist terrorist cells, but on a perceived self-defense against Moslem influence supposedly endangering European culture and integrity. However, if Europe fails to integrate its Moslems, it will be faced with internal upheavals that may indeed destroy European culture as we know it today. Integration cannot be based on assimilation and absorption – Moslems come with a great, deep-rooted civilization based on an equally deep-rooted religious heritage. Moslems, and especially Moslem youths, must be treated not only as individuals that may look forward to equal opportunity within a free-enterprise system, but their collective right to develop their own specific culture(s) in their own way, and on an equal basis, within

the host societies, must be recognized. Moslem anti-Semitism which stems, in part at least, from a lack of Moslem integration can, ultimately, only be successfully attacked by integrated, and culturally autonomous, European Moslems. It cannot be dealt with by police. We should devise educational strategies that emphasize the connection between Islamic, Christian-European and Judaic civilizations, their achievements and their problems, as a practical, rather than an abstract, way of teaching mutual understanding; not tolerance, but acceptance. The right of each civilization, ethnicity, religion, nationality, nation-state, or federation, to free and unfettered development could be another major point of emphasis, again, bolstered by historical examples. By nurturing pride in a Moslem heritage, one can open young Moslem hearts to the appreciation of other cultures and civilizations. Teaching about National Socialism as the extreme, racist, opposite pole to such an approach, could introduce us into discussing Holocaust and genocide issues, without arousing immediate opposition and distrust.

Among best practices are undoubtedly efforts at peer education, in a flexible educational situation, such as the experiments now being conducted in Berlin, where teachers use students to lead discussion in peer groups centered around these themes.

There is, obviously, a common interest of Europe and the Jewish people: the common struggle against mass violence and genocidal threats. We must not separate the singular memory of the Holocaust from a topical concern about genocide generally. If we isolate the Holocaust as totally unique – and I am talking as a scholar of the Holocaust - we may make it irrelevant, because if it stands completely outside general concerns, it becomes the target of meaningless memorials and attendant clichés. But the Holocaust was a form of genocide, after all, and in order to show to students that it was the most extreme, unprecedented form of a general human disease, we must compare it to other genocides, such as in Darfur today. Contemporary anti-Semitism can easily be shown to be based on a similar, ethno-nationalistic basis. Nazi anti-Semitism produced a genocide 60 odd years ago, and it was one of the ventral elements in an ideology that destroyed Europe and killed some 35 million people. Isn't that enough to make all of us, Europeans or not, allies against anti-Semitism in its modern form? Teaching about the dangers of genocide generally, and contemporary examples specifically, may be the right way of teaching against anti-Semitism, about the World War, and the Holocaust. One can, I think, explain in an educational set up, the connection between these issues, and lead up to the right of peoples and nations to

independence and equality, without denying the problems. In our specific context, that means not running away from the Israeli-Palestinian conflict in an educational environment, but not presenting it as a black-and-white issue. Rather, as a situation demanding a compromise, emphasizing the right of both sides to self-determination. This is also an indirect way to deal, in an educational context, with chattering-class-anti-Semitism. Recognizing the claim of Jews and their civilization to self-determination, together with the right to criticize anyone and everyone, then becomes a specific example of a general principle that one can show to students as an ideal. I think that more good ideas will emerge from an expert meeting on Holocaust education and best practices organized in conjunction by ODHIR and Yad Vashem for October this year. More can also be learned from the experience gathered by the Task Force for Holocaust Education, some of whose experts are here with us and can enlarge on it. The questions, then, that I suggest we pose to ourselves are these:

- Can we legitimately use history to show that anti-Semitism has led to disaster, primarily of course to Jews, but as a result of that to millions of others?
- Can we use educational strategies to help integrate deprived parts of the population into the societies in which they live?
- Can we show that anti-Semitism is morally repugnant in any society, and link it, not ignoring its exceptional specificity and historical depth, with islamophobia and other group hatreds?
- Can we show that hate propaganda against any state, nation, or group, including the Jews and their nation State, is ultimately disastrous to those who preach it, and is connected to genocidal dangers past and present?

PC.DEL/483/05
6 June 2005

ENGLISH only

**EUROPEAN MONITORING CENTRE ON RACISM AND XENOPHOBIA
OBSERVATOIRE EUROPÉEN DES PHÉNOMÈNES RACISTES ET XÉNOPHOBES
EUROPÄISCHE STELLE ZUR BEOBACHTUNG VON RASSISMUS UND
FREMDENFEINDLICHKEIT**



**OSCE CONFERENCE ON ANTI-SEMITISM AND OTHER FORMS OF INTOLERANCE
CORDOBA, 08/09 JUNE 2005**

Introduction by Beate Winkler to

Session 2 “Education on the Holocaust and on anti-Semitism”

I am honoured to speak in this distinguished forum of government officials and highly respected experts on the subject of education on the Holocaust and anti-Semitism.

The Shoah is the traumatic experience of Europe’s violent past. It has driven the EU’s founders to build a united and peaceful Europe and thus been at the very root of the European integration project. It was therefore clear for the EU to explicitly mention the fight against anti-Semitism in the core of the mandate of the European Monitoring Centre on Racism and Xenophobia.

The founding regulation of the EUMC specifies that its prime objective is to provide the European Union with objective, reliable and comparable data on the phenomena of racism, xenophobia and anti-Semitism. Purpose of our work is to help the EU institutions and Member States to take measures or formulate courses of action to fight these phenomena. In this context, education plays a pivotal role in fighting anti-Semitism as well as other forms of

racially, culturally or religiously motivated intolerance. The EUMC has just recently published an analysis of Eurobarometer survey data which indicated that the level of education is positively related to openness towards cultural and ethnic diversity.

In recent years, the European Union has been very concerned with the rise in anti-Semitism in some of its Member States. Also thanks to the reporting and work of the EUMC, there is increased awareness of and debate on, the persistence of antisemitic behaviour and attitudes in parts of the EU.

The EUMC collects data on racism, xenophobia and anti-Semitism including data on education through its RAXEN network of National Focal Points in all EU Member States. In March 2004, we presented the first major EU report on anti-Semitism containing data collected systematically and based on common guidelines for all Member States.

In parallel, the EUMC conducted interviews with members of the Jewish communities in order to make their personal experience and perception known. The report and some of the discussions around its publication initiated a broad public debate and raised awareness about the development of anti-Semitism in Europe, generating pressure for clear and strong measures against anti-Semitism in all its manifestations.

In our anti-Semitism report, we have stressed that education and training measures are of paramount importance in combating anti-Semitism.

In this context, we have put forward two main proposals for action:

1. EU countries should undertake in depth reviews of school textbooks in order to ensure that history is presented in a balanced way free of bias and that the history and message of the Holocaust is properly conveyed.
2. The EUMC has encouraged the Member States to introduce into teacher training a compulsory component that raises awareness, understanding and respect of the diverse cultures, religions and traditions in the European Union.

In order to gain support for implementing its proposals for action against anti-Semitism by the European institutions or Member State governments, the EUMC has organised and participated in, many round tables and discussions, initiated hearings and gave expert presentations.

We have put a strong effort on implementation of the EUMC's sensitive and challenging mandate. As in other areas, anti-Semitism is a field in which good intentions are easily formulated but often hard to implement – or they remain without follow up.

We therefore developed a specific working method to facilitate the process of turning words into action.

We have distributed here a preliminary analysis of an exercise to monitor the implementation of the proposals from the EUMC reports on anti-Semitism. The responses which we have so

far received from EU Member States testify to the effectiveness of the approach we have chosen; which is to address responsible institutions and offices directly in all the 25 Member States of the EU with as concrete proposals as possible. With this ongoing exercise, it is our intention to generate renewed interest in examining anti-Semitism and its proposals for combating it, but also to initiate interaction and discussion in other organisations on these suggestions.

In the report which we distributed to you regarding the implementation of our proposals, we find that in many EU Member States the review of textbooks is obligatory either directly as a mandate of the Ministries for Education on the national (for instance: Czech Republic) or regional level (Spain). Sometimes it is also delegated to external experts. In Belgium in 2005 a specific resource centre developing pedagogical concepts especially for a Jewish/Arabic dialogue was established.

Several of the Member States (e.g. Poland and Italy) have referred in their responses to their cooperation with the “Task Force for International Cooperation on Holocaust Education, Remembrance, and Research”.

Not the least through the work of the EUMC, the European Union has made it extensively clear that it will not tolerate anti-Semitism and combat any of its manifestations. I can name here only a few of the recent initiatives that highlight the importance given by the European Parliament and Commission to this subject. At the level of the Commission, an inter-service group has been established to discuss anti-Semitism. Two high-level meetings (June 2004, March 2005) were held together with representatives of Jewish organisations. The EUMC participated in the last meeting and supported it strongly. As first Commission President, Jose Manuel Barroso received the whole Board of the World Jewish Congress in January 2005. Dialogue meetings are being held with members of the Jewish communities to build trust and confidence.

The European Parliament hosted the presentation of the EUMC report on anti-Semitism in March 2004. There is a cross-party Anti-Racism Intergroup of MEPs that among other issues discusses anti-Semitism and recently held a meeting with Jewish organisations. On 27 January 2005, the European Parliament adopted a resolution on remembrance of the Holocaust, anti-Semitism and racism.

Education on the Holocaust is a crucial theme in all these discussions, initiatives and arising measures against anti-Semitism. As an example, the European Parliament resolution calls for “making Holocaust Education and European citizenship standard elements in school curricula throughout the EU” and for teaching Second World War history with “utmost rigour”.

At EU level, much Community action is underway to foster intercultural education. The promotion of intercultural understanding is a basic rationale underlying many of the Commission’s instruments including the mobility actions of the Leonardo, Socrates and Comenius programmes. The fight against anti-Semitism is alongside with the fight against racism and xenophobia one of the priorities of the YOUTH Community Action Programme.

Directly linked to education on the Holocaust is the Community action to support the preservation of the main sites associated with the deportations and the memorials which have

been raised on the former camps and other places of mass-civilian extermination. The EU provides financial assistance to organisations that implement projects explaining why, how and what happened in the former camps in order to keep alive the memory of victims at these sites. In 2005, the programme has allocated aid to projects commemorating the 60th anniversaries of the liberation of the camps at Ravensbrück (30 April), Terezín (3 May) and Mauthausen (5 May).¹ Schools can receive financial assistance through the Socrates programme to adopt such memorials and implement related educational history projects.

Undoubtedly, lasting peace in Europe must be based on remembrance of its history, including its darkest chapter. I may refer to the recent public opinion survey of the American Jewish Committee (*Thinking about the Holocaust 60 Year later*) showing that this conviction is widely shared by the European population. The vast majority of people answered that teaching about the Holocaust should be mandatory in schools – Germany: 79%; Austria: 92%; France: 86% and Poland: 69%.

As morally legitimate and socially desirable Holocaust education is, finding the right method to reach out to the new generation of pupils seems to be a challenge.

In Austria, the government-funded project *National Socialism and the Holocaust: Memory and Present* starts from the following basic assumptions:

- . • Teaching on National Socialism and Holocaust quite often does not reach its intended cognitive, ethical and affective goals;
- . • Knowledge deficits are obvious and learners repeatedly express a feeling of overfeed;
- Phenomena of rejection appear.

In response, the education project formulated as its goal

- . • to present the study of the Holocaust and National Socialism as relevant for learners in their present environments without the topic being made pedagogically pleasing or left to individual interests.

Learners should be addressed as active and thinking subjects who independently acquire an understanding of history. It is only through this approach that they can also critically reflect their value system.

This approach reflects the old paradigm that memory of the Shoah needs sound historic knowledge embedded in a firm set of moral and ethical values.

What does this mean for memorial pedagogy? How can remembrance contribute to a culture of healing involving the new generations in the countries of victims and perpetrators?

I leave it to the experienced experts who are here today to contribute their ideas on this

1 Other examples of supported projects include: Designing web sites and other materials (DVD, printed documentation, exhibitions, etc.) dedicated to extend the knowledge of the Holocaust (Museum of the Radogoszcz in Poland, Hollandsche Schouwburg Museum in Norderland, ...); building Memorial sites (Für das Erinnern - Kz Gedenkstätte Muhldorfer - Germany, Gemeinde Sandbostel - Germany, ...); Preserving archives by using digitalisation (Musée Juif de la déportation et de la Résistance - Belgium, ...); educating the new generation (Youthstart, United Kingdom, ...)

particular subject. I very much welcome the comprehensive overview on educational approaches, compiled by the ODIHR for this conference. I believe that the OSCE participating States will find plenty of inspiration in the examples of good practice and recommendations developed.

I would like to conclude on a more general note, and share with you my conviction that Holocaust education and remembrance are key elements in the effective combat against present-day anti-Semitism.

For that, the statement “Never Again” needs to go hand in hand with accepting the reality that manifestations of the same old anti-Semitism still exist. Only then will we be harnessed against the historical possibility of a reoccurrence of the enormous horror and tragedy of the Holocaust.

At the same time, one must not take Holocaust education to be sufficient to combat present-day anti-Semitism in all its forms. Today’s manifestations of anti-Semitism require distinct responses including most importantly an analysis of the social and political context in which they arise. In this context, intercultural education approaches are particularly apt to promote community cohesion and diffuse prejudices and stereotypes that underlie antisemitic and other acts fuelled by racial hatred.

Looking at some of the other important issues that this Conference will address, I may add that this is of relevance not only for the Jewish communities but also for other minorities. While clearly pointing to its specificities and context, education on the Holocaust can convey wider lessons about victimising people on the basis of race, ethnic origin, religion and/or belief.

Education is crucial in combating anti-Semitism and all forms of intolerance – but it is not all. A different approach in our societies is necessary: an approach of inclusion, value, respect of difference; an approach, which includes the past and our memory; a memory, which enables us to work for a culture of respect, dignity and justice, for a culture of healing; a healing, which celebrates diversity in its different shadows and tones and brings together a colourful picture of Europe.

ENGLISH only



United States Mission to the OSCE

Statement on Responding to Anti-Semitic and Hate-Motivated Crime

Drafted for delivery by Ambassador Edward B. O'Donnell
to the Cordoba Conference on Anti-Semitism
and on Other Forms of Intolerance
June 8, 2005

Chairman Rupel, Minister Moratinos, excellencies and distinguished delegates:

I appreciate the opportunity to share with you, from the perspective of my office in the U.S. Department of State, the experience of the U.S. Government in monitoring and combating anti-Semitism. As Special Envoy for Holocaust Issues, I have been working closely with other U.S. Government agencies, NGOs, and the U.S. Congress to combat anti-Semitism. Fighting anti-Semitism and other forms of intolerance continues to be a top priority for the U.S. Government.

We are pleased to have as head of our delegation Governor George Pataki of New York, a U.S. state with a record of commendable tolerance and best practices, as well as many continuing challenges. New York has a richly diverse religious, multi-ethnic and multi-racial population. Our U.S. delegation reflects the cooperative relationship in the United States of federal and state governments, religious leaders and NGOs that address this highly important human rights issue of anti-Semitism. While my work and remarks today refer to anti-Semitism as a tragically unique phenomenon, the strategy for promoting respect for individuals and minorities applies to all the forms of intolerance that we are addressing at this Conference today and tomorrow.

In recognition of an alarming increase in global anti-Semitism, the U.S. Congress passed the Global Anti-Semitism Review Act of 2004, signed into law by President Bush last October. The legislation directed the Secretary of State to issue a report documenting acts of anti-Semitism worldwide and to create an office of the Special Envoy for Monitoring and Combating Anti-Semitism. As President Bush said when he signed the Global Anti-Semitism Review Act into law: "Defending freedom means also disrupting the evil of anti-Semitism."

The State Department released the Global Anti-Semitism report on January 5, 2005. The report was written by my office and the U.S. the State Department's Bureau of Human Rights, Democracy and Labor. It is based on information provided by our embassies, as well as non-governmental organizations that monitor and report on anti-Semitism, such as the Anti-Defamation League, the Roth Institute in Israel and of course the European Union Monitoring Center (EUMC). The report describes types of anti-Semitic activities and incidents that occurred in 62 countries from the period of July 2003 through mid-December 2004. For each country, the list is illustrative of the problem, and is not exhaustive.

Importantly, the report also highlights the efforts many countries have taken to combat the deplorable trend of anti-Semitism. We praised leaders who spoke out against anti-Semitic incidents when they occurred, or governments that worked diligently to undertake programs to stop anti-Semitism. We cited countries that passed legislation, increased law enforcement, and increased educational efforts to combat anti-Semitism.

The Vienna-based European Union Monitoring Center has identified France, Germany, the United Kingdom, Belgium and the Netherlands as the EU member countries with the most notable increases in anti-Semitism. These five countries have also taken affirmative steps to combat anti-Semitism by condemning anti-Semitic acts, enacting new legislation to punish hate crimes, and mounting law enforcement and educational efforts.

In addition to this report, the State Department also reports on anti-Semitic incidents in its annual International Religious Freedom Report and in the yearly Country Reports on Human Rights Practices. For the future, this collection of information for these reports will be coordinated by a new Office of a Special Envoy for Monitoring and Combating Anti-Semitism, to be established in the State Department's Bureau of Human Rights, Democracy and Labor, in accordance with the Global Anti-Semitism Review Law.

U.S. Government efforts to deal with anti-Semitism and other hate crimes go back to the civil rights legislation of the 1960s. Law enforcement authorities in the individual states report under the 1990 Hate Crimes Statistic Law, and the FBI publishes an annual report that analyzes these hate crime statistics. Of the hate crimes that were motivated by religious bias, 69 percent were based on an anti Jewish bias. In order to implement a successful strategy for reducing bias-motivated crime, we need to develop reliable statistics about when, why and where such crimes occur. Recently, the Anti-Defamation League reported that in 2004 anti-Semitic incidents in the United States reached their highest level in nine years.

In the United States, the responsibility for prosecuting perpetrators of bias motivated crimes is divided between our state, local and federal governments, which work cooperatively together. For federal crimes, a convicted offender's sentence may be increased if the court determines that he or she intentionally selected any victim or any property as the object of the offense because of actual or perceived race, color, religion, national origin, ethnicity, gender, disability, or sexual orientation. In the U.S. experience, we have found that an effective way to deter and prevent bias-motivated crimes is to prosecute and punish those engaging in such criminal behavior to the full extent of the law. Prosecuting bias-motivated crimes remains a top priority for the Justice Department. Since 2001, the Civil Rights division of the Justice Department has charged 154 defendants in 104 cases of bias-motivated crime.

One of the federal government's most effective programs for combating anti-Semitic and other hate crimes is run by the Community Relations Service of the U.S. Department of Justice. The Community Relations Service, for example, provides skilled professionals to a community to help defuse ethnic or race-based tensions and to resolve issues between groups in a community.

I want to mention several best practices from the U.S. experience in the areas of education, law enforcement and legislation, for purposes of our discussion in Session 3 today. This is based on cooperation between the federal government, the U.S. Congress, state and local leaders, NGOs, and religious community leaders. Today and tomorrow in other sessions and

interventions, you will hear other members of the U.S. delegation provide examples of what we have undertaken in the United States to fight against anti-Semitism and other forms of intolerance. I encourage you to see what practices might be adopted for use in your own countries to address intolerance and to promote respect and understanding among different communities, and look forward to hearing about best practices and programs, from which we in the United States can also learn.

Education

Now in its seventh year, the Anti-Defamation League's (ADL's) *Bearing Witness* program brings together educators from schools around the U.S. to examine anti-Semitism from its beginnings, through the Holocaust and to the present day. The Vatican has cited *Bearing Witness* as one of the most important programs in improving relations between Catholics and Jews.

Another program offered by ADL, a *National Youth Leadership Mission Program*, brings approximately 100 ethnically and racially diverse American high school students, based on their demonstrated interest in issues of diversity and leadership, to come to Washington for a youth conference. The participants make a commitment to educate themselves and others on tolerance once they return to their home communities.

On the local level, the Holocaust Memorial Foundation of Illinois, originally founded by Holocaust survivors in 1981 following their successful campaign to stop a 1977 neo-Nazi rally from taking place in the highly Jewish-populated Chicago suburb of Skokie, hosts a biennial Holocaust Arts and Writing Contest for students in grades 5 through 12 in the fields of poetry, creative writing, illustration, and other methods of artistic expression.

The Holocaust Museum of Houston, through its *Curriculum Trunks* initiative, ships actual trunks containing multi-media tools, artifact kits, maps, books, lesson plans and student activities relating to the Holocaust to interested schools nationwide. In order to ensure maximum benefit in the use of the trunks, educator training is provided throughout the United States on a continuous basis.

Over 4 million people have visited the Simon Wiesenthal Center's *Museum of Tolerance* in Los Angeles and its recently opened New York Tolerance Center in the last decade. By applying interactive technology to up-to-the-minute research, the museum empowers visitors to explore issues relating to the Holocaust, tolerance and genocide. Its *Tools for Tolerance* program has trained over 100,000 law enforcement professionals and thousands of educators to explore these issues in the context of personal and professional ethics and responsibilities.

The core mission of the New Jersey Commission on Holocaust Education is to promote Holocaust education in the State of New Jersey. On a continual basis, the Commission surveys the status of Holocaust education; designs, encourages and promotes the implementation of Holocaust and genocide education and awareness; provides programs in New Jersey; and coordinates designated events that will provide appropriate memorialization of the Holocaust on a regular basis throughout the state.

Law Enforcement

The U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum (USHMM) is focused on providing educational programming to meet the needs of military and government audiences. Studying the Holocaust offers a uniquely powerful opportunity to examine the nature of leadership and core values – including character, honor, integrity, justice, and fairness. The Museum is working in coordination with training institutions, such as the U.S. Naval Academy and the U.S. Military Academy at West Point, to teach on topics such as the actions of Allied and Axis military forces in the context of Holocaust history, as well as current issues facing the United States and its military in protecting human rights and preventing genocide around the globe today.

The Sikh American Legal Defense and Education Fund (SALDEF) created the Law Enforcement Partnership Program (LEPP) to build relationships between the law enforcement and the Sikh-American community, when individual Sikhs were targeted and/or attacked in the period following the September 11, 2001 attack. To date, SALDEF has provided training to over 100 agencies and 5,000 local, state and federal law enforcement officials.

In 2000, the Washington DC Metropolitan Police Department and other law enforcement agencies have participated in a program entitled *Law Enforcement and Society: Lessons of the Holocaust (LEAS)*. The United States Holocaust Memorial Museum and the Anti-Defamation League developed the program, which is based on the lessons of the Holocaust. As one of the program's originators, Police Chief Charles H. Ramsey now requires this one-day training for all Metropolitan Police recruits, and the program has expanded to other cities.

The U.S. Department of Justice Community Relations Service (CRS) co-sponsored a cultural awareness and protocol seminar on June 3, 2004 for law enforcement officers, support service workers, local officials, and community leaders from the Pacific Northwestern states of Alaska, Idaho, Oregon and Washington. The seminar focused on improving awareness of Arab, Muslim and Sikh cultures and issues, featuring a cultural-awareness film entitled *The First Three to Five Seconds*, a police roll-call training video.

Annually, the Oswiecim Center for Genocide Prevention, founded by American Fred Schwartz, leads several cadets/midshipmen from U.S. military academies for an extensive orientation into the history and lessons of the Holocaust. The cadets are taken to the U.S. Department of State, the Pentagon, the USHMM and to Auschwitz and other sites in Poland to gain first-hand exposure to what occurred during the Holocaust. The cadets also interact with their Polish military counterparts.

Legislation

In addition to federal laws, nearly every state has some form of statute that can be invoked to combat bias-motivated crimes. The majority of states have one or more of the following types of laws:

- Criminalizing vandalism of religious institutions;
- Outlawing bias-motivated violence and intimidation;
- Requiring law enforcement personnel to receive training in identifying and investigating hate crimes;
- Proscribing interference with another person's civil rights; and
- Requiring states to compile statistics on hate crimes.

Examples –State and Local Enforcement of Hate Crimes Legislation

In October 2003, in a suburb of Milwaukee, Wisconsin, four white supremacists were arrested and charged under Wisconsin's hate crimes statute after beating a Hispanic man outside a tavern. Two of the suspects fled the state, but were arrested by law enforcement officials in Florida in February 2004, and were extradited to Wisconsin to face trial.

On June 3rd of 2005, a Texas youth was convicted under that state's hate crimes statute for his involvement in the burning of a cross in a woman's yard, painting a swastika and other racist graffiti on her garage and driveway, and hanging a noose from a tree in front of her house.

On May 27th of 2005, two men were arrested and charged with hate crimes for drawing swastikas and anti-Semitic slurs on cars near a synagogue in Queens, New York.

In March of 2005, in Brooklyn, New York, five white teenaged girls were attacked by a group of 30 black teenaged girls. Following an investigation into the incident by the city's bias crimes unit, hate crimes charges were added to the complaint.

In February of 2005, in California, a white supremacist was charged with attacking and beating a mail deliverer of Indian descent. If the court finds that the attack was motivated by bias, the attacker faces a greater penalty under the state hate crimes statute.

Mr. Chairman, fellow delegates, let me conclude by noting that the examples of the U.S. experience in combating bias-motivated crimes reflect what works in many communities in the United States. There are excellent examples of best practices in other OSCE participating States and we look forward to hearing about them. We look forward to exchanging ideas among experts in education, law enforcement, legislation and the media as we continue our work in the OSCE to fight against prejudice, bigotry and hate crimes, with a goal of developing acceptance, tolerance and understanding of minorities, which is an essential basis for democracy in the OSCE region.

Thank you.

Address by Mr. Paul Goldenberg

**Programme Manager, OSCE/ODIHR Law Enforcement Officer
Training Programme for Combating Hate Crimes**

**OSCE Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights
(ODIHR) and National Public Safety Strategy Group (NPSSG)**



**OSCE Conference on Anti-Semitism and on Other Forms of
Intolerance**

Cordoba, 08 June 2005

Excellencies, Distinguished Representatives, Ladies and Gentlemen:

Fifteen years ago I was among those law enforcement executives who did not take crimes of hate very seriously. Even though I knew that these crimes were unique, it was hard for me as a seasoned police executive to see these crimes as deserving my highest priority. At the time I was responsible for the investigation of serious crimes, such as murder and robbery, and I discounted, and therefore did not allocate many resources, to crimes that were often reported as mere criminal mischief.

I want to share a story that had a profound impact on my thinking. On a cold April morning, I received a phone call from a local police agency in a rural section of my state. The police were investigating a cemetery desecration, which turned out to be one of the worst such desecrations in the United States.

Officers at the scene reported that hundreds of tombstones had been toppled. Racial and anti-religious epithets had been scrawled across their facades. Blood red swastikas had been spray painted on the sides of mausoleums. The number "88", which meant nothing to me, was daubed strategically throughout the crime scene. Despite the scope of property damage, I rolled my eyes at the thought that my experienced investigators would request a senior officer, such as myself, to respond to what appeared to be essentially a case of graffiti and vandalism on the markers of deceased people.

It was only after I requested directions to the cemetery that it struck me -- my father was buried there. His grave could be among those desecrated. The thought of a swastika across the façade of my father's grave left me with a feeling that I still have difficulty describing. I felt personally violated in a manner I had never felt before. But for the first time I also better understood what the power of a symbol of hate is intended to do.

This is why it gives me such great pride to stand before you today to present the results of the ODIHR's Law Enforcement Officer Training Program for Combating Hate Crimes.

Now, I recognize that there have been criticisms that governments and international bodies prefer talk and declarations to tangible action. This Training Programme dispels that myth.

Last year, many of us attended the OSCE Conferences held in Berlin and Brussels

The Berlin and Brussels Declarations resulting from the two OSCE Conferences held last year, contained commitments which were endorsed by Decisions 607 and 621 of the Permanent Council and by the Ministerial Council in December 2004. Under these Decisions OSCE states committed themselves to consider establishing training programmes for law enforcement officials relating to hate crimes.

In less than 12 months, the ODIHR has moved from political pledge to the design, development and delivery of a concrete Programme, with hate crime training programs in both Spain and Hungary.

Through the tangible efforts and contributions of law enforcement agencies -- including those in France, Germany, the United Kingdom, Canada and the United States -- we have crafted a

comprehensive hate crimes training curriculum that is both universally applicable and nationally adaptable to reflect and address local conditions.

At last year's Human Dimension Implementation Meeting in Warsaw, I underlined the important role that law enforcement agencies, particularly front-line officers, can have in leading the fight against hate crimes. Police, and the organizations that employ them, are often at the forefront of social change. They are in a unique and vital position in maintaining civil society and protecting the safety and security of a nation's citizenry.

While the full engagement of law enforcement is necessary to fight hate crimes, it is not sufficient. The participation of NGOs is essential, and is built into ODIHR's Programme design. Hate crimes threaten communities in a manner that few other crimes do. But communities, working together in partnership with law enforcement, can help reduce the frequency and severity of hate crimes, and increase the likelihood that those responsible will be apprehended and punished.

To our partners in the many NGOs that assisted and supported our successful efforts – some of which are represented at this conference -- thank you for your contributions and for your belief in this Programme. As we say in our business, your fingerprints will forever be found on this project.

Allow me to share with you, briefly, some of the other elements that have made the Law Enforcement Officer Training Programme for Combating Hate Crimes an essential component in the ODIHR's work in fighting violent manifestations of hatred and intolerance.

First, we researched good practices in combating hate crimes across the OSCE region. The result was an electronic repository of good practices that became the basis for the next stages of our work. This collection of practices will be accessible through the ODIHR's public database.

In February (merely four months ago) our search for partners to co-develop and deliver the Programme began. We looked for countries with robust and sophisticated law enforcement operations, with emphasis on training and a command level commitment to the concept. We were very fortunate that the Guardia Civil and the Policia Nationale in Spain and the Hungarian National Police, the Rendorseg, were not only eager to work with us, but also perfect partners to initiate this project.

In April, two key meetings were held. One was a meeting of law enforcement experts on curriculum development to insure that we produced the best training materials possible. The other was a meeting of law enforcement experts on hate crime data collection, which produced a methodology for collecting data. The format was designed to blend as seamlessly as possible with existing law enforcement data collection systems. We have incorporated a copy of the data collection template in our training curriculum and the ODIHR has also included it in their report on Hate Crimes. We hope this template will provide a valuable tool for law enforcement officers in OSCE states to use when recording and reporting on hate crimes.

Because of the willingness of the ODIHR to support and prioritize this Programme, we were able to give police officers the tools to fight hate crimes effectively and to work in the best manner possible with the people, communities and organizations most affected by hate crime.

I also need to recognize the vision, commitment and assistance of the National Liaison Officers assigned by the host and supporting nations - Major Zsolt Molnar of the Rendorseg (the Hungarian National Police) and Mr. Antonio Arrabal Villalobos of the Spanish Foreign Ministry. The other members of the training cadre are present here today and will participate in a separate side-event that will take place _____. Can I ask that all these officers to stand up?

Others – too many to name – have helped as well. But I must also acknowledge the role of the American Jewish Committee, which assisted this Programme in countless ways from conception to inception, but never sought credit, and whose only goal was to help ODHIR and law enforcement in the OSCE region discover for themselves and then institutionalize the best ways to combat hate crimes effectively.

So, what have we achieved and what are the results?

1. For the first time, a cadre of law enforcement officers from throughout the OSCE region, together, crafted a curriculum that will equip police officers to respond to and investigate hate crimes.
2. In a timeframe of less than six months, the Programme was successfully piloted in two OSCE countries – Spain and Hungary.
3. A template for data collection on hate crimes throughout the OSCE region has been developed that will for the first time provide consistency in measuring and analyzing the occurrence of hate crimes and the effectiveness of efforts to combat it.
4. A model has been developed for the engagement of community organizations to assist in managing the effects of hate crimes on victims and communities.

And, what are the next steps?

The implementation team for the Law Enforcement Officer Training Programme for Combating Hate Crimes is now available to all OSCE states. We are eager to support the development and delivery of a training curriculum, customized and adapted to the needs and circumstances of each individual state. We hope that each OSCE state will take on this project, not only because they have made a commitment to counter hate crimes, but also because training to combat hate crimes produces tangible benefits to societies.

While hate crimes training needs to be tailored to needs of individual countries, one lesson is universal. When hate crimes are not vigorously investigated and prosecuted, there are extreme costs. It is not only the victims who suffer, nor is the damage limited to the group to which they are perceived to belong. It is to the social fabric itself, because the message is clearly heard by the haters, which empowers them – that there is an “unremarkable” and “tolerable” level of hate violence.

We all need to be smarter in how we approach hate crimes, as police officers, as societies, as NGOs, as citizens. I learned, many years ago – at my father’s cemetery – that hate is promoted by symbols. That number “88” I mentioned? “H” is the eighth letter of the alphabet. “88” represents “HH”, shorthand for “Heil Hitler”.

It is much easier for someone filled with hate to scribble a symbol than for good people to organize to empower law enforcement and communities, together, to make such acts less frequent, quickly punished, and universally condemned.

That is our task. That is our mission. The leadership of Hungary and Spain in addressing this problem – which afflicts every society – is a model which all of us should commend. But it is one which we hope every OSCE country will follow. We are looking forward to working with each and every one of you to make this hope a reality.

Thank you.

Imam Dr Abduljalil Sajid's
paper at OSCE Cordoba, 8 and 9 June 2005*

**“Fighting intolerance and discrimination against Muslims -Islamophobia:
facilitating integration and respecting cultural diversity: Islamophobia: A
new word for an old fear”**

**OSCE CONFERENCE ON ANTI-SEMITISM AND ON OTHER FORMS OF
INTOLERANCE**
Cordoba, 8 and 9 June 2005

**Session 4: Fighting intolerance and discrimination against Muslims -
Islamophobia: facilitating integration and respecting cultural diversity**

Islamophobia: A new word for an old fear

By Imam Dr Abduljalil Sajid

Chairman Muslim Council for Religious and Racial Harmony UK 8 Caburn Road Hove BN3
6EF (UK) Tel: 01273 722438 FAX: 01273 326051 Mobile: 07971861972 Email:
sajid@imamsajid.com, imamsajid@yahoo.co.uk

* For the page restriction reasons only the main body of Imam Dr Abduljalil Sajid's paper at OSCE Cordoba is published in this Consolidated Summary of the Cordoba Conference. For the Full Text of Imam Dr Abduljalil Sajid's paper at **OSCE Cordoba**, 8 and 9 June 2005 (PC.NGO/53/05, 14 June 2005, ENGLISH only) see OSCE official web-site at: <http://www.osce.org/item/9735.html>.

Bismillah Hir Rahma Nir Rahim (I begin with name of God the Most Kind the Most Merciful). I greet you with the greetings of Islam (**Assalamu Alaykum wa Rahmatullah wa Barakathu** (May God's blessing and peace be with us all.)

"And they ill-treated them (Believers) for no other reason except that they believed in Allah" (Al-Quran 85-8)

A PRIZE-WINNING writer specialising in Islamic affairs says Islamophobia is **"the new anti-Semitism" in Britain**. William Dalrymple, whose book *White Mughals* won awards last year for its depiction of a British-Muslim love affair in 18th-century India, said: "Just as Islam has replaced Judaism as the second religion in this country, so I believe it is becoming very clear that **Islamophobia is replacing anti-Semitism** as the principle expression of bigotry in this country." (See: <http://www.timesonline.co.uk/newspaper/0,,175-1225486,00.html>)

I am honoured -- and deeply humbled -- to be invited to speak to you this afternoon on the very important and timely topic of **Fighting intolerance and discrimination against Muslims - Islamophobia: facilitating integration and respecting cultural diversity**

At the very outset I brought greetings of **Iqbal Sacraine Secretary General** of the Muslim Council of Britain (**MCB** the most representative body of British Muslim). MCB messages are enclosed at the last Appendix. I have brought some printed information about **MCB** - However, one can easily look at MCB website www.mcb.org.uk) I have pleasure to introduce you **Mr Khalid Sofi** an official delegate from **MCB** to this conference who is chairman of MCB legal Committee.

I am very grateful to Spanish Government who invited me as their guest and to the British Government who included me as a member of their official Delegation.

It is a great honour for me to be here in the city of Cordoba – the centre of Multi-faith and multi-cultures for centuries until 1492 when peaceful co-existence was forcefully denied. It is a great symbol of hope when the representatives of 55 world countries are meeting in Cordoba for two days and talking about practical measures for **fighting intolerance and discrimination** at all levels against all sections of their communities. The fact is that **Islamophobia has replaced anti-Semitism as the new sharp end of racist issues in the world today**. Last year at OSCE I said **"Anti-Semitism and Islamophobia are two sides of the same coin"** and it is an evil plague of Europe which is full of hate and re-emerged during recent years.

After the September 11, attacks in the United States in 2001, the EU asked its then 15 member countries to compile reports on what effect the attacks had had on their Muslim communities. The European Monitoring Centre (EUMC) (2002) compiles these reports and all concluded that **"hatred against Muslims and crimes against Muslims increased tremendously"**

Last year Open Society has produced reports on the situation of Muslims in major European countries and gave shocking conclusions of rise of hate crime against Muslims.

Anti-Semitism

Hatred against Jews (best known as Anti-Semitism) has been since past two thousand years however, hostility towards Islam and Muslims has been a feature of European societies since the eighth century of the Common Era. It has taken different forms, however, at different times and has fulfilled a variety of functions. For example, the hostility in Spain in the fifteenth century was not the same as the hostility that had been expressed and mobilised in the Crusades. Nor was the hostility during the time of the Ottoman Empire or that which was prevalent throughout the age of empires and colonialism.¹ It may be more apt to speak of 'Islamophobias' rather than of a single phenomenon. Each version of Islamophobia has its own features as well as similarities with, and borrowings from, other versions.

A key factor since the 1960s is the presence of some forty million Muslim people in European countries and they are not going anywhere. They are going to stay. Another is the increased economic leverage on the world stage of oil-rich countries, many of which are Muslim in their culture and traditions. A **third** is the abuse of human rights by repressive regimes that claim to be motivated and justified by Muslim beliefs. A **fourth** is the emergence of political movements that similarly claim to be motivated by Islam and that use terrorist tactics to achieve their aims.

See for example Noorad (2002), Sardar and Davies (2002), Halliday (2002) and Said (1987). **The word Islamophobia was first used in print in 1991 and was defined in the 1997 Runnymede Trust report as 'unfounded hostility towards Islam, and therefore fear or dislike of all or most Muslims'.**

The term Islamophobia refers to unfounded hostility and fear towards Islam. It refers also to the practical consequences of such hostility in unfair discrimination, prejudice and less favourable treatment against Muslim individuals and communities, and to the exclusion of Muslims from mainstream political and social affairs. The word 'Islamophobia' has been coined because there is a new reality which needs naming –

Anti-Muslim prejudice has grown so considerably and so rapidly in recent years that a new item in the vocabulary is needed so that it can be identified and acted against. In other European Union countries it is customary to use the phrase '**racism, xenophobia and anti-Semitism**' as a way of summarising the issues to be addressed. The phrase is cumbersome and is unlikely to be widely used in Britain.

Anti-Muslim racism

Anti-Muslim racism has been a feature of European culture at least since the Crusades, but has taken different forms at different times. In modern Britain its manifestations include discrimination in recruitment and employment practices; high levels of attacks on mosques and on people wearing Muslim religious dress; widespread negative stereotypes in all sections of the press, including the broadsheets as well as the tabloids; bureaucratic obstruction or inertia in response to Muslim requests for greater cultural sensitivity in education and healthcare; and non-recognition of Muslims by the law of the land, since discrimination on grounds of religion or belief is not unlawful with exception of EU Directive

of 27 Nov 2000 which has been enacted in British domestic laws since 2 December 2003 only in the area of employment. Further, many or most anti-racist organisations and campaigns appear indifferent to the distinctive features of anti-Muslim racism, and to distinctive Muslim concerns about cultural sensitivity.

Silence about anti-Muslim racism was particularly striking in relation to the Stephen Lawrence Inquiry report. 'Where's the Muslim,' asked a headline in the Muslim magazine *Q News*, 'in McPherson's Black and White Britain?' The magazine welcomed the report but described it as a two-edged sword: 'As most of us are from visible minorities, we want racism to be firmly dealt with. But as victims of Islamophobia, we know that any attempts to tackle racism without also tackling Islamophobia will be futile ... Much as Muslims want to confront racism, they have become disillusioned with an antiracism movement that refuses to combat Islamophobia and which, in many instances, is as oppressive as the establishment itself.' An editorial in *Muslim News* commented that 'the real litmus test of whether the lessons of the Lawrence tragedy have been learnt will be if ... a Muslim youngster dies in an Islamophobic attack and his murder is not treated in the same way'.

When Islamophobia Commission issued a consultation paper, the *Independent on Sunday* (2 March 1997) ran a large headline in which we were accused of wishing to be 'Islamically correct'. In a similar way there was a time in European history when a new word, anti-Semitism, was needed and coined to highlight the growing dangers of anti-Jewish hostility. The coining of a new word, and with it the identification of a growing danger, did not in that instance avert eventual tragedy. By the same token, the mere use of the new word 'Islamophobia' will not in itself prevent tragic conflict and waste. But, I believe, it can play a valuable part in the long endeavour of correcting perceptions and improving relationships.

The term 'Islamophobia'

The term 'Islamophobia' is not, admittedly, ideal, for it implies that one is merely talking about some sort of mental sickness or aberration. Some of the people quoted above do indeed sound as if they are mentally unstable. But the imagery, stereotypes and assumptions in their messages are widespread in western countries and are not systematically challenged by influence leaders. The writers quoted earlier, for example, are widely respected and are read with approval by millions of people. They don't use obscene language and do observe elementary conventions of spelling, punctuation and grammar. They don't propose violent removal or repatriation of Muslims; don't deploy terms such as 'subhuman freaks', 'animals', 'not people', 'vile' and 'evil'; and don't express pleasure in the thought of Muslim men, women and children being slaughtered. But their basic message, at least in the perception of many British Muslims, seems similar to the one that underlies the inarticulate rants in 'you don't belong here'.

Islamophobia inhibits the development of a just society, characterised by social inclusion and cultural diversity. For it is a constant source of threat and distress to British Muslims and implies that they do not have the same rights as other British citizens. Islamophobia increases the likelihood of serious social disorder, with consequent high costs for the economy and for the justice system. Persistent Islamophobia in the media means that young British Muslims develop a sense of cultural inferiority and lose confidence both in themselves and in their parents. They tend then to 'drop out' and may be readily influenced by extremist groups which seem to give them a strong sense of identity. Islamophobia makes it more difficult for mainstream voices and influences within Muslim communities to be expressed and heard. In

consequence many Muslims are driven into the hands of extremists, and imbibe extremist opinions.

Islamophobia prevents Muslims and non-Muslims from cooperating appropriately on the joint diagnosis and solution of major shared problems, for example problems relating to urban poverty and deprivation. Further, it prevents non-Muslims from appreciating and benefiting from Islam's cultural, artistic and intellectual heritage, and from its moral teachings. Likewise it inhibits Muslim appreciation of cultural achievements in the non-Muslim world. Islamophobia means that Britain is weaker than it need be in political, economic and cultural relations with other countries and it actively damages international relations, diplomacy and trade.

Islamophobia makes it more difficult for Muslims and non-Muslims to cooperate in the solution and management of shared problems such as global political, ecological issues and conflict situations (for example Bosnia, most notably, in the former republic of Yugoslavia). Many Muslims believe Islamophobia has played a major part in Western attitudes to events in Bosnia, and has prevented a just and lasting settlement. The term 'Islamophobia' was coined by way of analogy to 'xenophobia'. Its use involves distinguishing between unfounded ('mad') hostility to Islam on the one hand and reasoned disagreement or criticism on the other.

Examples

In Britain as in other European countries, manifestations of anti-Muslim hostility include:

- . • verbal and physical attacks on Muslims in public places²
- . • attacks on mosques and desecration of Muslim cemeteries
- . • widespread and routine negative stereotypes in the media, including the broadsheets, and in the conversations and 'common sense' of non-Muslims – people talk and write about Muslims in ways that would not be acceptable if the reference were to Jewish people, for example, or to black people
- . • negative stereotypes and remarks in speeches by political leaders, implying that Muslims in Britain are less committed than others to democracy and the rule of law – for example the claim that Muslims more than others must choose between 'the British way' and 'the terrorist way'³
- . • discrimination in recruitment and employment practices, and in workplace cultures and customs
- . • bureaucratic delay and inertia in responding to Muslim requests for cultural sensitivity in education and healthcare and in planning applications for mosques
- . • lack of attention to the fact that Muslims in Britain are disproportionately affected by poverty and social exclusion
- . • non-recognition of Muslims in particular, and of religion in general, by the law of the land, since up until recently discrimination in employment on grounds of religion has been lawful and discrimination in the provision of services is still lawful
- . • anomalies in public order legislation, such that Muslims are less protected against incitement to hatred than members of certain other religions
- . • Laws curtailing civil liberties that disproportionately affect Muslims.

Some of these matters are discussed later. Let us see some **contextual factors**:

2

There are examples in Allen and Nielsen (2002), and on the websites of the Forum Against Islamophobia and Racism, the Islamic Human Rights Commission and *The Muslim News*.

3

This particular insult was made by Denis MacShane MP, minister of state at the Foreign and Commonwealth Office, in November 2003. It was compounded by the feebleness of his apology a few days later. See, for example,

Islamophobia is exacerbated by a number of **contextual factors**. One of these is the fact that a high proportion of refugees and people seeking asylum are Muslims. Demonisation of refugees by the tabloid press is therefore frequently a coded attack on Muslims, for the words 'Muslim', 'asylum-seeker', 'refugee' and 'immigrant' become synonymous and interchangeable with each other in the popular imagination. Occasionally, the connection is made entirely explicit. For example, a newspaper recycling the myth that asylum-seekers are typically given luxury space by the government in five-star accommodation added on one occasion recently that they are supplied also with 'library, gym and even free prayer-mats'.⁴ A member of the House of Lords wishing to evoke in a succinct phrase people who are undesirable spoke of '25-year-old black Lesbians and homosexual Muslim asylum-seekers'.⁵ In 2003, when the Home Office produced a poster about alleged deceit and dishonesty amongst people seeking asylum, it chose to illustrate its concerns by focusing on someone with a Muslim name.⁶ An end-of-year article in the *Sunday Times* magazine on 'Inhumanity to Man' during 2003 focused in four of its five examples on actions by Muslims.⁷

A **second contextual factor** is the sceptical, secular and agnostic outlook with regard to religion that is reflected implicitly, and sometimes expressed explicitly, in the media, perhaps particularly the left-liberal media.⁸ The outlook is opposed to all religion, not to Islam only. Commenting on media treatment of the Church of England, the Archbishop of Canterbury remarked in a speech in summer 2003 that the church in the eyes of the media is a kind of soap opera: 'Its life is about short-term conflicts, blazing rows in the pub, so to speak, mysterious plots and unfathomable motivations. It is both ridiculous and fascinating. As with soap operas, we, the public, know that real people don't actually live like that, but we relish the drama and become fond of the regular cast of unlikely characters with, in this case, their extraordinary titles and bizarre costumes.'⁹ At first sight, the ridiculing of religion by the media is evenhanded. But the Church of England, for example, has far more resources with which to combat malicious or ignorant media coverage than does British Islam. For British Muslims, since they have less influence and less access to public platforms, attacks are far more undermining. Debates and disagreements about religion are legitimate in modern society and indeed are to be welcomed. But they do not take place on a level playing-field.

4

Daily Mail, 5 October 2001, cited in Villate-Compton (2002). See also Yarde (2001), who writes: I groan inwardly every time I read a headline in the popular press about our asylum "crisis". I don't need to read the text, I've read the story a hundred times: same words, same message, repackaged according to the demon of the day, then regurgitated as if the use of the same tired old metaphors were something new.' The latest demon of the day, she adds, is Muslims.

5

Norman Tebbit, *The Spectator*, 27 April 2002.

6

The Muslim Weekly, 5-11 December 2003, p.11. The text on the poster read 'Ali did not tell us his real name or his true nationality. He was arrested and sent to prison for 12 months.' This statement was translated

into five languages, all of them connected with Muslim countries. A detailed legal reference was given in small print but in fact the case that was cited had nothing to do with asylum and nationality claims.

7

One of the five examples was about a legal case that was *sub judice* at the time. A British Muslim had been arrested and charged but not yet tried or convicted.

8

There is further discussion in Commission on British Muslims and Islamophobia Report titled *Islamophobia: a Challenge for Us All*, published in 1997. (ISBN 0 9022397-98-2).

9

Presidential address at General Synod, York, 14 July 2003.

A **third contextual factor** is UK foreign policy in relation to various conflict situations around the world. There is a widespread perception that the war on terror is in fact a war on Islam, and that the UK supports Israel against Palestinians. In other conflicts too the UK government appears to side with non-Muslims against Muslims and to collude with the view that the terms 'Muslim' and 'terrorist' are synonymous. These perceptions of UK foreign policy may or may not be accurate. The point is that they help fashion the lens through which events inside Britain are interpreted – not only by Muslims but by non-Muslims as well.

The cumulative effect of Islamophobia's various features, exacerbated by the contextual factors mentioned above is that Muslims are made to feel that they do not truly belong here – they feel that they are not truly accepted, let alone welcomed, as full members of British society. On the contrary, they are seen as 'an enemy within' or 'a fifth column' and they feel that they are under constant siege.¹⁰ This is bad for society as well as for Muslims themselves. Moreover, time-bombs are being primed that are likely to explode in the future – both Muslim and non-Muslim commentators have pointed out that a young generation of British Muslims is developing that feels increasingly disaffected, alienated and bitter. It's in the interests of non-Muslims as well as Muslims, therefore, that Islamophobia should be rigorously challenged, reduced and removed. The time to act is now, not some time in the future.

A further negative impact of Islamophobia is that Muslim insights on ethical and social issues are not given an adequate hearing and are not seen as positive assets. 'Groups such as Muslims in the West,' writes an observer, 'can be part of transcultural dialogues, domestic and global, that might make our societies live up to their promises of diversity and democracy. Such communities can ... facilitate communication and understanding in these fraught and destabilising times.'¹¹ But Islamophobia makes this potential all but impossible to realise.

'The most subtle and for Muslims perilous consequence of Islamophobic actions,' a Muslim scholar has observed, 'is the silencing of self-criticism and the slide into defending the indefensible. Muslims decline to be openly critical of fellow Muslims, their ideas, activities and rhetoric in mixed company, lest this be seen as giving aid and comfort to the extensive forces of condemnation. Brotherhood, fellow feeling, sisterhood are genuine and authentic reflexes of Islam. But Islam is supremely a critical, reasoning and ethical framework... [It] or rather ought not to, be manipulated into "my fellow Muslim right or wrong".'¹² She goes on to remark that Islamophobia provides 'the perfect rationale for modern Muslims to become reactive, addicted to a culture of complaint and blame that serves only to increase the powerlessness, impotence and frustration of being a Muslim.'

Violent language

On 11 September 2001 and the following days there were strong feelings of powerlessness, impotence and frustration amongst non-Muslims as well as among Muslims. When people feel powerless and frustrated they are prone to hit out with violent language. Below “You don’t Belong here” for example, shows the kind of

10

The sense of being under siege is global, not confined to Britain: see Ahmed (2003).

11

Modood (2002).

12

Davies (2002).

violent language that was used in email messages to the Muslim Council of Britain immediately following 11 September, 2001. The writers were under great stress and at least one of them later apologised. Their messages were nevertheless significant, for they expressed attitudes and imaginings that are widespread amongst non-Muslims and that are recurring components of Islamophobia.

You don’t belong here

Email messages to the Muslim Council of Britain, September 2001 – March 2003

You don't belong here and you never will. Go back to fornicating with your camels in the desert, and leave us alone. (11/9/01)

Are you happy now? Salman Rushdie was right; your religion is a joke. Long live Israel! The US will soon kill many Muslim women and children. You are all subhuman freaks! (11/9/01).

I really have tried not to follow my father who was a simple racist. However, I saw your people celebrating in Palestine and Libya and I was sick with despair. How on God's earth can you justify killing in this way? HOW can you celebrate? I no longer have any respect for you. None at all. I am so sorry, but I just despise you and your cruel God. You are not people. Just cold killers. May God forgive you but from now on, may the Americans find you and remove you from my country. I can no longer be civil to you. I am so angry, so hurt, just...oh, leave it, and leave it there. Just get out of the UK. Go back to your homes and leave us alone. Cowards. (11/9/01).

Have you heard the saying ‘crocodile tears’, well in my opinion your sentiments of sympathy regarding the attacks in New York and Washington are exactly that. I have never considered myself to be a racist – but I am now... Your kind knows nothing but force.... Well you've sown the seed, now reap the whirlwind, you have woken us up to what you all stand for.

It sickens me to now what a VILE EVIL race you load of Muslims are you have demonstrated this with the destruction in the USA. Get out of my country now! England is for white civilised English people.

The rest of the world will now join to smash the filthy disease infested Islam you must be removed from Britain in body bags. hope you like the bombs, payback for your satanic

religion. We will kill you all if we have too stayed in the stone-age and may Islam burn under US bombs. (14/9/01)

Why do you bother to live here? you hate the English with a passion. You hate Christianity. You hate America. but all of you like taking our hospitality and money and then turning on us. If we get attacked in this country I along with thousands of normal Christians will make absolutely sure that all Muslims will suffer. the worst thing this country did was offer refuge to animals who call themselves humans bombing places like the world trade centre is the action of scum. (13/2/03)

We know where to find you. (14/2/03)

Source: this is just a small selection of such messages posted on the website of the Muslim Council of Britain (www.mcb.org.uk). Original spellings and punctuation have been retained.

Islamophobia is the fear and/ or hatred of Islam, Muslims or Islamic culture. Islamophobia can be characterized by the belief that all or most Muslims are religious fanatics, have violent tendencies towards non-Muslims, and reject as directly opposed to Islam such concepts as equality, tolerance, and democracy. Islamophobia is a new form of racism whereby Muslims, an ethno-religious group, not a race, are, nevertheless, constructed as a race. A set of negative assumptions are made of the entire group to the detriment of members of that group. During the 1990's many sociologists and cultural analysts observed a shift in racist ideas from ones based on skin colour to ones based on notions of cultural superiority and otherness.

The term Islamophobia is a neologism dating from the early 1990's and derives from Xenophobia. As such, it reflects the influence of such 1990s movements as multiculturalism and identity politics.

The term Islamophobia most often appears in discourse on the condition of immigrant Muslims living as minorities in the West. In this case, the common experiences of immigrant communities of unemployment, rejection, alienation and violence has combined with Islamophobia to make integration particularly difficult. This has led, in the United Kingdom, for example, to Muslim communities suffering higher levels of unemployment, poor housing, poor health and levels of racially motivated violence than other communities.

Islamophobia, as a phenomenon, dates back at least as far as the Crusades. It has been present in Europe and the West for many centuries. It has been argued that Islamophobia exists outside the West, for example in India. This is more closely related to Communal Politics in India, although Islamophobia in India does share, with western Islamophobia, the denigration of Islamic culture and history.

It has been argued by some, most notably Edward Said, that the denigration of Islamic civilisation associated with Islamophobia is central to the concept of Western Civilisation. The ousting and marginalising of Islam marks the debut of 'Western' Civilisation and, thus, explains the depth and longevity of western Islamophobia:

“Islam was a provocation in many ways. It lay uneasily close to Christianity, geographically and culturally. It drew on the Judeo-Hellenic traditions. It borrowed creatively from Christianity - it could boast unrivalled military and political successes nor was this all. The Islamic lands sit adjacent to and even on top of the biblical lands. Moreover, the heart of the

Islamic domain has always been the region closest to Europe... Arabic and Hebrew are Semitic languages, and together they dispose and re-dispose of material that is urgently important to Christianity. From the end of the 7th century to the 16th century, Islam in either, its Arab, Ottoman, North African or Spanish form dominated or effectively threatened European Christianity. That Islam outstripped and outshone Rome cannot have been absent from the mind of any European." **Edward Said: Orientalism., Penguin Books, 2003 Edition. Page 74 .**

An alleged factor, that some argue drives Islamophobia, is the rise of anti-Western Islamist movements, which have either come to power outright in some countries (Iran, Sudan, post-Soviet-era Afghanistan), or else exerted a strong influence on government policy in others (Saudi Arabia, Pakistan). Many people mistakenly believe that most Muslims are Islamist, when in fact the Islamist movement is only a minority position. Perhaps the most important factor shaping the present wave of Islamophobia, though, is the extremely large and disproportionate media coverage given to Islamist-inspired terrorism, for example, to the September 11, 2001 Terrorist Attacks, while relatively little media coverage is given to equivalent acts of terrorism by other groups or nation-states.

Recently there have been several efforts by non-Muslims to combat Islamophobia. In the wake of September 11, 2001 for example, a few non-Muslim women practiced hijab in a show of solidarity with their Muslim counterparts, who it was feared would be particularly vulnerable for reprisal given their distinctive dress. Non-Muslims also helped form community watches to protect mosques from attack.

Examples of Islamophobia

Rep. C. Saxby Chambliss (R-GA): "Just turn (the sheriff) loose and have him arrest every Muslim that crosses the state line" (to Georgia law officers, November 2001)
(<http://www.visalaw.com/03feb1/17feb103.html>)

Ann Coulter: "We should invade their countries, kill their leaders and convert them to Christianity." (<http://www.nationalreview.com/coulter/coulter091301.shtml>)

Robert Kilroy-Silk: "Muslims everywhere behave with equal savagery. They behead criminals, stone to death female - only female - adulteresses, throw acid in the faces of women who refuse to wear the chador, mutilate the genitals of young girls and ritually abuse animals" http://www.fact-index.com/r/ro/robert_kilroy_silk.html

Jean-Marie Le Pen: "These elements have a negative effect on all of public security. They are strengthened demographically both by natural reproduction and by immigration, which reinforces their stubborn ethnic segregation, their domineering nature. This is the world of Islam in all its aberrations." (http://www.fpp.co.uk/online/02/04/Haaretz_LePen.html)

Jerry Vines: "Christianity was founded by the virgin-born Jesus Christ. Islam was founded by Mohammed, a demon-possessed paedophile who had 12 wives, and his last one was a 9-year-old girl."
(http://www.biblicalrecorder.org/content/news/2002/6_14_2002/ne140602vines.shtml)

Little Green Footballs: "Refugee camp my tuchus!! Centre of terror and genocide, maybe,

but no refugee camp. Is this part of the area the UN is bleating that it can't feed? I hope so. If every subhuman piece of excrement in the Rafah non refugee camp dies slowly and painfully of starvation, I'll have a great Passover"

(<http://www.littlegreenfootballs.com/weblog/?entry=10437>)

Michael Savage: "I think these people [Arabs and Muslims] need to be forcibly converted to Christianity ... It's the only thing that can probably turn them into human beings." [05/12/03] (On his radio show [The Savage Nation](#))

Institutional Islamophobia

The failure of race equality organisations and activists over many years to include Islamophobia in their programmes and campaigns appears to be an example of institutional intolerance.

'The concept of institutional racism,' said the Stephen Lawrence Inquiry report, '... is generally accepted, even if a long trawl through the work of academics and activists produces varied words and phrases in pursuit of a definition.' The report cited several of the submissions that it had received during its deliberations and then constructed a definition of its own. If the term 'racism' is replaced by the term 'Islamophobia' in the submissions, and if other changes or additions are made as appropriate, the statements are as follows:¹³

'Institutional Islamophobia may be defined as those established laws, customs and practices which systematically reflect and produce inequalities in society between Muslims and non-Muslims. If such inequalities accrue to institutional laws, customs or practices, an institution is Islamophobic whether or not the individuals maintaining those practices have Islamophobic intentions.'

(Adapted from a statement by the Commission for Racial Equality.)

'Differential treatment need be neither conscious nor intentional, and it may be practised routinely by officers whose professionalism is exemplary in all other respects. There is great danger that focusing on overt acts of personal Islamophobia by individual officers may deflect attention from the much greater institutional challenge ... of addressing the more subtle and concealed form that organisational-level Islamophobia may take. Its most important challenging feature is its predominantly hidden character and its inbuilt pervasiveness within the occupational culture.'

(Adapted from a statement by Dr Robin Oakley)

'The collective failure of an organisation to provide an appropriate and professional service to Muslims because of their religion. It can be seen or detected in processes, attitudes and behaviour which amount to discrimination through unwitting prejudice, ignorance, thoughtlessness and stereotyping which disadvantage Muslims.'

(Adapted from the Stephen Lawrence Inquiry report)

The impact of institutional Islamophobia is described below in examples. The An-Nisa Society, mentioned earlier in this chapter, provides a range of services for Muslim people in north-west London.

The idea of adapting the concept of institutional racism to Islamophobia was pioneered in training organised by the An-Nisa Society.

Institutional Islamophobia: Some Examples

Khalida Khan, director of the An-Nisa Society, says the draining effect of institutional Islamophobia affects entire communities and has both practical and psychological consequences. 'Relentless Islamophobia directly affects the morale of Muslims themselves,' she said. 'It lowers their self esteem leading to withdrawal and stress.'

One person who sought help from An-Nisa gave a graphic example of how individuals are affected. 'Sometimes the discrimination is subtle. It starts from the time they find out your name or the way you dress. Then they keep prodding you to see how much you can take. I normally don't take much nonsense but soon you get tired. You can't spend all your life trying to educate people who have decided to be ignorant. To be honest I have neither the time nor energy.'

An-Nisa argues strongly that the failure of institutions to service Muslim communities properly can be blamed, at least in part, on the reluctance of legislators and subsequently of officials to recognise Muslims as a distinct group. 'For the last two decades Muslims have been subsumed under the category of "Asians". And even then, the term only covers people from the Indian sub-continent. Whoever coined that term wiped off Turks, Iranians, Chinese, Filipinos and others from the continent of Asia. Workers on the ground are well aware that Muslims come from many races and national origins. But by treating such diverse communities as if they are one, the organisers of services have inadvertently devised insensitive and unjust policies with serious consequences.'

If institutions evolve a corporate ethos which is prejudiced against Muslims, or which doesn't take their needs into account, how will their workers respond? Evidence compiled by An-Nisa suggests workers operating in such an atmosphere act in accordance with that ethos. Khalida Khan says one case brought to her attention proves how devastating ignorance or just lazy thinking can be. 'A social worker was sent to assess a family in connection with a child being fostered and perhaps adopted. She was told that the family prayed five times a day so she said that they were fundamentalists. The father was asked what he would do for the future and it is Allah's will and we cannot predict the future. That too led to them being regarded as fundamentalists.' **(Source: interview by Hugh Muir, summer 2003)**

Negative stereotyping

The negative image of Muslims and Islam began as early as the Crusades when Christian and mercenary soldiers marched to Palestine in order to "free" Jerusalem and the Holy Land from Islamic influence and authority. Songs were sung by marching Crusaders characterizing Islam and Muslims not only negatively but Muslims as infidels and idolaters. Ever since the early Crusades, Islam and Muslims have been portrayed in a derogatory fashion. With the declaration of the Jewish state of Israel at the expense of the Palestinians in 1948, there has been a continuing, sometimes covert, oftentimes obvious and blatant effort to stereotype Arabs and Muslims as barbaric terrorists possessing no conscience or mercy in their war against the civilized populations of the world.

Novels and encyclopaedic information either subtly and shrewdly or manifestly insert defamatory statements about Arabs and Muslims in such a way that the reader is unaware of these attacks. The film industry is even more effective in the portrayal of Arabs and Muslims in a manner that creates hate and prejudice in the hearts and minds of international viewers. Arab and Muslim groups living within the United States have struggled to combat these negative images but do not have the power, the means nor possess as effective a voice as the billions of dollars that back the entertainment industry.

A United Nations special investigator on religion, a Tunisian lawyer, Abdul Fattah Amor, said on March 17, 1999, that a pervasive Islamophobia exists in the United States and is fed by a "hate-filled" image of Muslims presented in the media. Amor, who compiled his report after a visit to the United States in January and February of 1999, argues that, "The Muslim community can certainly flourish freely in the religious sphere, but it has to be recognized that there is an Islamophobia reflecting both racial and religious intolerance." He went on to say, "This is not the fault of the authorities, but of a very harmful activity by the media in general and the popular press in particular, which consists in putting out a distorted and indeed hate-filled message treating Muslims as extremists and terrorists."

It is sad that some of the greatest enemies of Islam can be found in the dictators of Muslim countries. Examples of so-called Muslim leaders who want a secular state at the expense of the lives and welfare of their people can be found in Algeria and Turkey. Their day-to-day massacres of Algerian civilians are not carried out by true Muslims, but by paid mercenaries wishing to turn the hearts of the people against Islam. There are many other leaders of Muslim countries whose prisons are full of those wishing to promote Islam and Muslim governments.

Essentially foreign Some findings from research on Media and British Muslims

A study was made of all articles on British Muslims that appeared in The Guardian /Observer and The Times/Sunday Times in the period 1993-97. There were 837 articles altogether, 504 in the Guardian/Observer and 333 in The Times/Sunday Times. In addition stories about British Muslims in 1997 were studied in the Sun and the Mail. A count was also made of stories about Muslims in the wider world. The findings of the research included:

Only one story in seven was about Islam in Britain, as distinct from the wider world. The implication was that Islam is essentially foreign. Muslims in Britain were frequently represented irrational and antiquated, threatening British liberal values and democracy.

The agenda of Muslims in Britain was seen as being dictated by Muslims outside Britain. A strong focus on extremist and fanatical Muslims marginalised the moderate and pragmatic stance of the majority of British Muslims.

Muslims in Britain were depicted as being involved in deviant activities, for example corruption and crime. The Guardian gave much more coverage to Muslim issues than other papers and was more likely to write positively and to provide alternative viewpoints. It is read by far fewer people than other most other papers, however, and its secular, human rights stance means Islam is sometimes formulated as offensive to its liberal norms.

Commenting later on the findings, the author noted that Muslims are becoming a more

powerful lobbying force and have made efforts to create a representative body, the **Muslim Council of Britain (MCB)**, with which the government can negotiate. She judged that lobbying by Muslims has had a positive effect on both the government and the media (Source: the research was undertaken by Dr Elizabeth Poole, University of Staffordshire. It is published in *Reporting Islam*, I.B.Tauris, 2002)

Post September 11, 2001 there was a genuine recognition among most media outlets of the need to avoid content that would be inflames the relationship between Muslims and non-Muslims in Britain. Led by the line from Downing Street, even *The Sun* – long saddled with a reputation as a racially intolerant and a sensationalist newspaper – issued a high profile appeal for calm. On September 13, 2001, a full-page article written by David Yelland – then the editor – proclaimed “Islam Is Not An Evil Religion”. It may have been stating the obvious. But at the time it made a valuable contribution – a fact recognised by the Commission for Racial Equality which short listed the article for a “Race in the Media Award”.

Whose watchdog?

In July 2001, a month before the US terrorist atrocities, senior officials from the Muslim press and the Muslim Council of Britain met with Lord Wakeham, then the chairman of the Press Complaints Commission. Together the learned gathering discussed the ‘negative stereotyping’ of Muslims and Lord Wakeham assured those present that he understood their concerns. On the 15th of November, 2001 amid the pleas for calm and mutual tolerance and the establishment of Islam Awareness Week to promote greater understanding across the communities, the *Daily Express* published an article by columnist Carol Sarler which seemed to encapsulate all of the worries conveyed to Lord Wakeham just four months previously.

Under the headline *Why Do I have To Tolerate The Rantings of Bigots Just Because They Are Muslim*, Ms Sarler said even she, as a ‘conscientious, secular liberal’ felt unable to voice legitimate doubts about the Islamic faith and its adherents. The irony of the fact that she was doing so over an entire page of a national newspaper did not trouble her. Citing one single opinion poll which, she said, showed 70 per cent of British Muslims either support or condone Osama bin Laden, she said: ‘We are constantly told that the vast majority of Moslems in this country are moderates and hush your mouth if you even might think, oh really, so where are they then?’ She said many refer to Islam as ‘a religion of tolerance, peace and love’, adding: ‘Which is jolly splendid but goes nowhere towards explaining why every Moslem state in the world today is a cauldron of violence, corruption, oppression and dodgy democracy: the direct opponents of everything a liberal holds dear; yet at your peril do you mention it.’ The Qur’an she dismissed as ‘no more than a bloodthirsty little book.’ The equivalent insult if her target had been Christianity would have been ‘Jesus was no more than a bloodthirsty little man.’

On the day of publication, an *Express* reader submitted a complaint to the Press Complaints Commission, still led by Lord Wakeham, on the grounds that the article was discriminatory and inaccurate. But the complaint was rejected. In its adjudication, the PCC accepted the *Express*’s argument that ‘the article, headed as comment, was clearly distinguished as the opinion of the columnist, in accordance with terms of the Code.’ It noted the *Express* printed a letter of rebuttal from the Muslim Council of Britain the following week. Other complaints

from the Muslim Council of Britain have been rejected on the grounds that individuals have a right to reply if inaccurate reports are printed about them, but not organisations on behalf of a religious faith.¹⁴ The PCC said: 'Clause 13 (Discrimination) relates only to named individuals and, as in the article no specific persons were subject to prejudiced or pejorative attack based upon their race or religion, did not consider that a breach of the that clause could be established.' There are no plans to close this loophole, even when the new press regulator assumes responsibility.

What also disturbed many was the fact that the PCC seems unable or unwilling to act even when many of the comments made by the author are based on claims that are themselves open to challenge. For example, the columnist claimed that few Muslim leaders had spoken out against September 11, 2001. In point of fact the Muslim Council of Britain issued a condemnatory press release within three hours of the atrocity on 11 September and within 48 hours convened a meeting of community leaders from which emerged a joint statement denouncing the atrocities as indefensible. It is clear that the PCC is not an adequate bulwark against Islamophobia in the media. A more reliable bulwark, if it can be created, would lie in a revised code of professional ethics

Representation

As the shock from September 11, 2001 subsided, however, Muslim concern about the media's tendency to elevate fringe figures to a place of mainstream importance became, once again, a live issue. For many years Muslims had complained about the prominence given to Omar Bakri Muhammed – the North London cleric with a penchant for publicity and the provocative quote. For all the good intentions, after September 11 many newspapers and broadcasters still found him a hard habit to break. But the appeal of Omar Bakri paled dramatically when set against the attractions of Abu Hamza. Here, just waiting for an unquestioning press, was a villain straight out of central casting. He has an eye patch, a hook replacing an amputated hand, a claimed association with Taliban training camps and a knack for issuing bloodcurdling threats.

In an analysis of the media post September 11, the academic researcher Christopher Price noted that the *Daily Mail* printed the same photo of Abu Hamza on the 15th, 17th, 18th, 20th and 21st. The paper also printed an interview with him on the 13th September that was partially repeated on the 15th and 18th as well. Days after the beginning of the war in Iraq, his views were sought again. The Press Association, which supplies all national and regional papers, described him as 'one of Britain's best

The website of the **Muslim Council of Britain** (www.mcb.org.uk) has several examples of letters of complaint sent to national newspapers and the Press Complaints Commission, and of dismissive and unhelpful replies.

known Muslim preachers'. For journalists from the *Telegraph* to the Today Programme, and from the *News of The World* to Newsnight, he was a top attraction.

Of course, figures like Hamza and his associates have a right to have their views reported, as does any other citizen of this country. But too often such views are reported as representative of all Muslim communities. Moderates who sought to place them in their proper context struggled to make their voices heard. Inayat Bunglawala of the Muslim Council of Britain voiced the frustrations of many. 'There are over 800 mosques in the UK and only one of them

is run by a known radical. Yet this one mosque (Finsbury Park, London) seems to get more coverage than all the rest put together! The situation is akin to taking a member of the racist BNP and saying his views are representative of ordinary Britons.’¹⁵

Ahmed Versi, the editor of the *Muslim News* says that frustration remains. ‘The Muslim community is attacked for not denouncing September 11 enough, yet the newspapers and television news will give an enormous amount of space and airtime to people like Abu Hamza and not seek out moderate voices. He is a nothing figure in the Muslim community. He doesn't have a major following. Young Muslim men are not particularly attracted to his teachings. So why do newspapers continue to give him so much space? **It is Islamophobia.**’

‘Historically,’ the Archbishop of Canterbury said in his Christmas Day sermon in 2003, ‘religious faith has too often been the language of the powerful, the excuse for oppression, and the alibi for atrocity. It has appeared as itself intolerant of difference (hence the legacy of anti-Semitism), as a campaigning, aggressive force for uniformity, as a self-defensive and often corrupt set of institutions indifferent to basic human welfare. That’s a legacy that dies hard, however much we might want to protest that it is far from the whole picture. And it’s given new life by the threat of terror carried out in the name of a religion – even when representatives of that religion at every level roundly condemn such action as incompatible with faith.’¹⁶

Perceptions of Islam as a threat: Some columnists’ views

“At least as dangerous”

“Muslim fundamentalism is at least as dangerous as communism once was. Please do not underestimate this risk ... at the conclusion of this age it is a serious threat, because it represents terrorism, religious fanaticism and exploitation of social and economic justice.”
(*Willi Claes, Secretary General of NATO* Television interview reported by Inter Press Service, 18 February 1995)

“Chief threat to global peace”

“Muslim fundamentalism is fast becoming the chief threat to global peace and security as well as a cause of national and local disturbance through terrorism. It is akin to the menace posed by Nazism and fascism in the 1930s and then by

¹⁵ On November 20, 2001,

¹⁶ All major statements by the Archbishop can be downloaded from www.archbishopofcanterbury.org/serpns-speeches.

communism in the 1950s.” (*Clare Hollingsworth, defence correspondent International Herald Tribune*, 9 November 1993)

“Different civilisation”

“The underlying problem for the West is not Islamic fundamentalism. It is Islam, a different civilisation whose people are convinced of the superiority of their culture and are obsessed with the inferiority of their power.” (*Samuel Huntington, Harvard University The Clash of*

Civilisations and the Remaking of World Order, 1996, page 217)

'There will be wars'

We do not know who primed and put the Oklahoma bomb in its place; we do know that they were, in the fullest meaning of the word, fanatics. Unlike most of us, they do not in the least mind being killed; indeed, they are delighted, because they believe that they are going to a far, far better place ... Do you realise that in perhaps half a century, not more and perhaps a good deal less, there will be wars, in which fanatical Muslims will be winning? As for Oklahoma, it will be called Khartoum-on-the-Mississippi, and woe betide anyone who calls it anything else. (*Bernard Levin, columnist The Times, 21 April 1995*)

**(Muslims had in fact no responsibility for the Oklahoma bombing.)*

Muslims are a threat to our way of life

"All Muslims, like all dogs, share certain characteristics. A dog is not the same animal as a cat just because both species are comprised of different breeds. An extreme Christian believes that the Garden of Eden really existed; an extreme Muslim flies planes into buildings - there's a big difference." (July 25, 2004)

Muslims are a threat to our way of life

Author By Will Cummins (Telegraph Jul 25, 2004)

<http://www.sport.telegraph.co.uk/opinion/main.jhtml?xml=/opinion/2004/07/25/do2504.xml>

A Tory platform hostile to Islam

Do the Tories not sense the enormous popular groundswell against Islam? Charges of "racism" would inevitably be made against the party but they would never stick. It is the black heart of Islam, not its black face, to which millions object. The Conservatives would be charged with cynicism and expediency: look who would be talking!

But unlike the "Nazi-Soviet Pact" that the feminist, pro-gay Left has forged with Britain's Muslims, a Tory platform hostile to Islam would be neither incongruous nor immoral. An anti-Islam Conservative Party would destroy the BNP as quickly as Margaret Thatcher despatched the National Front in 1979 when she warned that, unless immigration was curbed, Britain would be "swamped" by "an alien culture". Infinitely more is at stake now.

The Tories must confront Islam instead of kowtowing to it, Will Cummins, The Daily Telegraph, 18 July 2004

Certain characteristics

All Muslims, like all dogs, share certain characteristics. A dog is not the same animal as a cat just because both species are comprised of different breeds. An extreme Christian believes that the Garden of Eden really existed; an extreme Muslim flies planes into buildings - there's a big difference.

Muslims are a threat to our way of life, Will Cummins The Daily Telegraph, 25 July 2004

Highly indignant

The Crusades – for which the Pope has apologised to Islam (he did so again last week), rather as an old lady might apologise to a mugger for trying to retrieve her purse – were simply an attempt by medieval Christians to get their homelands back. Spain, Sicily, and parts of the Balkans were recovered. Palestine wasn't, though the Muslim colonisers there – who are no more "native" to the Holy Land than the European Jews who removed them – were largely ejected in 1948. It goes without saying that today's Muslims – who, unlike today's Westerners, are very proud of their history of imperialism – are highly indignant at being parted from this stolen property.

Dr Williams, beware of false prophets, Will Cummins, The Daily Telegraph, 4 July 2004

Forced themselves on us

A virulent hatred of Muslims can no more be racism than a virulent hatred of Marxists or Tories. Nobody is a member of a race by choice. Such groups are protected from attack because it is unfair to malign human beings for something they cannot help. However, nobody is a member of a community of belief except by choice, which is why those who have decided to enter or remain within one are never protected. Were such choices not open to the severest censure, we could no longer call our country a democracy.... A society in which one cannot revile a religion and its members is one in which there are limits to the human spirit. The Islamic world was intellectually and economically wrecked by its decision to put religion beyond the reach of invective, which is simply an extreme form of debate. By so doing, it put science and art beyond the reach of experiment, too. Now, at the behest of Muslim foreigners who have forced themselves on us, New Labour wants to import the same catastrophe into our own society. **"We must be allowed to criticise Islam"**, Will Cummins, The Daily Telegraph, 11 July 2004

Mr. Will Cummins writes distorting facts about Islam in Sunday Telegraph;

"...three of the four schools of Islamic law enjoin faithful Muslims to murder anyone who wishes to leave the faith, thus limiting every Muslim's freedom of action", he wrote in an article published on 11th July, 2004 entitled "We must be allowed to criticise Islam." In his most recent article entitled "Muslims are a threat to our way of life" published on **Sunday Telegraph 25th July 2004**, Mr. Will Cummins compared 'Muslims to dogs' and called Britain 'Islamofascist'. His previous articles explicitly incite religious hatred, 'All but an infinitesimal minority of our Muslims are peaceable and law abiding' he stated in the article of **Sunday Telegraph 18th July 2004**".

We learnt that **Sunday Telegraph** writer was in fact the Press officer of the British Council - the agency who has been working to promote Britain within Muslim World and was celebrating diversity of British culture. This fact was revealed by the Guardian last week, the author of a number of poisonous articles against Islam and Muslims which appeared in the Sunday Telegraph in recent weeks, is indeed Harry Cummins, Press Officer of the British Council. Writing under the pseudonym "Will Cummins", Harry Cummins compared Muslims to Dogs and argued that it is Islam's 'dark heart' rather than its 'dark face' that people should fear. For an individual with such appalling views and racist tendencies to be occupying a prominent position in the British Council, which promotes Britain and its culture to the Arab and Muslim world, is repulsive. Will Cummins, seems to relish making vitriolic statements

about Muslims.

"Do the Tories not sense the enormous popular groundswell against Islam? Charges of "racism" would inevitably be made against the party but they would never stick. It is the black heart of Islam, not its black face, to which millions object." (**Sunday Telegraph July 18, 2004**)

"Now, at the behest of Muslim foreigners who have forced themselves on us, New Labour wants to import the same catastrophe into our own society." (**Sunday Telegraph July 11, 2004**)

"Christians are the original inhabitants and rightful owners of almost every Muslim land and behave with a humility quite unlike the menacing behaviour we have come to expect from the Muslims who have forced themselves on Christendom, a bullying ingratitude that culminates in a terrorist threat to their un-consulted hosts." (**Sunday Telegraph July 4, 2004**)

I believe that these sentiments are clearly designed to provoke readers of the Sunday Telegraph into hating British Muslims and their faith. This ignoble endeavour is, of course, utterly at odds with the purpose and mission of the British Council which is to encourage understanding and build ties between different peoples.

You can read some of Will Cummins writings in the Telegraphs

1.. "The Tories must confront Islam instead of kowtowing to it"
<http://www.opinion.telegraph.co.uk/opinion/main.jhtml?xml=/opinion/2004/07/18/do1802.xml&sSheet=/opinion/2004/07/18/ixopinion.html>

2.. Will Cummins articles can be downloaded from the following links "Muslims are a threat to our way of life"
http://www.telegraph.co.uk/opinion/main.jhtml;sessionid=D5P01UD5EORIDQFIQM_GSM54AVCBQWJVC?xml=/opinion/2004/07/25/do2504.xml&secureRefresh=true&_requestid=133718 3.. "We must be allowed to criticise Islam"

<http://www.opinion.telegraph.co.uk/opinion/main.jhtml?xml=/opinion/2004/07/11/do1102.xml>

4.. "Dr Williams, beware of false prophets"
<http://www.opinion.telegraph.co.uk/opinion/main.jhtml?xml=/opinion/2004/07/04/do0401.xml>

5. Sunday Telegraph Anti-Islam Columnist: A British: Council Employee

<http://www.aljazeera.com/News%20archives/2004%20News%20archives/August/1%20n/Sunday%20Telegraph%20Anti-Islam%20Columnist%20A%20British%20Council%20Employee.htm>

**An article by Anthony Browne was published in weekly Spectator (24 July 2004)
Spectator Cover Story : The Muslims are Coming**

[www.gnXP.com/MT2/archives/002455.html?entry=2455 - 101k](http://www.gnXP.com/MT2/archives/002455.html?entry=2455-101k)

<http://www.virtuosityonline.org/portal/modules/news/article.php?storyid=1082>

Spectator magazine (UK) 24 July 2004 has a lead article by **Anthony Browne**, a well known London *Times* journalist, arguing that: **"Islam really does want to conquer the world. That's because Muslims, unlike many Christians, actually believe they are right and that their religion is the path to salvation for all"**.

We are absolutely stunned that a mainstream journalist can get away with sparking such religious hatred. Anthony Browne's cover article in the *Spectator* 24/7/04 (see below) prompted the following ignorant reaction illustrating for the umpteenth time the consequences of the unfair portrayal of Islam within the media:

"...a demonstrative, indulgent, obsessive, hateful, judgmental religion that leads by religious inspiration POLITICALLY... judicially perverse, teaching wife battery, death by a 1000 cuts, beheading, (often of innocent bystanders), demeaning of women, the hatred of Israel, and the west who stands in the way of a war with Israel. The 6th day war, the denial of Jews a homeland, suicide bombers, a prophet-leader who bedded a 9 year old girl....(Mohammad)"

The article incited this hatred by comparing Islam's teachings to Hitler's behaviour, and to add insult to injury, *Times* journalist Anthony Browne arrogantly states:

"There's no plot... Islam really does want to conquer the world. That's because Muslims, unlike many Christians, actually believe they are right, and that their religion is the path to salvation for all."

Nobody who is in the influential spotlight of the media should be able to get away with comments that, time and again, add fuel to the fires of anti-Muslim hatred.

- . • Anthony Browne's ignorant and inflammatory article relies on misinformation from notorious Islamophobes such as Bernard Lewis (*Spectator* 24/7/04).
- . • If Islam is as bad as he portrays it, why would thousands of Westerners be freely choosing to convert to Islam, as he mentions?
- . • Anthony Browne's belief in freedom of religion was preached 1400 years ago in the Qur'an: "Let there be no compulsion in religion" (The Holy Qur'an 2.256)
- . • The Qur'an also teaches: "God does not love the aggressors" (The Holy Qur'an 2.190).
- . • It is only natural that people should want to share what they believe is beneficial with others – whether this is Christianity, Islam or Atheism. Indeed many British churches run 'Alpha courses' for this purposes, and Jehovas Witnesses offer their message door to door.
- . • Anthony Browne seems unaware of the fact that Christian missionaries operate freely in many Muslim countries across Asia and Africa – Bangladesh being just one example. The restrictions imposed by tyrannical regimes such as the US- and UK-supported Saudi royal family are completely un-Islamic.
- . • Browne also seems unaware that the 1988 Education Act requires that Religious Education and Collective Worship in state schools must be "mainly Christian".

- Is Anthony Browne implying that because Muslims allegedly want to “take over the world” that the “persecution and mass murder” of Muslims would be justified?

“The hooded hordes will win”

“You can be British without speaking English or being Christian or being white, but nevertheless Britain is basically English-speaking, Christian and white, and if one starts to think that it might become basically Urdu-speaking and Muslim and brown, one gets frightened and angry ... Because of our obstinate refusal to have enough babies, Western European civilisation will start to die at the point when it could have been revived with new blood. Then the hooded hordes will win, and the Koran will be taught, as Gibbon famously imagined, in the schools of Oxford. (*Charles Moore, editor of The Spectator* ‘Time for a More Liberal and “Racist” Immigration Policy’, *The Spectator*, 19 October 1991).

Islam wants the whole world to Submit

Islam means "submission" (not "peace") and it is the aim of Muslims ("those who have submitted") to make the whole world submit. The teaching seems not to envisage the idea of Muslims as a minority, except as a temporary phenomenon. The best that non-Muslims - in Britain that means Sikhs and Hindus, as well as Jews and Christians - can hope for is that they be treated as "dhimmis", second-class citizens within the Islamic state.

Islam is not an exotic addition to the English country garden By Charles Moore (*Telegraph: 21/08/2004*) A very evil, wicked religion

Islam is, quite simply, a religion of war... [American Muslims] should be encouraged to leave. They are a fifth column in this country. **Why Islam is a Threat to America and the West by Paul Weyrich and William Lind**

We should invade their countries, kill their leaders and convert them to Christianity. We weren't punctilious about locating and punishing only Hitler and his top officials. We carpet bombed German cities, and killed civilians. That's war. And this is war.
Columnist Ann Coulter, National Review, 13 September 2001

Muslims pray to a different God ... Islam is a very evil and wicked religion ...
Franklin Graham (son of Billy Graham), speech on NBC Nightly News, November 2001

They want to coexist until they can control, dominate and then, if need be, destroy ... I think Osama bin Laden is probably a very dedicated follower of Muhammad. He's done exactly what Muhammad said to do, and we disagree with him obviously, and I'm sure many moderate Muslims do as well, but you can't say the Muslim religion is a religion of peace. It's not.

Rev Pat Robertson, founder of Christian Coalition, CNN, February 2002

Islam is a religion in which God requires you to send your son to die for him. Christianity is a faith in which God sends his son to die for you.

John Ashcroft (US Attorney General), Los Angeles Times, 16 February 2002

Muhammad was a demon-possessed paedophile...Allah is not Jehovah... Jehovah's not going to turn you into a terrorist that will try to bomb people and take the lives of thousands and thousands of people.

Rev Jerry Vines, past president of the Southern Baptist Convention, speaking at the Convention in June 2002

Noose

Was world communism ever such a threat as militant Islam now is? If Islam were to draw a noose about the world, could it be resisted, would its political and economic consequences be worse, would its dominion last longer than the half-century of communism after the Iron Curtain dropped?

Brian Sewell, Evening Standard

Oppressive darkness

Call me a filthy racist – go on, you know you want to – but we have reason to be suspicious of Islam and treat it differently from the other major religions ... While the history of the other religions is one of moving forward out of oppressive darkness and into tolerance, Islam is doing it the other way round. **Julie Birchill, The Guardian**

Treachery and deceit

Oriental... shrink from pitched battle, which they often deride as a sort of game, preferring ambush, surprise, treachery and deceit as the best way to overcome an enemy... This war [in Afghanistan] belongs within the much larger spectrum of a far wider conflict between settled, creative, productive Westerners and predatory, destructive Orientals. **John Keegan, The Daily Telegraph, 8 October 2001**

Blind, cruel faith

Islamist militancy is a self-confessed threat to the values not merely of the US but also of the European Enlightenment: to the preference for life over death, to peace, rationality, science and the humane treatment of our fellow men, not to mention fellow women. It is a reassertion of blind, cruel faith over reason.

Samuel Brittan, : The Financial Times, 31 July 2002

Fifth column

We have a fifth column in our midst... Thousands of alienated young Muslims, most of them born and bred here but who regard themselves as an army within, are waiting for an opportunity to help to destroy the society that sustains them. We now stare into the abyss, aghast. **Melanie Phillips, Sunday Times, 4 November 2001**

When the Runnymede Trust Commission on Islamophobia published a consultation paper in 1997 it quoted from an article by a prominent journalist. Islam was once, he had said, 'a great civilisation worthy of being argued with'. But latterly it had degenerated into 'a primitive enemy fit only to be sensitively subjugated'. Seeing him quoted in this context, the journalist immediately published a defiant response. He entitled it 'I believe in Islamophobia' and concluded: 'To worry about contemporary Islam is not mad. It would be mad to do otherwise.'
(Peregrine Worsthorne, Sunday Telegraph, 3 February 1991)

Consequences and connections of Islamophobia

The consequences of Islamophobia may be summarised as follows.

1. Injustice

Islamophobia inhibits the development of a just society, characterised by social inclusion and cultural diversity. For it is a constant source of threat and distress to British Muslims and implies that they do not have the same rights as other British citizens.

2. Effects on the young

Persistent Islamophobia in the media means that young British Muslims develop a sense of cultural inferiority and lose confidence both in themselves and in their parents. They tend then to 'drop out' and may be readily influenced by extremist groups which seem to give them a strong sense of identity.

1. **3. Dangers of disorder**
2. **4. Muting of mainstream voices**

Islamophobia increases the likelihood of serious social disorder, with consequent high costs for the economy and for the justice system.

Islamophobia makes it more difficult for mainstream voices and influences within Muslim communities to be expressed and heard. In consequence many Muslims are driven into the hands of extremists, and imbibe extremist opinions.

5. Waste in the economy

Islamophobia means that much talent is wasted. This is bad for wealth creation and the economy, and bad also for international trade.

6. Obstructing cooperation and interchange

Islamophobia prevents Muslims and non-Muslims from cooperating appropriately on the joint diagnosis and solution of major shared problems, for example problems relating to urban poverty and deprivation. Further, it prevents non-Muslims from appreciating and benefiting from Islam's cultural, artistic and intellectual heritage, and from its moral teachings. Likewise it inhibits Muslim appreciation of cultural achievements in the non-Muslim world.

7. Harming international relations

One of the great strengths of a multicultural society is that it is more likely to be efficient and competitive on the world scene. But Islamophobia means that Britain is weaker than it need be in political, economic and cultural relations with other countries and it actively damages international relations, diplomacy and trade.

Further, Islamophobia makes it more difficult for Muslims and non-Muslims to cooperate in the solution and management of shared problems such as global ecological issues and conflict situations (for example, most notably in recent years, in the former republic of Yugoslavia). Many Muslims believe Islamophobia has played a major part in Western attitudes to events in Bosnia, and has prevented so far a just and lasting settlement. One of our correspondents (not himself a Muslim) wrote as follows:

“During the Bosnian war I had many encounters with politicians, including a senior cabinet minister. It was clear to me that irrespective of their political loyalties their reluctance to sanction military intervention in Bosnia was rooted in a large degree in their reluctance to support the creation of a new Muslim polity in Europe. ‘Muslims have a tendency to radicalism,’ the cabinet minister told me, when I asked why the government was refusing to lift the arms embargo against the Bosnian government.”

How can Islamophobia be fought? To answer this we must examine its causes. Firstly, there is prejudice, and no amount of education will dispel it. The only answer is power. In 1913, Leo Frank, a Northern Jewish industrialist in Georgia, was wrongly convicted of the sexually-motivated murder of young Christian girl Mary Phagan. He was lynched in 1915 by ‘The Knights of Mary Phagan’, which metamorphosed into the Ku Klux Klan. Attacks on Jews followed his conviction, and Medieval smears of ‘Jewish ritual murder; re-surfaced. The case caused the Jewish community to be more pro-active and they formed the Anti-Defamation League specifically to combat negative stereotypes of Jews. By the 1940s, few US politicians could afford to offend the community as it became an influential political force. British Muslims should learn from this, by voting tactically en bloc, not just against the BNP but against any candidates supporting the Occupation of Muslim lands. Then the parties and media will be too scared to promote (or even acquiesce in) Islamophobia in future.

Effects of Islamophobia

In my humble opinion some specific challenges faced by the British Muslim community include the following:

1. Prejudice, fuelled by unbalanced media representation, in the following areas:

The association of Islam and Muslims in general, explicitly or implicitly, with fundamentalism, terrorism, and intolerance. Disproportionate emphasis in institutionally Islamophobic media on unrepresentative extremists, arrests of suspected “terrorists”, etc. The use of biased language to stigmatise Islam and Muslims.

- The reduction of the richness of Islamic tradition to a few simplistic clichés around controversial issues which tend to stigmatise Islam as ‘backward’ or oppressive – e.g. Hijab, Jihad, Madrasa-style education, ritual slaughter.
- The misleading association of Islam with specific cultural identities and practices, especially Asian and African, e.g. female circumcision, forced marriage, honour killings.
- Blatant and unchecked dehumanisation of Muslims, including abuse and incitement .

It should be noted that these misleading associations and stereotypes, all of which underlie the widespread existence of Islamophobia in British society, are motivated not only by ignorant prejudice but also by deliberate design in certain quarters so as to sustain the pernicious doctrine of a clash of civilisations between Islam and the West. The deliberate cultivation and dissemination of such prejudices by unscrupulous ideologues sustains the false notion of the Islamic “bogey” which justifies in the popular mind the demonisation of all Muslims.

It must also be admitted that such prejudices are also aggravated by disproportionate emphasis placed by some Muslims themselves on those very issues which ignite intercultural and inter-religious tensions, and also by the occasionally hostile and exclusivist manner in which such Muslims convey their own beliefs to others. However, the existence of such minority elements is common to all communities, whether religious or secular. No community should be universally stigmatised on the basis of unrepresentative attitudes, beliefs and opinions held by a vocal minority.

With regard to Islamophobia, the Muslim community needs to avoid the confusion between valid and constructive criticism and self-criticism on the one hand, and unwarranted Islamophobia on the other. It does not serve the community to use “Islamophobia” as a label to repel all criticism, especially when elements of the community many have phobias of their own against other communities and openly express them.

2. Persecution, as a result of a) and in direct contravention of the best traditions of British fairness. Muslims feel under suspicion and feel unjustly targeted as a community. In such a climate, they feel vulnerable to false accusations based on unsubstantiated assumptions about their supposed level of “radicalism”, “extremism” or “fundamentalism”, and these fears are confirmed by the draconian measures which they see applied to those Muslims who have been harassed, arrested, abused, humiliated, released without charge and even detained without charge.

Given the way in which Muslims feel targeted, it is fundamentally unjust to blame them for isolating, segregating and turning in on themselves when such a reaction is itself one of the understandable consequences of persecution.

3. Discrimination

Muslims still experience discrimination as a result of inadequate legislation, as well as institutional discrimination and indirect discrimination.

4. Unease with (and hostility to) religion in dominantly secular Britain.

A recent survey has identified Britain as the most secular country in the world on the basis of the number of people claiming an active religious affiliation. However, religion is so central to Muslims and so interwoven into their daily lives that exclusion of religion from public life and the absence of a public discourse for religion inevitably results in the exclusion of Muslims.

Furthermore, gross misunderstandings about the role of religion in fomenting violent conflict are endemic in popular and even academic secular discourse. These

misunderstandings exacerbate prevailing unjust associations between Muslims and violence.

Recent debates about the desirability or otherwise of increasing the number of faith schools in Britain have revealed extreme prejudices by secularists, atheists and others opposed to religious education which often seem to reflect the prevailing ideological perspective in Britain today. "Secular schools as opposed to religious schools are not ideologically free zones. Secularism has its own ideological assumptions about the human person, the ideal society, and the ideal system of schooling and the meaning of human existence. While these assumptions may not be formally codified into a curriculum subject designated 'secular education' as an alternative to 'religious education' they characteristically permeate the ethos and culture of state-provided secular schools and form a crucial part of the 'hidden curriculum'".

The marginalisation of religion and religious discourse is also reflected in the fact that when it comes to the analysis of the concerns and needs of ethnic minorities, "religion is subsumed in the race construct even when it plays a more visible role than race." However, "policy provisions, legislation and action flowing from such analyses do not include religion, and thus often exclude Muslims".

5. Low participation and under-representation in key areas of British public life, including Politics and Policy Making [xv], Public Authorities, Media and Popular Culture

6. Endemic ignorance of the finest elements of the Islamic intellectual, cultural and spiritual tradition, not only amongst non-Muslims, but also amongst many Muslims themselves. Concomitant with this is the over-emphasis by the Muslim community on social and political issues, at the expense of a deeper understanding of their religion and its spiritual values. However, this disproportionate emphasis can in part be justified by the exclusion experienced by Muslims in British society which has understandably led them to focus on such issues and demand greater inclusion and an end to discrimination.

It also has to be said that the Muslim community needs to do much more to advance intelligent understanding of authentic Islam amongst mainstream British society. The Muslim community needs more ambassadors who can build inter-cultural and interfaith bridges connect with mainstream Britain and present universally applicable Islamic values to non-Muslims in a friendly and open manner. A glance at the bookshelves on Islam in mainstream British bookshops (as opposed to Islamic bookshops serving Muslim communities) reveals disproportionate space given to books, often by Western authors, which identify problematic aspects of Islam in the contemporary context. The reason for this is that Islamic publishers have often failed to break into mainstream distribution and are unrepresentative as a counterbalance to this unsympathetic literature. Behind this is the failure to develop more widespread distribution channels but also the failure to develop appropriate aesthetics in book design which would make many Islamic publications more attractive to non-Muslim readers.

7. Low educational achievement, especially of young men. This can be attributed to various factors:

. social exclusion which has led to disaffection . prejudice by poorly trained and uninformed

non-Muslim teachers lacking understanding of non-Western cultures in general, or even with active antipathy to certain cultural or religious identities, notably Islamophobia, despite the requirement to actively promote such understanding and respect under the statutory diversity strand of the new National Curriculum Citizenship programme (DfEE/QCA 2001). This lack of understanding also extends to the underestimation by teachers of the abilities of bilingual and multilingual children, despite evidence that these children often do better at school than monolingual children. poor proficiency in English in some Muslim communities. inadequate educational aspiration amongst some Muslim communities . inadequacies in curriculum and teaching methodology in some Muslim schools.

However, as Dr. Jeremy Henzell-Thomas have written , “it would be a great pity if faith schools, including Muslim schools, in their desire for recognition and their anxiety to be seen to subscribe to the performance culture of “success”, simply reproduce the innate flaws in the worst of the state secular education system.” Similarly, the first statement in the Executive Summary of Muslims on Education: A Position Paper (2004) states that “Qualitative aspects such as spirituality and independence of thought are as important as quantitative aspects such as key stage assessments and examination grades in setting a vision for education”. The Muslim community is faced with a challenge to maintain those qualitative aspects in the face of a narrowly defined utilitarian and functional secular curriculum, as are all schools which seek of offer a truly holistic education fostering full human potential, rather than mere schooling for the work place in the service of the “economic health” of the country. Significantly, the latter is the first priority of the educational system according to the government. Our young people are not to be fully formed human beings but units of production.

8. Socio-Economic Disadvantage and Deprivation

In addition to educational under-achievement, Muslims experience disadvantage and deprivation in Employment and Income, Housing and Health.

9. Fear of Assimilation into mainstream culture and erosion of the Islamic faith and heritage

Many Muslim parents are concerned that the assimilationist model is a long term attack on the survival of their faith, identity and heritage.[xxvii] Given evidence of widespread social, environmental, moral and spiritual decline in Britain,[xxviii] which some have characterised as a crisis reflecting terminal civilisational decay, if not total civilisational collapse, it is hardly surprising that concerned parents should wish to protect the higher civilisational values represented by their faith and cultural heritage.

The justifiable fears of such parents are not allayed by proposals for tests on knowledge of British history, culture and way of life to be administered to immigrants seeking British citizenship, especially in view of the fact that pilot studies have revealed that many white British citizens lack the requisite knowledge to pass the tests. Decline in historical knowledge amongst British schoolchildren of all cultural backgrounds is pervasive, and it seems prejudicial to expect people of other cultural and ethnic backgrounds to give evidence to a high degree of knowledge of which the majority of the population may be ignorant.[xxix]

Many Muslims feel that the dominant concept of what it is to be British is often not truly inclusive and does not reflect the multi-cultural nature of British society. They feel that

pressure should not be put on the minority to adapt to the majority and to conform with majority values, but that the ideal relationship should be one of mutual accommodation in which different communities share in developing a common set of values and norms, so that all communities feel at ease and at home with a larger community of communities.

Unfortunately, an increasingly jingoistic climate fostered by certain sections of the media which exploit xenophobia in the name of patriotism does nothing to facilitate such a mutual accommodation of values.

10. The challenge to contribute to wider British society

What can Muslims offer as a contribution to a better society at large? The challenge for the Muslim community is to find ways in which the finest elements of their own faith and way of life, including all those elements which engendered a great world civilisation, can begin to exert a positive influence on Britain and play a part in arresting the evident decline in British society.

Muslims and other people of faith have a major contribution to make as the guardians of many civilisational values, including principled standards of behaviour, both public and private, in which there is accelerating decline. But such a contribution needs to be orchestrated by people who are able to demonstrate and articulate in fresh language how the Islamic vision of the fine human being is accessible to everyone, and how in its primordial essence it is in harmony with the core identity of all human beings. A problem, or rather, a challenge, for the Muslim community is that their ability to make such a contribution to the whole of society, and thereby to benefit not just Muslims, but all mankind, (as they are enjoined to do by the Prophet Muhammad) necessitates a concerted effort by the most visionary and articulate members of the community to renew and animate the message of Islam in ways which will strike a chord amongst a much wider cross-section of the community as a whole (i.e. the community of communities which make up British society).

In such a way, bridges will be built and common ground found between the best of Islam and the best of the British way of life. In such a way, also, will Muslims cease to regard themselves as a victimised minority and play a larger role in the reclamation of civilisation for the British people? In such a way too they can play a positive, proactive role in actively addressing and pre-empting prejudices which cause Islamophobia instead of relying heavily on a reactive stance concerned predominantly with correcting misrepresentations and countering attacks.

11. Narrow focus on a few high-status professions as a mark of success

The positive contributory effort highlighted above needs people with many skills, but especially those with well-developed interpersonal and communications skills and inter-cultural knowledge and sensitivity. This represents a barrier for the Muslim community if such emphasis continues to be placed on a narrow band of conventionally high-status or high-earning professions as a mark of success, i.e. law, medicine, accountancy, academic research, engineering, science, technology.

If the Muslim community is to communicate the full depth of its heritage as a means of reclaiming civilisational values for the society as a whole, it needs to educate people in the humanities as well as the sciences; it needs journalists, media professionals (presenters,

editors, producers, directors), writers and teachers able to articulate Islamic principles in universal ways which inspire non-Muslims as well as Muslims; it needs ecologists, environmentalists and horticulturalists who can reclaim the Qur'anic vision of the sanctity of Nature in an age when Nature has been desacralised; it needs people of spiritual insight (not merely conventional religiosity or intellectuality wedded to academic rationalism) who can restore to mankind the original, primordial conception of the human Intellect as a spark of the divine; it needs historians, anthropologists, archaeologists, psychologists and counsellors who have studied the human condition; it needs well-read people well-versed in breadth and depth in their own tradition and familiar with the essential elements of other traditions too; it needs translators who can translate into many languages the rich heritage represented by the huge corpus of Islamic literature still buried in libraries and never brought to light; it needs librarians who know about books of all cultures; it needs artists and designers who can reclaim beauty of form for Islam in publications which are attractive to the eye, but who have sufficient substance in themselves never to overrate style over substance. The list is a long one and I have only begun to explore it here.

12. Achieving unity of purpose

A further challenge for the Muslim community will be the need to find a common purpose and work together to achieve it. There are many disparate strands in the Muslim community. Rivalry and disputation between groups and organisations (whether doctrinal or national) fragment the community and deprive it of the power it needs to advance itself and exert a positive influence on the wider society.

Information about the full report from which this extract is taken can be obtained from the Commission on British Muslims and Islamophobia Report titled "**Islamophobia: a Challenge for Us All**", published in 1997. The report itself can be ordered through any bookshop (ISBN 0 9022397-98-2). A progress report entitled "Addressing the Challenge of Islamophobia", published by the Commission in late 2001

The new report on Islamophobia entitled "Islamophobia: issues, challenges and action" was published on 21 June 2004 by Trentham Books, ISBN 1 85856 317 8, price £12.99. This report is a successor to "*Islamophobia: a Challenge for Us All*", published in 1997 and launched at the House of Commons by Jack Straw, then the Home Secretary. The new report, "*Islamophobia: Issues, Challenges and Action*", says that not enough progress has been made in tackling the problem since the earlier report. Hostility towards Islam permeates every part of British society and will spark race riots unless urgent action is taken to integrate Muslim youths into society, according to this new devastating report on Islamophobia.

The Commission on British Muslims and Islamophobia (CBMI), which is chaired by a key government adviser to the Stephen Lawrence inquiry, warns that more and more Muslims feel excluded from society and simmering tensions, especially in northern English towns, are in danger of boiling over. Members of the commission interviewed scores of British Muslims for their report, which will be published this week and will conclude that Britain is 'institutionally Islamophobic'.

"Muslims in Britain are now at the sharp end of race hatred and xenophobia."

I have heavily used both Islamophobia reports for this paper. For further information contact:

1) “Islamophobia: a Challenge for Us All”, published in November 1997 Uniting Britain Trust C/O The Stone Ashdown Trust, 4th floor, Barakat House, 116-18 Finchely Road, London NW3 5HT

2) “Islamophobia: Issues, Challenges and Action” published on 21 June 2004 from Trentham Books, Westview House, 734 London Road, Oakhill, Stoke on Trent ST4 5NP

Anti-Semitism in Europe is on rise, where Christians widely believed that Jews were Christ-killers; they had betrayed Christ and so had to be punished. Crusaders against the Muslims often began their journey in Europe by slaughtering Jews. Hitler's Glaubenskrieg, the war against Jews, was the culmination, the inexorable conclusion, of a millennium of anti-Semitism. It has become the symbol of evil, and the Holocaust one of the darkest stains on human conscience.

Let us constantly remind ourselves that anti-Semitism is far from dead in Europe. As a Muslim, I note that whenever there is Islamophobia or hatred against Muslims, the signs of anti-Semitism are not far behind. We need to point out that the roots of prejudice among Muslims against the Jewish people are complex and originate from different sources. Prejudice can be religious, ie anti-Judaic; it can be racist, ie anti-Semitic; and it can be political, ie anti-Zionist. Prejudice may combine all three, but one prejudice does not automatically assume the other two. There may be those who oppose the political ideas of Zionism, but are not either anti-Judaic or anti-Semitic.

The success of Zionism in creating Israel complicates matters for Muslims. Loss of land for the Palestinians and the loss of Jerusalem are viewed with injustice and anger among Muslims. In the rhetoric of confrontation, many blur the distinction between anti-Judaism, anti-Semitism and anti-Zionism. Such Muslims make the mistake they accuse others of making about themselves: seeing all Jews as monolithic and threatening.

As President of the European Commission, Romano Prodi invoked Europe's Jews in exactly these terms:

“I believe we can learn a lot from the history of the Jews of Europe. In many ways they are the first, the oldest Europeans. We, the new Europeans, are just starting to learn the complex art of living with multiple allegiances – allegiance to our home town, to our own region, to our home country, and now to the European Union. The Jews have been forced to master this art since antiquity. They were both Jewish and Italian, or Jewish and French, Jewish and Spanish, Jewish and Polish, Jewish and German. Proud of their ties with Jewish communities throughout the continent and equally proud of their bonds with their own countries of origin.”. (Romano Prodi, “A Union of Minorities.” **Opening Speech (as published) at the “Seminar on Europe – Against anti-Semitism, For a Union of Diversity.” Brussels, 2/19/04, p. 2.)**

Suggested Recommendation for OSCE consideration:

I would strongly suggest that in the final statement being prepared at the **OSCE** conference here the term **Islamophobia is explicitly used with Anti-Semitism**, as Europe has no choice but to face the reality that millions of its people are now Muslims are suffering from hostility, discrimination. **OSCE** must ask its 55 member countries to establish system to monitor or record crimes against Muslims and provide advise, support and representation to all those who become victim of Islamophobic crimes

In order to reduce the numbers of people who progress to such levels of hate and prejudice that they host Islamophobic and anti-Semitic messages in the media and the internet, **OSCE** should identify communities which have significant, if small numbers of people who send out these messages.

The majority in these communities usually are not Islamophobic or anti-Semitic, so the **OSCE** should sponsor and support governments, NGOs and individuals who seek out and meet those silent majorities, to set up programmes to educate them that Jews are people little different from themselves.

It was agreed at many Sessions of **OSCE** conferences that a major new Islamophobic and anti-Semitism come from either from ignorance or from extremists (and terrorists).

Programmes to be supported by **OSCE** can include practical measures such as:

- . • Map positive contacts between local Muslims and local Jewish communities. If there are insufficient local Jews or Muslims then **OSCE** can sponsor contacts on the internet.
- . • Facilitate Jews and Muslims to share best practice in protecting themselves against their common enemies, including neo-fascists.
- . • Promote inter-faith and inter-cultural dialogue for better understanding between different faith communities.
- . • Joint work on university campuses when each other's rights are under threat e.g when examinations are set on days which are religious holidays.
- . • Study religious texts together and sponsor visits to each other's places of worship.
- . • Develop together arts programmes.
- . • Play football together, especially at school age.
- . • Set up dialogue groups, especially facilitated discussions on the Israel/Palestine problem in order to address and unpick stereotypes.
- . • Support the silent Muslim majorities to express their shame and horror at anti-Semitic filth from the small minority of extremists in their community."

The draft has too many words for a Recommendation. The British Foreign Office has welcomed and sponsored the positive contacts growing between British Muslims and British Jews as a practical way of drawing together the large silent majorities in both communities. If Recommendations along these lines are agreed by **OSCE** in principle, the British delegation, and in particular I shall be happy to work with **OSCE** officials to improve the wording.

Religious Freedom is in danger in Europe and OSCE must act

FECRIS application for participatory/consultative (NGO status) with the Council of Europe

FECRIS (European Federation of Research and Information Centres on Sectarianism) acts as an umbrella organization for national "anti-cult" groups from different European countries.

The message spread by FECRIS is an alarmist one whereby they attempt to create a generalized and derogatory classification of "sect" which they categorize as 'dangerous'. Their actions target a wide range of minority religious groups and their intent is to lobby governments to accept this unscientific concept, establish themselves as 'experts' in the field, disseminate what is biased, false and misleading information and create discriminatory legislation targeting such groups.

FECRIS have applied for participatory status (a special non-government organisation status) **with the Council of Europe.** This would provide FECRIS with a credibility it does not deserve that would be used to forward its actions as described above - all contrary to the Council of Europe's standards of tolerance, dialogue, pluralism and justice. FECRIS are entitled to their opinions but they are not entitled to the support and endorsement of the Council of Europe in disseminating them.

The application is currently at the last stage – a final decision by the Committee of Ministers. This is likely to be taken in the coming few weeks. The only reason that the application has moved so far (it passed through the Parliamentary Assembly) is because a set of arbitrary procedural rules was adopted at the beginning of the investigation which resulted in the Assembly ignoring all submissions from NGOs.

Whilst providing many examples of discrimination and intolerance caused by FECRIS members these submissions also evidenced that **in at least seven countries FECRIS groups and its members have been condemned in courts more than 20 times for offences ranging from false imprisonment and physical harm to defamation** (a list and short summary of each case, all final decisions not under appeal, follows).

The Assembly's conclusions were even factually wrong. For example, two of the conclusions passed by the Assembly were that *'Mr. Griess, Vice President of FECRIS...has not indulged in reprehensible verbal attacks against the Council of Europe's principles of tolerance'* and *"Neither FECRIS nor its member groups have been responsible for spreading false information with damaging consequences for innocent individuals"*.

Mr. Griess is both a Vice President of FECRIS and their webmaster and has been convicted by Austrian and German courts on 7 occasions for defamation (and offences related to this) concerning a minority Christian movement.

The drafting of a final decision has been assigned to the Romanian Ambassador to the Council of Europe, H.E. Mr. Gheorghe Magheru (as responsible for relations with NGOs in the Committee of Ministers). It is currently with the Directorate General for Legal Affairs for additional legal review before a final decision is made.

List of cases in which FECRIS members were condemned

Extracts or summaries of judgements concerning FECRIS member groups and individuals

1. **Friedrich Griess, Secretary General of FECRIS** Court case: 17Cg 15/96d in Vienna Commercial court in Sept. 1996. Conviction for defamation about the Christian Family Fellowship, Styrian Christian Fellowship and the Life Fellowship (Norwegian Movement) including that they enlist people by “flirty fishing”, engage in incest, adultery and deceit.
2. **2. Friedrich Griess, Secretary General of FECRIS** Court case: 17Cg 15/96d in Vienna Commercial court in March 1997. Conviction for defamation with regard to the Christian Family Fellowship, Styrian Christian Fellowship and the Life Fellowship (Norwegian Movement) “Norwegians”.
3. **3. Friedrich Griess, Secretary General of FECRIS** Court case: 37Cg 77/98x in Vienna Commercial court on Sept 1998. Conviction for defamation for alleging that the Christian Family Fellowship, Styrian Christian Fellowship and the Life Fellowship (Norwegian Movement). Fine of 60,000 Austrian shillings
4. **4. Friedrich Griess, Secretary General of FECRIS** Court case: 17 O 85/98 in Stuttgart County Court in Germany – June 1998. Conviction for defamation against the “Norwegian movement”
5. **5. Friedrich Griess, Secretary General of FECRIS** Court case: 37Cg 19/00y in Vienna Commercial court in March 2000. Conviction for defamation and ordered by court to publish a correction statement on his web page and establish a link to the web page of the Norwegian Movement.
6. **6. Friedrich Griess, Secretary General of FECRIS** Court case: GZ 8E 3407/00 w in Klosterneuburg District Court. Violation of settlement agreement. He did not pay a fine and was ordered to remove false information from his web page and from search engines.
7. **7. Friedrich Griess, Secretary General of FECRIS** Judgement procedure GZ 8F 2687/02 s-3 in Klosterneuburg District Court. Violation of settlement agreement and order to pay a fine.
8. **8. SADK, 1990** [FECRIS member group], Switzerland In 1990, two members of FECRIS member group SADK were sentenced to prison in connection with a violent deprogramming attempt on a member of the Hare Krishna movement. Mr. Rossi, who at the time was the spokesman for SADK, spoke out loudly in favour of the deprogramming (during which the victim had been subdued with tear gas) saying “We support and approve of the deed.”
9. **9. FRI, 1990** [FECRIS member group], Sweden Case Nr B4901-88, ref.Nr. 75636712, issued December 19, 1990. In this judgement FRI-member Eva Pehrsson (now Pohl) was sentenced for the illegal deprivation of liberty and kidnapping of Gustavsson.
10. **10. FAIR, 1987** [FECRIS member group], United Kingdom Cyril Vosper, at the time an executive board member of FAIR, was convicted in Germany for false imprisonment and bodily harm in December 1987.
11. **11. ADFI Paris** [FECRIS member group] was condemned by the Paris County Court (Tribunal de Grande Instance) for defamation regarding Mrs. Josiane Henri and Mr. Ian Combe. (Decision RP 59 656, RG 7 987/92, ASS/20.02.92, CIVIL TRIAL

COURT OF GENERAL JURISDICTION OF PARIS, 1st Chamber, 1st Section) 27th May 1992.

12. **12. Mrs. Tavernier** [President of a FECRIS member group]. 5th January 1994. Criminal conviction for defamation. The Paris Court of Appeal confirmed the judgment regarding the culpability of libel of Mrs. Tavernier and the punishment imposed on her by the Paris County court on 22nd June 1993. Decision n° 5490/93, APPEAL COURT OF PARIS, 11th Chamber on 5th January 1994
13. **13. Mrs. Ovigneur-Dewynter, President of ADFI Nord** [FECRIS member group], 15th January 1997. The Douai Court of Appeal condemned Mrs. Ovigneur-Dewynter, President of ADFI Nord for defamation regarding the Cultural Association of the Jehovah's Witnesses in France. Case N° 96/02832, Decision on January 15th, 1997, 4th Chamber, APPEAL COURT OF DOUAI
14. **14. Jacky Cordonnier**, [member of UNADFI, FECRIS member group]. 29th March 2002. Criminal conviction for defamation. The Marseille County Court condemned her for libel regarding the association of Jehovah's Witnesses. Decision n° 2972/02 Number 01207964
15. **15. Janine Tavernier President of UNADFI** [FECRIS member group]. 5th February 2003. The Paris Court of Appeal confirmed the judgment in the civil proceedings against Janine Tavernier and UNADFI (decisions of the Paris County Court of 20 November 2001). Case N° 01/03757, Decision of February 5th, 2003, APPEAL COURT OF PARIS, 11th Chamber, section A
16. **16. AGPF and Sect-Info Essen** [FECRIS member groups]. The German Federal Supreme Court ruled on 27 March 1992 that it was unconstitutional for the State to provide funding for organisations such as AGPF and Sect-Info Essen, both FECRIS member groups. (The case was brought by the new religious movement, OSHO, Ref. Case Nr. 7C21-90LU66). That AGPF and Sect-Info Essen deal with new religious movements in a way that cannot be considered objective or neutral was made clear in this decision.
17. **17. Ms. Heide-Marie Cammans**, founder of Sect-info Essen [FECRIS member group]. In a final judgment on 19th December 2001 by the Munich State Court, Ms. Heide-Marie Cammans, founder of FECRIS member group Sect-info Essen was ordered to stop circulating falsehoods about Takar Singh (an Eastern religious group) on pain of being fined up to 500,000 DM or, if not paid, jailed for up to 6 months. Case Nr. Az: 908736/99 Munich I State court, 9 civil chamber (German: Landgericht Munchen I).
18. **18. CIC [FECRIS member group]. Ian Haworth is a FECRIS founding member and runs the UK group Cult Information Centre (CIC)**. He has a court decision against him on 24 Oct 1989, when the Supreme Court of Ontario (Canada) ordered he

pay \$10,000 in libel damages to a philosophical group. At the time Mr. Haworth was involved in a similar group to CIC in Canada. On the 17 April 1996 there is also a UK High Court decision against him for non-payment of the damages award

1. **19. Siren (FECRIS correspondent group)** 27 March 1997. 2 members of the group were convicted of kidnapping in The Netherlands.
2. **20. AIS/PRO Juventud** [FECRIS member group] (Canals case 1995) Spain which states that:

“That the group AIS had intervened in all breaches of fundamental rights which the accused has suffered of. That neither the President nor her group had any consent at all to carry out

any 'therapeutic work' on him. That this group did not have any kind of judicial authorization to replace the lack of 'consent' of the supposedly ill person. That in consequence, in a State of Rights, it is not possible to tolerate the degradation, whatever the purpose may be, of a citizen that has proven his mental integrity."

21. AIS/PRO Juventud [FECRIS member group] (Riera Blume case, 1999) European Court of Human Rights which states that "In the light of the foregoing, the Court considers that the national authorities at all times acquiesced in the applicants' loss of liberty. While it is true that it was the applicants' families and the Pro Juventud association that bore the direct and immediate responsibility for the supervision of the applicants during their ten days' loss of liberty, it is equally true that without the active cooperation of the Catalan authorities the deprivation of liberty could not have taken place."

Suggestion for Spanish authorities regarding Cordoba Masjid :

We are here meeting in beautiful surroundings next to famous **Cordoba Masjid** (Mosque). In the spirit of tolerance and accepting Muslims in our midst, I ask as a European Muslim **a)** to allow Muslim to pray in **Cordoba Masjid** (Mosque) **b)** give ownership rights back to Muslims. I hope and pray that my suggestion will be given some serious and favourable considerations

The Necessity of Dialogue and honest conversation:

In my faith tradition the Holy Qur'an commands believers for interfaith co-operation "to come to common grounds" (The Holy Qur'an 3:64). As a Muslim I have been ordered to build good relations with all people of the world (The Holy Qur'an 49:13 & (16:40); work for peace everywhere and whenever possible with others (2:208) & 8:61); cooperate with others in furthering virtue and God-consciousness (5:2); seek and secure human welfare, promote justice and peace (The Holy Qur'an 4:114); do good to others (The Holy Qur'an 28:77) and not to break promises made to others (The Holy Qur'an 16:91). The Holy Qur'an tells believers that those who do good deeds and help others are the best creation (The Holy Qur'an 98:6). The Holy Prophet of Islam made it clear that "Religion is man's treatment of other fellow-beings" (Bukhari & Muslim); and "the best among you is he who does good deeds in serving other people" (Ahmad & Tabrani).

The Prophet of Islam (May the peace of God be upon him) practiced this ideal for interfaith dialogue himself while talking to Jews, Christians and other faith traditions, as well as people with no faith on issues concerning life, death and relevant matters. The Prophet of Islam confirmed this in writing explicitly in the Charter of Medina in 622 CE. The Holy Qur'an not only recognized religious pluralism as accepting other groups as legitimate socio-religious communities but also accepting their spirituality. The preservation of the sanctity of the places of worship of other faiths is paramount in Islamic tradition (The Holy Qur'an 22:40). The Holy Qur'an is full of many examples but time does not permit me to dwell on this.

The Role of Religion and Belief:

Religion brings joy and hope to millions of people in the world. Religion is a social force that can be harnessed to build bridges or manipulated to erect walls. Living and working together in today's multicultural, multi-religious and multi faith society is not always easy. Faith communities have huge human and financial resources. Religion motivates its followers for

doing good deeds such as raising funds for good causes, helping elderly and needy people in our communities and motivating their followers to tackle many social issues in our society. Religion harnesses deep emotions, which can sometimes take destructive forms. Where this happens, we must draw on our faith to bring about reconciliation and understanding. The truest fruits of our faith are healing the wounds of the past and being positive to construct trust and fellowship between different people. We have a great deal to learn from one another, which enriches us without undermining our own identities. Together, listening and responding with openness and respect, we can move forward to work in ways that acknowledge genuine differences but build on shared hopes and values.

The need of Inter-religious Dialogue:

The famous German theologian Prof Hans Kung once said, “No peace among nations without peace among religions, and no peace among religions without dialogue between the religions”. In the document the Caux 2002 Dialogue: An honest conversation among concerned Muslims and non-Muslims on Peace, Justice and Faith I added, “No peace without justice and no justice without forgiveness and compassion”. Among many prerequisites of meaningful dialogue are active listening, honest conversation, accepting the other’s vision whether agreeing or disagreeing, and acknowledging the other’s pain. In today’s world there is a dire need of inter-religious dialogue. There are common values that human beings share irrespective of religion, nationality or ethnicity. These values include the sanctity of life, freedom, equality, respect for human rights, international humanitarian law, commitment to cultural and religious diversity, human dignity, human development, democracy, the rule of law, and equitable access to the earth’s resources and equitable distribution of power.

Diversity recognised, appreciated and celebrated:

Islam presents the concept that all human beings are equal and we are equal because we are all creatures of God with no distinctions of colour, race or country, or tribe or clan or anything else. One would find that fanaticism is generated in the last analysis either from any of these false prejudices, when you try to group humanity into certain watertight compartments. One cannot change the colour of his skin; one cannot change his place of birth. If one believes in any of these standards, then rational fusion of the human race is not possible and you become intolerant towards others. In Islam, the rational fusion is possible for whatever tribe, you come from, from whatever race you come, whatever colour you may have, whatever territory you might be born in, whatever language you speak, you are one, you can be one. You belong to one race the human race, the one family the human family. You belong to one brotherhood. Diversity among fellow human beings must be recognised, appreciated and valued in all aspects of life. The majority community is always judged by the way it treats its minority community

Ends cannot justify means:

Another point is that Islam is very unique and firm in asserting that the ends cannot justify the means. The source from where fanaticism and intolerance have most often come from is the mistaken belief that the ends justify the means. This means that to achieve even good ends you can resort to evil means. The principle that Islam has enunciated is that "Good and bad are not equal. Replace evil by good". (The Holy Qur'an 41:34)

The world's Religious view:

Plurality is a fact of today's global village. People from many different faiths and belief or no faith live side by side. But society can only be built on mutual respect, openness and trust. This means living our lives with integrity, and allowing others to do so too. Our different religious traditions teach us the importance of good relationships characterized by honesty, truth, love, unselfishness, compassion and generosity of care for resolving conflicts by peaceful means.

Better understanding of others require us to share our desire for peace-building based on reverence of life, freedom, and justice, the eradication of poverty, dissolution of all forms of discrimination and protection of the environment for future generations. We should show each other respect and courtesy. In dealing with people of other faiths and beliefs, or no convictions of any faith, this means:

- . • Respecting other people's freedom within the law to express their beliefs and convictions;
- . • Learning to understand what others actually believe and value, and letting them express this on their own terms;
- . • Valuing and respecting the convictions of others about food, dress, and social etiquette and not behaving in ways which cause needless offence;
- . • Recognizing that all of us at times fall short of the ideals of our own traditions and never comparing our own ideals with other people's practices;
- . • Working together to prevent disagreement from leading to conflict;
- . • Always seeking to avoid violence in our relationship.

Common, Core, Shared Human Values:

Honesty and sincerity, love and compassion, dignity and mutual respect, modesty and humility, moderation and restraint in our actions, sacrifice and unselfishness, kindness and courtesy, a sense of justice and a sense of fairness, a sense of balance and a sense of propriety, seeking forgiveness and asking for apology for past mistakes – these are values which all religions cherish.

When we talk about matters of faith and society with one another, we need to do so with sensitivity, honesty and straightforwardness. This means:

- . • Recognising that listening carefully with respect, as well as speaking, is necessary for a genuine and honest conversation;
- . • Being honest about our beliefs and religious allegiances in bringing people together, not in confrontation but in trust to tackle urgent needs of the community;
- . • Not misrepresenting or disparaging other people's beliefs and practices;
- . • Correcting misunderstandings or misrepresentations not only of our own but also of other faiths whenever we come across them;
- . • Being straightforward about our intentions in searching for solutions, focusing on what is right rather than who is right;
- . • Accepting and valuing the God-given diversity of our human family, honouring each person, appealing to the best qualities in everyone, and refusing to stereotype others;

- . • Ensuring that all religious commitments of all those who are present in any interfaith meetings will be respected;
- . • Recognising that energy for change requires a moral and spiritual transformation in each human spirit.

All of us want others to understand and respect our personal views. Some people will also want to persuade others to join their faith. In a multi faith society where this is permitted, the attempt should always be characterized by self-restraint and concern for the other's freedom and dignity. This means:

- . • Respecting another person's expressed wish to be left alone;
- . • Avoiding imposing ourselves and our views on individuals or communities who are in vulnerable situations;
- . • Always being sensitive and courteous;
- . • Avoiding violent actions or language, threats, manipulation, improper inducements, or the misuse of any kind of power;

- . • Respecting the right of others to disagree with us;
- . • Building lasting relationship outside our comfort zones.

Since September 11, 2001 a concerted effort has been underway in some quarters to bring about a 'clash of civilisations" between Islam and the West. Part of this is through inflammatory articles and speeches some of which can be clearly and justly labelled as anti-Semitic or Islamophobic, (though little of which could be characterised as racist against Westerners). On the other side of the spectrum are efforts to bring about a dialogue of civilisations. In bringing about such dialogue we cannot start by pointing fingers and casting blame. Instead, we must recognise the areas of agreement and build on them.

Muslims stand clearly against all forms of racism. Islamic teachings insets on establishing justice between people, and through justice, peace. Islam protects the universal, God-given rights of humankind, while recognising that people have differing paths in religion which they are free to follow and which confer differing social and economic rights among people such as in marriage, divorce and inheritance. This freedom is at the heart of the tolerance of Islam.

In this world there are many injustices, among these are the rise of anti-Semitism especially that manifested in unjust attacks on innocent Jews, the rise of Islamophobia, the attacks on innocent Muslims and the numerous other cases where human rights are violated across the world. In seeking to heal the world of these problems, we need to identify the good actions of those being criticised, as well as identifying their bad actions, and we need to avoid intending retribution by our criticism by forgiving those who have injured us or at least clearly being prepared to do so, should they ask for it. If it is done right, this will help to create, not inflamed argument, but sincere dialogue. **We need a dialogue of civilisations, not a monologue and not a clash of civilisations.**

Together we will share our lives and resources that God has given us to make our earth a trusting community of hope, security and opportunity for all. Let us pray,
"Let there be respect for the earth, peace for its people, love in our lives, delight in the good, forgiveness for our past wrongs and from now on a new start". Amen.

PC.DEL/530/05
9 June 2005

ENGLISH only

**CONTRIBUTION OF
H.E. PROF. EKMELEDDIN IHSANOGLU,
SECRETARY GENERAL OF THE
ORGANISATION OF THE ISLAMIC CONFERENCE,
TO THE WORK OF THE
FOURTH SESSION OF THE O.S.C.E. CONFERENCE
ON ANTI-SEMITISM AND
ON THEIR FORMS OF INTOLERANCE
CORDOBA: 8-9 JUNE 2005.**

Distinguished Delegates, Ladies and Gentlemen,

There are very few places on earth that once stood witness to human harmony, compassion, tolerance, love, equality, and where cultural diversity, interfaith connection, dialogue and recognitions of the other thrived and flourished as Cordoba, the city which ages before the dawn of renaissance and modernity was a shining beacon of tolerance, liberality and knowledge which lit the skies at a time when dark ages in Europe brought forth tyranny, religious bigotry and intolerance.

The choice of Cordoba to host our meeting today is highly meet and befitting as we hope that the “spirit” of Cordoba will inspire us all and prevail over our deliberations.

The need to the spirit of Cordoba is evident as we see and read about what is happening around us in Europe. Dr. Israel SHAHAK of the “Peace Now” movement in Israel warned of what he termed “the mounting of cosmic war against Islam and Muslims”. German academic GUNTHER GRASS said in one of his articles that: “the current climate of hate against Islam brings us very close to a situation similar to that which prompted Germany’s infamous ‘KRISTALLNACKT’ in 1938. Once ‘the enemy’ has been so dehumanized and portrayed as demonic and parasitical, what further justification is needed to persecute and finally exterminate it.”

Christopher Allen one of the two editors of the report of European Monitoring Center on Racism and Xenophobia wrote in an article published in a book “the Quest for Sanity”, the following:

“The report unequivocally highlighted the regularity with which Muslims, throughout Europe, became indiscriminate targets for abusive and sometimes violent retaliatory attacks against them. Islamophobia became much more extreme, explicit and accepted across European society. Incidents ranged from verbal abuse, indiscriminately blaming all Muslims for the attacks of 9/11, women having their headscarf torn from their heads, Muslim male and female being spat upon ... or randomly assaulted in the streets with some of the most extreme leaving victims paralysed, or indeed, hospitalized for many day ... yet despite this fact Islamophobia remained overlooked and dismissed by a variety of detractors from unlikely sectors of the society.”

Due to time constraints, I don’t want to dwell on the myriad of testimonies given or written by non-Muslims, about the bleak plight of Muslims of Europe today. But we are very worried when we see that this onslaught has been able to permeate the discursive structures throughout Europe’s various modes of disseminations, and finds spokesmen at the level of politicians and even high ranking officials in certain European governments.

Islamophobia had historic roots in Europe, and preceded 9/11 attacks. But 9/11 fueled and enraged the whole world. What happened that day was as much a crime in Islamic law, as it was in the American constitution, European laws, international law and covenants. For

Muslims 9/11 was a dark day in their history at the dawn of 21st Century, as it was for the U.S., Europe and else where.

The work of the aberrant behavior of misguided individual of hate-filled group, who have turned their murderous hate on their fellow Muslims cannot, justly and logically, be blamed on all Muslims. A Canadian writer commented on this saying that: “even if a thousand Muslims (not nineteen) were to commit similar acts every year – an unimaginable scenario – they would represent only one criminal per millions of Muslims”.

Islam is a living faith with nearly 1300 million global adherents. It has survived as a world religion for more than 1400 years. It has developed a radiant civilization which led the world for long centuries, and stood for values that match or even surpass the modern sublime values on tolerance, human rights compassion, justice, recognition of the other. Islam enacted the first law in the history of humanity which defend equality among all human beings regardless of their colour, race, ethnic origin, faith, social status etc. Inter religious tolerance was the central message of Islam. The Holy Qur’an says for example in ALBAKARA, Verse 136 the following:

“Say (O Muslims) We believe in God and that which is revealed unto us and that which was revealed unto Abraham, and Ismail, and Isaac, and Jacob, and the tribes, and that which Moses and Jesus received, and that which the Prophets received from their Lord. We make no distinction between any of them, and unto Him we have surrendered.”

So the claim that Islam is separate from Judeo-Christian West in a false pretension. Islam in its faith in the revelation of Abraham, Moses, Jesus and Mohamed, belong to the same traditions as Christianity and Judaism.

Islam was a civilization, a super power and a genuine geopolitical rival to the West. Islam and Christianity were not enemies, no more competitors. They have a lot in common, the most important of which is their common spiritual reference. Islam and Christianity borrowed and learned from each other, whether in relation to scholarship, philosophy, scientific inquiry, medicine, architecture, and technology.

The classical learning from Athens and Rome which was lost to Christendom was jealously preserved by the Muslims, and came to western Europe, through them. That Europe came to define its civilization as a renaissance of Greece and Rome, and excised the Muslim contribution to its foundations, and its well being, is an example of racist myth-making that has much relevance today.

We, in the OIC, believe that the world is witnessing the birth of a new racism in Europe, based on religious grounds which is more virulent and dominant than racial abuse, or discrimination. This irrational trend should be checked and stopped.

We believe that the virtues of compassion and justice are not the preserve of any one people, religion or civilization, but are universal human values, which we all need to internalize and uphold.

It is under the Islamic principles of tolerance, and acknowledging the other, that the lands of Islam played host, through centuries, to three out of four Christian patriarchate

mainly those of Jerusalem, Antioch and Alexandria, which produced some of the most prominent intellectual thinkers and writers in theology.

Islamophobia is highly dangerous because it does not respect the individual. On many instances it stands on the fringes of collective punishment outlawed by international law, and considered a crime.

Muslims in Europe need to be protected against the lifelong social and psychological damage inflicted by hate mongering, negative stereotyping, mental and physical abuse and smear campaign against their self-identity, self-esteem and human dignity.

For that purpose there is an urgent necessity to:

- give recognition to Islam as an official religion in EU member states that do not grant this recognition;
- strengthen legislation on hate crimes, and enacting laws on “Equal Treatment” adopted by EU Council directives in 2000 with the target of the 2003 as a deadline to its implementation. Many EU member states have yet to meet that deadline – this will help in countering discrimination in employment, housing, services etc.;
- revise national text-books at all level of education, particularly in key disciplines such as history, geography, philosophy, social and human sciences, with a view to present a balanced views of other cultures and civilizations;
- install genuine inter-cultural dialogue at local, national, regional and international levels, and in all media, from news to feature stories, fiction and even cartoons;
- promote tolerance and encourage debate within the intelligentsia and media about their responsibility to avoid perpetuating prejudices against Muslims;
- develop campaign to foster and disseminate respect for cultural and religious pluralism, and disseminate their virtues;
- ensure the right to freedom of religious practices;
- help in addressing the root causes of terrorism, mainly the political injustices.
- give Muslim minorities more incentive to participate in public life, to enable them to retain their confidence and help in integration process. This needs more care,

put an end to harassment, avoiding segregation. Assimilation is difficult to attain in a short period of time. It is better left to future generations;

- prosecute abuses and punish discriminatory and violent acts by law enforcement agents;

- monitor discrimination against Muslims and coordinate this effort with the OIC;

The OIC believes that what we require today is a greater understanding of the needs of one another. The Muslim diaspora in the West can be a critical source of dialogue and bridge building. They should be an asset to both sides, not a liability. Their presence in Europe is needed by Europeans, for a variety of economic or social reasons. This need is projected to increase in the future. In a shrinking world of globalization, they can be a useful tool to embrace the challenge of a connected world.

SP-CORDOBA
Disk 6/DC-2005
AH

Cordoba, 9 June 2005

**OSCE Conference on
Anti-Semitism and on Other Forms of Intolerance**

Ombretta Fumagalli Carulli, Moderator

**Session 5 - Fighting intolerance and discriminations against
Christians and members of other religions:
respecting religious identity in a pluralistic society**

Eccellenze, Distinte Delegate, Distinti Delegati,

Sono onorata dell'invito a moderare la presente sessione su un tema di grande attualità ed importanza: la lotta contro l'intolleranza e la discriminazione contro i cristiani e i membri delle altre religioni, nel rispetto dell'identità religiosa in una società pluralistica.

Si tratta di un argomento che io stessa ho avuto occasione di approfondire in contesti e circostanze diverse, scientifiche e politiche.

Sono certa di interpretare i sentimenti di tutti i presenti, esprimendo vivo apprezzamento per la volontà degli Stati partecipanti dell'OSCE di combattere questi fenomeni, al fine di rafforzare e di rendere più efficace il loro ambizioso ed importante impegno in favore della tolleranza.

Sono certa altresì che il dibattito, che tra poco avrà inizio, contribuirà ad approfondire la nostra consapevolezza della natura e tipologia di tale problematica. In questo senso, la presente sessione è già un successo: una delle numerose "storie di successo" che caratterizzano l'impegno dell'OSCE in favore dei diritti umani.

Questo successo si riannoda e completa il proficuo lavoro che, dal dicembre dello scorso anno, sta svolgendo la Sig.ra Anastasia Crickley, in qualità di rappresentante personale del Presidente in esercizio dell'OSCE per la lotta contro il razzismo, la xenofobia e la discriminazione, con un focus sull'intolleranza e la discriminazione contro i cristiani ed i membri di altre religioni.

Prima di passare la parola ai qualificati Introducers, stimo utile ricordare che trenta anni fa, con la conclusione della Conferenza di Helsinki, i popoli europei si sono

trovati d'accordo sul significato universale dei diritti dell'uomo e delle libertà fondamentali. Tra essi hanno posto la libertà religiosa.

Il cammino compiuto, prima dalla CSCE e poi dall'OSCE, ha visto sin dall'inizio tappe significative che tutti voi ben conoscete: dal Documento conclusivo di Vienna dell'89, al Documento Helsinki del '92, al Documento di Budapest del '94. Sono stati via via enucleati e precisati i tre aspetti della libertà religiosa: individuale, comunitaria ed istituzionale. Da tempo, dunque, la libertà religiosa passa attraverso la valorizzazione delle religioni in quanto tali.

PC.NGO/34/05

9 June 2005

ITALIAN only

La focalizzazione più recente sulla discriminazione per motivi religiosi ha prodotto ulteriori e importanti impegni per gli Stati partecipanti, in simmetria con altre istituzioni internazionali, in particolare l'apposita Commissione delle Nazioni Unite.

Eppure l'intolleranza religiosa è tutt'altro che scomparsa. Talvolta -questo è un fenomeno nuovo- a farne le spese sono le confessioni cristiane di maggioranza.

Su alcuni specifici temi invito i presenti ad intervenire.

Anzitutto, l'impegno degli Stati a combattere la discriminazione dei cristiani e dei membri delle altre religioni sui media, in Internet, sul posto di lavoro e in prassi amministrative. I media, in particolare, rappresentano un ambito vasto, nel quale bisogna combattere gli stereotipi, i pregiudizi, gli *hate-speeches*.

Nella lotta contro l'anti-Semitismo e contro le discriminazioni ai danni dei musulmani l'OSCE ha giustamente riservato particolare attenzione ai media. Mi sembra necessario fare altrettanto nella presente sessione. Non va poi tralasciato il rilievo del settore dell'educazione e quello del dialogo inter-religioso nella promozione della tolleranza, del rispetto e della reciproca comprensione.

Siamo tutti consapevoli che il contributo specifico offerto dai cristiani e dai membri delle altre religioni alla vitalità ed al benessere dei nostri sistemi democratici costituisce un valore strutturale per le nostre società pluraliste, se non vogliamo vedere limitata la dignità della persona umana dagli eccessi della secolarizzazione.

Di qui l'importanza di presentare e condividere le *best practices* dei governi, delle istituzioni e della società civile in due direzioni: anzitutto nell'assicurare le condizioni di libertà perché la religione sia presente nella vita pubblica e non solo in quella privata, in conformità con le legislazioni nazionali e gli obblighi assunti a livello internazionale; in secondo luogo, nell'accogliere e valorizzare il contributo dei cristiani e delle altre religioni.

Infine mi pare opportuno riflettere sul ruolo del *Panel di esperti sulla libertà religiosa e di credo*. È un organismo efficace, sia a breve che a lungo termine. Può offrire un aiuto qualificato affinché le legislazioni e le prassi dei nostri governi non siano all'origine di comportamenti intolleranti o discriminatori.

PC.DEL/593/05
16 June 2005

ENGLISH
Original: SPANISH

STATEMENT BY

AMBASSADOR MERCEDES RICO,

DIRECTOR GENERAL OF RELIGIOUS AFFAIRS, SPANISH
MINISTRY OF JUSTICE, AT SESSION V OF THE OSCE
CONFERENCE ON ANTI-SEMITISM AND ON OTHER FORMS OF
INTOLERANCE

Cordoba, 8 and 9 June 2005

Discrimination against Christians and members of other religions is a subject of particular relevance for the OSCE, a region with an extensive Christian tradition in general but one where historically all kinds of persecution and discrimination have also taken place against Christians, be they Catholic, Protestant since Luther's reform or members of the orthodox church.

The use of religion as a key factor in unification and political domination has been a consistent feature of the history of our continent. The enforcing of a single religion in a country, territory or national community has not only been a cause of bloodshed in past centuries but also, unfortunately, a widespread practice in the twentieth century — from the persecution of any type of religious expression or commitment in the former Social Realist bloc to the struggle for ethnic and religious unification in the 1990s during the dissolution of former Yugoslavia, not forgetting, of course, the culmination of exterminating frenzy that was Nazism and the Holocaust, which not only eliminated with particular brutality and success all those who could be considered Jewish but also persecuted, albeit not so obsessively, Christians, Muslims, Jehovah's Witnesses and members and followers of all confessions and denominations in the occupied countries. The valour of some religious leaders of the time and of the members of the churches of central and eastern Europe since, as symbolized most prominently by the late Pope John Paul II, without a doubt laid the foundations for reconciliation in Europe on the basis of the irrefutable humanist values that we share today.

In Europe today, there are plenty of examples of a general trend towards recognition of freedom of religion and worship as a fundamental right inseparable from freedom of conscience, and in this respect we cannot but acknowledge the role played by the OSCE in the progress that has been made. At the same time, there are still instances of discrimination in practice and sometimes also in legislation in some countries in the OSCE area, against which we need to continue fighting at every level, and — as has been noted during this Conference — the old anti-Semitism still exists and is re-emerging with new focuses, new proponents and new prejudices.

Bearing in mind that this Conference is taking place in Spain and referring to the second part of the title of this session, "respect for religious identity in a pluralistic society", I

should like to dwell at some length, in the time allowed to me by the moderator, on the current situation in a country like Spain, which, until 1978 when the current Constitution was approved and promulgated, was a Catholic State with very limited religious freedom.

As all of you are well aware, the enforcement of a single religion was one of the features of the creation of the modern State of Spain from 1492 onwards.

This enforced religion included not only the expulsion of the large Jewish population from Spain and the ongoing persecution of those who accepted forced conversion, but also a century later the Moors and Muslims still living on Spanish territory following political unification and then, from the middle of the sixteenth century, all members of the groups of reform Christians that were emerging in Spain, as in the other mainly Catholic countries of western Europe.

In this way the Catholic State dominated our recent and contemporary history with the exception of two brief Republican periods (1869-1874 and 1931-1936). The 1978 Constitution established the non-confessionality of the State and freedom of religion and worship as a fundamental right (article 16), while article 14 prohibits discrimination on account of religion, among other things, and article 9 commits the public authorities to ensuring that these rights are enforced.

In this respect, there are several comments to be made.

1. A law was passed in Spain in 1967 concerning religious freedom, which transformed the de facto tolerance with regard to non-Catholic minorities since the last decades of the nineteenth century into a legal fact. Thereafter small Jewish, Protestant and, later, Muslim communities that started to establish themselves were not in principle persecuted, although they were still socially marginalized.
2. The non-confessional constitutional status of Spain and the freedom of religion were possible in part thanks to the collaboration of the Catholic Church, which, under the prompting of the Second Vatican Council, supported the Constitution and put the seal, as you will remember, on the reconciliation of the Spanish fractions that had existed since the Civil War and the long period of dictatorship.
3. The Spanish Constitution, at the same time as proclaiming the non-confessionality of the State, stipulates that the public authorities should take into account the beliefs of Spanish society and urge them to co-operate with the Catholic Church and other confessions. Moreover, article 27 states that public authorities must guarantee the right of parents to ensure that their children receive religious and moral instruction in accordance with their own convictions, i.e., to create their own schools and receive religious education.

The Constitution therefore establishes the principle of non-confessionality or secularity (the authors regard the two terms as being equivalent) based on co-operation between religions. It recognizes religion as a social value and includes within the guaranteed freedom of religion the right not to make statements regarding ideology or beliefs. It also makes a particular reference to the Catholic Church, which is the only body to be mentioned by name.

Like the 1978 Constitution as a whole, this was the result of a basic political pact between the Catholic tradition and the secular tradition of the Spanish Left.

The development of these constitutional concepts was a long drawn-out process and their implementation has required a good deal of effort by all concerned, which continues to this day.

— In 1980, the Organic Law or Basic Law on Religious Freedom was adopted; its twenty-fifth anniversary is being celebrated this year. It was an extremely important law, guaranteeing non-Catholics the right to establish places of worship, to disseminate and propagate their own beliefs, to appear in public, to train ministers and open teaching centres and, as the case may be, sign agreements with the State;

— The constitutional demand for co-operation developed very quickly with the Catholic Church: four co-operation agreements were signed in 1979 with the Holy See, which are still in force, replacing the old Concordat of 1953;

— With the other main religions, it was not until the symbolic year of 1992 that the three co-operation agreements were signed with the Federation of Jewish Communities of Spain (FCIE), the Islamic Commission of Spain (CIE), and the Evangelical Federation (FEREDE). They were historic agreements, recognized throughout the world as the end of the centuries-old failure by Spain to come to terms with the Jewish, Muslim and reform Protestant communities;

— These co-operation agreements with the minority religions, approved by Parliament with the status of laws, provide for co-operation in part inspired by the agreements with the Catholic Church. In particular, they grant similar tax benefits, give civil recognition to religious marriages, recognize the right to teaching these religions in school, to hold religious services in prisons, hospitals and for members of the armed forces, and to open religious teaching centres, among other things.

But as the leaders of these federations, who are in regular communication with the State, do not fail to remind us continually, not all of these points have yet been implemented with the same degree of intensity. It should be noted that this is due in part to the fact that in 1992 the Muslim, Protestant and Jewish communities in Spain were not very large and in some areas the need for co-operation was not seen as an urgent necessity once the rights had been guaranteed.

Today, 13 years later, however, the religious minorities in Spain have developed and constitute an important part of our society, in good measure as a result of immigration, which has transformed Spain in the last ten years.

The Government that came to power in April 2004 is therefore endeavouring to fully implement the 1992 agreements, put right the inequalities that still exist and prevent, in the difficult circumstances since the attacks in Madrid in March 2004, any sense of rejection or anti-Muslim public sentiment.

It should nevertheless be pointed out that there has not been a significant increase in xenophobic attitudes in Spanish society since those terrible attacks, although there are still fervent (and opportunist) anti-Islamic voices in the media, including the Internet, and partisans of the clash of civilization, and there is still a certain amount of anti-Semitism in the very small number of groups on the extreme right, and on the extreme left, which use the Middle East conflict as a pretext to collect pictures and make stupid and obscene jokes, as has already been mentioned here. These groups must be closely watched. There have also been a few acts of desecration of religious sites including Catholic ones.

While remaining vigilant in the face of these acts, we believe that the fundamental problem facing Spain in this respect is to prevent the social marginalization of minority religions, especially immigrant groups — not least at this difficult time when, as in the rest of Europe, society is increasingly secularized and there are strong secular currents in Spain that would like to see a reduction in the influence of all forms of religious expression in society.

The Government has nevertheless determined that the best approach is to welcome

religious minorities by developing the instruments available to us, i.e., the 1992 agreements, to the full and creating a genuinely pluralistic environment for coexistence in which the things that unite us — mutual respect and the human rights on which our legal system is based — are much stronger than those that divide us.

The Government also believed that it should take important steps in this direction by reducing the relative disadvantages under which the large minority religions, be they non-Catholic Christian, Jewish or Muslim, exist in Spain and has made efforts to give real and effective force to the agreements by including religious education in State schools under the same conditions offered to the Catholic religion, organizing religious services in prisons, helping local authorities to enable temples and mosques to be built where they are required, and providing burial grounds for the different religions, among other things.

Moreover, it has endeavoured in particular to send out a clear signal to the faithful, to the leaders of the communities and to the Spanish public as a whole that the State is aware of the difficulties in which the minority religions exist, that their congregations often have scant financial resources to support themselves adequately and that there is a large amount of ignorance in Spanish society, which is often a precursor to mistrust, insecurity and, as a result, rejection.

To put it bluntly, we don't want ghettos in Spain today, we don't want discrimination on account of belonging to a religious minority and we do believe that by strengthening the development capacity of these minorities, who are so closely linked to our history, we will help to improve society as a whole and its ability to coexist with respect for a plurality of cultural and religious traditions as they exist in our society today. I should like to point out that in this undertaking the Government has received the express and repeated support of the Catholic Church, which is the most important social actor in Spain after the State and has shown a continuous commitment to dialogue and inter-religious co-operation.

In late 2004, a public foundation was established, the *Fundación Pluralismo y Convivencia*, to finance social and cultural projects and programmes for the minority religions that have an agreement with the State, with initial State funding of 3 million euros, to be renewed every year and with the possibility in the future of private donations and funding from other Spanish or foreign foundations. The State funding is not intended for religious purposes, as we believe that this is the exclusive responsibility of the members of the communities.

This Foundation is directed by a board made up of representatives of the Government and persons nominated by the executive bodies of the Jewish, Protestant and Muslim communities.

We are all perfectly aware that the Foundation cannot solve all of the many problems experienced by the minority religions, but we hope that it will serve to alleviate some of them and also to stimulate awareness and respect by the whole of Spanish society, of which they are part.

The Foundation is currently in the process of issuing its first public invitation for the funding of projects and programmes, which are designed, among other things, to strengthen the self-help organizations in the communities, support cultural and education programmes, the communities' own communication and distribution media, the fight against prejudice, and greater understanding of the religions and their rights.

The other religions in Spain are protected by the Constitution and Organic Law on Religious Freedom and entered in the register of the Ministry of Justice. The Government is maintaining dialogue with them with a view to improving the conditions in which they exist in our country.

ODIHR.GAL/49/05
9 June 2005

ENGLISH only



Introductory Statement by Ambassador Christian Strohal Director, OSCE Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights

*Session 6: Fighting racism, xenophobia and other forms of intolerance and
discrimination: inter alia, the role of education, the media and education*

OSCE Conference on Anti-Semitism and on Other Forms of Intolerance
Cordoba, 09 June 2005

Excellencies, Distinguished Delegates, Ladies and Gentlemen and Colleagues

It is a great pleasure for me to be able to address this session on fighting intolerance and discrimination, a session that is significant in both its theme and its timing. I say timing because we are witnessing increasingly violent manifestation of racism, xenophobia and other forms of intolerance across the OSCE region. Let me draw your attention to a number of cases that have occurred in just this past month, cases that are troubling not only for the violence they demonstrate, but because of the message of prejudice and hate they send to the victim and to the community the victim belongs to;

- Just a few weeks ago, a 15 year old Roma boy was stabbed with a Samurai sword by a group of six youths dressed in military clothing. He was stabbed in public, while riding a bus, in daylight. Although he suffered life-threatening injuries, passengers left the bus after the attack without helping this young boy.
- Also in the last month, a 17 year-old Sikh boy was attacked by five men who called him by a racial slur and assaulted him. The attackers removed the boy's turban and cut off his hair with a knife, violating the Sikh faith which says hair is to be worn unshorn and in a turban. He was attacked because of his religious convictions.
- Also in the last month, a prominent editorial director was beaten severely by seven men as he was walking hand-in-hand with his boyfriend in a busy downtown core. Dozens of onlookers ignored the altercation – an incident known disgracefully as 'gay-bashing'.

It is my hope that this panel on *'Fighting racism, xenophobia and other forms of intolerance and discrimination'*, with a specific view on the role of *education*, the *media* and *law enforcement* will bring together key stakeholders to identify the issues at hand, as well as solid recommendations and avenues for action. It is only through concrete measures, vigorous action, and sustained and resolute commitment between all stakeholders involved, that such acts of hate-motivated violence can be effectively responded to, and in my hope, prevented.

Let me also add, that the OSCE recognizes that intolerance and exclusion are not the sole burden of visible ethnic minorities. Intolerance is multidimensional and intersectional in nature, and affects individuals on the grounds of their religion or belief, their background or status, their sexual orientation or their particular abilities. The OSCE will focus its efforts to ensure the recognition and protection of all groups affected by discrimination and intolerance within the OSCE region. During the next Human Dimension Implementation Meeting in September, the ODIHR will focus the special day on Tolerance and Non-Discrimination on multidimensional and cross-cutting forms of intolerance exclusion.

The ODIHR has been working rigorously in its activities to combat racism, xenophobia and other forms of intolerance and discrimination. I would like to briefly recall the mandate and priorities that the ODIHR was given under the Decisions on Tolerance and Non-Discrimination of the OSCE Ministerial Council in 2004 and 2005. The ODIHR was tasked to:

- Serve as a collecting point for information, statistics and legislation;
- Disseminate information, findings and 'good practices' aimed at preventing and responding to racism, xenophobia and discrimination.

- Monitor incidents motivated by racism, xenophobia, anti-Semitism and intolerance and report to the OSCE's permanent Council and at the HDIM on information received;
- Offer assistance to OSCE participating States and NGOs in their efforts to combat racism, xenophobia, anti-Semitism and intolerance.

In implementing these taskings, the ODIHR is cognizant of the fact that many well-established organizations such as the EU Monitoring Centre on Racism and Xenophobia, the European Commission against Racism and Intolerance and the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights and the United Nations Committee for the Elimination of Racial Discrimination have a vast amount of acquired experience and expertise through their involvement in the fight against racism, xenophobia and other forms of intolerance. This is why, in the ODIHR's efforts to establish a Programme on Tolerance and Non-Discrimination we conducted a *Comparative Study on International Action against Racism, Xenophobia, anti-Semitism and Intolerance in the OSCE Region* so that we could assume a role that would build on the existing efforts of organizations and avoid duplication. I am pleased to be joined by Mr. Doudou Diène and Ms. Anastasia Crickley, whom we have worked with in her capacity as the Chair of the EUMC Management Board and also in her new role as one of the Personal Representatives of the OSCE Chairman-in-Office.

I would like to also stress the vital role of numerous stakeholders including governments, intergovernmental organizations, non-governmental organizations, and professional practitioners such as teachers and journalists. All concerned have an integral role to play in the fight against all forms of intolerance.

Let us now turn to the specific issues that should be discussed by this session:

- Education and Training
- Role of the media
- Law enforcement

1. The Role of Education and Training:

The ODIHR has identified education and training as a key tool to enhance the level of awareness of racism and intolerance-based incidents including root causes and ways to prevent this. Education, be it formal or non-formal, does not only imply the dissemination of knowledge; it also involves enhancing capacities and empowering individuals, minority communities and civil society organisations.

Recent activities of the ODIHR in the area of education include:

- The provision of *training for NGOs* to increase their capacity to monitor and report on *hate crimes*. The ODIHR participated in a training session on the monitoring and reporting of hate crimes organized by the European branch of the International Lesbian and Gay Association. It also conducted a pilot training in cooperation with INACH (International Network against Cyber Hate) for civil society representatives willing to establish a complaints bureau on hate on the Internet. The ODIHR will also pilot a training seminar in June for civil society representatives dealing with various forms of intolerance from the OSCE region.

- Addressing issues of *segregated schools and classes* for Roma children in round table meetings and analyzing the situation of education of Roma children in Rumania, Bulgaria and Hungary.
- The ODIHR's Panel of Experts on Freedom of Religion or Belief has undertaken several initiatives to promote *inter-cultural and inter-faith dialogue and understanding* including through the development of the Website Guide to Tolerance Education and is now working to produce an evaluation of initiatives relating to tolerance education.

The following proposals could be subject to discussion during this session:

1. An enhanced focus should be given to *intercultural and interfaith dialogue*. Open communication channels and exchange are needed in order to establish local, regional and national fora that guarantee appropriate and ongoing dialogue, because I believe that people talking to each other will develop respect, understanding and appreciation of their respective differences.
2. *School curricula* covering aspects of diversity, mutual understanding and respect is needed at all levels of formal education. ODIHR hopes to have the support of relevant governmental institutions such as education ministries and institutions in developing tolerance education as a feature of curricula at the primary, secondary and higher education levels.
3. In order to facilitate speedy *integration* of newcomers and migrants into the receiving country the promotion of *language courses* would constitute an appropriate tool to achieve this goal. This would need considerations in adult education systems as appropriate. Above all, policies and practices must be developed so that we move beyond the idea of mere tolerance to embrace a model of *intercultural education* – a model built on the foundation of understanding, appreciation and *respect for diversity*. These recommendations were recently made at the Human Dimension Seminar on Migration and Integration.
4. *Guidance and support* aiming to implement intercultural education in a sustainable manner and to evaluate its impact. *ODIHR* is ready to offer its capacities and expertise.

I cannot underline enough that *'implementation'* is the key message here. I invite OSCE field missions to develop robust partnerships and actively engage in these future activities.

2. The Role of the Media:

Media plays an extensive role in the 'informal education' of the population. The deliberate or careless use of stereotypes or prejudice fuel latent and dormant attitudes of intolerance. As such, the media must recognize its influence, and strive to follow clear and defined *codes of conduct*. There is always something positive and negative to report on events interesting for the public. A *balanced approach* is needed – an approach that stays close to the information and away from labeling minority communities in a generic and negative manner.

The Roma community in particular is often portrayed negatively in the press. The empowerment, inclusion and access of this community to media channels represents a promising prospect for ensuring *balanced reporting* on this community. The ODIHR's Contact Point for Roma and Sinti Issues has commissioned two *studies* to document the positive and

less-positive '*lessons learnt*' in the portrayal of Roma in the media. An introduction of these studies was given at the NGO Forum on Monday this week in Sevilla.

I propose the following aspects to be considered during our subsequent discussions:

1. Inviting prosecutors to use the framework of legal instruments to act against severe forms of *hate speech in the media*.
2. Establishing *dialogue* between media representatives, governments and representatives of minorities in order to address the use of stereotypes and bias in reporting, and discuss positive and appropriate alternatives.
3. Recognizing the important role that the OSCE's Representative on Freedom of the Media can play, particularly through the publication of guides such as *The Media Freedom Internet Cookbook*, in highlighting good practices for media education, where the Internet can be used as a preventative tool to overcome prejudices and stereotypes.

3. The Role of Law Enforcement:

I believe you will agree with me in saying that law enforcement officials - as the first respondents to hate crimes - play one of the most central roles in tackling hate crimes. The ODIHR has therefore carried out a number of activities targeted to law enforcement officials, including:

- Designing and implementing a training programme on '*Policing multi-ethnic communities*,' targeted to police officers, local administrations and Roma NGOs which aims to improve cooperation between Roma communities and the police, and to produce a *Guidance Manual* on this topic.
- Developing a law enforcement officer training programme on combating hate crimes, consisting of a curriculum which promotes hate crime awareness, good practices in hate crime responses, engagement of community partners in responding to hate crimes and the development of a hate crime data collection, analysis and dissemination process.

I hope that this session will be informed by an exchange on the following issues:

1. Establishing long-term and ongoing *training of law enforcement personnel* in order to increase the confidence and efficacy of police officers in responding to hate crimes;
2. The creation of a *specialized cadre of law enforcers* with expertise on the many faces of discrimination including the violent manifestations of hate against minority groups;
3. Encouraging cooperation between *informal local / regional networks* of relevant community groups, law enforcement officers and jurists to ensure that society receives the message that hate-motivated crimes will be reported, investigated and punished appropriately.

The ODIHR is aware that many more progressive and innovative measures can and should be taken. I and the ODIHR staff welcome all proposals and suggestions for concrete and sustainable activities during the course of the next few days. I believe we all can agree that racism, xenophobia and other forms of intolerance are a phenomenon, which needs to be tackled with our undivided attention and full creativity.

Thank you.

ON RACISM OR FEELING GUILTY OR NOT GUILTY

Turgut Tarhanlı²

“Morally speaking, it is hardly less wrong to feel guilty without having done something specific than it is to feel free of all guilt if one is actually guilty of something.”

Hanna Arendt³

Morally speaking, it is not possible to disagree with Arendt on this point. However, as it was later stressed by her, the determination to prevent a real criminal from feeling completely purified from the guilt is the real question that the law should respond to in a democratic society.

Robert H. Jackson, the chief prosecutor of the United States, in his opening statement of the Nazi major war criminals trial, before the International Military Tribunal at Nuremberg in 1945, was aware of a reality regarding the law: “Judicial action always comes after the event”.⁴

This time, however, that law did not originate and derive its power from national legal orders. The origins of the legitimacy started to be developed in the international legal order. Besides, according to Jackson, in this particular case, “the real complaining party (...) is Civilization”.⁵ Therefore, it should be possible to acknowledge the basic principles upon which the new law bases its legitimacy as a civilized world order and hold individuals responsible for its violation.

This principle also includes the victors of the War. Prosecutor Jackson, pointing to the judges of the four allied powers, stresses the following: “We are able to do away with domestic tyranny and violence and aggression by those in power against the rights of their own people only when we make all men answerable to the law. This trial represents mankind’s desperate effort to apply the discipline of the law (...)”⁶

² Turgut Tarhanlı, Professor of International Law and Human Rights Law at İstanbul Bilgi University Faculty of Law; Director of the Human Rights Law Research Center, İstanbul Bilgi University. ttarhanli@bilgi.edu.tr

³ Hanna Arendt, *Eichmann in Jerusalem, A Report on the Banality of Evil*, Revised and Enlarged Edition, Penguin, 1994, p. 298.

⁴ “Opening Statement at Nuremberg by the Chief U.S. Prosecutor, Justice Robert H. Jackson, 1945”, *Crimes of War*, Ed. By R.A.Falk, G. Kolko and R. J. Lifton, Vintage, 1971, p. 85.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 87.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 86.

And Jackson proceeds, completing his speech with these words: “(...) your judicial action will put the forces of International Law, its precepts, its prohibitions and, most of all, its sanctions, on the side of peace, so that men and women of good will in all countries may have ‘leave to live by no man’s leave, underneath the law.’”⁷

Behind Jackson’s impressive speech, it is possible to feel the persecutions and the sufferings of the entire war. This is the starting line of the conception to hold the individuals accountable for establishing and operating the widest and the deepest ‘discrimination’ system of the modern times; at the same time this is the threshold for the redefinition of our civilization.

After this historical starting point what sort of power and effect would the law have?

I am of the opinion that this question should be answered within the context of the function of law in protecting human rights. It was stated by the International Court of Justice, in the *Barcelona Traction, Light and Power Company, Limited Case*,⁸ that in contemporary international law, *inter alia*, “the protection against racial discrimination” is among the *erga omnes* obligations of the states.

In international law, in the period after 1945, it is possible to observe a development designating the mentioned ruling of the Court. While, among the purposes and the principles of the UN Charter there is a general reference to human rights, it should be taken into consideration that only the ‘prohibition of discrimination’ is stipulated in the entire instrument.

In International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights⁹, adopted by the UN General Assembly in 1966, it is emphasized that derogations exercised in time of public emergency should not involve discrimination solely on the ground of race, colour, sex, language, religion or social origin.

Therefore, it can be clearly stated that, dating back to Nuremberg trials, in the present international legal order prohibition of all forms of discrimination is not only an *erga omnes* obligation but has also acquired the status of a peremptory norm to be observed by all states.

Today, however, the entire field of human rights has already raised international concern. For instance, in the OSCE countries, from the beginning of the 1990s, haven’t the questions relating to human rights been recognized as issues of international

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 87.

⁸ *Barcelona Traction, Light and Power Company, Limited, Second Phase, Judgment, I.C.J. Reports 1970*, para. 34.

⁹ Adopted by the UN General Assembly resolution 2200 A (XXI) of 16 December 1966.

concern? Hence, it can not be asserted that such questions should be regarded as internal affairs and should fall within the domestic jurisdiction of states.

Consequently, how should the link between human rights and the right to be protected against racism (including discrimination, anti-Semitism, xenophobia, intolerance) is established? What is the function of law, in a democratic society, taking into consideration the importance of the exercise of the right individually or through media, especially in the effective exercise of freedom of expression and in protection against the aforementioned practices of racism?

The European Court of Human Rights held in its *Handyside v. United Kingdom*¹⁰ judgment that freedom of expression “is applicable not only to ‘information’ or ‘ideas’ that are favorably received or regarded as inoffensive or as a matter of indifference, but also to those that offend, shock or disturb the State or any sector of the population. Such are the demands of that pluralism, tolerance and broadmindedness without which there would be no democratic society.”

In the Court’s words the function of the press and the audiovisual media, including the internet, as a ‘watchdog’ in a pluralist democracy adds importance to this legal viewpoint. Certainly, however, it would be necessary to be sensitive about setting a cautious and fair balance on this matter. Hence, could the meaning of the exercise of freedom of expression in a pluralist democratic society be confined to offensive, shocking or disturbing ideas? Is it possible to argue that such offence, shock or disturbance should have a common borderline? With this approach only, the establishment of a fair balance and the diligence in the maintenance of such balance between the beneficiary of this freedom and the public become essential.

The press and the audio-visual media are the fundamental institutions of freedom to receive and impart information. Therefore, from the perspective of the activities of the institutions providing this freedom and people who would like to disseminate their ideas through these providers, this issue will be considered within the context of freedom to impart information. On the other hand, the individuals affected by the exercise of this freedom would constitute the other perspective of the evaluation concerning this freedom.

What should be the degree of this affect? Or what should be the meaning of the execution of this relationship in a fair balance between the parties to the freedom? In other words, how should the basic criterion for the cautious and fair balance to be established between the rights and interests of the beneficiaries of the freedom to receive and impart information, be determined? To give an immediate answer to this question, in this bilateral relationship, it is possible to come across with a situation where one of the parties’ rights may be violated by creation of an impact where power, beyond the reasonable and proportionate use of the freedom, has a determining role.

¹⁰ *Handyside v. U.K.* (1979 – 80) 1 EHRR, p. 523.

The balance is destroyed or has a tendency to be destroyed towards ‘power’. This result, however, should be prevented in the light of the principle of the rule of law in a democratic society.

*Jersild v. Denmark*¹¹ case that was decided before the European Court of Human Rights, about ten years ago, was related to a similar situation. Jens Olaf Jersild, the applicant in this case, is the producer of *Sunday News Magazine* program at *Danmarks Radio* which was broadcasting radio and television programs; he broadcasts an interview with the members of the *Greenjackets*, a youth group with racist tendencies in Denmark.

During this interview the *Greenjackets* members put forward their racist opinions against colored people, foreigners and migrants based on their ethnic or national status. For instance, a *Greenjackets* member says the following: “A nigger is not a human being, it’s an animal, that goes for all the other foreign workers as well, Turks, Yugoslavs and whatever they are called.”

The Court considers the punishment of those persons expressing such racist opinions within the margin of appreciation of Denmark, and does not find a violation of the freedom of expression in the light of the European Convention on Human Rights. However, the Court does not reconcile the punishment of the broadcaster and the producer with the freedom of expression, and declares that Article 10 of the European Convention has been violated concerning these persons.

How should the function of the media, especially the audio-visual media as a follower of the democratic pluralism, be evaluated in terms of that cautious and fair balance? In the light of Article 17 of the Convention, the freedom of expression may not be interpreted as implying the right to engage in any activity or perform any act aimed at the destruction of any of the rights and freedoms set forth in the Convention or at their limitation to a greater extent than is provided for in the Convention. In short, “freedom to destroy freedom” is out of question.

International law is in line with this European legal practice. For instance, the UN Human Rights Committee in its General Comment No. 11¹² on Article 19 and 20 of the International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights mentioned that the State parties, as it is stated in Article 20, are obliged to take measures that prohibit the actions referred to in the article. What is meant by these actions is, first of all, “propaganda of war” and then “advocacy of national, racial or religious hatred that constitutes incitement to discrimination, hostility or violence”.

¹¹ *Jersild v. Denmark* (1995) 19 EHRR p. 1.

¹² Human Rights Committee, *General Comment No. 11: Prohibition of propaganda for war and inciting national, racial or religious hatred* (Art. 20) : 29/07/83, (Article 20).

According to Article 4 of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination¹³, “State Parties (...) shall declare an offence punishable by law all dissemination of ideas based on racial superiority or hatred, incitement to racial discrimination, as well as all acts of violence or incitement to such acts against any race or group of persons of another color or ethnic origin, and also the provision of any assistance to racist activities, including the financing thereof”.

This article of the Convention is a ‘mandatory’ provision for the States Parties. They are not allowed to prevent the exercise of the provision or to suspend it. The United Nations Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination reaffirms in its General Recommendations¹⁴ the mandatory character of this provision and that the States Parties may not state otherwise.

According to the ruling of the European Court in *Jersild v. Denmark* case, there is no doubt that the freedom of expression of the *Greenjackets* can be restricted. On the other hand, the case of Jersild, as the responsible person of the TV program, should be considered separately within the context of the role of media regarding the freedom to impart information.

According to Court’s judgment, the statements of the members of the *Greenjackets* should be considered in the context of the rights of persons residing in Denmark and targeted by those statements. Within the context of the restriction criterion at Article 10 (para. 2) of the Convention (“for the protection of the reputation or rights of others”), it is not possible to argue that the members of *Greenjackets* should benefit from the freedom of expression for the purpose of protecting the rights of those persons residing in Denmark and who have been subject to racial discrimination.

However, in the judgment of the Court, regarding the TV presenter and the producer, the responsibility to present the conveyed information and opinions in the context of receiving and imparting information in a fair balance is also stressed. This is an effort to limit or even to prevent the effect of the racist rhetoric by pointing to the counter argument recognized by law. The factors said to maintain the balance are listed as follows:

i) “TV presenter’s introduction and the applicant’s conduct during the interviews clearly dissociated him from the interviewed”; ii) “he (Mr. Jersild) referred to the criminal records of some of them”; iii) “applicant also rebutted some of the racist statements”; iv) “finally, the filmed portrait surely conveyed the meaning that the racist statements were part of a generally anti-social attitude of the *Greenjackets*.”

¹³ Adopted by the UN General Assembly resolution 2106 A (XX) of 21 December 1965.

¹⁴ See General Recommendations No. 1, 7 and 15.

As a result, according to the Court it is not possible to restrict the freedom of the media in those topics which may be of interest to the public unless there are “particularly strong reasons”.

It is of course possible to define this criterion, in a democratic society, within the context of the restriction criteria in Article 10 of the Convention. However, this issue that was particularly emphasized in *Jersild v. Denmark* case is related to the responsibility of the media to the public. As I have mentioned above, the Court is of the opinion that this responsibility is fulfilled through four factors. This is the consciousness and the responsibility to prevent the racist activities or racist rhetoric from exceeding the limits of the function of informing the public particularly when this function is fulfilled in connection to racism.

These criteria articulate a valid responsibility of the states. Resolution No. 621 of the Permanent Council of the OSCE emphasized the same mentality: “participating States commit to (...) combat hate crimes, which can be fuelled by racist, xenophobic, anti-Semitic propaganda in the media and on the Internet, and appropriately denounce such crimes publicly when they occur”¹⁵.

There is no doubt, however, not only the prevention of the violations of the rights but also some ‘additional measures’ enabling the effective use of rights is necessary. The need for additional measures should be considered in the light of the ‘empowerment’ concept which constitutes the essence of human rights law. All these rights and freedoms, in related subject matters, do have a strengthening effect on the status of individuals; and target at finding means of protection against the interferences caused by public authorities or private persons within the system.

However, regarding the types of racism that becomes visible through media, there is no doubt that some additional measures will be necessary in the context of “protection of the rights of others” even though this media activity has been performed within legal boundaries and in a balanced way, in the light of informing the public about the characteristics of racism.

First of all, these measures should aim at reducing the anxiety experienced by those target groups to be effected by those news and information. It was also emphasized in *Jersild v. Denmark* case that some additional measures are required during the performance of media activities. However, the measures in question should not be confined to those. Therefore, preparation of some other programs as a tool for empowerment in the context of protecting the rights of the groups targeted by racism and the free exercise thereof should be considered. Hence, the members of the groups subject to interference, even in different degrees, should be reminded not only of the rights they have within the system, but also the pressure or the anxiety preventing them from exercising these rights efficiently in fact should be eliminated.

¹⁵ PC. DEC/621, 29 July 2004, para. 1, vii.

This should be regarded as an expression of a parallel responsibility in the context of freedom to impart and receive information. However the effect of racism on freedom of expression may be reduced through measures, containing legal, political and social tools for not only the right in question but also for all other rights and freedoms that may be used as a channel for empowerment by persons who have been subject to racism, which are exercised persistently in the related legal order.

In conclusion, with reference to Hanna Arendt, the very first measure to be taken to prevent the perpetrators of a serious crime like racism from feeling not guilty might be the establishment of legal sanctions; furthermore the parallel measures that should be considered together, in specific or broader terms, are our responsibility, as a society, to be able ask ourselves and answer clearly what we have done for the benefit of the 'victim'.

Report of Moderator Gert Weisskirchen (Personal Representative of the Chairman-in-Office of the OSCE on Combating Anti-Semitism)

Session 2: Education on the Holocaust and Anti-Semitism

We have had an inspiring debate. To summarize the highlights, I would like to start with the conviction: there is a growing need for more awareness by teachers of their role in the formation of students' personalities and the development of children's values. Therefore, a comprehensive approach in education is necessary to be successful in the fight against anti-Semitism and other forms of intolerance. The importance of Holocaust education was stressed to underline its significance as a watershed in history. However, there was agreement that Holocaust education alone is not sufficient to combat present day anti-Semitism in all its forms. Instead, young people need to learn more about Jewish life and history, as well as about Israel. New approaches were stressed, with one speaker, Yehuda Bauer, mentioning peer education in a Berlin program as a promising technique.

The following recommendations were made at this session:

- 1) Holocaust education remains essential for our understanding of the world today. Tools for keeping it relevant include visits to former concentration camps, support for more programming at these memorial sites and comparisons to contemporary examples of genocide.
- 2) Teachers need to be given the opportunity to discuss the problems they face in teaching about the Holocaust and in teaching about anti-Semitism. This means that at the national and international level it is important to hold teachers conferences that focus on the exchange of best practices.
- 3) Dialogue should be encouraged as an important requisite for successful education programs, especially between groups in our societies confronted most directly with intolerance and discrimination.
- 4) NGOs and educational authorities should work together to create teaching materials for both the elementary and the secondary level that are easily available to teachers.
- 5) The OSCE and its member states should develop educational programs that promote a deeper knowledge of the history, traditions and culture of the Jewish people and their contribution to the society at large.
- 6) Educational material should be developed to teach young people about the history of Israel and its birth within the context of European history. This can be reinforced with more academic and teacher training exchanges by OSCE countries with Israel.
- 7) Boycott threats and intimidation at universities related to the issue of Israel and other spheres of anti-Semitism compromise academic freedom and should be condemned. Instead, education should promote cultural mediation, bringing diversity into the dialogue.
- 8) Anti-Semitism among some in the Muslim world stems in part from a lack of Moslem i

Integration and should be countered by programs to integrate Moslems. Educational strategies should stress the achievements of the Islamic, Christian-European and Judaic civilizations, stressing acceptance and mutual understanding.

- 9) The OSCE should encourage member states to review textbooks and other educational material related to the Holocaust, the depiction of Jews and modern Israel. It should also fight against anti-Semitism in schoolbooks, including those found in some countries of the Mediterranean basin and the Middle East.
- 10) The OSCE should encourage all member states to participate in the police training program to deal with "hate" crimes established by ODHIR.
- 11) The OSCE should encourage the parliaments of all member states to establish parliamentary committees to consider and recommend legislation and educational reforms to deal with "hate" crimes and other educational reforms at all levels of education.

Cervantes/ Don Quichotte: Nada de grande se hace sin sonar. German Bundestag: Spokesman on Foreign Affairs for the SPD Group OSCE: Personal Representative of the Chairman-in-Office of the OSCE on Combating Anti-Semitism Vice-President of the Parliamentary Assembly Platz der Republik 1, 11011 Berlin / Germany phone +49-30-227-73503, fax +49-30-227-76503 Email: gert.weisskirchen@bundestag.de, Internet: <http://www.gert-weisskirchen.de>

**INTERVENCIÓN SR. MINISTRO DE ASUNTOS EXTERIORES Y DE
COOPERACIÓN, SR. MORATINOS, EN LA CEREMONIA DE CLAUSURA
CONFERENCIA OSCE (Córdoba, 9 de junio de 2005)**

SR.	PRESIDENTE,
SRES.	MINISTROS
SRES.	DELEGADOS,

AL APROXIMARSE EL FIN DE ESTA CONFERENCIA DESEO REITERAR MI AGRADECIMIENTO A TODOS QUIENES LA HAN HECHO POSIBLE, ACEPTANDO Y ENRIQUECIENDO EL OFRECIMIENTO QUE REALICÉ HACE UN AÑO EN BERLIN.

AGRADEZCO A TODAS LAS DELEGACIONES SU ENTUSIASTA PARTICIPACIÓN ASÍ COMO LA MUY NUMEROSA PRESENCIA DE REPRESENTANTES DE LAS ORGANIZACIONES NO GUBERNAMENTALES Y DE INVITADOS ESPECIALES.

PERMITANME TAMBIEN UN AGRADECIMIENTO MUY ESPECIAL A TODO EL EQUIPO QUE HA TRABAJADO EN LA PREPARACIÓN DE LA CONFERENCIA, EL EQUIPO DE LA PRESIDENCIA ESLOVENA, DE LA SECRETARÍA GENERAL DE LA OSCE Y AL EQUIPO ESPAÑOL Y LOCAL DE LA CIUDAD. A TODOS, INTÉRPRETES, PERSONAL DE SEGURIDAD, POLICÍA, MEDIOS DE COMUNICACIÓN Y OTROS MUCHOS, LES DEBEMOS LA PERFECTA CELEBRACIÓN DE ESTA REUNIÓN.



DADOS LOS PROFUNDOS VÍNCULOS QUE ME UNEN A ESTA CIUDAD, ME ES MUY GRATO EN ESTOS MOMENTOS FELICITAR TAMBIÉN A LAS AUTORIDADES LOCALES Y AUTONÓMICAS Y A TODOS LOS CIUDADANOS DE CÓRDOBA POR LA EXTRAORDINARIA HOSPITALIDAD QUE NOS HAN DISPENSADO, ACORDE CON SU SABER HACER...Y SABER CONVIVIR.

EL ALTO SIMBOLISMO DE CÓRDOBA, SU DEMOSTRADA CAPACIDAD DE ACOGIDA Y LA CONMEMORACIÓN DE LA FIGURA DE MAIMÓNIDES FUERON LAS PRINCIPALES RAZONES QUE ME LLEVARON A OFRECER ESTA CIUDAD COMO SEDE DE LA CONFERENCIA. ESTOY SEGURO DE QUE EN ESTOS DOS DÍAS HABRÁN PODIDO APRECIAR LO ACERTADO DE LA ELECCIÓN. Y QUE LAS ALTAS TEMPERATURAS, PROPIAS DE ÉSTA ÉPOCA, NO HAN IMPEDIDO EL DESARROLLO DE DEBATES CONSTRUCTIVOS Y EFICACES.

LA OFERTA Y LA REALIZACIÓN DE ESTA CONFERENCIA SON TAMBIÉN PRUEBA DEL PROFUNDO COMPROMISO DEL GOBIERNO ESPAÑOL EN LA LUCHA CONTRA EL ANTISEMITISMO. COMO SE HA PUESTO EN EVIDENCIA AYER Y HOY, NO ES DESGRACIADAMENTE UN PROBLEMA DEL PASADO O RESIDUAL. SURGE AQUÍ Y ALLÁ EN SITUACIONES MUY DIVERSAS Y NOS OBLIGA NO SOLO A ESTAR VIGILANTES SINO A ACTUAR PARA PREVENIR Y ATAJAR CUALQUIER ATISBO.

DE IGUAL MODO, EL PASADO AÑO EN LA CONFERENCIA DE BRUSELAS QUISE DEJAR CONSTANCIA DE NUESTRO EMPEÑO EN EL COMBATE CONTRA TODAS LAS FORMAS DE INTOLERANCIA Y DISCRIMINACIÓN. AQUÍ HEMOS REAFIRMADO QUE NUNCA HAY UNA JUSTIFICACIÓN PARA EL RACISMO, LA XENOFOBIA Y LA DISCRIMINACIÓN.



QUIERO DESTACAR EN ESTE PUNTO QUE CÓRDOBA HA CONSTITUIDO UN HITO EN EL TRATAMIENTO DE ALGUNAS DE ESAS FORMAS PARTICULARES DE INTOLERANCIA Y DISCRIMINACIÓN, SOBRE LAS QUE, ENTIENDO, NO CABE ESTABLECER JERARQUÍAS.

POR VEZ PRIMERA EN LA HISTORIA, LA OSCE HA ABORDADO EN SESIONES PLENARIAS LA DISCRIMINACIÓN CONTRA LOS MUSULMANES Y LA DISCRIMINACIÓN CONTRA LOS CRISTIANOS Y MIEMBROS DE OTRAS RELIGIONES. A MI JUICIO EL TRATAMIENTO DIFERENCIADO HA SIDO UN FACTOR DE POTENCIACIÓN Y NO DE DISMINUCIÓN DE LAS CUESTIONES QUE HEMOS ABORDADO. LO PEOR QUE PODRIAMOS HACER SERÍA BANALIZAR LOS CONTENIDOS CON UN ENFOQUE INTEGRAL QUE NO HICIESE DISTINCIONES ANTE PROBLEMAS QUE SIENDO PARECIDOS REQUIEREN SOLUCIONES DIFERENTES.

ESTA CONFERENCIA RECOGE EL TESTIGO DE LAS CONFERENCIAS PREVIAS DE VIENA, BERLÍN Y BRUSELAS Y DE LA REUNIÓN DE PARÍS Y CULMINA UN CICLO EN LA LUCHA DE NUESTRA ORGANIZACIÓN CONTRA EL ANTISEMITISMO, LA INTOLERANCIA Y LA DISCRIMINACIÓN.

AHORA, HEMOS PASADO DE LAS RECOMENDACIONES A LA ACCIÓN. NO EN VANO, EL LEMA DE ESTA CONFERENCIA HA SIDO: DE LAS PALABRAS A LOS HECHOS. CONFIO QUE HAYAMOS PODIDO DEMOSTRAR A NUESTROS CIUDADANOS Y, SOBRE TODO, A AQUÉLLOS QUE SUFREN LA INTOLERANCIA Y LA DISCRIMINACIÓN QUE LES ESCUCHAMOS Y CUMPLIMOS CON NUESTRA PALABRA, Y QUE TODOS MANTENEMOS EL COMPROMISO DE DESARROLLAR PLANES CONCRETOS DE ACTUACIÓN A NIVEL NACIONAL. -3 -MINISTERIO DE ASUNTOS EXTERIORES Y DE COOPERACIÓN



SEÑOR PRESIDENTE,

PRECISAMENTE ME COMPLACE MENCIONAR ALGUNAS MEDIDAS ADOPTADAS POR ESPAÑA PARA CUMPLIR LOS COMPROMISOS OSCE EN MATERIA DE TOLERANCIA Y NO DISCRIMINACION.

EN EL TERRENO DEL ANTISEMITISMO, AUNQUE TODAVÍA QUEDA CIERTO RECORRIDO, SE HAN ADOPTADO IMPORTANTES MEDIDAS. EN EL ÁMBITO LEGISLATIVO, ESPAÑA HA TIPIFICADO PENALMENTE EL ANTISEMITISMO Y LA XENOFOBIA. RECIENTEMENTE, EN DICIEMBRE DEL AÑO PASADO, EL GOBIERNO INSTITUYO EL 27 DE ENERO COMO DÍA OFICIAL DE LA MEMORIA DEL HOLOCAUSTO Y DE PREVENCIÓN DE LOS CRÍMENES CONTRA LA HUMANIDAD.

ASIMISMO, Y COMO SEGUIMIENTO DE LA DECLARACIÓN DE BERLÍN Y DE LA DECISIÓN 607 DEL CONSEJO PERMANENTE DE LA OSCE, ESPAÑA HA CONTRIBUIDO A FINANCIAR EL “PROYECTO DE EDUCACIÓN SOBRE EL HOLOCAUSTO Y EL ANTISEMITISMO” ELABORADO POR LA OFICINA DE INSTITUCIONES DEMOCRÁTICAS Y DERECHOS HUMANOS. ESPERO QUE CONSTITUYA UNA REFERENCIA PERDURABLE EN UN MOMENTO EN EL QUE, CON EL PASO DEL TIEMPO, CORREMOS EL RIESGO DE QUE LA MEMORIA DE LA “SHOAH” SE PIERDA CON LA DESAPARICIÓN DE SUS ÚLTIMOS SUPERVIVIENTES.

TAMBIÉN EN COLABORACIÓN CON LA OFICINA DE INSTITUCIONES DEMOCRATICAS Y DERECHOS HUMANOS, ESPAÑA HA PARTICIPADO EN LA FINANCIACION DEL “PROYECTO DE REGISTRO DE DATOS EN INTERNET SOBRE TOLERANCIA Y NO- DISCRIMINACIÓN”, UN EJEMPLO DE CÓMO ES POSIBLE UTILIZAR POSITIVAMENTE LA RED PARA



COMBATIR A QUIÉNES PRETENDEN UTILIZARLA PARA DISEMINAR SU DISCURSO DE ODIO.

ADEMÁS DE LA EDUCACIÓN Y DE LOS MEDIOS DE COMUNICACIÓN, OTRO DE LOS INSTRUMENTOS HORIZONTALES QUE PUEDEN SER UTILIZADOS CONTRA LAS DISTINTAS FORMAS DE INTOLERANCIA ES EL DE LAS FUERZAS DE SEGURIDAD. TAMBIÉN AQUÍ MI PAÍS HA QUERIDO DAR EJEMPLO AL PARTICIPAR EN EL PROYECTO DE LA OFICINA DE INSTITUCIONES DEMOCRÁTICAS Y DE DERECHOS HUMANOS PARA “LAS FUERZAS DE SEGURIDAD EN LA LUCHA CONTRA LOS CRÍMENES DE ODIO EN EL ÁREA DE LA OSCE”, AL QUE ESPERO QUE PRONTO SE UNAN MÁS ESTADOS.

RESPECTO A LA DISCRIMINACIÓN CONTRA LOS CRISTIANOS Y MIEMBROS DE OTRAS RELIGIONES, EN PARTICULAR, LOS MUSULMANES, ESPAÑA PUEDE MOSTRAR SU EXPERIENCIA. ESTE AÑO SE CUMPLE EL 25 ANIVERSARIO DE LA LEY DE LIBERTAD RELIGIOSA. DICHA LEY CONSOLIDA UN MODELO DE ESTADO ACONFESIONAL Y, AL MISMO TIEMPO, ABIERTO AL HECHO RELIGIOSO. ES UN MODELO ACONFESIONAL QUE NO SÓLO NO EXCLUYE LA COOPERACIÓN CON LAS COMUNIDADES RELIGIOSAS, AL CONTRARIO, LA CONTEMPLA Y LA ESTIMULA A TRAVÉS DE SENDOS ACUERDOS DE COOPERACIÓN CON RANGO DE LEY QUE SITÚAN DESDE EL PUNTO DE VISTA POLÍTICO, ÉTICO Y SOCIAL A LAS TRES COMUNIDADES RELIGIOSAS DE MAYOR IMPLANTACIÓN EN NUESTRO PAÍS AL MISMO NIVEL DE INTERLOCUCIÓN CON EL ESTADO Y CON LA SOCIEDAD.

POR ÚLTIMO, PERMÍTANME DESTACAR LA CONSTITUCIÓN, A FINALES DEL 2004, DE LA “FUNDACIÓN PARA EL PLURALISMO Y LA CONVIVENCIA” QUE, CON FINANCIACIÓN PÚBLICA, IMPULSARÁ PROGRAMAS E INICIATIVAS

QUE, DESDE UNA DOBLE ÓPTICA PREVENTIVA Y OPERATIVA, FAVORECERÁ LA CONVIVENCIA Y EL -5 -MINISTERIO DE ASUNTOS EXTERIORES Y DE COOPERACIÓN



DIÁLOGO INTERCONFESIONAL MEDIANTE LA PROFUNDIZACIÓN EN EL CONOCIMIENTO DE LA REALIDAD DE LAS CONFESIONES, SUS DERECHOS Y ASPIRACIONES.

SEÑOR PRESIDENTE,

SOY CONSCIENTE DEL ESFUERZO Y EL INTERÉS MOSTRADO POR TODOS USTEDES PARA HACER POSIBLE EL ÉXITO DE ESTA CONFERENCIA CELEBRADA EN UNA CIUDAD CUYO NOMBRE EVOCA EL ESPÍRITU DE TOLERANCIA Y DE DIÁLOGO QUE NOS HEMOS COMPROMETIDO A PRESERVAR Y PROMOVER. QUIERO EXPRESAR MI SATISFACCIÓN PORQUE VAMOS A ADOPTAR UNA “DECLARACIÓN” QUE HACE HONOR AL ESPÍRITU DE LA CIUDAD QUE NOS HA ACOGIDO.

CREO QUE HEMOS SUPERADO ESTÉRILES Y PARALIZANTES DEBATES SOBRE LA MEJOR MANERA DE HACER FRENTE A LA INTOLERANCIA Y LA DISCRIMINACION. QUIERO REITERAR AQUÍ LA POSICIÓN ESPAÑOLA, QUE CREO COINCIDE CON LA MEJOR PRÁCTICA DE ESTA ORGANIZACIÓN. ESPAÑA CONSIDERA QUE LA APROXIMACIÓN GLOBAL A LOS FENÓMENOS DE INTOLERANCIA ES COMPATIBLE CON LA ADOPCIÓN DE MEDIDAS CONCRETAS DIRIGIDAS A AQUELLAS MANIFESTACIONES QUE, DADOS LOS PRECEDENTES HISTÓRICOS Y LAS TENDENCIAS ACTUALES, PRESENTAN CARACTERÍSTICAS ESPECÍFICAS.

AHORA DEBEMOS MIRAR HACIA EL FUTURO. ME GUSTARÍA QUE LAS CONCLUSIONES DE ESTA CONFERENCIA, RECOGIDAS EN LA “DECLARACIÓN DE CORDOBA”, PUDIERAN SER INCORPORADAS A UNA DECISIÓN QUE IMPULSARA LAS MEDIDAS AQUÍ DEBATIDAS, A SER POSIBLE MEDIANTE UN

PLAN DE ACCIÓN CON UN HORIZONTE TEMPORAL DETERMINADO. ESTE ES PRECISAMENTE NUESTRO GRAN DESAFÍO Y LES INVITO A TODOS A GANARLO. MUCHAS GRACIAS.

SIDE EVENTS

8 June 2005

11.45 a.m. – 1.15 p.m.

Convened by the ODIHR

Title: Education on the Holocaust and Anti-Semitism

Place: At the Sala Ambrosio de Morales (Congress Palace)

Moderator: Dr. Kathrin Meyer, OSCE/ODIHR Adviser on Anti-Semitism Issues, Tolerance and Non-Discrimination Programme

Speakers: Professor Jolanta Ambrosewicz-Jacobs (Centre for European Studies, Faculty of International and Political Studies)
Dr. Juliane Wetzel (Centre for Research on Anti-Semitism, Technical University Berlin and Chair of the Academic Working Group, ITF)
Ms. Deidre Berger (Managing Director, American Jewish Committee, Berlin)

Contributors: Ms. Hanne Thoma (Task Force on Anti-Semitism and Education, American Jewish Committee, Berlin)
Mr. Günter Y. Jikeli (Kreuzberg Action Group Against Anti-Semitism)

3.15–5.15 p.m.

Convened by the French Delegation to the OSCE

Title: Combating Hate Speech Online in the OSCE Framework: What Can Be Done and How?

Place: At the Sala Ambrosio de Morales (Congress Palace)

Opening remarks: Ambassador Yves Doutriaux, French Ambassador to the OSCE

Introductory speech: Mr. Miklos Haraszti, OSCE Representative on the Freedom of the Media

Moderator: Arnaud Amouroux, Office of the OSCE Representative on Freedom of the Media

Speakers: Ms. Floriane Hohenberg, ODIHR
Mr. Gerard Kerforn or Philippe Houbé, Observatoire pour la Prévention de la Haine sur Internet
Mr. Stefan Glaser, International Networks against Cyber Hate
Mr. Rafal Pankowski, Never Again Association

Title: Anti-Semitism and Satellite Television: The Audiovisual Sector Facing Incitement to Racial and Religious Hatred — State of Play and Responses

Place: At the Sala Ambrosio de Morales (Palace Congress)

Organized by the CEJI (Centre Européen juif d'information) and the CRIF (Conseil Représentatif des Institutions Juives de France) in Co-operation with the French Ministry of Foreign Affairs

Speakers: Elisabeth Cohen Tannoudji, Representative, Conseil Représentatif des Institutions Juives de France
Pascale Charchon, Director, Centre Européen Juif d'Information (CEJI)
Hadassah Hirschfeld, Deputy Director, CIDI
Representative of the European Commission
Representative of the European Platform of Regulatory Authorities

5.30–7 p.m.

Convened by the Anti-Defamation League

Title: Teaching the Holocaust and the History of Anti-Semitism in Catholic Schools: Promoting Tolerance and Interfaith Understanding

Place: At the Sala Ambrosio de Morales (Congress Palace)

Moderator: Ms. Stacey Burdett, Anti-Defamation League

Speakers: The Most Reverend Charles J. Caput, Archbishop of Denver
Ms. Karen Brady, Catholic School Educator, St. Joseph School, Tucson

7–9 p.m.

Convened by ICARE (Internet Centre Anti-Racism Europe)

- Title: Why Should We Work Together? Because We Must.
- Place: Hotel Conquistador
- Moderator: Ms. Karen Weisblatt, Director of the Transatlantic Institute
Mr Ronals Eissens, Director of Magenta Foundation
- Speakers: Mr. Michael McClintock, Programme Director of Human Rights First
Mr. Hadassa Hirrschfeld, Deputy-director CIDI
Ms. Laura Murphy, Washington Director, ACLU, on behalf of the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights
Iman Dr. Abduljalil Sajid

9 June 2005

9.30–11 a.m.

Convened by OSCE/ODIHR Tolerance and Non-Discrimination Programme

- Title: The ODIHR's Law Enforcement Officer Training Programme for Combating Hate Crimes: From Commitments to Implementation
- Place: At the Sala Ambrosio de Morales (Congress Palace)
- Moderator: Ms. Jo-Anne Bishop, Acting Head of the Tolerance and Non-Discrimination Programme
- Speakers: Mr. Paul Goldenberg and Mr. James Brown (Programme Manager and Chief Executive Office of the National Public Safety Strategy Group)
Mr. James Brown, Programme Implementing Partner and Senior Vice-President of the National Public Safety Strategy Group
Dr. Zsolt Molnár (Police major, Deputy Director of the Crime Prevention Academy, Ministry of Interior of Hungary)
Mr. Antonio Arrabal Villalobos, Department of International Police Co-operation, Ministry of Interior of Spain

Contributors: Members of the ODIHR Cadre of Law Enforcement Hate Crimes Experts from Canada, France, Hungary, Spain and the United Kingdom
Dr. James Nolan, Hate Crimes Statistic Expert
Mr. John Howley, Main Curriculum Developer for the Programme

11.15 a.m. – 12.45 p.m.

Convened by B'nai B'rith

Title: The Role of Parliaments in Combating Anti-Semitism

Place: At the Sala Ambrosio de Morales (Congress Palace).

Convenor: Mr. Joel Kaplan, President of B'nai B'rith International

Moderator: Mr. Daniel Mariaschin, Executive Vice President, B'nai B'rith International

3.15–4.45 p.m.

Convened by Simon Wiesenthal

Title: The Anti-Semitism/ Terrorism Nexus, Hate Sites on the Internet

Place: At the Sala Ambrosio de Morales (Congress Palace)

Moderator: Mr. Shimon Samuels, Director for International Liaison

Speakers: Rabbi Marvin Hier, Dean and Founder Simon Wiesenthal Centre, Los Angeles
Rabbi Abraham Cooper, Associate Dean, Simon Wiesenthal Centre, Los Angeles

5–6.30 p.m.

Convened by ILGA-EUROPA

Title: Discrimination, Hate Crimes and Intolerance on the Grounds of Homophobia

Place: At the Sala Ambrosio de Morales (Congress Palace)

Moderator Ms. Patricia Prendeville. Executive Director ILGA-Europe.

Speakers: Maxim Anmeghichean
Mr. Ricardo Soares