



Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe
Permanent Council

PC.DEL/949/04
1 October 2004

Original: as delivered

Bulgarian Chairmanship

OSCE CONFERENCE ON TOLERANCE AND THE
FIGHT AGAINST RACISM, XENOPHOBIA AND
DISCRIMINATION

Brussels, 13 and 14 September 2004

CONSOLIDATED SUMMARY

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Introduction.....	1
(A) Annotated agenda.....	2
Opening of the Conference: Keynote session	2
Session 1: Legislative and institutional mechanisms and governmental action, including law enforcement.....	3
Session 2: The role of governments and civil society in promoting tolerance, respect and mutual understanding, particularly through interfaith and intercultural dialogue and partnerships.....	4
Session 3: Combating discrimination against migrant workers and facilitating their integration into the societies in which they are legally residing.....	5
Session 4: Promoting tolerance, respect for diversity and non-discrimination through education and media, particularly among the younger generation.....	7
Closing session: Development of conclusions and recommendations.....	8
(B) Agenda of the workshops.....	9
(C) Report of plenary sessions	10
Session 1: Legislative and institutional mechanisms and governmental action, including law enforcement.....	10
Session 2: The role of governments and civil society in promoting tolerance, respect and mutual understanding, particularly through interfaith and intercultural dialogue and partnerships.....	14
Session 3: Combating discrimination against migrant workers and facilitating their integration into the societies in which they are legally residing.....	17
Session 4: Promoting tolerance, respect for diversity and non-discrimination through education and media, particularly among the younger generation.....	20
Closing session: Development of conclusions and recommendations.....	23

(D) Annexes

Annex 1: The Declaration of the Chairman-in-Office concluding the Conference

Annex 2: Maastricht Ministerial Council Decision No. 4 on Tolerance and Non-Discrimination (MC.DEC/4/03)

Annex 3: Statements

INTRODUCTION

The Maastricht Ministerial Council Decision on Tolerance and Non-Discrimination decided “to follow up the work started at the OSCE Conference on Racism, Xenophobia and Discrimination, held in Vienna on 4 and 5 September 2003 and welcomed the offer by Belgium to host a second OSCE conference on this subject in Brussels in autumn”. (See Annex 2 for the text of the decision). On 13 and 14 September the OSCE organized the second Conference on Tolerance and the Fight against Racism, Xenophobia and Discrimination hosted by Belgium in Brussels.

The annotated agenda of the OSCE Conference on Tolerance and the Fight against, Racism, Xenophobia and Discrimination was developed in Vienna in close co-operation with and consultation among a representative group of participating States, which had come together regularly since May 2004. The sustained attention from participating States in organizing the Conference resulted in high level political attendance at the Brussels Conference. Expert keynote speakers, introducers and moderators well known for their dedication in the fight against racism, xenophobia and discrimination set the tone for a very engaged discussion between the over 800 participants from governments, international organizations and non-governmental organizations.

The report of this Conference consists of the following parts:

- (A) The annotated agenda, comprising the names of the speakers and the conceptual background on which the discussions were based.
- (B) The agenda of the workshops, including the names of speakers.
- (C) A report of plenary sessions (including the results of the discussions at the workshops), 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 introductory speakers is attached to each of the sessions.
- (D) The annexes contain the Declaration of the Chairman-in-Office concluding the Conference which he called the “Brussels Declaration”, the Maastricht Ministerial Council Decision on Tolerance and Non-Discrimination (MC.DEC/4/03), the speeches of the keynote speakers in the opening session, the speeches from the introducers in the plenary sessions as well as the closing speeches. The “Brussels Declaration” contains commitments taken by the Permanent Council of the OSCE.

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

(A) ANNOTATED AGENDA

Opening of the Conference

Keynote session: Dialogue and Partnerships towards Tolerance, Respect and Mutual Understanding

In the Decision on Tolerance and Non-Discrimination, Ministers in Maastricht reaffirmed their commitment to promote tolerance and non-discrimination and decided to follow up the work started at the OSCE Conference on Racism, Xenophobia and Discrimination, held in Vienna on 4 and 5 September 2003, and welcomed the offer by Belgium to host a second OSCE conference on this subject in Brussels. This Conference aims to build upon the general and specific discussions in the OSCE on racism, xenophobia, discrimination and anti-Semitism that have taken place since the Porto Ministerial Council Meeting in 2002.

The overarching concept of the Conference is dialogue and partnerships towards tolerance, respect and mutual understanding. Its purpose is to deliver a clear and distinctive message on the value of ethnic, cultural and religious diversity, the unacceptability of racist, xenophobic and discriminatory actions and attitudes, and to arrive at action-oriented results to combat them. The Conference should also focus on exploring and identifying additional concrete measures that the OSCE and participating States might take to address these problems more effectively.

Taking the lead from the Maastricht Ministerial Council Decision of 2 December 2003 (MC.DD/4/03), specific aspects of dialogue and partnerships deserve to be highlighted in the plenary sessions. These include: legal and institutional measures for combating discrimination; promoting inter-cultural and inter-religious dialogue and partnerships both between citizens and governments and among citizens themselves; combating all forms of racism, xenophobia, discrimination and anti-Semitism against, *inter alia*, people of African descent, Arabs, Muslims, Jews, ethnic, religious or linguistic minorities, Roma and Sinti and indigenous people; mechanisms to promote more effective integration of migrant workers into the societies in which they are legally residing; and promoting tolerance, respect for diversity and non-discrimination through education and media, including Internet.

Furthermore, the Conference will reaffirm commitments made in the Maastricht Decision on Tolerance and Non-Discrimination and in PC.DEC/607 on Combating anti-Semitism to promote legislative and institutional measures by participating States and OSCE institutions. This would include data collection and reporting on hate crimes. It would also concern ways to encourage dialogue and partnerships and methods for individual citizens to bring their concerns before appropriate authorities.

Keynote speeches by prominent figures will set the tone and direction for the discussions to follow.

Opening speeches: H.R.H. Prince Filip of Belgium
H.E. Guy Verhofstadt, Prime Minister of Belgium
H.E. Dr. Solomon Passy, OSCE Chairman-in-Office

Keynote addresses: H.R.H. Prince Hassan of Jordan
His All Holiness Patriarch Bartholomew I
Ms. Marieluise Beck, Federal Government Commissioner for
Migration, Refugees and Integration, Germany
Ms. Alcee L. Hastings, President of the OSCE Parliamentary Assembly

The respective moderators or their designated representatives could chair workshops to discuss further aspects of the subject matter of the Conference. While the workshops will be open to all participants, practitioners with expertise in each area under discussion will be encouraged to participate in these informal discussions. The moderators will introduce the results of these discussions in the plenary sessions.

Session 1: Legislative and institutional mechanisms and governmental action, including law enforcement

Moderator: Ambassador Christian Strohal, Director of the OSCE Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights (ODIHR)

Introducers: Ms. Elena Mizulina, Deputy Head of the Legal Department, State Duma and the Representative of State Duma to the Constitutional Court, Russian Federation
Mr. Larry Thompson, Former Deputy Attorney General, United States of America

Note taker: Ms. Rebecca Williams, NGO Liaison Officer, ODIHR

Having the necessary institutional and legal foundations to combat racism, xenophobia and discrimination is important as such, but there is also a need to have the mechanisms in place that foster dialogue and government and private partnerships towards tolerance, respect and mutual understanding in our societies. Governmental action is required both at national and local levels, as efforts must be taken to ensure that policies and laws are not discriminatory and do not foster intolerance. It is equally imperative to collect and keep records on reliable information and statistics on hate crimes, including forms of violent manifestations of racism, xenophobia, discrimination and anti-Semitism. Therefore, we will focus in this session on legislative and institutional mechanisms and governmental action, including law enforcement activities, and on developing methods for individuals to bring their concerns before appropriate authorities.

How has national legislation evolved in combating hate crimes and addressing hate speech related to racism, xenophobia and discrimination? How can institutional mechanisms, such as establishment of community-oriented policing programmes, and creation of community outreach and civil rights services within government bodies, community ombudspersons, and bodies for seeking redress against discrimination help to foster dialogue and partnerships between different components of a society or between government and minority communities? How can governments ensure that their laws and policies are not

discriminatory? How can they prevent manifestations of discrimination in their criminal justice system? How can governments combat discrimination in access to public services, health care, housing, employment and education? What progress has been made by participating States on the elaboration of national institutional mechanisms to collect reliable data and information on hate crimes and what steps have they taken to inform ODIHR about existing legislation regarding crimes related to intolerance and discrimination? What steps have participating States taken to educate law enforcement officials on hate crime legislation and to enforce the message on the importance of seriously implementing these laws? What can police do to ensure that minorities and migrants feel safer in reporting crimes committed against them? What is the status of the implementation and follow up by participating States and the ODIHR of the Maastricht Ministerial Decision on Tolerance and Non-Discrimination?

Workshops (in parallel):

- Promotion of Tolerance and Non-discrimination towards Muslims
- Facilitating Freedom of Religion and Belief through Transparent and Non-Discriminatory Laws, Regulations, Policies and Procedures

Session 2: The role of governments and civil society in promoting tolerance, respect and mutual understanding, particularly through interfaith and intercultural dialogue and partnerships

Moderator: Ms. Claudia Roth, German Government Commissioner for Human Rights Policy and Humanitarian Aid at the Foreign Office

Introducers: Cardinal William Keeler, Archbishop of Baltimore, United States of America
Cobi Benatoff, President of the European Jewish Congress
Imam Dr. Abduljalil Sajid, Imam of Brighton Islamic Mission, United Kingdom

Note taker: Dr. Eltje Aderhold, Counsellor, German delegation to the OSCE

Following the Baku Conference held in October 2002 and the SHDM of July 2003, as well as other relevant meetings, this session will examine the role of governments, political leaders and groups representing different faiths and cultures in fostering interfaith and intercultural dialogue and partnerships to promote tolerance, respect and mutual understanding. The OSCE's comprehensive and co-operative approach to security has long involved providing support to civil society activities as a means of furthering democracy and human rights in its participating States. All forms of racism, xenophobia, discrimination and anti-Semitism against, *inter alia*, people of African descent, Arabs, Muslims, Jews, ethnic, religious or linguistic minorities, Roma and Sinti and indigenous people can have a detrimental and negative effect on societies, especially if they are not confronted proactively by governments, political leaders and civil society.

OSCE participating States have already made commitments to foster a climate of tolerance, respect and mutual understanding among believers of different religions, and between believers and non-believers. They also have agreed to "ensure and facilitate the

freedom of the individual to profess and practice a religion or belief, alone or in community with others, where necessary through transparent and non-discriminatory laws, regulations, practices and policies". Furthermore, States have pledged to engage in consultations with religious communities, through the institutions and organizations that represent them, in order to achieve a better understanding of those faiths and of their requirements for religious freedom.

The increasing cultural diversity of most societies also presents the need for dialogue and partnerships among groups representing different cultures in order to address ignorance, which is often at the root of racism, xenophobia and discrimination.

Conference participants will examine how interfaith and intercultural dialogue and partnerships can be fostered and nurtured and how governments and elected leaders can ensure state policies do not discriminate against religious practice or cultural diversity.

What are the possible models of dialogue and partnerships to promote tolerance, respect and mutual understanding among all communities, including majority and particularly minority religious communities, groups representing different cultures, and government? How can governments ensure that their policies do not discriminate against any communities, including minority religious communities, and reasonably accommodate various religious beliefs? How can governments promote freedom of religion or belief as a recognized public good? What examples of good practice are available, both on the national and local level? What obstacles must be overcome before interfaith and intercultural dialogue is possible? What strategies might be helpful in overcoming these obstacles? What kind of outcomes can be hoped for from a process of interfaith and intercultural dialogue? What are the different consequences of an integrative approach versus an assimilative approach towards different religious communities and/or people from different cultures in society? How can governmental and political leaders tackle and confront all forms of racism, xenophobia, discrimination and anti-Semitism against, *inter alia*, people of African descent, Arabs, Muslims, Jews, ethnic, religious or linguistic minorities, Roma and Sinti and indigenous people? How can governments, political leaders and civil society support and encourage dialogue between those with conciliatory views, as a counter-balance to rhetoric advocating hate? What self-initiated activities can religious leaders and religious communities undertake to further promote tolerance, respect and mutual understanding as well as respect for human rights and the rule of law?

Session 3: Combating discrimination against migrant workers and facilitating their integration into the societies in which they are legally residing

Moderator: Associate Professor Ayhan Kaya, Full-time Lecturer at Istanbul Bilgi University; Chairperson of the Department of International Relations; Member of the Bilgi Migration Centre Directory Board

Introducers: Professor Marie-Claire Foblets, Professor at the University of Leuven, Belgium
Stephane Hessel, a prominent activist on migrants problems, France

Note taker: Ms. Nilvana Darama, Counsellor, Turkish delegation to the OSCE

Throughout the OSCE region, problems sometimes arise between communities with labour shortages and those individuals who come from other countries to fill these shortages. Despite the indispensable role that legally residing migrant workers play, they are all too frequently confronted with obstacles in the field of employment as well as in the more general field of social integration.

In the context of employment, legally residing migrant workers may face impermissible discrimination in terms of access to the job market, wages, contracts, promotion, and terms and conditions including health and safety regulations. Measures for protection from racial harassment are often lacking. On the social front, they may face practical or even legal difficulties in terms of housing, education as well as access to health care and general support and advice.

The result is that migrants, in particular migrant workers, tend to remain “outsiders”, thus being put in a highly disadvantageous, not to say vulnerable, position and exacerbating potential problems between the ‘existing’ society and the relative newcomers. Latent xenophobia may be manipulated by political forces and develop into openly racist statements, incidents and even attacks.

Employment-related problems and socially related ones are closely linked — principles of equality, respect and non-discrimination need to be applied, consistent with international obligations in both cases. It is also clear that rights and responsibilities apply to both sides of the equation — that is, to the host countries and to the migrant workers. Just as migrant workers should respect the social and legal norms of their countries of residence, so too should host countries be willing to assist the integration of migrant workers into the legal and social frameworks of the countries in which they are lawfully residing.

In this context dialogue and partnerships in the working place and the communities in which migrants live are important tools to integrate migrant workers into the societies in which they legally reside. Therefore, dialogue and partnerships can and should be supported by all concerned actors, including governments, labour agencies, professional associations, NGOs, businesses, unions and representatives of migrant communities.

What are the best practices from participating States in dealing with intolerance and with problems related to integration? What support and opportunities should participating States provide to legally residing migrant workers to facilitate their inclusion or integration into mainstream society and how should these efforts be balanced with the responsibility of migrants to respect the social and legal norms of their new countries of residence? What are the roles of governments, parliaments, political parties, and civil society in combating intolerance towards migrant workers? How can they promote dialogue and partnerships in migrant workers’ work places and communities? How can we make public administration responsive to the needs of migrants? What are best practices in the private sector for integrating migrants into the work place?

Dinner Hosted by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Kingdom of Belgium (by invitation)

Workshops (in parallel):

- Implementing ODIHR's and Participating States' Tolerance Taskings after Maastricht and Berlin, including Complementarity among International Organizations Dealing with Intolerance
- Combating Discrimination Based on Colour

Session 4: Promoting tolerance, respect for diversity and non-discrimination through education and media, particularly among the younger generation

Moderator: Ms. Anastasia Crickley, Chair of the EUMC; Chair of Ireland's National Consultative Committee on Racism and Interculturalism

Introducers: Professor Dr. Bostjan M. Zupancic, Judge at the European Court for Human Rights, Slovenia
Ms. Sheila Rogers, Chief Executive of the UK Commission for Racial Equality
Professor Gert Weisskirchen, Vice-President, OSCE Parliamentary Assembly

Note taker: Ms. Julia Raschka, Political Assistant, U.S. delegation to the OSCE
Mr. Timon Bo Salomonson, Second Secretary, Belgian delegation to the OSCE

Responsibility for promoting dialogue, tolerance, acceptance of diversity and rejection of intolerance, racism and xenophobia amongst the younger generation is inevitably spread across a wide range of actors. However, the formal education system and the media, including the Internet, both have an enormous role to play.

If education is to enable both individuals and society as a whole to develop the skills to address future challenges, it is essential that it promotes tolerance and an appreciation of diversity. In other words, the promotion of respect for each individual's cultural, religious or ethnic identity within a context of social integration is an indispensable part of the educational process. Furthermore, education systems have the opportunity and the responsibility to address specific national or local manifestations of racism, xenophobia or discrimination — whether historical or current — and to combat prejudice and negative stereotypes. The formal curriculum, textbooks and supplementary materials, extra-curricular activities, the school environment itself, and teacher training programmes are all crucial instruments in achieving a positive outcome.

The media, like education systems, have the opportunity to tackle prejudice and eliminate ignorance and misunderstanding, both through specific educational and awareness-raising campaigns aimed at young people, and also by leading by example, e.g., taking care to reflect the ethnic, linguistic, cultural and religious diversity of society in their output, and providing access to diverse and contrasting points of view. However, they also have the potential to exacerbate problems — to stimulate suspicion, stir up fear and perpetuate negative stereotypes.

This session should continue to focus on best practices in these two areas, also with a view toward adding to or refining, as needed, the suggestions made in these areas during the Berlin Conference on anti-Semitism and during the Paris Meeting on the Relationship between Racist, Xenophobic and anti-Semitic Propaganda on the Internet and Hate Crimes.

How can promotion of tolerance and the appreciation of different faiths and cultures be integrated into existing curriculum subjects? How can students best be exposed to the diversity of their own communities and beyond? What can we learn from school initiatives to promote tolerance through informal activities outside of the normal curriculum? What role could the OSCE and its institutions and field missions play? How can acceptance and appreciation of diverse cultures be mainstreamed within media output? What professional journalistic practices can help foster mutual understanding? How can co-operation between the media and educational institutions be increased to provide multi-faceted educational campaigns aimed at young people? How can effective innovation be compared, discussed, and shared throughout the OSCE region? How might media, including Internet, be used to promote tolerance and combat the prejudice, ignorance and misunderstanding that contribute to racism, xenophobia, discrimination, anti-Semitism and other forms of intolerance?

Closing session : Development of conclusions and recommendations

In this session the moderators will summarize discussions and recommendations made in the sessions and the workshops on how the OSCE participating States and OSCE structures can strengthen and operationalize their efforts to prevent discriminatory policies, promote dialogue, respect, tolerance and fight against racism, xenophobia and discrimination. Reactions from the floor will also be possible. The results of the Conference will be brought forward to the Human Dimension Implementation Meeting in Warsaw in October 2004.

In order to more accurately reflect the results of the Conference, participants are encouraged to submit in writing to the Chairmanship-in-Office any recommendations they wish to make. It would be helpful if participants could specify for whom the recommendations are intended, for example, individual OSCE participating States, the OSCE as a whole, OSCE structures and institutions, such as the Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights, the High Commissioner on National Minorities, and the Representative on the Freedom of the Media, or OSCE field operations.

Doudou Diène, UN Special Rapporteur for Contemporary Forms of Racism, Racial Discrimination, Xenophobia and Related Intolerance

Reports by the Plenary Sessions Moderators

Comments from the floor

Closing Speeches: H.E. Karel De Gucht, Minister for Foreign Affairs of Belgium
H.E. Dr. Solomon Passy, OSCE Chairman-in-Office

(B) AGENDA OF THE WORKSHOPS

Day 1 : 13 September 2004

1:40–2:50 p.m. Workshops (in parallel)

Location: Room 1
Title: Promotion of Tolerance and Non-discrimination towards Muslims
Moderator: Professor Ayhan Kaya, Lecturer at Istanbul Bilgi University, Chairperson of the Department of International Relations, Turkey
Introducer: Professor Khaled Fouad Allam, Trieste University, Italy
Assistant: Ms. Nilvana Darama, Counsellor, Turkish delegation to the OSCE

Location: Room 2
Title: Facilitating Freedom of Religion and Belief through Transparent and Non-Discriminatory Laws, Regulations, Policies and Procedures
Moderator: Ms. Claudia Roth, German Government Commissioner for Human Rights Policy and Humanitarian Aid at the Foreign Office
Introducer: Mr. Caryl M. Stern, Senior Associate National Director, Anti-Defamation League
Assistant: Dr. Eltje Aderhold, Counsellor, German delegation to the OSCE

Day 2 : 14 September 2004

8:45–9:55 a.m. Workshops (in parallel)

Location: Room 1
Title: Implementing ODIHR's and Participating States' Tolerance Taskings after Maastricht and Berlin, Including Complementarity among International Organizations Dealing with Intolerance
Moderator: Ambassador Christian Strohal, Director of the ODIHR
Introducer: Dr. Beate Winkler, Director, European Union Monitoring Centre on Racism and Xenophobia (EUMC)
Michael Head, Chairman of the European Commission against Racism and Intolerance (ECRI)
Assistant: Ms. Rebecca Williams, NGO Liaison Officer, ODIHR

Location: Room 2
Title: Combating Discrimination Based on Colour
Moderator: Ms. Anastasia Crickley, Chair of the EUMC, Chair of Ireland's National Consultative Committee on Racism and Interculturalism
Introducer: Robert Woodson, Founder and President of the National Center for Neighborhood Enterprises, United States of America
Assistant: Ms. Julia Raschka, Political Assistant, U.S. delegation to the OSCE

(C) REPORT OF PLENARY SESSIONS

Session 1: Legislative and institutional mechanisms and governmental action, including law enforcement

After the speeches of the two introducers (see Annex 4), the following delegations participated in this discussion (in speaking order): The Netherlands (on behalf of the European Union: the candidate countries Bulgaria, Croatia, Romania, and Turkey aligned themselves with this statement), Slovenia, United States of America, United Kingdom, Latvia, Germany, Russian Federation, Italy, Ukraine, Serbia and Montenegro, Croatia, Turkey, Norway, Czech Republic, Climate of Trust Regional, Austria, Switzerland, Egypt, European Roma Rights Centre, European Network Against Racism and Human Right First.

Summary and general recommendations

The session demonstrated a strong commitment amongst delegations to engage further in the fight both against discrimination of all kinds as well as for tolerance, respect and inclusion. A strong emphasis was laid on the need to co-operate and to share experiences, and to take a multi-pronged approach, on the basis that, since intolerance itself takes so many different forms, so must the fight against it.

Several delegations pointed out that discrimination does not only affect the communities that are specifically targeted, but that it also has a far-reaching detrimental impact on society as a whole, which in turn can have serious implications at the international level. For all of these reasons the fight against racism, xenophobia and discrimination, and the promotion of tolerance, understanding and respect are a priority. A number of delegations suggested that, in tackling these phenomena, it is important to avoid creating a 'hierarchy' amongst types of discrimination, and that although the specificities of each type of discrimination merit individual attention, that there is enough common ground to merit an integrative approach.

It was agreed that there is a need for a strong legal framework, as well as strong and effective law enforcement and judicial mechanisms to implement it. But it was also stated several times that this is not enough and that education and human rights training have a crucial role to play in achieving the attitudinal change that is essential for the eradication of racism, xenophobia and discrimination.

It was noticed by several participants that OSCE participating States should undertake the necessary steps in order to promote tolerance, understanding and an appreciation of diversity in the formal school curriculum, in teacher training programmes and through the media.

Attention was drawn to the fact that, over the last 12 months, the OSCE has developed clear and valuable additional commitments, and there was general agreement that the way forward should now be to focus, in an action-oriented way, on the implementation of those commitments. Commitments that were particularly emphasized were:

- The importance of both national governments and the international community speaking out strongly against manifestations of racism, xenophobia and discrimination whenever they occur;
- The establishment by participating States of a comprehensive legal framework to combat discrimination and violent manifestations of racism, anti-Semitism, xenophobia and related intolerance;
- Monitoring and data collection on all aspects of these phenomena;
- Increased co-operation between OSCE institutions, and also between international organizations (particularly the EUMC, ECRI and UN CERD/OHCHR);
- The importance of civil society and NGOs and the need to fully engage with them at local, national and international levels;
- Inter-cultural, inter-ethnic and inter-religious dialogue.

Speakers stressed the need to ensure meaningful follow-up to the Conference and they put forward specific recommendations for further action.

Additional recommendations

To OSCE participating States

European Union

- Immigrant status should never be used as grounds for discrimination;
- Processes of integration should remain an important focus (without any attempt to assimilate) in order to create respectful and peaceful multicultural societies; an inclusive notion of citizenship might play an important role in this respect;
- There should be an effort to increase the complementarity of the work of international organizations and avoid unnecessary duplication, particularly amongst the EUMC, ECRI, UNCERD/OHCHR and the OSCE/ODIHR, including increased harmonization of reporting and information mechanisms.

Slovenia

- It would be reasonable to merge the “parallel” processes (with anti-Semitism on one hand and all other forms of intolerance on the other) in the forthcoming year.

Turkey

- Participating States should work towards the universal ratification and effective implementation of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination;

- Participating States should adopt specific national legislation and administrative measures, or strengthen the existing ones where necessary, to combat all forms of racism and racial discrimination;
- Civil society representatives, particularly the representatives of the vulnerable groups should also be consulted in the preparation of such legislation and measures;
- Racist abuses and violence, as well as incitement to racism and hatred should be criminalized, allegations of such crimes should be effectively investigated, the perpetrators should be brought to justice and the victims should receive remedies;
- Governments should ensure effective implementation of relevant legislation and administrative measures at national, regional and local levels. Government programmes should include explicit references to anti-discriminatory policies;
- Public officials, particularly law enforcement and judicial staff should receive specific instructions and training to be sensitized with human rights, tolerance and non-discrimination and to develop cross-cultural understanding and communication skills;
- The conduct of public officials at all levels, particularly of law enforcement and judicial staff should be monitored, with a view to identifying and eliminating all forms of racist and discriminatory practices;
- Racist behavior or the use of racist language by public officials should be addressed with disciplinary and criminal measures;
- Law enforcement units should act promptly and decisively to prevent and respond to all forms of racist attacks;
- Particular attention should be paid to racist abuses in detention centers and prisons;
- Specialized national bodies, including monitoring units and ombudsman institutions should be established, where necessary, to observe and assess the situation and to deal with complaints arising from racist and discriminatory acts;
- The society in general and members of the vulnerable groups in particular should be informed of existing anti-discriminatory legislation and practices, as well as of their rights and options to resort to legal and administrative tools against any racist abuse or violence;
- A uniform statistical method conducive to data comparison among participating States in terms of racist and hate related crimes should be developed;
- Statistics related to racist and hate related crimes should be made public;
- OSCE institutions should pay attention to and monitor in accordance with their mandates, the manifestations of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance in the participating States. Also, they should diversify the scope and broaden the geographical focus of their relevant project activities;

- OSCE should closely follow the relevant work carried out in other international organizations and undertake joint projects where possible.

Egypt

- A specific conference on discrimination against Muslims in the OSCE area should be held.

European Network Against Racism (ENAR)

- Jewish and Muslim communities should be encouraged to work together to combat these phenomena.

Human Rights First

- Participating States should establish specialized bodies or institutions at the national level with responsibility for the fight against racism, xenophobia and discrimination, e.g., ombudsmen, to act as effective implementation bodies;
- Participating States should develop clear legal definitions of the phenomena with which they are dealing in order to improve monitoring, reporting and law enforcement processes;
- Participating States should ensure that their laws make racist motivation an aggravating factor for criminal acts.

To OSCE institutions

Ukraine

- Given the importance of ensuring conscientious law enforcement, the ODIHR should establish regional law-enforcement training programmes;
- Good practices should continue to be shared, and countries that are the source of positive initiatives should act as hosts for seminars, roundtables or training sessions to disseminate those best practices as part of the development of regional and cross-border co-operation.
- Elaborate inside the ODIHR quick-reaction mechanism in order to address racism, discrimination and xenophobia cases in the participating states timely and in proper manner. In these terms to ensure practical-oriented assistance and constructive recommendations, not limiting to criticism only.

European Network against Racism (ENAR)

- Tolerance education, both through educational structures and the media, should be given further attention by international organizations such as the OSCE with a view to developing an awareness and appreciation of diversity.

Human Right First

- The OSCE should consider creating a special mechanism, such as two special rapporteurs — one on racism, xenophobia and intolerance, and the other on anti-Semitism;
- The OSCE should allocate funds as part of its core annual budget in order to effectively address these issues.

Session 2: The role of governments and civil society in promoting tolerance, respect and mutual understanding, particularly through interfaith and intercultural dialogue and partnerships

After the speeches of the three introducers (see Annex 4), the following delegations participated in this discussion (in speaking order): Belgium, Slovakia, Canada, Belarus, France, Israel, Ireland, Switzerland, Sweden and Finland.

Summary and general recommendations

At this session, delegations reiterated that tolerance, respect and mutual understanding are the cornerstones of a free and democratic society. Delegations reaffirmed their commitments and encouraged governments to play an active role in fostering a climate of tolerance, respect and mutual understanding and enabling the harmonious co-existence of different groups within societies. They emphasized the particular importance of inter-religious and interfaith dialogue in this regard.

Best practices of state action were presented. Delegations described constitutional measures and anti-discrimination legislation as core elements of national action. They agreed that legislative action has to be embedded in a comprehensive strategy bringing together all actors in society. Participants underlined the paramount importance of co-operation with non-governmental organizations as well as the need to initiate voluntary policies against the numerous forms of intolerance, *inter alia*, in the areas of employment and housing. Delegations presented models for integration policies which aim at equal rights and opportunities for everyone and counteract and prevent social exclusion of immigrants. They stressed the importance of implementation of legislation and effective response to racist incidents and attacks. Special emphasis on measures aimed at developing strong and stable pluralistic societies which prevent intolerance from even developing was placed. In this context delegations presented best practices of education and raising of public awareness, including through research and surveys on attitudes and participation in manifestations of intolerance. Delegations also presented best practices related to policies on national minorities as well as special measures to develop the social participation and living conditions of the Roma.

Participants subscribed to international co-operation within OSCE and other international organizations and fora. They recognized the OSCE as a security organization and unique platform for dialogue and the development and strengthening of partnerships on political level and between all sectors of society. The UN standard setting as a vital tool, in particular the Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Racial Discrimination (CERD) was welcomed.

The discussion at this session delivered a clear message on the value of ethnic, cultural and religious diversity and that social cohesion should be built on diversity and

respect for differences. It was acknowledged that all cultures can benefit from dialogue and should be open, self-critical and interactive in their relations with each other. Mutual respect, mutual recognition and mutual acceptance was described as a two way relationship which creates opportunities, builds trust among people and enriches societies, rather than dividing. Delegations concluded that — as key principle — respect for diversity should go along with sharing and promoting common values.

At the workshop on Facilitating Freedom of Religion and Belief through Transparent and Non-Discriminatory Laws, Regulations, Policies and Procedures it was recalled that governments have committed themselves to take action to ensure the freedom of the individual to profess and practice a religion or belief, alone or in community with others. While recognizing that religion can be invoked as a pretext for claims of different origin and create intolerance, contributions to the workshop highlighted the positive role religion and belief and the development of social values can offer to society. It was emphasized that faith should be respected and welcomed in public life and that religion can be a major force in encountering intolerance, along with other forms of association and civic engagement. In this regard, attention was drawn to the valuable contributions of religious communities on grass root level.

Additional recommendations

To OSCE participating States

Belgium

- To face up to the challenge of “living together” there is an absolute need to link prevention and repression. This can be done by linking together the resolute condemnation of all forms of intolerance related violence, legal and educational initiatives against discrimination, and pedagogical work to combat prejudice.
- National Action Plans should be approved of which principal objectives could be:
 - o Improvement of anti-racism legislation;
 - o Prosecution of those guilty of inciting racial hatred on the Internet;
 - o Better information and preventive measures, specifically by supporting actors in the field and by making available to them the kind of resources that will enable them to get to know, contact and enter into dialogue with the various cultures to which our fellow citizens belong;
 - o A deeper understanding of the situation with regard to our inter-cultural relations thanks to a “tolerance barometer”.
- There is a need to promote voluntary policies against the numerous forms of discrimination – in employment, education, housing, etc. – which, under the surface, give rise to frustration and feelings of exclusion.

United States of America

- The most effective way to bring about harmony is to identify common interests that are shared by all groups, and organize around those interests.

Turkey

- Participating States should strive to eliminate all forms of institutionalized racism, as well as racist and discriminatory tendencies in the society, through effective action combining educational, criminal, economic and social measures;
- Participating States should strive to ensure that human rights and dignity of all individuals residing on their territory are respected and that they are protected from all forms of discrimination and racist violence;
- Governments should send strong and clear messages that racism will not be tolerated in whatever form it may be;
- Government representatives, political personalities and high level officials should publicly condemn racism, xenophobia and discrimination;
- Well known personalities, academicians, artists, representatives of profession groups, society organizations should be encouraged to initiate and/or join public campaigns to denounce racism, xenophobia and discrimination;
- Governments and civil society should take pro-active positive approach to fight against racist rhetoric, bias, prejudice, discrimination and to promote multiculturalism and humanitarian values in the society;
- Governments and civil society should collaborate in conducting counter-racism strategies and projects;
- Governments, IOs and civil society organizations should promote and help conduct inter-religious and multi-cultural dialogue as a means to promote tolerance, understanding and mutual respect;
- Efforts in the fight against racism, xenophobia and discrimination should be systematic.

The Jacob Blaustein Institute

- Bring their domestic legislation into conformity with international norms on non-discrimination, both within the framework of recommendations from European institutions and including the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR) and the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination (CERD);
- Develop a more clear-cut framework for legislating against hate crimes and creating precedents and deterrents in court cases and to establish a system of monitoring incidents of racism and anti-Semitism in their own countries, as encouraged by the OSCE Ministers meeting in Porto and then in Maastricht;
- Revisit their educational programmes, both those teaching remembrance of the past, including the Holocaust, and those addressing general intolerance, with a renewed focus on combating contemporary forms of racism and anti-Semitism;
- Revisit the commitments they affirmed in Copenhagen and to take new and vigorous steps to implement them in practice;

- Create two special representatives, one on racism, and the other on anti-Semitism within the OSCE based on the model of the special representative on press freedom.

Session 3: Combating discrimination against migrant workers and facilitating their integration into the societies in which they are legally residing

After the speeches of the two introducers (see Annex 4), the following delegations participated in this discussion (in speaking order): Spain, the Netherlands, United States of America, Turkey, The French Jewish Council, United States of America, Arabs against Discrimination, Ukraine, Russian Federation, Azerbaijan, Jacob Blaustein Institute for the Advancement of Human Rights, Institute on the Holocaust and the Law and International Federation of the Red Cross and the Red Crescent Societies.

Summary and general recommendations

During this session, participants addressed discrimination against members of migrant communities and integration related problems. Different approaches to the challenges posed by migration were discussed on the basis of country specific examples and best practices. Particular problems of migrants of Muslim and/or Arab origin were the focus of the preceding workshop on Tolerance and Non-Discrimination towards Muslims. The discussions that took place in the workshop were summarized at the beginning of the actual Session.

During the workshop, the interpretation of migration related issues as threats to national security was challenged. A question was posed as to whether the resurgence of Islamic radicalism in the post 9/11 period was the source of increasing tensions in Western societies or a symptom of existing structural problems and a quest for justice and fairness vis-à-vis majority societies.

With respect to integration and identity related issues, pros and cons of two different approaches — namely the assimilative or in other words universal system and the communitarian Anglo-Saxon model — were compared both during the workshop and in the actual session. Integration models based on “unity in diversity” rather than “unity over diversity” were recommended. In order to build harmonized societies, calls were made to focus on commonalities, but not on differences between groups. One participant, based on his own country experience, stressed the need for a culture of tolerance and the merits of a minimal, flexible national identity for the success of integration policies. Another participant suggested that integration should take place at citizens’ level, based on equality of rights. In response to criticisms on rigid citizenship regimes as an impediment before integration, one participant argued that receiving citizenship alone would not suffice to develop a sense of belonging in the members of migrant communities, but should be supported with effective and adequate economic, social and cultural policies.

Many participants raised specific problems such as labour market marginalization, rigid citizenship regimes, hidden discrimination in the society, housing segregation, inadequate trade union rights, discriminative asylum procedures that still need to be addressed. The need for effective implementation of legal mechanisms protecting the rights of the migrant workers was particularly stressed in this respect. There were calls for

multilateral, transparent and coherent approaches to migration related problems. The need for complementing present immigration policies based on equal obligations with policies focusing on equal rights and equal opportunities was also highlighted.

Additional recommendations

United States of America

- Naturalization laws should not bar anyone from acquiring citizenship because of who they are or where they are from;
- Governments should lead the way by taking steps to value diversity and integration, both in school and at work, in order not to allow ignorance and prejudice to prevail;
- Political leaders should vocally speak out about the importance of diversity and respect for traditions and cultures, while also looking to appoint qualified minorities to government positions;
- Minorities should be integrated into society through ongoing mutual dialogue, tolerance and understanding.

Turkey

The participating States:

- Should take legal and administrative measures enabling migrant workers and their families to participate in the social, economic and cultural life on an equal footing;
- Should allow participation of migrant workers and their families in the decision making processes;
- Should pursue policies of integration rather than assimilation;
- Should encourage and assist migrant workers to preserve their national and cultural identity;
- Should pay special attention to the specific needs of the second and third generation migrants and develop special education strategies to facilitate their integration;
- Should adopt a multilateral, transparent and coherent approach, taking into account and addressing various factors affecting the situation of migrant workers, like labour market conditions, education, health and social security systems, visa and citizenship policies, return and reintegration schemes;
- Should engage all relevant governmental departments in the elaboration of migration policies;
- Should create national monitoring systems to inspect enforcement of relevant legal and administrative provisions and should involve the representatives of migrant communities in these mechanisms;

- Should facilitate access to information and legal counseling for migrant workers and their families;
- Should become party to relevant international instruments including the International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families;
- Should rapidly translate existing international commitments into national legislation and ensure their effective implementation;
- Should facilitate naturalization and family unification of migrant workers;
- Should implement pro-active policies to prevent negative stereo-typing towards migrants in the media and to promote tolerance, non-discrimination, respect for diversity and mutual understanding;
- Taking into account their demographic forecasts, should undertake to prepare well defined plans to compensate future labor shortages in a way not to repeat the past mistakes in procurement of migrant labor;
- The OSCE should continue to focus on the situation of migrant workers and follow-up the conclusions of the debate in relevant OSCE meetings;
- The ODIHR and the HCNM should include the situation of migrant workers in the OSCE area into their monitoring activities and provide advice and assistance to the participating States on practical implementation of the relevant OSCE commitments as appropriate.

Ukraine

- Participating States should ensure full application of the best endeavor clause by abolishing all discriminatory measures based on nationality which affect migrant workers, as regards working conditions, remuneration or dismissal;
- Participating States should ensure that people arriving in the country are informed and aware of their rights and do not fall prey of employers who mistreat them in terms of access to the job market, wages, contracts, promotion as well as terms and conditions including health and safety regulations;
- The Governments of receiving countries should guarantee rendering effective assistance to migrant workers — victims of racism and racial discrimination both through adoption of the adequate national legislation and providing appropriate legal protection;
- The role of NGOs and the media in preventing human rights abuse as well as a broad public debate should be enhanced in order to prevent the growth of intolerance and exclusion of migrants in the whole OSCE region;
- Special attention should be given to elaborating training programmes, pilot awareness — raising projects with a view to facilitating migrant workers' integration into the host society.

Lithuania

- Participating States should develop training sessions, seminars and exchange programmes for the staff that directly work with migrant workers to share and enhance work experience with institutions from other countries;
- Participating States should establish consultation mechanism that could solve the problems related with the most vulnerable issues of migrant workers;
- Participating States should guarantee the establishment of the information mechanism of “good practice” solving the issues of discrimination and intolerance.

International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies (ICRC)

- Participating States should become party to and comply with the International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families.

Session 4: Promoting tolerance, respect for diversity and non-discrimination through education and media, particularly among the younger generation

After the speeches of three introducers (see Annex 4), the following delegations participated in this discussion (in speaking order): Belgium, Holy See, France, Armenia, Leadership Conference on Civil Rights, Canada, United States of America, Russian Federation, ODIHR — Contact Point for Roma and Sinti, International Roma Union, American Association of Jewish Lawyers and Jurists, Italy, Russian Orthodox Church, Switzerland, Lithuania and the Republic of Korea.

Summary and general recommendations

In this session participants agreed that education and awareness campaigns are crucial factors in fighting racism, xenophobia and discrimination. Many participants stated that tolerance is the responsibility of all, but that young people are essential in pursuing mutual respect and understanding.

Prevention, awareness-raising, education and exchange of good practices were stressed as part of a partnership approach to intolerance that should fully involve governments and NGOs. Several participants gave an overview of the response to intolerance that was developed within the educational systems of their countries. One participant felt that the OSCE could serve as a laboratory for testing and making known these existing national experiences and lessons learned to the participating States at the national level.

According to one participant, intolerance is a consequence of obsolete, but often institutionalized, values; he stressed that the best way to promote tolerance is to promote new and more adequate social values that give people hope for a better society. As this happens in the transition of knowledge and values from older to younger generations, the educational system and the media have an important role to play. Or, as another participant put it, children are not born racist. Racism is a learned behavior and, as such, it can be influenced by

the social environment. One participant stated that the keyword of tolerance is “knowing” and that freedom is the basic source of justice, and free people with equal rights should come together on an equal basis to mutually assist each other. Yet allocating equally and broadly the rights, privileges and benefits of human civilization is precisely one of society’s hardest tasks according to another participant.

Participants widely agreed that education is an important instrument for raising the new generation in a spirit of tolerance. School is the place where children of different backgrounds meet that still have all their potential openness towards each other. Therefore, the educational system must continuously offer the opportunity and encourage young people to enter into inter-cultural and inter-religious dialogue. They should also learn about the root causes of intolerance. This would require teacher-training and, according to some participants, the assurance that education of tolerance does not become the lowest common denominator of different beliefs. Instead, schools should prevent a lack of knowledge of religions. At the same time, another participant felt that freedom of conscience is best achieved by ensuring that schools remain a neutral place. One participant explicitly referred to UNESCO’s experience in devising teaching and methodological material on tolerance. One participant also put forward concrete proposals to organize a competition among young schoolchildren people in the schools to solve conflicts peacefully.

Additional recommendations

To OSCE participating States

Belgium

- At all levels of the educational system tolerance should be taught as a specific subject. Teachers should be given adequate tools and advice in this regard.
- At the level of the OSCE the participating States should exchange pedagogical experiences in the domain of respect and mutual understanding.
- The OSCE could launch a competition on tolerance within schools in the OSCE-area, preceded by nation-wide competitions.

Leadership Conference on Civil Rights

- OSCE should urge the participating States to:
 - Develop national public monitoring systems;
 - Adopt strong laws against racism, xenophobia and discrimination;
 - Establish official specialized anti-discrimination bodies within their countries;
 - Appoint two OSCE Special Representatives, one dealing with Racism, Xenophobia and Discrimination and the other with anti-Semitism;
- OSCE participating States should develop and institute appropriate anti-bias education programmes designed to make schools a safer environment;

- OSCE participating States should strongly encourage the media to lend its support to the fight against racism, xenophobia and discrimination;
- Media outlets should be encouraged to select programming that fosters an appreciation of diversity and shows the harms caused by racial, ethnic, national and religious intolerance;
- Participating States can and should utilize public and paid media to launch public service announcements and other similar forms of educational outreach, using messages that discourage intolerance and discrimination;
- The growth of hate speech and other forms of intolerance on the Internet should be countered through substantial efforts to develop educational websites and online materials. Such sites and materials should be heavily promoted throughout the Internet.

United States of America

- Schools and the media should combat intolerance by making an effort to report events that portray minorities in a positive and unbiased light. Textbooks and newspapers should report news of interethnic peace and co-operation, not just news of war;
- Participating States should ensure that all groups in society enjoy equal access to education and the media.

Russian Orthodox Church

- The speaker recommends instituting a “responsible dialogue” between Church and State and the establishment of common values.

Turkey

- Participating States should review school curricula, textbooks and teaching methods at all levels with a view to eliminating prejudices, negative stereotyping and racist and discriminatory elements;
- Participating States should include in their educational curricula and social programmes at all levels, as appropriate, knowledge of, and tolerance and respect for, foreign cultures, peoples and countries;
- Human rights education should be part of school curricula starting from early stages of education;
- Ethical education of human rights should be used as an effective tool to combat racism and discrimination, especially in preventing younger generation from becoming racists;
- Human rights education should not be confined to children, but should also address adult members of the society. Targeted education programmes should be regularly undertaken for politicians, teachers, media and civil society representatives, law

enforcement officers, judges, prosecutors, prison staff, customs and immigration officers, health and social welfare services personnel and other officials;

- Participating States should take all appropriate measures to eliminate obstacles limiting the access of children to education;
- Participating States should ensure safe school environments, free from violence and harassment motivated by racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia or related intolerance;
- The misuse of print, audio-visual and electronic media and new communication technologies, including the Internet, to incite violence motivated by racial hatred should be condemned;
- Media should be encouraged to avoid stereotyping based on racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance;
- Media should be encouraged to draw up self-regulatory codes of conduct on the ethics of journalism, setting professional and ethical standards for journalists and broadcasters, prohibiting the instigation to racial discrimination, violence, hatred and intolerance in the media while respecting freedom of speech;
- The dissemination of racist and xenophobic material and incitement to racial hatred and violence through new information and communications technologies, including the Internet should be criminalized;
- Taking into account the trans-boundary effects of electronic media, law enforcement agencies should foster co-operation in identifying, investigating and prosecuting those responsible for such dissemination;
- Participating States should support and encourage the use of the Internet to set up educational and awareness-raising networks to combat racism, xenophobia and discrimination;
- Anti-racist hotlines should be established;
- Members of the print, audio-visual and electronic media should receive training to understand and combat racism.

Closing session : Development of conclusions and recommendations

After the closing keynote speeches (see Annex 4), the following delegations participated in this session: the Netherlands (on behalf of European Union, the candidate countries Bulgaria, Croatia, Romania and Turkey aligned themselves with this statement) and the United States of America.

Summary and general recommendations

Delegations reaffirmed their responsibility and commitment to take an active part in the follow-up to the Brussels Conference. They acknowledged recommendations made

during the working sessions related to legislative and institutional mechanisms, to the promotion of tolerance, respect and mutual understanding, to combating discrimination against migrant workers, to the role of education and to the role of media. Speakers reiterated the key role of the ODIHR in serving, *inter alia*, as a data collection point and urged all participating States, NGOs and others to work in partnership with ODIHR.

In this session respective moderators introduced the results of the workshops which had not preceded the relevant plenary sessions.

At the workshop on combating discrimination based on colour it was said that government efforts alone are inadequate. It was suggested that we need to get participating States, the OSCE and civil society to work together. It was noted that the consequences of oppression cannot be removed merely by removing the oppressor. To bring about true equality, one must go beyond anti-discrimination laws. Some participants said that different strategies will be needed to deal with different aspects of this problem. Work on one particular strategy does not imply the unworthiness of other strategies. It was suggested that we need to pool our strengths and experiences, and bring them all to bear in the fight against racism, xenophobia and discrimination.

The workshop on “Implementing ODIHR’s and Participating States’ Tolerance Taskings after Maastricht and Berlin, including Complementarity among International Organizations dealing with Intolerance” provided an opportunity for the ODIHR to present both its work to date and its plans for the forthcoming period in terms of the implementation of taskings in the field of Tolerance and Non-Discrimination. In order to avoid unnecessary duplication, and in order to strengthen the fight against intolerance and discrimination, the implementation process has already involved and will continue to involve close co-operation with other inter-governmental organizations, in particular EUMC, ECRI, UNCERD and the OHCHR, representatives of which joined the ODIHR on the platform. Activity to date has included the publication of a comparative study on the mandate and activities of the above-mentioned organizations as well as an inter-agency meeting between the five institutions, both of which resulted in a set of concrete recommendations.

In terms of future work, a presentation was given on the new Tolerance and Non-Discrimination Programme of ODIHR and in particular its information management system for gathering and making available to the public relevant IGO and NGO reports and recommendations, official information from participating States, statistics and information about incidents motivated by hatred, and about good practices.

Key recommendations that emerged from the workshop were that the ODIHR could play an invaluable role in monitoring and providing proactive support to participating States to implement existing recommendations, obligations and commitments from various inter-governmental organizations, as well as to ratify further relevant instruments; a key part of this work would involve the collection, dissemination and promotion of good practices. Emphasis was also given to the need to develop links with NGOs and civil society, both to identify areas in which participating States need support and as a valuable source of information. A clear message emerged that there was no room for unnecessary duplication of efforts in this field — the issue of racism and intolerance is far too important for that — and that continued and increasing co-operation among governments, specialized institutions, and international governmental as well as non-governmental organizations is the way forwards.

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

Additional recommendations

United States Commission on International Religious Freedom (USCIRF)

The USCIRF has urged that the U.S. government adopt the following Commission recommendations with reference to the OSCE and its participating States. The USCIRF recommends that:

- The OSCE create two positions to be appointed by the Chairman-in-Office: a Special Representative on Discrimination and Xenophobia and a Special Representative on Anti-Semitism. These officials would provide continuing high-level attention to these issues, including meeting periodically with the leadership of relevant countries to address serious problems;
- The OSCE and OSCE participating States take concrete action to engage in a regular public review of compliance with OSCE commitments on freedom of religion or belief, and on racial and religious discrimination, including anti-Semitism, including by facilitating an active role by non-governmental organizations (NGOs) as part of that process;
- The Office of Democratic Institutions and Human Rights (ODIHR) be provided with the necessary mandate and adequate resources to hire experienced staff to monitor compliance with OSCE obligations on freedom of religion or belief and to combat discrimination, xenophobia and anti-Semitism. As part of its monitoring and provision of technical advice to participating States, ODIHR staff should co-ordinate with OSCE Missions, international organizations and NGOs;
- OSCE participating States take specific steps to ensure that they are complying with their commitments to combat discrimination, xenophobia and anti-Semitism, as detailed in the 1990 Copenhagen Document on the Human Dimension. These commitments include adopting laws to protect against incitement to violence based on discrimination and providing the individual with effective remedies to initiate complaints against acts of discrimination;
- OSCE participating States, while vigorously protecting freedom of expression, publicly condemn attacks targeting Muslims and pursue and prosecute the perpetrators of such attacks. Government leaders should be reminded that hostile rhetoric against any racial or religious minority may fuel an atmosphere in which perpetrators believe they can attack persons from that group with impunity;
- OSCE participating States take all appropriate steps to prevent and punish acts of anti-Semitism, such as to publicly condemn specific anti-Semitic acts, to pursue and prosecute the perpetrators of violent acts targeting Jews or their property, and, while vigorously protecting freedom of expression, to counteract anti-Semitic rhetoric and organized anti-Semitic activities;
- OSCE participating States ensure that efforts to combat terrorism not be used as an unrestrained justification to restrict the human rights, including the freedom of thought, conscience, religion or belief, of members of religious minorities;

- OSCE participating States bring their national legislation and practice into conformity with their international legal obligations regarding the right to freedom of religion or belief and the prevention of discrimination on the basis of religion or belief, and take steps to bring local laws and regulations on religious activities into conformity with international human rights standards and OSCE commitments.
- OSCE participating States:
 - Permit all religious groups to organize and conduct their activities without undue interference;
 - Discontinue excessive regulation of the free practice of religion, including registration or recognition requirements that effectively prevent members of religious communities from exercising their freedom to manifest religion or belief;
 - End the practice of unjustifiably denying registration to religious groups and then erecting obstacles to religious practice based solely on that unregistered status;
 - Permit limitations on the right to freedom of religion or belief only as provided by law and consistent with participating States' obligations under international law;
- National governments of OSCE participating States monitor the actions of regional and local officials who violate the right to freedom of religion or belief, and provide effective remedies for any such violations;
- OSCE participating States: (a) ensure that all persons are able to exercise their human right to freedom of thought, conscience, religion and belief without threat of harassment, discrimination, detention, imprisonment, or torture; (b) release immediately and unconditionally any persons who have been detained solely because of their exercise of the right to freedom of religion or belief; (c) ensure that detained persons are afforded humane treatment in accord with international standards.

Turkey

- Participating States should undertake all efforts to reach at a concept of “us” instead of “the other”. It should be recognized that dialogue, communication, culture of co-operation and solidarity would be conducive in combating racism, xenophobia and discrimination;
- Participating States should strive, within all means at their disposal, to refrain from identifying any form of criminality, including terrorism and anything evil on cultural, ethnical and especially religious lines. Within this scope, they should condemn and counter tendencies and practices of Islam-phobia and help create an environment of tolerance and understanding, respecting international norms of human rights;
- The OSCE community should continue its efforts to combat racism, xenophobia and discrimination, also through convening similar events (conferences) in the future and be seized with this matter continuously.

Mouvement International de la Réconciliation/Internationale des Résistants à la Guerre (MIR/IRG)

- In order to overcome discrimination, racism, xenophobia and anti-Semitism, the idea of resisting these scourges (“what you resist persists”) should be replaced by the idea of giving each human being the means to develop the power to eradicate them in himself. In this context, there should be less prohibition (prohibitions are frequently recommendations) and more prescription. The prescribing of what? The prescribing to each individual of the development of his “good” power, which is the sign of the maturity of what is human in a human being.

United States of America

Recommendations to the OSCE and the participating States

- Leaders of participating States should speak out and take resolute action against attacks and crimes directed at individuals based on race, colour, religion, political or other opinion, sex, language, national or social origin, property, birth or other status;
- All OSCE participating States should seek to eliminate racial and ethnic profiling as a basis for routine law enforcement actions. As a preliminary step, participating States should carry out comprehensive studies of whether their law enforcement agencies are using racial and ethnic profiling. OSCE should develop best practices for law enforcement to serve as alternatives to racial and ethnic profiling;
- Participating States should vigorously and transparently enforce existing legislation against bias-motivated crimes and incitement to violence. States should also investigate and prosecute all crimes, regardless of the victim;
- Participating States without anti-discrimination laws should enact such legislation at the earliest opportunity. Those States with anti-discrimination laws should make strengthening such legislation a top priority. All States may consult the ODIHR on best practices;
- Participating States should reach out to minority communities and establish procedures for the reporting of possible bias-motivated crimes and violations of anti-discrimination laws. Authorities should ensure the rapid and effective investigation and prosecution of such crimes;
- Participating States, OSCE institutions, and NGOs should co-operate in developing training programmes for law enforcement and justice officials on legislation relating to hate crimes and its enforcement;
- Participating States should consider developing comprehensive strategies involving civic education programmes and increased outreach for integration, not assimilation, of minority communities;
- Participating States should encourage discussion and possible joint action among NGOs and community-based organizations on local issues that cut across community lines in order to reduce tension between groups;

- Participating States should affirmatively declare that institutionalized discrimination against religious communities is unacceptable and ensure that their legal systems foster equality, not subordination, of religious groups. Registration laws, policies, and procedures should be non-discriminatory, neutral and transparent and should not use overly burdensome numerical or temporal thresholds;
- Participating States should fully respect the freedoms of expression and religion in both private and public life;
- The OSCE should consider meetings on the promotion of tolerance and non-discrimination towards Muslims;
- ODIHR activities related to tolerance, which are mandated by multiple Ministerial and Permanent Council Decisions, should be an integral part of OSCE's work and be generally funded from the core budget and performed by personnel on the permanent staff table. Participating States should provide ODIHR with appropriate resources to carry out those activities;
- Participating States should take steps against discrimination, intolerance and xenophobia against migrants and migrant workers. States should also take appropriate steps to reduce barriers to equal participation by legal immigrants in economic and civic life.



Bulgarian Chairmanship
The Chairman-in-Office

Distinguished delegates,

Let me sum up the proceedings of this Conference in what I would like to call
“Brussels Declaration”.

Based on consultations I conclude that OSCE participating States,

Reaffirming the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, which proclaims that everyone is entitled to all the rights and freedoms set forth therein, without distinction of any kind, such as race, colour, sex, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, property, birth or other status,

Recalling in particular that Article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and Article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights state that everyone has the right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion,

Recalling the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination,

Recalling the Maastricht Ministerial Council Decision on Tolerance and Non-Discrimination (MC.DEC/4/03) as well as previous decisions and documents, and committing ourselves to intensify efforts to combat racism, xenophobia, discrimination and anti-Semitism and to promote and strengthen tolerance and non-discrimination,

Recalling also 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; and that the Conference in Berlin expressed concern and condemned anti-Semitism as a distinct and specific form of intolerance and developed operational recommendations for combating anti-Semitism,

Recognizing that acts of intolerance pose a threat to democracy, the values of civilization and, therefore, to overall security in the OSCE region and beyond,

1. Condemn without reserve all forms of racism, xenophobia and anti-Semitism and other acts of intolerance and discrimination, including against Muslims, incitement, harassment or violence against persons or communities based on race, colour, sex, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, property, birth or other status, wherever they occur;
2. Condemn organizations and individuals promoting hatred or acts of racism, xenophobia, discrimination, or related intolerance, including against Muslims, and anti-Semitism;
3. Urge participating States to adopt effective measures to combat acts motivated by intolerance and to speak out publicly against such acts;
4. Examine the need for a structural follow up within the OSCE to ensure implementation of the commitments on tolerance and non-discrimination;
5. Reject firmly the identification of terrorism and extremism with any religion, culture, ethnic group, nationality or race;
6. Declare unambiguously that international developments or political issues never justify racism, xenophobia or discrimination.

In addition, I note that the Maastricht Ministerial Council in its Decision on Tolerance and Non-Discrimination, tasked the Permanent Council “to further discuss ways and means of increasing the efforts of the OSCE and the participating States for the promotion of tolerance and non-discrimination in all fields.” In light of this Ministerial Decision, I welcome the July 29 Permanent Council Decision on Tolerance and the Fight Against Racism, Xenophobia and Discrimination and, in accordance with that Decision, incorporate it into this Declaration.

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;

This Decision will be forwarded to the Ministerial Council for endorsement at its Twelfth Meeting.



Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe
Ministerial Council
Maastricht 2003

MC.DEC/4/03
2 December 2003

Original: ENGLISH

2nd day of the Eleventh Meeting
MC(11) Journal No. 2, Agenda item 8

DECISION No. 4/03
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's 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. 6 on Tolerance and Non-discrimination, adopted at the Tenth Meeting of the Ministerial Council in Porto on 7 December 2002,

Reaffirming its commitment to promote tolerance and combat discrimination, and its concern about all manifestations of aggressive nationalism, racism, chauvinism, xenophobia, anti-Semitism and violent extremism in all participating States, as well as discrimination based, *inter alia*, on race, colour, sex, language, religion or belief, political or other opinion, national or social origin, property, birth or other status,

Urging the relevant authorities in all participating States to continue to condemn publicly, at the appropriate level and in the appropriate manner, violent acts motivated by discrimination and intolerance,

Affirming its commitment to increase its efforts for the promotion of tolerance and non-discrimination in all fields,

Welcoming the work done by the OSCE during 2003,

1. Commits itself to promote the implementation of the Action Plan on Improving the Situation of Roma and Sinti within the OSCE Area;
2. Decides to enhance the efforts being made to increase women's participation and the role of women in furthering democratization and economic development, and to consider integrating the provisions of the OSCE Action Plan on Gender Issues where applicable into

national policies. Further decides to enhance its efforts to achieve gender balance at all levels within the OSCE, taking full account also in this respect of the principle of recruiting staff from all participating States on a fair basis. Reiterates that the OSCE encourages female candidates to apply for OSCE positions;

3. Decides to follow up the work started at the OSCE Conference on Anti-Semitism, held in Vienna on 19 and 20 June 2003 and welcomes the offer by Germany to host a second OSCE conference on this subject in Berlin on 28 and 29 April 2004;

4. Decides to follow up the work started at the OSCE Conference on Racism, Xenophobia and Discrimination, held in Vienna on 4 and 5 September 2003 and welcomes the offer by Belgium to host a second OSCE conference on this subject in Brussels in autumn 2004;

5. Tasks the Permanent Council to further discuss, in addition to the two above-mentioned conferences, ways and means of increasing the efforts of the OSCE and the participating States for the promotion of tolerance and non-discrimination in all fields;

6. Encourages all participating States to collect and keep records on reliable information and statistics on hate crimes, including on forms of violent manifestations of racism, xenophobia, discrimination, and anti-Semitism, as discussed and recommended in the above-mentioned conferences. Recognizing the importance of legislation to combat hate crimes, participating States will inform the ODIHR about existing legislation regarding crimes fuelled by intolerance and discrimination, and, where appropriate, seek the ODIHR's assistance in the drafting and review of such legislation;

7. Tasks the ODIHR, in full co-operation, *inter alia*, with the United Nations Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination (UNCERD), the European Commission against Racism and Intolerance (ECRI) and the European Monitoring Centre on Racism and Xenophobia (EUMC), as well as relevant NGOs, with serving as a collection point for information and statistics collected by participating States, and with reporting regularly on these issues, including in the format of the Human Dimension Implementation Meeting, as a basis for deciding on priorities for future work. The ODIHR will, *inter alia*, promote best practices and disseminate lessons learned in the fight against intolerance and discrimination;

8. Recognizes the need to combat hate crimes, which can be fuelled by racist, xenophobic, and anti-Semitic propaganda on the internet. We welcome the offer by France to host in Paris in 2004 a forward-looking event, fully respecting the rights to freedom of information and expression, on the relationship between propaganda on the internet and hate crimes;

9. Affirms the importance of freedom of thought, conscience, religion or belief, and condemns all discrimination and violence, including against any religious group or individual believer. Commits to ensure and facilitate the freedom of the individual to profess and practice a religion or belief, alone or in community with others, where necessary through transparent and non-discriminatory laws, regulations, practices and policies. Encourages the participating States to seek the assistance of the ODIHR and its Panel of Experts on Freedom of Religion or Belief. Emphasizes the importance of a continued and strengthened interfaith and intercultural dialogue to promote greater tolerance, respect and mutual understanding;

10. Ensures the advancement of the implementation of the OSCE commitments on national minorities, and recognizes the importance of the recommendations of the High Commissioner on National Minorities on education, public participation, and language, including on its use in broadcast media, and the relevant recommendations of the Representative on Freedom of the Media in this regard;
11. Undertakes to combat discrimination against migrant workers. Further undertakes to facilitate the integration of migrant workers into the societies in which they are legally residing. Calls on the ODIHR to reinforce its activities in this respect;
12. Undertakes, in this context, to combat, subject to national legislation and international commitments, discrimination, where existing, against asylum seekers and refugees, and calls on the ODIHR to reinforce its activities in this respect;
13. Takes into account the UN Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement as a useful framework for the work of the OSCE and the endeavours of participating States in dealing with internal displacement;
14. Decides that the OSCE in addressing the issues contained in this document will increase its efforts towards the younger generation in order to build up their understanding of the need for tolerance. Human rights education merits particular attention;
15. Decides to intensify the co-operation of the OSCE with relevant international organizations such as the United Nations, the Council of Europe and the European Union, as well as with civil society and relevant non-governmental organizations to promote tolerance and non-discrimination;
16. Tasks the Permanent Council, the ODIHR, the HCNM and the RFoM, in close co-operation with the Chairmanship-in-Office, with ensuring an effective follow-up to the relevant provisions of the present decision, and requests the Permanent Council to address the operational and funding modalities for the implementation of this decision.

Opening Statement
by the OSCE Chairman-in-Office Dr Solomon Passy,
Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Bulgaria,
at the OSCE Conference on Tolerance
and the Fight against Racism, Xenophobia and Discrimination
Brussels, 13 September 2004

Your Holiness,
Your Royal Highnesses,
Mr. Prime Minister,
Ladies and Gentlemen,

C'est un grand honneur pour moi d'être aujourd'hui à Bruxelles à cette conférence importante sur la tolérance et la lutte contre le racisme, la xénophobie et la discrimination. Ce troisième forum, après Berlin et Paris, nous offre la possibilité, ici dans la "capitale de l'Europe", de formuler notre réponse décisive à tout acte d'intolérance, d'antisémitisme, de racisme, de xénophobie et de discrimination dans les pays membres de l'Organisation pour la sécurité et la co-opération en Europe. Je voudrais remercier le Gouvernement belge d'avoir accueilli cette manifestation importante.

(It is a great honour for me to be present today in Brussels at this important Conference on tolerance and the fight against racism, xenophobia and discrimination. This concluding forum – after Berlin and Paris, presents us with the opportunity to sum up here, in the "capital of Europe", our decisive response rebuffing all manifestations of intolerance, anti-Semitism, islamophobia, racism, xenophobia, and discrimination in the OSCE area. I would like to thank the Belgian Government for hosting this event.)

Let me start with greetings once again to my German and French colleagues, Joschka Fischer and Michel Barnier, for the excellent organization of the two preceding conferences in, respectively, Berlin and Paris. They both helped us put the issue of tolerance and non-discrimination, so relevant in our contemporary world, high on the OSCE agenda. Let me thank once again to Prime Minister Guy Verhofstadt, to Foreign Minister Carl de Gucht and his predecessor Louis Michel, and the Belgian Government which built upon what was achieved in Berlin and Paris.

We are well aware of the special interest that the Royal family in Belgium takes in problems like social exclusion, education and social security in general. One of many examples are the programmes and activities of the King Baudouin Foundation, many of which are implemented in the countries of Southeast Europe.

And now let us look to the future. We all have noted the proposal of the Spanish Government to organize the 2005 OSCE Conference in Cordoba, a city of much symbolism which, I believe, will boost our joint efforts to counter this recurring evil. For obvious reasons, Spain is always among the most appropriate places to discuss the dialogue between Christians, Muslims and Jews.

Let me remind you the example of my own country, Bulgaria, which was the only European state that saved its 50 thousand Jews during the World War II. And it was done by the entire

nation – politicians, intellectuals, the Bulgarian Orthodox Church through its Holy Synod – they all stood against the deportation. And those efforts succeeded due to the ingeniousness demonstrated by King Boris III on this matter. That is why Bulgaria became known as the European country which increased its Jewish population during the Second World War.

Exactly because of the legacy from the time of the Holocaust, my country, as current Chairman-in Office of the OSCE, has been raising up the urgency to respond to all forms of intolerance and discrimination as a key priority of the Organization. We need to remind ourselves, over and over again, the facts of our common history, especially the bitterest ones, so that they become firmly anchored in our memories and in the memories of the future generations. This will add essence to the awareness-raising campaigns and boost the effectiveness of our preventive measures.

After World War II, Europe started the process of its integration by building the European Coal and Steel Communities. Today, after 9/11, we need “Religion and Faith Communities” - to unite us on the grounds of our common values and the sanctity of human life. The OSCE can serve as a foundation of such a culture to grow and flourish. And I have in mind not only the specific value of the Organization but also its unique potential to involve new partners in our discussion on how to make a better world. The hardest thing to change in an Organization, is its name. And if I were to pick up a word to add to the name of the OSCE, I would put the word “tolerance” at the end, as it represents the very basis of security and co-operation. So I will dream to see OSCE become “Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe and Tolerance” - because we cannot have tolerance only in Europe, it should be also enjoyed universally worldwide. (By the way, changed name will help many not to mix OSCE with OECD).

Drawing on our past experience, I cannot escape mentioning the importance of inter-faith and inter-cultural dialogue and partnerships. I would like to take advantage of the opportunity to extend my sincerest personal greetings to His All Holiness Patriarch Bartholomew the 1st whose personal experience in advancing reconciliation among Catholic, Muslim and Orthodox communities, such as in the Western Balkans, will be especially valuable in our discussion later today. Let me recall his words from the early 1990's, that peaceful co-existence and co-operation among peoples is possible, desirable, and profitable. Our duty is to work for the realization of this beautiful dream. If we take to heart the message of peace and become peacemakers we can succeed in many things.

No-one can do as much harm to one religion, and no-one can create more enemies to one religion than its own false prophets. This weighs equally for Christianity, Islam and Judaism. Inter-faith dialogue can unlock the power of religious traditions and provide the inspiration, guidance, and validation necessary for populations to move toward non-violent means of conflict resolution. A pluralist and firm believer in consensus and respect for the fellow-man, His Royal Highness Prince Al Hassan bin Tallal of Jordan has been repeatedly pointing out the role of religious leaders in promoting peace and tolerance: “Inter-faith dialogue has ceased to be luxury, and has become a necessity”, he says.

Let me recall also the message of His Holiness Pope John Paul II during his papal visit to Bulgaria in 2002, that: "Every religion is called to promote justice and peace among peoples, forgiveness, life and love" .

We understand that the Islamic world now expects the OSCE to confront another fast emerging negative phenomenon, namely the attack on Muslims and Arabs, and the incitement against Islam and its followers. It is, indeed, the aim of this Conference – to reaffirm our decisive response against all manifestations of intolerance, racism and discrimination in the OSCE area. Thus, I believe, we have incorporated the legitimate concerns of all Muslims in the OSCE area into our agenda. Moreover, we shall never forget when condemning anti-Semitism, that the Arabs are a semitic tribe as well.

The shocking images from Bali /Indonesia and recently from Beslan / North Ossetia on our television screens filled us with revulsion and deep sadness as the brutal terrorist act led to the loss of hundreds of innocent lives, including many children. I hope you all will permit me to dedicate this Conference to the families of all those who were killed, injured, or hurt in the terrorist acts in 2004. And I hope you will support me to pass this legacy to the Cordoba Conference in 2005.

Having in mind the particular topic we are discussing today, and its significance for the OSCE future work, I believe I am expressing the prevailing opinion – that we all need the OSCE institutions to be more (even much more) creative in supporting the efforts of the participating States. We expect more initiative on behalf of the field missions as well - in their daily co-operation with the other international organizations represented in the respective countries.

This leads me to the issue of the OSCE transformation – which as you all know is already on our agenda. Risking to repeat myself, I would like to stress my firm belief that the transformation of the OSCE must not be delayed. The Organization can and should be enhanced in order to adapt to the contemporary geopolitical realities. In the last 15 years, the confrontation in the OSCE area, between what was then the Eastern and the Western Europe, has been replaced by the dialogue and co-operation between the countries to the East and to West of the Black Sea. The OSCE should increasingly play the role of a bridge of confidence over the Black Sea. In the run-up to the Sofia Ministerial on 6-7 December, I call once again for stronger political attention in the capitals towards OSCE, in order to agree in Sofia on basic elements of the process of OSCE transformation.

Ladies and Gentlemen,

I believe that our Conference will foster the dialogue and partnerships towards tolerance, respect and mutual understanding, will deliver a clear and distinctive message on the value of ethnic, cultural and religious diversity, the unacceptability of racist, xenophobic and discriminatory actions and attitudes, and will arrive at action-oriented results to combat them.

At the end, I am tempted to paraphrase once more the words of His All Holiness Patriarch Bartholomew the 1st : How beautiful is the sight of all of us here today! It is a picture of the possibility for peaceful co-existence throughout all humanity... May this picture and reality be expanded and widened, and may it be accepted by all hearts.

I wish us all a beneficial discussion.

OSCE Conference on Tolerance and the Fight against
Racism, Xenophobia and Discrimination
(Brussels, 13 and 14 September 2004)

Speech by Foreign Minister De Gucht at the OSCE Conference in Brussels

- This speech is partially in French -

Discours du Ministre des Affaires étrangères
Monsieur Karel De Gucht
à l'occasion de la conférence de l'OSCE sur la tolérance et la lutte contre le
racisme,
la xénophobie et la discrimination

Monsieur le Président,
Mesdames et Messieurs les Ministres,
Mister Secretary
Excellences,
Mesdames et Messieurs,

A la fin de cette Conférence, je voudrais tout d'abord vous remercier tous pour votre participation active aux travaux. Cette conférence symbolise l'intensité de l'effort que l'OSCE consent depuis 2003 pour promouvoir la tolérance dans les états-participants.

Venant après la conférence sur l'antisémitisme qui a eu lieu à Berlin et la réunion sur la propagande haineuse sur l'internet qui a eu lieu à Paris, c'est un honneur pour la Belgique d'avoir pu être le pays hôte de la présente conférence.

La promotion de la tolérance fait depuis longtemps partie des priorités de la Belgique en matière de politique extérieure. Accueillir cette conférence s'inscrit dans le prolongement d'engagements internationaux et d'initiatives antérieures de mon pays. Je pense ici notamment à l'action de la Belgique, en tant que président de l'UE, lors de la conférence mondiale contre le racisme à Durban.

Cette conférence mondiale a identifié des mesures concrètes pour lutter contre toutes les formes de racisme et de xénophobie. Elle a permis d'envoyer un signal clair à l'ensemble de la Communauté internationale. Nous devons nous en inspirer.

Mais si la condamnation du racisme et de l'intolérance est maintenant unanime et internationale, et nous ne pouvons que nous en réjouir, le travail n'est pas fini. L'actualité nous montre que cette condamnation seule ne suffit pas.

Il est important de se rappeler pourquoi nous sommes réunis ici à Bruxelles.

Parce que certains sont aujourd'hui encore victimes de la haine ou de la violence simplement en vertu de leur appartenance à une communauté donnée.

Parce qu'il est encore des personnes qui font l'objet de harcèlement et de discrimination uniquement en vertu de leur appartenance à une minorité.

Parce que des individus sont encore rejetés en raison de la couleur de leur peau ou en raison de leur croyance.

Parce que l'antisémitisme n'est pas éradiqué.

Parce que les populations musulmanes de nos pays ressentent un sentiment croissant d'insécurité.

Le racisme et la xénophobie ont de multiples visages. De « l'Holocauste » au génocide rwandais en passant par la guerre dans l'ex-Yougoslavie ou les massacres du Burundi et du Darfour, nous ne manquons pas tant dans l'OSCE qu'en dehors de celle-ci - de terribles exemples des conséquences de la haine érigée en système. Tout rejet de l'autre en raison de sa différence peut conduire à l'horreur absolue si l'on n'y prend pas garde.

Une responsabilité nous incombe: celle de faire en sorte que la diversité soit bien vécue, qu'elle soit perçue comme un atout, qu'elle conduise à l'enrichissement de tous. En tant qu'hommes politiques, c'est le message que nous devons veiller à diffuser en permanence.

Nos discussions servent à maintenir cette préoccupation à l'avant-plan de la conscience collective dans l'OSCE. En agissant sur les esprits, nous espérons influencer les actions et assurer que nos décisions formelles auront un impact réel sur la vie quotidienne des gens.

Ladies and gentlemen,

The key theme of this conference was dialogue; dialogue aimed at developing mutual respect and understanding, as well as promoting a fairer society. In this dialogue everyone has a responsible role to play: states, individuals, inter-state institutions, NGOs and community associations.

The peoples living within the OSCE represent a remarkable geographical, ethnic, cultural and religious diversity. The OSCE offers an ideal opportunity to promote dialogue.

La xénophobie et le racisme, nous l'avons dit, ont des visages multiples. Ces phénomènes renaissent constamment, adoptent des formes sans cesse différentes, parfois subtiles et voient de nouvelles technologies être utilisées pour recycler de vieilles idéologies nauséabondes.

Face à cette multiplicité de manifestations, nous nous devons d'offrir une réponse cohérente.

De fait, c'est à partir de la tolérance et du respect de l'autre que nous pourrons contrer les comportements haineux. C'est la tolérance et le respect de l'autre qui constituent la parade contre toutes les formes de racisme, de xénophobie et de discrimination, y inclus l'antisémitisme.

La lutte contre le rejet doit se concevoir comme un tout, dans une approche globale et cohérente.

Toutes les douleurs causées par la haine et la violence méritent en effet d'être reconnues et d'être traitées de manière égale. Il ne saurait y avoir une hiérarchie des souffrances.

Every manifestation of racism, xenophobia and discrimination including anti-

Semitism and Islamophobia should be fought with equal intensity and energy.

During the annual Human Dimension Implementation Meeting and the Ministerial Council in Sofia, the OSCE must establish what kind of operational follow-up it intends to give to its work on tolerance. Our responsibility will be to respond to the expectations of everyone who falls victim to racism and intolerance. Everyone without exception is entitled to our attention.

I strongly hope that the discussion will soon start on the implementation, within the OSCE, of a coherent structural arrangement promoting tolerance and respect for others, and capable of helping and encouraging all participating states to effectively implement good practices, develop partnerships and encourage our populations to cherish their diversity.

L'action de l'OSCE doit s'intégrer dans les initiatives internationales existantes de lutte contre le racisme et la xénophobie.

Il est important que toutes les enceintes internationales expriment une même volonté politique forte de promouvoir la tolérance et le respect de l'autre comme moyen de mettre fin au racisme et à la discrimination. Pour cela, il est indispensable d'assurer une coordination des actions, d'éviter les duplications et les contradictions. Ce qu'il nous faut encourager avant tout, c'est la mobilisation des ressources existantes, la collaboration entre les différents « acteurs » sur la scène régionale et internationale.

Je vous remercie.

ANNEX 3

OSCE CONFERENCE ON TOLERANCE AND THE FIGHT AGAINST RACISM ,
XENOPHOBIA AND DISCRIMINATION

OPENING SESSION : DIALOGUE AND PARTNERSHIPS TOWARDS TOLERANCE ,
RESPECT AND MUTUAL UNDERSTANDING
Brussels, 13th September 2004

OPENING ADDRESS

BY

HIS ROYAL HIGHNESS PRINCE PHILIPPE OF BELGIUM

1. I am delighted to have been asked to open this Conference and I welcome you all to Belgium . The subject of our Conference is a very challenging one, but it is also of crucial importance to the development of our societies . I personally take an active interest in the concepts of tolerance and respect, and I look forward to learning more about these topics in the coming days . But in this introduction I would simply like to share with you some personal views on the themes under discussion .
2. As our world is changing we observe an evolution towards ever more respect for human rights and ever wider promotion of freedom . Yet at the same time we also notice that intolerance, racism , xenophobia and discrimination occur more frequently in recent years . That is certainly the perception I have . The organisation of a series of conferences by the OSCE on these questions is a very welcome initiative, and presents a new opportunity to denounce these practices .
3. The first question I ask myself is : Why is it that in our increasingly free and prosperous societies, intolerance, racism , xenophobia and discrimination have increased in recent years? It is clear that there is more personal freedom , that ever more people can move freely, that societies become ever more multicultural . The vast majority of people feel comfortable with multiculturalism , and many of them even make the step towards intercultural relations through marriage , friendships or trade .

I believe it is in the fundamental nature of man to learn from other people , to discover the richness of other cultures . Yet there also remain many people who feel ill at ease in our multicultural world . They are the focus of our discussions today . On many occasions, their intolerant or racist attitude turns into aggressive behaviour towards the other or into rejection of other cultures .

The question here is : do they focus their aggression on the culture of the other, or do they use culture as a mere excuse for their rejection of the other simply because he or she is different? My belief is that it is the latter . I believe their behaviour is inspired by a feeling of domination and fear . People who feel superior to the other, are afraid of losing their dominant position .

This attitude of rejection is harming the others in their dignity, their self-respect . People who destroy the identity, the culture, the dignity of another person hurt this person in his or her deepest self .

Fear and domination are the enemies of tolerance and respect . If you harm someone so deeply, you make every dialogue impossible, and you open the way to violence .

4. So how can we break this cycle of rejection and violence?
I see four possible actions .

First, we should continue to denounce intolerance, racism, xenophobia and discrimination for what they really are: attitudes that hurt the others in their deepest self-respect.

Second, we should promote respect as an active form of tolerance. Tolerance can easily be a rather passive attitude. Respect, on the other hand, requires an active frame of mind. Respect is that which gives another person dignity and self-respect. And the principal way to achieve this, in my view, is by showing an active interest in the personality of the others, in their culture, their identity.

Third, we should do more in the area of education. We should teach young people to widen their perspective, to become more interested in other cultures. It has been shown that by learning several languages, for instance, young people become more alert and more open to the personalities and identities of others.

And fourth, I think we should focus more on the importance of values as a foundation for personal behaviour. A person brought up with a firm set of values, is confident in these values and often finds it easier to enter into dialogue with other people having their own set of values.

5. Let me end with a few observations about my own country, Belgium.

We are fortunate to live in a country where respect for the other is becoming a culture. A country which is in essence multicultural, where we constantly search for an equilibrium, for harmony between the various cultures, languages and opinions of our citizens. In searching for this equilibrium, this harmony, we breed pure respect for the other.

Many Belgians speak several languages. Many of us have developed an open, flexible outlook on the world, adapting easily to varying situations. I think many of these qualities are recognised around the world. It is also my view that precisely these qualities of harmony, flexibility and openness make it easy for the vast majority of Belgians to show active respect for other cultures and opinions.

That is what I hope my country can bring to this Conference: not only that we continue to denounce all acts of intolerance and racism, but that we should commit ourselves to an attitude of active respect for the dignity of the other.

In my part will continue my own commitment to further the dialogue and active respect between the people and communities of my own country and between the various cultures of our beautiful multicultural world.

I wish you very fruitful discussions and a pleasant stay in Belgium. Thank you very much.

PC.DEL/808/04
13 September 2004

ENGLISH only



13 September 2004
Wetstraat 16
1000 Brussels
Tel. 02/501 02 11

THE PRIME MINISTER

SPEECH BY PRIME MINISTER GUY VERHOFFSTADT AT THE OPENING OF THE
OSCE CONFERENCE ON TOLERANCE AND THE FIGHT AGAINST RACISM ,
XENOPHOBIA AND DISCRIMINATION

BRUSSELS, HEYSEL, 13 SEPTEMBER 2004

Monseigneur,
Excellencies,
Ladies and Gentlemen,

It is a privilege for Brussels, multicultural capital of a multicultural country, to host this important conference. And it is a pleasure for me to welcome you. In my opinion Belgium is indeed an excellent venue for discussing the themes of this conference given its location at the crossroads of different cultures. Moreover, of all the cities in the European Union, Brussels – along with Frankfurt and Luxembourg – is home to the highest percentage of foreign nationals, and Antwerp has the largest community of Orthodox Jews. This results in a colourful and diverse society, but of course we also do have our share of frictions and indeed expressions of intolerance.

An additional reason why I feel it is appropriate and important for my country to organise this conference today is Belgium's upcoming presidency of the OSCE in 2006. It signals my government's appreciation for the very valuable work of the OSCE, as well as our determination to contribute to the further development of the initiatives taken so far by this organisation. Let me take this opportunity to congratulate the current Chair, Bulgaria, for its successful term of office and for the way it negotiated a consensus about the topics to be discussed here in Brussels.

Ladies and gentlemen,

Probably many of us had thought that globalisation, television, the Internet and people's increased eagerness to travel would lead to greater tolerance in Europe and the entire world.

Unfortunately, we are regularly confronted with just the opposite. We have all witnessed the progress, in many countries, of ultra-right-wing parties which hardly refrain from spreading racist messages. And, even worse, we are witnessing a trend of increased racist violence.

So many books and articles have been written about the roots and causes of racism, xenophobia and discrimination. But I am positive that intolerance and racism can be traced back to the simple meaning of the word xenophobia: fear of that which is foreign. The fear that the 'unknown' could take something away from one's own identity and one's possessions: "status anxiety", as Alain de Botton recently called it.

Unfortunately it appears that this fear of the unknown cannot be dispelled just by handing out more information. Otherwise, television, the Internet and international travel would have solved the problem long ago. Some people even think that xenophobia cannot be cured at all. I do not agree. I am convinced that governments do have tools to combat intolerance. First of all, there must be a coherent legal framework prohibiting discrimination and racism of whatever sort. Without such a framework and its concrete implementation and enforcement by the courts, a policy promoting greater tolerance cannot succeed. But this is not enough. There are at least two other important keys to tolerance which a government can and must exploit : continued dialogue and education.

Ladies and gentlemen,

Dialogue. Due to its specific composition, Belgium has a long history of dialogue between communities. This dialogue resulted in a unique federal system aimed at protecting the identity of our three linguistic communities by offering them a very large degree of political, cultural and economic autonomy. Our institutional setup provides for many checks and balances and consultation structures. Of course this does not rule out tensions - as Prime Minister, I still have to smooth differences from time to time - however as a whole, the system has proved efficient. But in this world we can all learn from each other. The protection of cultural freedom and diversity has indeed become a global issue. Belgium is very willing to contribute to this process of sharing experiences. That is why we will organise the Third International Conference on Federalism in March 2005. I am convinced that combining experience and creativity will eventually bring solutions to many existing or emerging conflicts and thus foster greater tolerance.

Dialogue is also necessary with the immigrant community, the « new » Belgians as we call them here. A special body has been established to facilitate dialogue with the substantial muslim community in my country. It will gradually contribute to a process of open discussion on an equal footing about migration, integration and society. Furthermore, for foreigners who take up Belgian nationality, we offer a full set of educational programs, focusing on language and cultural history.

Ladies and gentlemen,

This brings me to a second tool which governments must use to the fullest to counter xenophobia, namely education. If children and youngsters are taught lessons in which the historic truth is distorted or concealed, if youngsters are raised to look down on others or made to believe that men have more rights than women, then achieving tolerance will be impossible within a society. And yet that is what continues to happen. Up to and including today. It is the government's mission to ensure that this no longer occurs.

In the light of recent racist incidents, I have concluded that young people in my country are often not sufficiently aware of the horrible consequences that racism, xenophobia and anti-Semitism have had in the past. They are not aware of what people went through because they happened to have a different colour of skin, religion or origin. I am shocked at how quickly this can be forgotten. Two weeks ago, I sat down with the various ministers for education in Belgium to discuss ways to ensure that history is not forgotten and that tolerance and dialogue are placed high up on the education agenda again.

Ladies and Gentlemen,

The OSCE, the Council of Europe and the European Union can be looked at as projects that in a way originated as a reaction to the intolerance, discrimination and racism that had gripped Europe for so many years. In 1945 all of us in Europe said "Never again!" Sixty years later it is still up to each and every one of us to keep that promise – each and every day. I wish you a highly productive debate in the days ahead.

Thank you.

Distributed at the request of Jordan

PC.DEL/860/04
14 September 2004

ENGLISH only

H R H Prince E l H assan b n T a l a l

K e y n o t e A d d r e s s
T o T h e

O S C E C O N F E R E N C E

T O L E R A N C E A N D T H E F I G H T A G A I N S T R A C I S M ,
X E N O P H O B I A A N D D I S C R I M I N A T I O N

B r u s s e l s , B e l g i u m

13th - 14th S e p t e m b e r , 2 0 0 4

Your Royal Highness;
All Holiness;
Excellencies;
Ladies and Gentlemen;
Dear Friends.

After that generous introduction I feel that I should sit down. I hope that the departure of the Prime Minister is not a sign of what I am about to say. But as I have come to realize, the heads of government are too busy being busy and therefore as a visionary, as I have been inadequately described, have to work to ensure that the silent majority becomes an articulate majority. May I say that first of all if the loadstar of Judaism is law, the loadstar of Islam is justice and the loadstar of Christianity is love, then I feel that we need the rule of law and justice as a commitment to a code of morality which we all share.

I identify Archbishop Fitzgerald as one of our participants, and I would like you to know that on October 1 we will be publishing a casket – the Old Testament, the New Testament and the Koran - as a prelude to post doctoral teaching of *conscience universelle et valeurs partagé* (universal consciousness and shared values): enhancing what is universal and respecting difference.

With all due respect to all this talk of tolerance, Mr Chairman, may I say I prefer the word respect. I do not want to tolerate you and you do not want to tolerate me. But I think if we

can learn to respect each other's traditions, particular in this time of world history when it seems to me as though it is being determined by exceptions rather than rules. We need to develop a continuum of commitment to respect for the other.

Two years ago I went to Auschwitz as Moderator of the WCRP (World Council for Religions for Peace). I asked myself, "Why am I accepting this invitation?". I thought to myself Christian and Jewish values particularly, with the emphasis placed on them after the Second World War are in effect our values many centuries before the upheavals of the World Wars. If I exempted myself I would be accused of being a hypocrite and not contributing to triangulating a conversation. The Catholic Church thanked me for contributing to a dialogue, a trialogue, and the Jewish participants were deeply moved by the fact that Muslims and Jews have been the victims ever since the holy inquisition in Spain ever. It was the Ottoman Empire that opened its arms to migrants from the Western Mediterranean, the Eastern Mediterranean, but let us all remember that the killing continued in the Balkans.

I would like to ask you in the wake of the horrific bombings of the World Trade Centre and the Pentagon on September 11, 2001, in the wake of the violence that persists, in the horrific bombings in Madrid (a new chapter of September 11) the bombings in Istanbul, the daily killings in our blighted region of the world, in Palestine, in Iraq, Darfur, in Afghanistan. I am not being judgmental; it isn't my role to be judgmental. I want to ask, "when will the pain and suffering be understood?" For only when it is understood will the pain and suffering stop.

I believe that it was the Prime Minister who spoke of prohibiting discrimination; I would rather suggest that we move to a world of cosmopolitanism rather than a world of compulsion. That we continue to rail against unilateralism and call for multilateralism. I would like to suggest when we speak of migration and integration. That there are three letters which should be remembered; TIM. Territoriality, Identity and Migration.

I recall at a meeting of the Middle East North Africa Summit in 1995, ministers of Europe present may wish to know that Shimon Peres and I, after Casablanca, went to the European Union and we said that thirty-five billion dollars are required for a decade of infrastructure development. To encourage the will of migrants to stay. The answer was a bureaucratic answer; again I am not being judgmental. The answer was first come, first served. There was no question of we will form a working group to come back in a few months. There was no understanding of how we can develop this vision to encourage people to stay in their countries, by providing clean drinking water and infrastructure. We were talking about ten years. After the destruction of the Twin Towers, including four hundred Muslims and people of many nationalities, including people from my own tiny country Jordan, the homeland security bill was signed in the United States. That same figure of thirty five billion dollars was signed to create the situation of enhanced security in the United States.

What, ladies and gentleman, has happened to crisis avoidance? I would like to remind you that before the atrocious attacks in America, occurring only one week after the Durban Conference against Racism, Racial Discrimination, Xenophobia and Related Intolerances ended in controversy. I with among others Martti Ahtisaari of Finland, Salem of Tanzania, Roland of Brazil were asked to convene in Geneva in a group of so called eminent persons. I call myself a non-eminent impert. We produced a statement calling for a Racial Equality Index.

You are all aware of the Human Development Report, started in consultation with my late friend from Pakistan Mahmoud Al-Huqq in 1995, but what about the Racial Equality Index? I would like to suggest that it is only when we provide the necessary impetus of support for initiatives that we promote mutual respect between Jews, Christians and Muslims. In particular after 9/11 in dialogue between Islam and the West and Islam and the United States, can we embark on an honest journey towards crisis avoidance?

However, the three traditional baskets for discussion – economics, politics and security – which can be traced from Helsinki through to Barcelona have had humanity/culture as an afterthought. How long will culture remain an afterthought? This fourth basket, culture, has to be added if we are going to make a real change in the human, as well as physical environment.

We have failed to consider, to our own loss, the ethical dimension to the challenges that face us today. Now, more than ever, we need an ethical code of conduct and I call on Mr Foxeman, if he is in this audience, to say that I agree with him on the basis of an inclusionist, non-discriminatory commitment to a code of conduct to protect us from anti-Semitism, anti-Muslimism, anti-Americanism, anti-Arabism; we need a code of conduct which protects us from Islamophobia, Semitic-phobia, Arab-phobia, Amerophobia and Xenophobia. But rather than solely working against something we need to work for something.

I have the respect which all or many of us share for Walter Sisulu who I had the privilege of visiting in Soweto, for Yehudi Menuhin, a man from a different background and different religion. In Salzburg Chancellor Schussel invited us to a conversation on politics, business and the arts.

In Budapest next year we are meeting to promote a knowledge society where science participates and I would like to invite you to consider that the world conference against racism, should consider working for the principle of universal humanity enshrined not only in the charter of the United Nations, but in our own: I recall the work of my late departed friend and colleague Sadruddine Agha Khan, and twenty eight nationalities who participated in that meeting including Simone Veil, herself a survivor of the holocaust, Robert McNamara and many others from all over the world for a new international humanitarian order.

Ladies and gentlemen, last year the United Nations General Assembly Resolution called yet again, as it has done consistently since 1988 for the adoption of a New International Humanitarian Order. I refer to Resolution 57-184. The principles are simple: the ethics of human solidarity, global issues, man against man, man against nature. I recall meeting with refugees, with the families of the *Disparcidos* in Buenos Aires, with the families of the street children, with the victims of arthritis, we recognized the forces of change vulnerable groups and man made disasters. But when the NGOs came to us they said we are the lobby of the powerless and I had to admit to them we are the powerless lobby for the powerless.

That is why I recognized the strength of the Helsinki Citizens Assembly where Bosnians, Croats and Serbs speak to each other. I recognized the challenges of the Turkish, Armenians and Azeris and say to people in our region that if the intensity of hatred is so high that part of the world with all their historical baggage why can we not do something about it before it is too late in developing the ERASMUS, SOCRATES, MINERVA program, teaching by analogy, leading to your generous initiative in Europe of a TEMPUS programme of funding the Centre for Mediterranean Humanities.

I will be meeting some of you in Turkey presumably at the EU, OIC Foreign Ministers meeting and I want to make specific proposals; the call for the teaching by analogy. The rich putting themselves in the shoes of the poor. Arabs putting themselves in the shoes of the Jews and vice versa. Secondly, after education the call for media. Disintermediating the media, citizens' conferencing, teleconferencing, not the monologue about the need for dialogue, but the interactive process of partnership in our common humanity.

Unfortunately we in the region are conditioned by circumstances not of our doing and I would like to remind you that it is barely sixty years since the Holocaust and anti-Semitism, that "very light sleeper", continues to raise its ugly head with every new generation. I say to my Jewish friends of Polish extraction that it is interesting for me - and I am not playing with words I hope - how it is that a Pole is Semite, but I an Arab am not? However, in the words of Pastor Neumann, which I paraphrase, "When they came for the communist I didn't care, when they came for the Jew I didn't care, when they came for me there was no one left to care".

Ambassador Roberto Toscano of Italy cautions that a lot will depend on wise policies on the part of governments – let me stress policies ladies and gentlemen not politics. The public good not private agendas. There was a Byzantine sophist who had on his gravestone in the sixth century, as if it was the cause of his death, "il a ete touché par l'amour de bien être publique" (he was touched by the love of the public good).

We need to develop a capacity to accept higher levels of cultural diversity within all countries. The situation of Muslims in many parts of the world appears to be 'problematic'. Do not misunderstand me, my wife was born in Calcutta and her family has married Sikhs, Hindus, Parsis, my mother was born in Istanbul in Turkey, so pluralism is not a theoretical exercise in my family. I believe in celebrating every holy day, particularly if it offers you a good meal. As Toscano contends, the answer may not be assimilation or differentialism, but pluralism. Perhaps one of the ways to deal with such neo-racisms is to acknowledge every civilisation's symbiotic, organic relationship with the perceived 'other'. Thus, in the case of Islam and Muslims, the shared Judaeo-Christian-Islamic heritage of Europe – and by extension America – should be reflected throughout school textbooks and in popular culture more widely.

Our efforts at promoting awareness and cultural pluralism are clearly falling short. It is a sad sign of the times when we see the British Shadow Home Secretary associated with a book heavily criticised as being little more than 'Islamophobic rant'. Yet this is not an isolated incident, rather part of a more worrying trend in which we have also witnessed in recent weeks the 'outing' of a senior British Council press officer as the author 'Harry' Cummins, the contributor of a series of inciteful and ignorant articles to the Sunday Telegraph.

Madeleine Bunting, writing in the Guardian newspaper on the 3 September, warned of a 'blind strand of opinion which refuses to accept the phenomenon of Islamophobia. Refuses to see how it represents a mutated form of racism, and refuses to see how such comments about Jews or blacks would be quite rightly regarded as unprintable'. I have been involved in the United Kingdom for over twenty five years in Christian, Jewish and Muslim conversations. I studied Hebrew at University and I am the only Muslim member on the Board of the Oxford Centre for Hebrew and Jewish Studies.

I think I am permitted to say that it is unfair that such examples be taken as the norm. What is often not discussed is the manner in which integration of the 'others' contributes towards a vibrant, rich mosaic of multiple identities which have strengthened pluralism in most European countries today.

I would like to say here, to my European friends, that we are aware of the pains which are troubling you at this moment. I said to Rita Süßmuth when she presented her study on immigration to the German Parliament "It reads very well, but there is very little reference to the reason for migration". To the best of my knowledge, and I stand corrected, there is only one centre in Germany and possibly the whole of Europe, that studies migration: the University of Osnabrück. Cause and effect. Sadly I know from my work with refugee studies - there is a centre at Oxford University at York University in Canada - very little being done to study the full phenomenon. For that reason when I was invited by Senators Ludgar and Biden to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee Meeting to call for partnership for what is sometimes called Casablanca-to-Calcutta or Marrakech-to-Bangladesh, sometimes referred to as the Greater Middle East Initiative, I said provided it is based on partnership and not patronage. Partnership means full involvement by all of us for a better understanding of the other, putting the text into the context. Moving from our episodic existence - moving from crisis to crisis - to a broader view of intra-regional co-operation and intra-independence.

As Muslims, we must share the blame when raising the issue of the dire level of ignorance that afflicts non-Muslim perception of important issues such as women's rights. We must also share the blame as it has been pointed out in numerous reports of our own shortcomings in governance, politisation of the armed forces, the absence of vibrant civil society, some say in the absence of democracy. But let me say that the essence of democracy is freedom. Particularly before 9/11 I have challenged the ministers of interior of the Muslim and Arab world to meet with thinkers to define clearly the limits of freedom which I would define in one word: responsibility. Solutions to our problems are not, in the words of the film Casablanca, only round up the usual suspects.

I am participating in a conference in a few days time entitled *It's Not Only About Economy, Stupid!* I would like to suggest that we move from the culture of futility to the culture of altruism and of giving.

Shimon Peres and I agreed, many years ago, that would it not be of greater inspiration to see the U.N co-coordinating blue overalls rather than blue helmets?

In other parts of the world, "Violent conflict causes massive humanitarian suffering, undermines development and human rights and stifles economic growth". (*Ensuring Progress in the Prevention of Violent Conflict: Priorities for the Greek & Italian EU Presidencies 2003, April 2003*) in such scenarios, "conflict creates conditions where terrorism and organized crime thrive", the parallel economy, the parallel society thrive. That is why I applaud the work of the Grameen Bank and those poverty empowerment agencies that work in different parts of the South Asia and South East Asia. I work with the Catholic Bishops Council and the Asian Muslims Association in Thailand and Cambodia, where we are addressing or attempting to address the question of the sex slave trade. Over a million and a half children are sold every year into the sex slave trade. Do governments want to know? In Africa we are working together with the Copt Church and the Mosque in altruism in the HAC (Hope For African Children). Where is the support that we require? My colleague Bartholomeos of the Nuclear Threat Initiative knows that we have spent over five

billion dollars through the initiative with Sam Nunn and Richard Lugar and dismantling Weapons of Mass Destruction and finding alternative occupations. Can we imagine that scale of funding for the issues I am addressing? The revenues in the Gulf Region and I am not talking about Iraq, Libya or Algeria, the Gulf Region has increased thirty five billion dollars over the last year. Is it not the right of millions of people to ask where is that money going? Three Arab countries represent seventy eight million people Egypt, Morocco and Yemen; seventy eight million illiterate people. We ask where are the limits to ignorance? In the words of Conrad Adenauer where are the limits to man's stupidity?

It is indeed a vicious cycle of despair, but "To fight poverty is to fight the war to end all wars, and to win that war is the only way to winning lasting peace". (Eveline Herfkens, UN Secretary General's Executive Coordinator for the Millennium Development Goals Campaign, WFUNA, 9 May 2003).

One last word. Partnerships of peace which would address root causes such as defense expenditures, terrorism (including state-sponsored violence), humanitarian contingency planning, poverty alleviation, education and development, civil society, and so on. Ethics or morality dictate respect for human dignity and ethical change cannot be brought about within an exclusionist discourse.

I hope that we can start speaking sooner rather than later. Not of petropolitics, but anthropolitics. I hope that the concept of a New International Humanitarian Order will be studied by you as a bridge of understanding of working towards integrating those common values that all humanity shares.

I would like to conclude my remarks by quoting a zahirite – a who lived in Spain between 1165 and 1240. Think where we have come in terms of psychological environment since then. In 1165 Ibn Arabi said:

"My heart is open to all the winds:
It is a pasture for gazelles
And a home for Christian monks,
A temple for idols,
The Black Stone of the Mecca pilgrim,
The table of the Torah,
And the book of the Koran.
Mine is the religion of love.
Wherever God's caravans turn,
The religion of love
Shall be my religion
And my faith."



Websites of interest:

Majlis El Hassan

www.elhassan.org

The Arab Thought Forum

www.almuntada.org.jo

The Royal Institute for Inter-Faith Studies

<http://www.riifs.org/>

The Higher Council for Science and Technology

www.hcst.gov.jo

The Royal Scientific Society

www.rss.gov.jo

The Arab League

www.arableagueonline.org/

World Conference on Religions for Peace

www.wcrp.org/

The Club of Rome

www.clubofrome.org

Al Ahram Centre for Strategic Studies

<http://extra.ahram.org.eg/>

Trans-Mediterranean Renewable Energy Cooperation "TREC"

<http://saharawind.com/documents/trec.pape.pdf>

Search for Common Ground / Partners in Humanity

www.majliselhassan.org www.sfcg.org/

Global Marshall Plan Initiative

www.globalmarshallplan.org

Commission on Globalization (University of Wisdom)

www.commissiononglobalization.org/

Human Security - Oxford Research Group

<http://www.oxfordresearchgroup.org.uk/>

Think Tank – 30

<http://www.clubofrome.org/tt30/index.php>

SPEECH
OF HIS ALL HOLINESS
ECUMENICAL PATRIARCH BARTHOLOMEOS
AT THE OSCE CONFERENCE IN BRUSSELS
ON THE TOPIC OF
“TOLERANCE AND THE FIGHT AGAINST
RACISM, XENOPHOBIA
AND DISCRIMINATION”
(13 September 2004)

* * *

Your Royal Highnesses,
Your Excellencies,
Dear Distinguished Delegates,
Ladies and gentlemen,

It is with great joy indeed that we participate in this Conference, although we do not represent some specific state, or national or international organization, but rather the Ecumenical Patriarchate, which is accorded precedence over all Orthodox Christian Patriarchates and Autocephalous Churches. The reason of our joy is that this Conference revolves around the topic of tolerance and the fight against racism, xenophobia and discrimination, a topic on which we are very sensible.

We say this because the Ecumenical Patriarchate is not a national organization and does not represent any particular national or local church, such as the Greek, or the one in Turkey, the country of its See, but is a supranational ecclesiastical institution, holding within its bosom the faithful of many nationalities, and maintaining a benevolent and equitable disposition, being open to all human beings on equal terms. It is an institution, which demonstrates religious tolerance as a beautiful reality, for we bear respect toward all our fellow humans, irrespective of their faith. Without any trace of fanaticism, or discrimination on account of differences of religion, we coexist peacefully and in a spirit that honours each and every human being.

Furthermore, we stand firmly against any racist ideology. Since 1872, a time when nationalism was rife in Europe and abroad, as propounded in chauvinist theories and a host of pan-slavist, pan-germanic and generally pan-nationalist movements, we had condemned nationalism and racism by a synodal decision. These movements were leading to the establishment of national Christian Churches, and rendering the unifying message of the Gospel the servant of nationalistic divisions and conflicts. Many centuries ago, at a time when the latinization of all nations was pursued by authorities in the West, we as Ecumenical Patriarchate did not hesitate to create a special alphabet for the Slavic language, through the efforts of our missionary saints Cyril and Methodius, and to translate our church service

books, promoting the establishment of a new, non-Greek civilization: namely the civilization of the Slavs. We have always sought and still do, in each country indigenous leaders for the local Churches, and when they are found and/ or trained, we assign to them the responsibility of governing those Churches without any racist considerations or discrimination. History records a multitude of such instances, and the present reality confirms our position, even though nationalist tendencies may still exist amongst certain ecclesiastical figures, without of course our approval.

Quite recently, in 1976 to be exact, on the occasion of the IV Preconciliar Panorthodox Conference held in Geneva, we expressed the desire that the Orthodox Church should contribute to the upholding of the Christian ideals of peace, freedom, brotherhood and love amongst peoples and to the removal of racist discrimination so far as to the inter-religious cooperation, and through it to the abolishment of fanaticism of every kind and likewise to the reconciliation of all peoples and the prevalence of the ideals of freedom and peace in the world, for the benefit of modern humanity, regardless of race or religious conviction. This issue has occupied our thoughts and we have discussed means, through which the Orthodox Church would be able to contribute to the elimination of racism and the fanaticism that derives from it. For the extreme racism undoubtedly breeds or provokes religious fanaticism which in turn leads to the scourge of terrorism, which in our present era delivers its blows on humanity so tragically and extensively.

We are not afraid of strangers: on the contrary we cherish them. The application of the Apostolic words “Be not forgetful to entertain strangers” (Heb. 13,2) is our daily practice and has been so for centuries, without concessions to any form of discrimination.

Therefore, we consider the topic of your conference most familiar and dear to us and are pleased that humanity has progressed insofar as to put forth such a demand on behalf of all human beings, for what we have always been preaching, even though many have regarded it as utopian, is put forth by means of the present conference and by numerous other praiseworthy activities of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe and of several other international Organizations and Agencies.

We have often expressed the view that all humans are equal both in spiritual terms and before the law, a view that is espoused by all sensible people, regardless of religious conviction, and have spoken repeatedly of the necessity that all should welcome the alterity of others and of their cultures, with all that such an attitude should entail.

With every given opportunity we emphasize that the minorities’ religious rights have to be respected and that one of the most substantial amongst those rights involves the right of educating its staff members under the care of specially trained educators, for if this task is assigned to others, outside the Minority, there is the direct and real danger of gradually distorting the content of the Minority’s religious tradition. That is in fact the reason why all the attempts that seek to distort peoples’ religions try to gain access to their educational system and to exert their influence thereby.

Overstressing the racial origins for one, and mainly racism, as well as discrimination against the weaker minorities on the basis of racial, religious, linguistic or any other reasons, together with xenophobia, are ideologies and mental attitudes that are entirely opposed to the attitude, the convictions and the principles espoused by the Ecumenical Patriarchate, who is the main exponent of the Orthodox Church. The term “Ecumenical” seeks precisely to denote the acceptance of all people who live on our planet, our ‘ecumene’, as equal and equally acceptable.

Thus, from the Ecumenical Patriarchate –which is perhaps the very first institution that has historically been accorded with the title “Ecumenical” (VI century A.D.), denoting its universality, not in any sense of holding dominion over the world, but in the sense of

accepting all human beings as equals - we feel profoundly moved as we address you, our wholehearted greetings and praises for your work.

We realize of course that there have been times and places when Christians did not live the Christian brotherhood of humanity, and that many times they tried to uphold their self-seeking discrimination against their fellow humans in the holy texts of their faith. However, those were but deviations from the right path, and grievous sins on the part of those who behaved in such a condemnable racist manner. Surely such censure cannot be levelled against healthy Christianity, which unequivocally condemns racism, discrimination and xenophobia.

Saint Paul, the Apostle himself while being of Jewish origin with a complete Jewish and Greek education, during the first period of his life at the time that he had not known Christ yet, was deeply intolerant and was persecuting the Church of Christ, under the influence of certain Jewish circles of the time. Once he came to know Christ, he overcame his nationalism and religious intolerance, and, due to his Hellenistic education, became sensible of the unity of humankind, and the equal love that God bears toward all human beings. From that time he declared the equality of all before God, which ought to become also the equality of all before one another. He is worthy of admiration for having conceived and expressed the profoundest tenets of Christianity regarding the brotherhood of humanity through pithy and unforgettable statements such as: "There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither slave nor free, there is neither male nor female: for ye are all one in Christ Jesus." (Gal.3,28).

Just a few simple words overturned all the discriminations between human beings of that time. That was immensely daring for his era, an era that recognized slavery as a lawful and morally correct institution, an era that regarded women as objects (*res*), an era when the prevalent attitude amongst Jews was that they were God's chosen people who had to keep themselves pure from any mingling with the society of the gentiles, an era also when other peoples strongly experienced a sense of their supremacy over all others, as was the case with the Roman citizens vis-à-vis all other nations.

The present conference is a fruit and an outcome of this declaration that was so revolutionary for its time, upsetting established order as it did. Of course not all of its participants are adherents of the religion preached by Apostle Paul, but we all rest assured that the principle he voiced in the words we quoted, stands true and indispensable for peaceful coexistence and progress of humankind.

Unfortunately, nationalism of all types and the racial discrimination based thereon, the oppressive measures often reaching to the extreme of eliminating minorities of various kinds, the discrimination based on religious considerations and oppression, the violations of prohibitions of religious conversion often carrying the death penalty, the extreme disadvantage at which women find themselves in many lands, all kinds of exploitation of children, xenophobia and the atrocities perpetrated wantonly against strangers for the sole reason that they differ from the majority inhabiting a given place, are all shameful and deplorable dark spots on our civilization: dark and shameful spots that the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe, in holding this conference, is commendably seeking to eliminate.

May it be permitted to us to express the view that racist nationalism is profoundly irrational. The racist views of any Nazism absolutely lack any scientific basis. They are the product of empty egotism, which instead of seeking – as it should – to reward those who possess it on the basis of their good and meritorious works, establishes their domineering views merely on the accident of their racial origin. In other words, no person is worthy of any praise, since such a person has engaged in no honourable effort in being born within any given race. Thus those who boast merely over their racial origins deserve our pity, rather than our esteem, for they have nothing of their own to contribute, and thus seek to make much of qualities, which they took no pains to make their own.

On the other hand, xenophobia is the product of a timorous conscience, namely of individuals who lack sufficient self-confidence, who do not feel secure in their personal status. Strangers are thus regarded as a threat, as posing a hazard.

It is precisely when we do not feel efficient in our self-assurance and confidence that we consider others, especially strangers, as the root cause of our worries and turn against them in the hope that by removing them we remove the danger that ostensibly threatens our being. Nevertheless, the insecurity that breeds xenophobia, is internal. The strangers are not the cause of it. It pre-exists their presence, and simply seeks to set them up blindly, as the object upon whom to place the blame for its existence. Proof of the truth of this is found in those great nations and confident peoples who receive them favourably and put their wherewithal to use for their progress.

The situation becomes unbearable for indigenous minorities, for those who exist within intolerant societal majorities, for they are deemed alien whilst being equally indigenous as the majority. In many cases the majorities merely indulge in intense attempts to assimilate the minorities culturally, religiously, nationally and linguistically. There are other more painful instances when majorities will be looking for scapegoats for their backwardness, or for their failure to progress, and find them in the members of the minority, against whom they turn virulently with the aim of destroying them, exterminating the minority as the ostensible cause of their real or imagined woes, despite the fact that the minority in question is actually not in the least responsible for what it is being blamed for. And then there are cases when confrontations drive minorities to take desperate measures of a bellicose nature that exacerbate the conflict and drive away any hope of peace.

Regrettably the societies of our times have yet to reach the necessary level of maturity to become fully accepting of strangers. The clause of the European Treaty in respect of freedom of taking up residence constitutes a courageous impetus towards the right direction, but certain reasonable reservations are bound to curtail its breadth of application. The reason for this would be that unrestricted freedom of taking up residence, if it oversteps certain boundaries, will certainly spark adverse reactions, because societies have not yet reached the advanced degree of freedom espoused and instituted by the Treaties.

For our part we pray that society will mature beyond the limits envisaged by the Treaties so that all of humanity, imbued by the spirit of brotherhood, will coexist in equitability, freedom and mutual respect. And with such a prayer we come to the close of our brief address and express our gratitude to you for having invited us to this forum, and for the attention with which you have followed our words, and add our prayer that the work of the Conference will be crowned with success, and that during its course resolutions that will benefit humanity will be achieved. So let it come about.

Keynote-Rede

anlässlich der

OSZE-Konferenz zu Toleranz und dem Kampf gegen Rassismus, Fremdenfeindlichkeit und Diskriminierung am 13./14. September 2004 in Brüssel

Marieluise Beck

Parlamentarische Staatssekretärin

im Bundesministerium für Familie, Senioren, Frauen und Jugend

Beauftragte der Bundesregierung für Migration, Flüchtlinge und Integration

Sehr geehrter Herr Vorsitzender,

Exzellenzen,

Sehr geehrte Damen und Herren,

Rassismus, Fremdenfeindlichkeit, Diskriminierung und Intoleranz – dies sind keine dunklen Gespenster der Vergangenheit, keine Probleme aus längst vergangenen Zeiten. Es sind Herausforderungen der Gegenwart, der heutigen Zeit - leider noch immer. Es sind Herausforderungen für uns alle in einer Welt, die sich immer schneller dreht.

Der 11. September ist für uns eine Wegmarke. Dieses Datum steht dafür, dass Intoleranz zur Bedrohung unserer Sicherheit werden kann, einen Angriff auf die demokratische Gesellschaft darstellt. Wir alle – Bürgerinnen und Bürger – sind gefordert im Einsatz für die Demokratie, im Einsatz für Respekt, Toleranz und Verständnis. Mit Hochachtung schauen wir auf die muslimische Gemeinschaft in Frankreich, die sich gegen die Gewalt im Irak gestellt hat, und für das Zusammenleben und gemeinsame

Agieren in einer offenen Gesellschaft.

Rassismus und Intoleranz gegenüber Andersseienden und Andersdenkenden stellen nach wie vor einen fundamentalen Angriff auf die Würde des einzelnen Menschen dar. Sie sind ein Angriff gegen die uns in der OSZE verbindenden Werte. Totalitäre Ideologien unter dem Deckmantel der Religion dürfen wir nicht dulden. Jeder Form von Intoleranz und Diskriminierung gilt es mit aller Entschlossenheit entgegenzutreten. Auf lokaler Ebene, auf nationaler Ebene, aber auch international, über die Staatsgrenzen hinweg.

Daher begrüße ich es außerordentlich, dass wir uns heute erneut zu einer Konferenz im Rahmen der OSZE zusammengefunden haben. Lassen Sie uns ein Zeichen setzen gegen jede Form von Intoleranz, von Unfreiheit und totalitären Ideologien. Wir müssen Strategien und Konzepte entwickeln, um Diskriminierung, Fremdenfeindlichkeit und Rassismus wirksamer zu bekämpfen.

Ein Blick in die Tageszeitung oder die Abendnachrichten zeigt uns immer wieder auf traurige Weise:

- Menschen werden wegen ihrer Hautfarbe zu Tode gehetzt,
- wegen ihrer Religion beleidigt und herabgesetzt,
- wegen ihrer Herkunft, ihres Geschlechts oder ihrer sexuellen Orientierung diskriminiert und erniedrigt.

Auch wenn nur eine Minderheit in der Gesellschaft rassistischem, fremdenfeindlichem oder antisemitischem Gedankengut anhängt – wir dürfen dieser Minderheit keinen Fußbreit Raum lassen. Ausgrenzung, Intoleranz und Hass gegenüber denen, die als anders empfunden werden, darf nicht geduldet oder

hingenommen werden. Wir alle sind aufgefordert hinzuschauen:

- was läuft falsch?
- was können und müssen wir tun?
- wo müssen wir handeln?

Sehr geehrter Herr Vorsitzender,

vier Handlungsfelder sind beim Kampf gegen Diskriminierung, Rassismus und Fremdenfeindlichkeit nach meiner Überzeugung von besonderer Bedeutung:

Zum einen bedarf es wirksamer Antidiskriminierungsbestimmungen. Es muss ein rechtlicher Rahmen geschaffen werden, der es gesellschaftlichen Minderheiten ermöglicht, die ihnen zustehenden Rechte wahrzunehmen und einzufordern. Die Europäische Union ist hier mit gutem Beispiel vorangegangen. Ihre Antidiskriminierungsbestimmungen werden zurzeit in allen EU-Mitgliedsstaaten in nationales Recht umgesetzt. Nationale Antidiskriminierungsstellen sollen in Zukunft die Interessen von Diskriminierungsopfern wahren und vertreten, die Opfer unterstützen und beraten. Die Aufnahme zahlreicher Antidiskriminierungsbestimmungen in bestehendes Arbeitsrecht wird ebenfalls zu einem verbesserten Schutz von Diskriminierungsopfern führen.

Gesetzliche Aktivitäten alleine reichen jedoch nicht aus, um Intoleranz, Diskriminierung und rassistische Umtriebe zu überwinden. Entscheidend für den Bestand einer offenen, demokratischen, fairen und multikulturell geprägten Gesellschaft ist das friedliche und respektvolle Zusammenleben aller gesellschaftlichen Gruppen.

Gemeinsame Werte und Normen und die Bereitschaft sich hierfür einzusetzen müssen im Mittelpunkt unserer Bemühungen stehen. Hierzu bedarf es einer tief greifenden Stärkung der Zivilgesellschaft sowie einer Ermutigung zu mehr Zivilcourage. Zivilcourage heisst auch Mut und Kraft, sich anderen entgegenzustellen.

Mit einem umfassenden Aktionsprogramm

„Jugend für Toleranz und Demokratie – gegen Rechtsextremismus, Fremdenfeindlichkeit und Antisemitismus“ – stärkt die Bundesregierung bereits seit vielen Jahren demokratisches Verhalten, ziviles Engagement, Toleranz und Weltoffenheit – Respekt gegenüber denen, die anders sind.

Zahlreiche Programme, Initiativen und Maßnahmen konnten so in den vergangenen Jahren unterstützt werden:

- Mobile Beratungsteams stärken demokratische Strukturen.
- Opferberatungsstellen unterstützen Opfer rassistisch motivierter Gewalttaten.
- Netzwerkstellen sammeln Daten, Erfahrungen und Erkenntnisse im Umgang mit Opfern und Tätern.
- Internationale Jugendbegegnungen, Geschichtswerkstätten, Filmprojekte oder Foto-Workshops, Ausstellungen, Bildungsveranstaltungen in Schulen und Betrieben.

Die Bandbreite der unterstützten Projekte ist breit gefächert.

Weiterhin bedarf es einer erfolgreichen Integration von Migrantinnen und Migranten in unsere Gesellschaft. Nicht Ausgrenzung und Abschottung, sondern Integration ist die grundlegende

Zielbestimmung politischen Handelns. Es bedarf der gleichberechtigten Teilhabe aller am wirtschaftlichen, gesellschaftlichen, politischen und kulturellen Leben, um Rassismus und Fremdenfeindlichkeit entgegenzutreten zu können.

Migrantinnen und Migranten sind heute fester Bestandteil unserer Einwanderungsgesellschaften. Über die Hintergründe, die zu Migration führen, wissen wir aber immer noch zu wenig. Dieses Defizit müssen wir abbauen.

Nur mit einer umfassenden Strategie wird es möglich sein, Ängste und Befürchtungen abzubauen, Vorurteile zu zerstreuen. Im Zuge der Neugestaltung des deutschen Zuwanderungsrechts wurde die Integration der bei uns lebenden Migrantinnen und Migranten deshalb nachhaltig verbessert.

Besondere Aufmerksamkeit wird man in Zukunft dem interreligiösen Dialog schenken müssen. Moslems, Christen und Juden dürfen nicht länger „sprachlos“ neben-, und leider allzu oft auch gegeneinander stehen. Vor dem Hintergrund der weltpolitischen Entwicklungen der letzten Jahre ist es heute wichtiger denn je, Andersgläubigen Verständnis, Offenheit und Toleranz, vielleicht sogar Interesse entgegenzubringen. Menschlichkeit, Brüderlichkeit, Schwesterlichkeit heisst heute, dass wir unsere Türen öffnen für Migranten und Migrantinnen, dass wir nicht abschotten, sondern Brücken bauen. Religiöser Dialog ist ein Dialog, der von Menschen getragen und täglich gelebt werden muss.

Schließlich müssen Rolle und Einsatz der Neuen Medien beim Kampf gegen Rassismus, Fremdenfeindlichkeit und Diskriminierung kritisch beleuchtet werden. Rechtsextreme

nutzen in zunehmendem Maße das Internet für ihre menschenverachtenden Aktivitäten. Das Internet ist ein grenzüberschreitendes, ein globales Medium. Die Bekämpfung rassistischer Umtriebe im Netz setzt daher eine enge internationale Zusammenarbeit voraus. Die OSZE-Konferenz von Paris vom Juni dieses Jahres war ein erster wichtiger Schritt in diese Richtung.

Unsere gemeinsamen Anstrengungen müssen jedoch weitergehen. Die Meinungsfreiheit ist ein wertvolles Gut. Sie ist ein Grundpfeiler jeder demokratischen und rechtsstaatlich verfassten Gesellschaft. Wo Meinungsfreiheit jedoch missbraucht wird, wo unter ihrem Deckmantel zu Hass, Gewalt und Intoleranz aufgerufen wird, muss sie ihre Grenzen finden. Hier gilt es mit Augenmaß, aber auch mit der nötigen Entschlossenheit aufzutreten. Repressive, strafrechtliche Maßnahmen seitens des Staates sind nur ein Ansatzpunkt. Sie können nur im internationalen Kontext Erfolg versprechend umgesetzt werden. Von mindestens ebenso großer Bedeutung sind:

- präventive Ansätze,
- die Förderung der Medienkompetenz von Eltern, pädagogischen Fachkräften und Jugendlichen sowie
- die Sensibilisierung der Zivilgesellschaft .

Sehr geehrter Herr Vorsitzender,

Die Mitgliedstaaten der OSZE haben auf der Konferenz in Berlin im Frühjahr dieses Jahres ihren unbedingten Willen zum Ausdruck gebracht, Antisemitismus in all seinen Erscheinungsformen gemeinsam zu bekämpfen und zu überwinden. Sie haben damit ein weltweit beachtetes Signal

gesetzt. Sie haben auch ein Zeichen des Vertrauens gesetzt, ein Vertrauen in Deutschland als Gastgeber dieser Konferenz.

Auch von dieser Konferenz muss ein unübersehbares Signal ausgehen. Rassismus, Fremdenfeindlichkeit, Diskriminierung und Intoleranz dürfen nicht Teil unserer Welt werden und erfordern entschlossenes staatliches und zivilgesellschaftliches Handeln. Ich hoffe, dass die Konferenz auch zur Stärkung des Bewusstseins beitragen kann: Anderssein muss nicht länger als Bedrohung wahrgenommen werden. Sie kann auch als Gewinn und Bereicherung empfunden werden.

Ich danke für Ihre Aufmerksamkeit!



PA.GAL/7/04
17 September 2004

ENGLISH only

Statement of
Rep. Alice L. Hastings, President of OSCE Parliamentary Assembly
to
Conference on Tolerance and the Fight Against Racism, Xenophobia and
Discrimination

(Brussels, 13 September 2004)

I would like to thank Chairman Passy, His Royal Highness, His High Holiness and the Belgian Government for hosting this conference.

It is unfortunate that changes in our society dictate that we must gather to discuss what should be commonplace in society. But, it is crucially important to have this dialogue since it is not.

- Article 1 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights adopted in 1948 suggests “All human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights. They are endowed with reason and conscience and should act towards one another in a spirit of brotherhood,” and sisterhood.
- This basic premise is the underlying concept of every human rights system in the world. However, it is the blatant, unabashed disregard of this premise that brings us to the table today and everyday until we are all free.
- While we all embrace and welcome the benefits and advances of globalization we must also embrace the diversity that occurs when worlds, people, and cultures come together.
- We all inhabit this incredible sphere called earth and it is our hope that one day we will do so without fear or prejudice but this hope is not yet fulfilled.
- The phenomena of xenophobia, racism, anti-Semitism, discrimination and religious intolerance and human trafficking permeate all our societies. It is complex in nature, but this is no new global occurrence. Xenophobia, the hatred or intolerance of otherness is as old as humanity itself.
- Today, few States are racially, ethnically, or religiously homogenous. Ethnic conflict and tensions are pandemic in many OSCE regions and beyond. Globalization and technology has brought about increased human mobility and migration.

- Although racism and xenophobia occurrences and manifestations are varied from region to region, its affects are the same.

Be it the United States, Russia, Germany or the Balkans, human rights atrocities abound and must be eradicated.

- The U. N. Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide, defined genocide as calculated efforts to destroy a national, ethnic, racial or religious group in whole or part. This definition can be applied to all of the issues we are discussing here at this Conference.

I commend Secretary Powell for declaring the human annihilation and eradication in the Sudan as genocide. The thousands that have been raped, starved and killed are proof of our need for increased participation in not just OSCE regions, but others as well.

- The international community has made great strides in the fight against these socially crippling intolerances. Laws have been enacted and numerous international human rights instruments have been adopted.
- The OSCE Assembly each year has adopted resolutions and declarations, most recently at the Edinburgh Session, where I was elected President of the Parliamentary Assembly.
- In Paragraph 64, of the Edinburgh Declaration, we declare, harmonious relations and confidence between individuals of different cultural backgrounds are a prerequisite for social stability and domestic and international integration and of particular importance on this connection is an ongoing, constructive and balanced dialogue between the authorities and the representatives of national minorities.

Last week, I met with Secretary of State Colin Powell to discuss the observation of the American elections. I am pleased that the Parliamentary Assembly will lead the OSCE's observation mission to insure the protection of the rights of all voters.

- During the Berlin Conference on anti-Semitism, there was much discussion about the need for the Chairman in Office to appoint a special envoy to address the issues of anti-Semitism in the OSCE regions. I support this idea and hope the Bulgarian Chair and the incoming Slovenia Chair will make this a reality.

OSCE Parliamentary Assembly has and will continue to condemn any acts of intolerance that undermines or impedes the processes of peace and security in the OSCE area.

- Acculturation is our desire
- Stability and peace is our mission
- Love of humanity is our mandate
- Mankind has intrinsically at its core the undeniable need to belong, to identify with others that are like minded, that speak the same language, or look the same. In the 1970's the late Henri Tajfel, Ph.D, of the University of Bristol in England and John

Turner, Ph.D, now of the Australian National University, in their *social identity theory* concluded that we also have a need to think highly of ourselves. One way of elevating one's own self-esteem is by denigrating the attributes of another.

- Mustapha Atatürk, the founder of Turkey, was so poignant and profound in his thoughts and observations of the world. He understood that we aren't just citizens of the geographic place and space that we occupy, we are first and foremost citizens of the world and we should therefore engage in making that our defining identity.
- Nationalistic narcissism has no place in our countries. Not American or Turk or Muslim or Jew. Not Sinti or Roma. Just citizens of the world.
- Racism, discrimination, intolerance, anti-Semitism all stem from fear, unawareness and a lack of knowledge. It is this ignorance of diversity that must be combated.
- Education and Legislation is our only hope, if we are ever to achieve tolerance, respect and mutual understanding. We must eliminate the fears of the unfamiliar and the unknown.
- As stated in this conference's agenda, if education is to enable both individuals and society as a whole to develop the skills to address future challenges, it is essential that it promotes tolerance and an appreciation of diversity. The promotion of respect for each individual's cultural, religious or ethnic identity within a context of social integration is an indispensable part of the educational process.

Inter-cultural education must begin being taught in educational institutions, religious centers, and most importantly, stressed in the media and within legal systems.

- There must be a consensus in every society to abide by basic rules of civility. The basic rights of fair and equitable treatment of human beings must be observed in a pluralistic community. In order for there to be security and positive development, we must have substantive engagement and look on our perceived differences with welcoming eyes.

Cultural and ethnic fusion should take place in our regions seamlessly.

And finally, comprehensive policies with greater transparency in function must be developed and enacted. And the consequences of violations enforced.

- Information should be fair, understandable and accessible. We can not allow the institutionalization of discrimination to block barriers to life's necessities such as shelter, food, employment and other social welfare to be based on fear, or lack of knowledge or prejudicial attitudes.

Such policies against the integration of human beings into are societies can not be readily reconciled with universally declared principles of equality and acceptance of diversity.

J. M. Vorster, in his analyzes writes, and I paraphrase:

- It seems that racism and xenophobia will occupy ethical, political, and sociological reflection for quite some time to come. In the process of dealing with these pressing issues, it is vitally important to keep in mind that mechanisms such as education and social integration are of no use if it does not create a sensitivity and desire for tolerance and respect for others. But tolerance and respect are of no use if they do not lead to the recognition of rights. And rights are of no use if they cannot be applied legally and effectively, in order to protect and empower the victims of racism and xenophobia.

This is our challenge and our charge to keep.

PC.DEL/833/04/Rev.1
14 September 2004

ENGLISH
Original: RUSSIAN

REPORT BY M S.ELENA BORISOVNA M IZULINA ,DEPUTY HEAD
OF THE LEGAL DEPARTMENT OF THE STATE DUMA OF THE
RUSSIAN FEDERATION AND REPRESENTATIVE OF THE STATE
DUMA TO THE CONSTITUTIONAL COURT, ON "LAW AND THE
AUTHORITIES IN COMBATING XENOPHOBIA ,RACISM AND
OTHER FORMS OF ETHNIC DISCRIMINATION – RUSSIA 'S
EXPERIENCE"

Brussels, 13 and 14 September 2004

Dear friends,

I find myself departing for the first time from my usual habit in addressing an international OSCE audience with these words rather than with my customary words "distinguished participants". In Russia, people say: "You know who your friends are at a time of trouble". In these tragic days for Russia, following the events in Beslan, you have acted as our friends. On behalf of ordinary Russian men and women, I want to thank you for the support and solidarity you showed us so spontaneously and sincerely.

1. Before I begin with my report, I should like to enter three reservations:
 - (1) In my report I shall deal only with ethnic discrimination as a variety of discrimination because this form of discrimination poses the greatest danger to society. Even if an isolated act of ethnic discrimination is directed at a specific individual, it affects many people for the reason that every person who regards himself or herself as belonging to that or another ethnic group feels degraded and humiliated. In this sense, ethnic discrimination always affects an indeterminate circle of persons. What is more, ethnic discrimination is closely associated with nationalism and patriotism. Frequently, ethnic discrimination takes on extremist, including terrorist, forms. We do not have to look far for examples, no further than the recent events in Belsan in North Ossetia. There were even political forces who read into these acts of terrorism and violence and of unprecedented cruelty against children national liberation motives.
 - (2) This report makes use of a generic concept, that of ethnic discrimination, taken to mean (in line with the International Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Racial Discrimination, approved under United Nations General Assembly resolution 2106 A (XX) of 21 December 1965) the violation of human and civil rights and freedoms and legitimate interests on the basis of a person's race, nationality, language, origin or attitude towards religion. Forms of ethnic discrimination include xenophobia, racism, anti-Semitism and ethnic extremism. Although xenophobia would not seem to fall under that list since it literally means "fear of the stranger" and describes an

attitude rather than an ideology, still, once it has penetrated the social consciousness and has begun to spread within it, xenophobia becomes an integral part of that consciousness, determining society's ideology and behaviour and its attitude towards ethnic discrimination. In any case, those against whom xenophobia is directed perceive it precisely as a humiliation and infringement of their human dignity.

In general, it should be noted that as far as combating ethnic discrimination is concerned, the international community has not made much progress in systematizing the various categories and in standardizing and delimiting the most important concepts. However, each of these concepts provides an important methodological basis for organizing and co-ordinating efforts to combat ethnic discrimination.

One would imagine that the concept of "fascism" is clear to everyone: an ideology based on the presumed racial superiority of Aryans over other races and peoples. This ideology may be seen in very specific material incarnations, for example the symbols and other trappings of Nazism. In any case, when the Russian law on countering extremist activities was adopted, despite rabid opposition on the part of a number of left-wing political parties in the State Duma, a provision was included in Article 1 of that law prohibiting Nazi propaganda or the public demonstration of the outer trappings or symbols of Nazism or of outer trappings or symbols so similar to those of Nazism as to be confused with them.

If a similar definitiveness with regard to the concept of "fascism" also existed under international law, the ceremony marking the inauguration of the memorial to the soldiers of the Twentieth Estonian SS Division in the Estonian village of Likhula in August of this year in commemoration of the restoration of Estonian independence would hardly have been possible. And this took place in a country that has recently become a member of the European Union and NATO. As far as I am aware, it was only the Russian public and the Russian authorities who raised their voices over this issue. Indifference on the part of international organizations to facts of this kind is a splendid argument for those political forces in Russia who argue that Russia has no friends in the West and is surrounded only by enemies.

- (3) My report draws on Russian experience, based on national law, in combating ethnic discrimination. This is not because this phenomenon is encountered more frequently in Russia than elsewhere; rather quite the opposite. Since its very beginnings, Russia has been a multi-ethnic country. A multitude of peoples have lived here peacefully side by side for many centuries. We are talking about something else. One may confidently include among the challenges of the twenty-first century the spread not only of international terrorism and of trafficking in narcotic drugs and human beings but also of xenophobia, racism, ethnic extremism and ethnic discrimination. Xenophobia and ethnic extremism are increasingly becoming systemic factors defining the direction of social development not only in Russia but also in many European countries as well. In my view, the reasons for this phenomenon are connected:

— First, with the fact that, following the collapse of the Soviet Union, the borders of States that had been part of the so-called socialistic camp — borders that for decades had been hermetically sealed — were opened, resulting in a sharp increase in migration flows. The authorities not only in Russia but also in

many countries of the European Union were tangibly confronted with the problems of spontaneous migration, the disaffection of the ethnic majority in the face of this influx of migrants and an increase in the number of conflicts arising on ethnic grounds. In public opinion, social problems more and more frequently began to be not politicized (when responsibility is placed on the authorities) but ethnicized (when responsibility is shifted to “alien” ethnic communities);

- Second, with the fact that at a time when European countries and the United States of America are experiencing powerful industrial growth and when the processes of pan-European integration are being actively expanded, there has been an intensification of trends towards social stratification not only within society but also between different States.

What is typical of Russia can be observed in other countries as well. For that reason, one may validly seek to identify certain common problems and formulate recommendations, taking Russia’s experience as one of the countries in the OSCE area as a point of departure.

2. This report consists of two parts:

- (1) The fundament legal principles for combating ethnic discrimination in Russia and their practical application;
- (2) Some recommendations for international co-operation in this area.

3. The bases for legally countering ethnic discrimination in Russia are the provisions of Article 19 of the Constitution of the Russian Federation. Part one of that Article establishes equality before the law and the courts; part two reads: “The State guarantees the equality of human and civil rights and freedoms regardless of sex, race, nationality, language, origin, property status and official position, place of residence, attitude towards religion, convictions, affiliation with public associations and other circumstances as well. Any limitation of civil rights on the basis of social, racial, national, linguistic or religious affiliation is prohibited.” However, beginning in 2002, Russia undertook a number of serious initiatives to combat various forms of ethnic discrimination at the legal level. Among these, the following should be mentioned:

- Federal Law No. 114-FZ of 25 July 2002 “On countering extremist activities”, which for almost ten years the State Duma refused to adopt even at its first reading. It was only in 2002 that, thanks to the fact that this law was reintroduced by the new President of Russia, Mr. Vladimir Putin, it was adopted;
- Amendments to the Criminal Code of the Russian Federation in 2002 and particularly in 2003;
- Amendments to the Code of Administrative Infractions.

The most important legislative innovations in the law “On countering extremist activities” include the following:

- (1) The concept of extremist activities (Article 1), which includes also the activities of religious associations or other organizations or media or physical persons in planning, organizing, preparing and carrying out actions aimed at inciting racial, ethnic or religious discord and also social discord, involving violence or calls for violence; the humiliation of national dignity; the propagandizing of the exclusivity, superiority or inferiority of citizens on the grounds of their attitude towards religion or their social, racial, ethnic, religious or linguistic affiliation; Nazi propaganda and the public demonstration of the outer trappings or symbols of Nazism or of outer trappings or symbols so similar to those of Nazism as to be confused with them; the financing of the aforementioned activities or the abetting in other ways of their commission, inter alia by making available for the commission of the aforementioned activities financial resources, real property, training and printed materials, logistic support, telephone, fax or other means of communication, information services and other material and technical facilities.

I might mention that there is always a political or ideological slant to contemporary xenophobia. The latter is closely linked with nationalism and patriotism. Moreover, contemporary nationalism is in effect an expression of xenophobia and a form of xenophobia.

It is clear that the feeling of belonging to a nation or an ethnic group along with a sense of national pride is normal and ineradicable. An exaggerated or distorted sense of national pride, which lies at the heart of nationalism, is something else altogether. Between what is national and what is nationalistic there is a very fine line, which is not fixed and is frequently imperceptible, and between the two there are a great many points where one can cross from one to the other. However, these are two qualitatively different phenomena. One cannot renounce the national, while the nationalistic is dangerous (including for those who espouse it). What is national is open and friendly; what is nationalistic is closed and aggressive. Patriotism differs fundamentally from nationalism. Patriotism is above all a love of one's homeland, of one's people. Nationalism is above all a hatred of another people's homeland and other people (or peoples). The language of patriotism is the language of love; the language of nationalism is the language of hostility.

However, patriotism is one of the preferred "cloaks" used to disguise nationalism. It is the favourite mask worn by nationalists. Theirs is rabid patriotism. It is not a manifestation of love of country, but a school of hatred — hatred for enemies, within and without, who, in the opinion of the nationalists, dream of nothing other than how Russia might be destroyed, dismembered or, at the very least, turned into a colony. "The only thing that can weld together a nation are enemies." This is how Umberto Eco described the psychology of nationalists. It is important to learn how to expose xenophobes, anti-Semites and nationalists posing as patriots. And here, we shall not be able to do without openness, an exchange of information and the establishment of unified legal standards to make it possible to distinguish these phenomena. We in Russia have become acutely aware of the need to establish a special independent expert centre. Possibly, the establishment of this kind of centre at the international level as well would also be justified.

- (2) The drawing up of a "federal list of extremist material". This kind of list must be compiled up on the basis of court rulings classifying information material as extremist

and, therefore, unsuitable for dissemination on the territory of the Russian Federation. A list of this kind could be useful in order to avoid having on every individual occasion to conduct a detailed analysis as to whether or not “M ein Kampf” or the forgery known as the “Catechism of the Jews” falls under the category of forbidden material.

- (3) The establishment, under a court order, of restrictions on access to government, municipal and certain other jobs for persons who have participated in the carrying out of extremist activities (Article 15).
- (4) The vesting of the Prosecutor General of the Russian Federation and of the relevant public prosecutors subordinate to him with the authority to issue warnings on the inadmissibility of extremist actions. In addition, a warning of this kind may serve as grounds for dissolving a public association or for terminating the operations of a media enterprise (Articles 7 and 8). It is true that the statistical data on the work of the Office of the Public Prosecutor does not yet contain a special section providing statistical information regarding warnings of this kind. But we are aware of a number of facts. For example, under the federal law of 10 October 2002 on 4 September 2002* the Omsk regional court agreed to hear a suit brought by the Office of the Public Prosecutor of the Omsk region and declared invalid the registration of the Omsk branch of the Russian National Unity party since, in the opinion of the court, its actions contravened the following laws: “On public organizations”, “On countering extremist activities” and “On perpetuating the memory of the victory of the Soviet people in the Great Patriotic War”.

On 2 October 2003, the Public Prosecutor of the Krasnodar region (kray) applied to the Krasnodar regional court to ban the activities of the religious group known as the Krasnodar Orthodox Slavonic Communion “VEK RA” (Vedic Culture of Russian Aryans), which was using symbols of particular solar signs (swastikas) similar to Nazi symbols or external trappings. Under a ruling of the Krasnodar regional court of 24 October 2003, this application was accepted for action by the court, and under a determination dated 18 November 2003 a comprehensive expert panel, including a group of specialists in the fields of linguistics, religion and history, was appointed. A final decision on this matter was not handed down only because on 8 April of this year the organization in question appealed to the Constitutional Court of the Russian Federation on the grounds that the federal law on countering extremist activities was unconstitutional. The Constitutional Court refused to hear this complaint, pointing out that the matter in question fell within the competence of the court of general jurisdiction (lower court). Accordingly, it is expected that this matter will be finally resolved in the very near future.

- (5) The obligation of public associations to disassociate themselves with extremist statements by members of their governing bodies, lest otherwise such statements be regarded as an indicator of extremist activity on the part of the organization as a whole (part 3, Article 15).

* Translator’s note: sic in the original.

- (6) A provision stipulating that, with the adoption of the law, the activities of a public or religious association may be stopped through an administrative procedure, albeit only until the court has considered the question of the association's dissolution (Article 10).
- (7) The introduction of accountability on the part of officials not only for statements of an extremist nature but also for their failure to take, in accordance with their powers, measures to put an end to extremist activities (Article 14). If even a very short time ago someone had told me that an official could be removed from his or her post in Russia for having made anti-Semitic comments, I would not have believed it. Today this is already a reality. In April of this year, the Deputy Prime Minister of the Republic of Gornii Altai was sacked for "conduct not in keeping with his official position" after, in an interview with one of the local newspapers, he referred to Prime Minister Fradkov as a non-Russian. The Office of the Public Prosecutor of the Republic began an inquiry into the incident to determine whether or not the Deputy Prime Minister's remarks contained an incitement to ethnic discord and arranged for a psycho-sociological expert examination at one of the leading institutions in Novosibirsk. Of course, it is not yet the case that everywhere in Russia public prosecutors are acting in such a principled way in applying the law. However, legal precedents already exist.

The Criminal Code of the Russian Federation contains a set of provisions aimed at combating ethnic discrimination:

- Article 63 (part 1, paragraph (e)) includes among the aggravating circumstances the commission of a crime for reasons of ethnic, racial or religious hatred or hostility, out of revenge for the lawful actions of others, or for the purpose of concealing another crime or abetting its commission.
- Article 105 (part 2, paragraph (l)) includes among the defining attributes of premeditated murder killing on the grounds of ethnic, racial or religious hatred or hostility or blood revenge. Murder on ethnic grounds is understood as referring to murder committed out of the murderer's conscious dislike of the nationality or race of the victim.

We should make it immediately clear, however, that accurate statistics on murders of this kind do not yet exist, since until recently Russian law enforcement agencies were not interested in having material on murders of this kind show up in their reports. However, convictions handed down under articles of the Criminal Code providing for criminal responsibility for crimes on ethnic grounds are no longer a rarity.

Most of the cases of murder on ethnic grounds have been recorded in recent years in St. Petersburg. Moscow is in second place and Volgograd in third. Murders on ethnic grounds have also been recorded in other Russian cities. If we look at the ethnic breakdown of those murdered, immigrants from the Caucasus (11 persons) are in first place, followed by natives of Central Asia (eight persons). Accordingly, the absolute majority of the victims were former Soviet citizens or their direct descendants. In addition, among the victims were Afghans (two persons), Koreans (two persons), Africans (two persons) and also Syrians, Indians and Nentsi (one each).

- (3) To Article 136 “violation of the equality of human and civil rights and freedoms” of Federal Law No. 162-FZ of 8 December 2003 there has been added the word “discrimination”. For the first time, the actual concept of “discrimination” has been included in the law and is gradually beginning to find its way into our legal system. The maximum punishment provided for under this article is two years’ imprisonment or, if the offence involved an abuse of official position, five years’ imprisonment.
- (4) Article 282 of the Criminal Code of the Russian Federation “incitement to ethnic, racial or religious hostility” has been amended by Federal Law No. 162-FZ of 8 December 2003.

The definition of the crime has not only been expanded by including such attributes as sex, language, origin and affiliation with a social group but, in addition, such behaviour as humiliating the dignity of the victim is now regarded as a criminal act for all the attributes listed in the article and not only for the attribute of ethnic affiliation. Of particular importance is the expansion of the “range” of punishments in the first part of the article and especially in its second part, which previously provided only for imprisonment. All of this is entirely proper, since what is involved is a non-violent crime, which in addition may involve very different degrees of danger to society. A sizeable fine may prove to be a more effective measure in the case of publishers of newspapers or brochures with a racist content than a prison sentence, which is almost always commuted to a suspended sentence.

According to figures released by the Office of the Prosecutor General of the Russian Federation, 17 crimes covered by Article 282 of the Criminal Code of the Russian Federation were recorded in 2000, with eight criminal cases referred to the courts. In 2001, the figures had already risen to 32 crimes on ethnic grounds, with six cases referred to the courts, and in 2002 74 crimes, with 19 cases referred to the courts. In 2003, of the 72 crimes recorded only 11 reached the courts in the form of criminal cases. Unfortunately, in criminal cases of this category the courts make wide use of the practice of imposing suspended sentences in place of real sentences. There are frequent cases where judges reclassify ethnically motivated crimes as hooliganism. I should add that it is true that so far nothing has been done to provide a comprehensive study of judicial practice for this category of offences, although this would be most desirable.

- (5) Article 280 “public calls for extremist activity” (in the version of Federal Law No. 112-FZ of 25 July 2002) provides for a maximum punishment of up to three years’ imprisonment.
- (6) Article 282¹ “organization of an extremist community” was first introduced by Federal Law No. 112-FZ of 25 July 2002 and provides for a maximum punishment of up to six years’ imprisonment.
- (7) Article 282² “organizing the activities of an extremist organization” was introduced by Federal Law No. 112-FZ of 25 July 2002 and provides for a maximum punishment of up to three years’ imprisonment.

The Russian Code on Administrative Infractions was supplemented in 2002 by two new articles providing, in particular, for administrative accountability for Nazi

propaganda and the public demonstration of the outer trappings and symbols of Nazism.

As you can see, a sufficient legal foundation has been put into place in Russia for combating ethnic discrimination.

Obviously, the adoption of a law does not mean an immediate change in judicial practice and, far less, in social and legal consciousness. However, what until quite recently seemed impossible in Russia is today becoming a reality. In April 2003, a group of skinheads from Surgut were sentenced to terms ranging from four to eight years for kicking and beating a Tajik. Some of those convicted were also sentenced to compulsory psycho-neurological treatment. A trial is under way involving skinheads from Volgograd who have also been accused of murder on ethnic grounds. The office of the Lefortovo Interregional Public Prosecutor is investigating the case of the murder of Mr. E. Mamedov. In spring 2003, the 18th counter-extremism bureau was set up under the department for combating organized crime in St. Petersburg.

The murder of the nine-year-old Tajik girl, Khursheda Sultanova, drew a sharp response from the authorities. The Governor of St. Petersburg, Ms. Valentina Matvienko, demanded that the murderers be immediately found and brought to justice in a show trial so as to demonstrate the authorities' hardline approach to extreme manifestations of ethnic intolerance. The case of the murder of Khursheda Sultanova is being personally followed by Mr. Rashid Nurgaliev, the Minister for Internal Affairs of the Russian Federation.

4. What needs to be done to provide a systemic answer to contemporary ethno-extremist challenges?

It is well known that ethnic phobias (xenophobia) are extremely persistent and may continue to exist in the mass consciousness long after the actual political causes that gave rise to them have disappeared. For example, many experts believe that even if it proves possible over time to find satisfactory solutions to the problems of Iraq (and, in Russia, of Chechnya), their repercussions may be extremely long-lasting.

What is more, xenophobia is uncontrollable in the sense that it cannot be directed at any one single ethnic community alone but, as a rule, extends to an entire spectrum of "alien peoples".

According to the data of the All-Russian Centre for the Study of Public Opinion, it is no accident that during the period from 2000 to 2002 there was an increase in the expression of negative opinion in Russia not only towards the Chechens but also towards half of the ethnic groups listed in the Centre's questionnaires. The same phenomenon has also been observed in the United States of America, particularly with regard to Arabs, following the events of September 11th. This is not yet a trend but it is already a danger.

There is no way of eliminating xenophobia altogether, but it can be reduced to a more or less acceptable and safe level. This requires:

- A special educational programme in schools. You have to begin with the schools. Children need to be taught to respect the customs and culture of all nations and not

only of one, even if it is the largest one. They need to learn that without dialogue and mutual understanding between peoples of different nationalities there can be no normal life but only war of all against all, and that it is in our interests to allow others to be different. The diversity of nations, cultures and religions and the uniqueness of each of them is not a reason for clashes and conflicts but a possibility for mutual enrichment through new experience and new knowledge;

- Unified standards or approaches as to what constitutes “xenophobia”, “anti-Semitism”, “nationalism”, “ethnic extremism” and “ethnic discrimination” and as to what are possible forms of their existence and of their recognition (“what is equally unacceptable for all”);
- A methodological system for creating an atmosphere of ethnic tolerance;
- An international “blacklist” of political figures who have been guilty of racist, xenophobic or anti-Semitic utterances or actions;
- An international register of media that carry material of this kind;
- Monitoring (with the involvement of non-governmental organizations) and periodic reports by governments on their efforts to combat xenophobia, anti-Semitism, nationalism, ethnic extremism and other forms of ethnic discrimination. The OSCE could forward these reports to rapporteurs appointed from among international experts for analysis and the preparation of a consolidated report. This consolidated report could in turn be discussed at the conferences regularly convened by the OSCE, similar to the one in which we are participating in today;
- The standardization of national laws providing for measures to combat xenophobia and ethnic discrimination.

The most important thing, however, is the demonstration by the authorities of a strict rejection of any manifestations of ethnic discrimination. I am certain that there is a direct link between ethnic tolerance within society and the behaviour of the authorities. The more intolerant the authorities are towards manifestations of anti-Semitism, racism or xenophobia, the more tolerant and restrained towards one another will be the representatives of different ethnic and religious groups.

One final point. During my ten years of work for the OSCE Parliamentary Assembly, I have on many occasions taken part in the discussion and adoption of resolutions on the subject of ethnic discrimination. A strange kind of trend has emerged: The more frequently this problem is discussed, the faster it grows. However, the events of September 11th have made one fact clear. When the international community really wants to solve a problem, it can act energetically, quickly and in concert and by working together it can succeed in combating the challenges of the twenty-first century.

E-mail: elena_mizulina@mail.ru

PC.DEL/893/04
20 September 2004

ENGLISH only



United States Mission to the OSCE

Introductory Statement for Session I:
Legislative and Institutional Mechanisms
and Governmental Action, Including Law
Enforcement

As delivered by Larry Thompson, Former U.S. Deputy Attorney
General
to the OSCE Conference on Tolerance and the Fight against
Racism, Xenophobia and Discrimination, Brussels
September 14, 2004

I would like to focus briefly on important law enforcement issues associated with the topics of this great conference.

First, on September 11, 2001, we saw intolerance that was transformed into the most terrible hatred imaginable - a hatred that resulted in murderous attacks on innocent civilians. In the days that followed, our president - President Bush - stood before our country to condemn not only the savagery of those terrible attacks, but he did more than that: he spoke for tolerance, for freedom of religion, and for the dignity of every human life.

So, in these times of terrorism, I believe that a nation proves its commitment to justice through a commitment to the rule of law - not by how the law treats the powerful, but by how the law treats its vulnerable minorities, both religious and ethnic minorities.

In the Department of Justice, we have strived to do this. Since September 11, the Department of Justice has investigated over 597 incidents of violence or threats of violence against individuals who were perceived to be of Middle East origin. The Justice Department has assisted in over 142 state and local prosecutions. And the Department of Justice has brought federal charges in 18 cases against 23 defendants - and I am proud to report that the Department has a 100 percent conviction rate.

An example of one of the successful prosecutions is the conviction of Robert Goldstein and three associates for amassing weapons and explosives and plotting an attack on the Islamic Education Center in St. Petersburg, Florida. Goldstein pleaded guilty and received 151 months in prison. His associates also pleaded guilty and received stiff sentences.

The Department, through its community relations service, has also been very successful in bringing communities together in holding more than 250 town and community meetings throughout the country since September 11. These meetings are very important. These are outreach meetings, but in my experience in the Department of Justice and in law enforcement, a number of very important leads and a great deal of important information came to the Department of Justice or the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) through information that was provided by Muslim Americans.

Law enforcement is obviously very important in how we protect our citizens and secure the public safety of our citizens against terrorist acts. When I was a government official, I viewed my job as one where I had to do whatever I could to make certain that those of us in law enforcement took appropriate, responsible, legal – and, yes, even aggressive measures to secure the public safety of our citizens.

Our focus could no longer be only on investigation and, after the fact, prosecution, but on the prevention and disruption of terrorist attacks. But also, when I was in law enforcement, I gave several speeches around the country in which I said that law enforcement authorities – and I think that this is important - in dealing with terrible prospects of terrorism, should not be unchecked and should not be unbridled. There should be appropriate checks and balances.

I came to realize as a government official that our country's success in dealing with terrorism would depend a great deal upon the confidence that average Americans had in our law enforcement efforts and the confidence that they thought that what the government was doing, while it was aggressive, was fair and appropriate.

So, in closing, I would like to mention that it's extremely important to eliminate, for example, racial and ethnic profiling as a basis for routine law enforcement actions. Racial and ethnic profiling is not only morally and legally wrong - it is simply bad law enforcement. Over a year ago, President Bush issued an order prohibiting racial and ethnic profiling by Federal law enforcement agencies. This order was based on a comprehensive study of incidents of racial profiling by Federal agencies. I believe such studies are important: they increase the transparency for minority communities about the nature of law enforcement practices. We cannot afford to alienate these communities, because they are generally the source of much very helpful law enforcement information.

Adherence to the rule of law. You heard about a prosecution – and I will close on this one point, Mr. Chairman – in Detroit, where someone was convicted for terrorist acts. It came to the Department of Justice's attention that that conviction was procured through improper means. I am very proud of what the Department of Justice did in conducting an investigation and then asking the judge to throw out that conviction, because it was procured improperly.

Clearly, an adherence to the rule of law, adherence to fairness, can help us secure the public safety that all of our citizens demand, but it can also help us secure the dignity of racial and ethnic minorities, which I believe is just as important.

Thank you.

PC.DEL/846/04
13 September 2004

ENGLISH only



United States Mission to the OSCE

Introductory Statement on Role of Governments and Civil Society in Promoting Tolerance, Respect and Mutual Understanding, Particularly Through Interfaith and Intercultural Dialogue and Partnerships

As prepared for delivery by William Cardinal Keeler,
Archbishop of Baltimore
to the OSCE Conference on Tolerance and the Fight Against
Racism, Xenophobia and Discrimination, Brussels
September 13, 2004

I bring to this topic a sense of humility – it is so complex and important. I also bring a sense of gratitude. I live in the state of Maryland in the United States. From its earliest days, Maryland was the first place in the English-speaking world enacting religious freedom. It was a beacon of hope to many in the faith and helped prepare the way for religious liberty in our nation. In addition, my life and ministry have been greatly enriched by dialogue with sisters and brothers who express faith in different ways. It has not always been easy, but the advances have outweighed the problems; hopes have overcome our fears.

However, in the United States, racism and discrimination have divided our nation, wounded our Church and diminished so many lives. At its core, the sin of racism dwells within the temptation of the human heart to discard the God-given dignity that belongs to each human being. I have personally witnessed the ravages and discord that racism brings as well as the hope that comes from dialogue, respect and common action to overcome bigotry and injustice.

Pope John Paul II recently addressed the treatment of migrants and refugees who are vulnerable to the most terrible forms of racism and xenophobia in his Message for the 89th World Day of Migrants. Increased mobility of migrants and refugees can transform our societies into multi-ethnic and multi-cultural communities. Such changes can have a positive impact by bringing renewed diversity, vitality, and greater awareness of ethnic and religious pluralism. They also heighten the need for improved understanding of relations and dialogue among people of different faiths and backgrounds.

On the other hand, such shifts can lead the majority to feel threatened and can make them resistant to a sense of welcome and accommodation to those “from outside.” In an atmosphere of fear and suspicion, newcomers are seen as a challenge to the status quo, threatening existing political, social and economic arrangements. Too often, religious

identities and prejudices can be manipulated to draw people into ethnic or nationalistic conflicts or to intensify existing ones. Pope John Paul II has repeatedly urged us to resist the tendency to turn in on ourselves, inviting us instead to “discern in people of other cultures the handiwork of God.”¹ This can be a difficult path, requiring at times both prophetic and loving words, but a necessary path which can deepen the gift of unity and encourage solidarity in opposing all forms of racism, xenophobia and exaggerated nationalism.

Societies today not only face new tensions resulting from migration but also from internal longstanding racial, ethnic and religious differences that diminish human dignity, and in some tragic instances, lead to violence and even armed conflict. We must be constantly vigilant to see the signs of this sickness within ourselves and our societies while working ever more diligently to build genuine dialogue and respect among diverse communities.

The scourge of racism, xenophobia and discrimination is a complex reality that is sometimes exacerbated by dishonest and distorted religious claims which can create a lethal mix of hatred, fear and even violence. Given this, the commitment and witness of religious leaders to mutual understanding and authentic dialogue is essential.

I want to lift up two particular themes: the positive role that religion can play in public life and a renewed spirit of interreligious encounter. First, governments and elected officials have an important role to play in valuing and safeguarding the proper place of religion in public life, where religion can make positive contributions. While the state and religion clearly differ in their roles, they share a goal of building up the common good for the benefit of the entire society. Though religion may be misused -- even tragically at times -- or distorted, it can offer positive values to society and can be a major force for healing the infection of racism and xenophobia. The political order subverts its own best hopes by confining religion to the margins and mistakenly thinking that the way to preserve peace is to deny space in the public square to religious believers and communities. Faith should be respected and welcomed in public life, and the particular character of religious communities should be valued along with other forms of association and civic engagement. Societies in which faith is marginalized and impoverished are diminished societies.

Second, the strength and persuasiveness of our religious call to overcome racism, bigotry, prejudice and discrimination will require greater understanding and cooperation among religious leaders and communities themselves. The path to greater respect and dignity requires a real change of heart, which cannot be achieved through political or legal measures alone. For believers, our faith reveals to us the full meaning of who we are and the road to which our human dignity is calling us. This path entails the “daily challenge of turning from egoism to altruism, from fear to openness, from rejection to solidarity.”²

Not content with tolerance and respect for each other’s differences, interreligious understanding and dialogue offer the hope of genuine mutual enrichment that can provide us with the resources necessary to overcome the darkness of violence and division. As children of Abraham, Jews, Christians, and Muslims have a special reason to seek the path of understanding and solidarity. Treasuring what is distinctive in each religious tradition,

¹ “Message of the Holy Father John Paul II for the 89th World Day of Migrants and Refugees 2003: For a commitment to overcome all racism, xenophobia and exaggerated nationalism.” 24 October 2002. #4.

² Ibid. #4

together we should resist any attempt to suggest that what the world needs is fewer rather than more people of faith.

Authentic dialogue cannot be satisfied with vague expressions of good will, empty of genuine search for truth and unity. We are called to listen to what other communities bring out of their own resources which may be complementary to or richer than our own. This is more than tolerance or even respect: it is to be ready to receive from others what we may not fully possess on our own. Thus our legitimate differences may enrich our world, rather than divide it.

I want to emphasize that genuine interreligious dialogue can only be a force to heal racism and other societal injustices if dialogue safeguards and respects the truth in each religion and culture. Attempts to distort the particular character, beliefs or practices of respective religious communities can itself be an offense against human dignity and basic human rights. Efforts to compel religions to alter fundamental tenets or moral principles can lead to further stumbling blocks on the path to peace.

In today's world of increased tension between people of different faith, race and culture, we must take a stand to protect the religious freedom and human rights of every group. If not, we risk deepening divisions and fostering the prejudice and hatred that lies at the heart of racism, xenophobia and discrimination. It is a source of pain to acknowledge that, as Christians, we have at times failed to extend the tolerance and understanding that we ourselves expect. We cannot call for an end to discrimination against Christians if we do not seek the same for our Jewish, Muslim and brothers and sisters of other faiths and no faiths.

History is a sad reminder of the human capacity to justify hatred for one another because of religious, ethnic or other differences. The temptation to marginalize the outsider, to exclude the stranger and even destroy the one who is different has haunted the human family and still is shamefully with us today. We know and deplore the terrible human costs of anti-Semitism, hostility to Muslims and migrants, and other attacks upon people because of religious or other differences, as evidenced by the continuing reality of anti-Semitism and the fact that it is appearing in new forms. All forms of intolerance, xenophobia and racism should be resolutely condemned. Our challenge is to respect the dignity of all.

Rather than reach out in dialogue and solidarity, we are tempted to isolate ourselves, building spiritual and physical walls that are thicker, fences that are higher and employing weapons that are more deadly than ever before. In many parts of the world today, religious intolerance, ethnic conflict and excessive nationalism tragically combine with political oppression, economic disadvantage and cultural hegemony to fuel a seemingly endless cycle of violence and retaliation.

However, history also reveals a universal human yearning for unity and solidarity, for reconciliation and peace. Time and again, people of every creed and color have rejected the path of division and exclusion, and have courageously acted to prevent or end hatred and war. By their actions, they have borne witness to the mission of each religious community to be "agents of peace amidst the harsh realities of injustice, aggression, terrorism and war."³

³ Pontifical Council for Justice and Peace. "Final Declaration of the Participants in the Symposium on Spiritual Resources of the Religions on Peace." January 16-18, 2003.

In order for religious communities to be “agents of peace,” it is necessary for us to engage in active and on-going collaboration. If religious communities can model in their own interaction the ideals of cooperation and respect, then can they help heal society’s divisions. The history and recent growth of interreligious cooperation shows great promise and offers great hope.

Beyond dialogue and mutual respect, people of faith are invited to witness to God’s power to unite through the very aspects of our traditions that distinguish us. In this regard, we have come to see that genuine justice and peace require active efforts at reconciliation. In the light of a troublesome history, where religions have sometimes added to the arsenal of hatred, it means asking for and being ready to grant forgiveness. Those who forgive, as those who are forgiven, will come to know true liberation from the sins of racism, xenophobia and intolerance.

For me and, I know, for many others, religious faith is the source of vision and moral integrity. Religious faith enables the Catholic community – and other believers – to be a builder of bridges among communities in conflict. It contributes to the vitality of democracy because it empowers commitment to pursue justice for all. Speaking very personally, I know that genuine dialogue, collaboration and reconciliation have strengthened my faith, enriched my religious community, helped to heal my nation’s wounds and build bridges across a divided world. I know first hand that dialogue and forgiveness can lead to genuine conversion of the heart and mind. I sincerely believe that communities of faith must play an indispensable role in building a better world and lasting peace among all peoples and races. So let us live and proclaim the truths of our respective faith traditions with the excitement of captives finding freedom from prisons of bigotry, discrimination and exclusion. As believers, we are called to secure a place at the table of life for all of God’s children.

PC.NGO/33/04
13 September 2004

ENGLISH
Original: ITALIAN

STATEMENT BY MR. COBIBENATOFF,
PRESIDENT OF THE EUROPEAN JEWISH CONGRESS, AT THE
OSCE CONFERENCE ON TOLERANCE AND THE FIGHT AGAINST
RACISM, XENOPHOBIA AND DISCRIMINATION

Brussels, 13 September 2004

Role of Governments and civil society in promoting tolerance,
respect and mutual understanding, particularly through dialogue and
inter-faith and inter-cultural partnership

I should like, first of all, to thank the organizers of this conference for giving me an opportunity to participate and speak at this round table in my capacity as President of the European Jewish Congress, a body that represents European Jewry and co-ordinates the work of European Jewish organizations.

I am here to let out a cry of alarm to Europe, to its institutions, to its leaders and to all its citizens.

Anti-Semitism and prejudice against Jews have returned, or perhaps they never disappeared.

The monster is again among us, and we are increasingly living with feelings of anger, fear and insecurity but also of frustration, because what most concerns and saddens us is the indifference of our European fellow citizens. After the horror of the Shoah, during our youth, we thought that the monster had disappeared, blown away by the wind of horror, and that if it were ever to reappear, all our fellow citizens would fill the streets of Europe to make clear their opposition, to cry out against this indecency and to combat it together.

But, on the contrary, it seems, to our great sadness and anger, that together with the increase in the number of instances of intolerance there is also an increase in indifference in the face of these events. It has now become "normal and acceptable" in public opinion that some persons should be the object of violence and exclusion only because they practise a different religion.

Often, such acts of violence are explained or even justified by reference to external conflicts, using for example the policy of the Government of Israel and the Middle Eastern conflict as a pretext for justifying the violence — essentially, that is, blaming the victim for being the cause of the violence he experiences.

This to be sure saddens us, possibly even angers us, but it certainly does not cause us to lose the will to fight this phenomenon and its spread. We are here today to remind each of us, our fellow citizens, that the quality of our democratic life and of our civil coexistence will be gauged by our ability to combat intolerance. For that reason, I am here not only to give a cry of alarm but also to seek together with you a solution of the kind that will enable us to overcome prejudice, fear and lack of understanding and to announce our availability as an organization and as individuals in the work of building together a more equitable and tolerant society.

This is why we believe that now, more than ever before, dialogue between faiths, religious leaders and believers is a vital need, one that is fundamental for our religious experience as well as for the democratic life of our countries.

For some years, now the religious reawakening has been accompanied by false prophets. Very often the name of God is invoked as a pretext for a variety of nationalist, ethnic or political claims of different origin, in which frequently persecution, violence and killing are the instruments used to affirm one's own blind religious fanaticism, exacerbated to the point of denying others the right of their existence as human beings who are different.

As represented by some of its institutions and national States and by certain of its politicians, Europe seems to think that institutional systems can do without the faith-based experiences of its citizens in building the continent and putting into place a civil society in general, thereby confining religion either to the private sphere or, what is even worse, to a status of insignificance. Often, religions are regarded as a retrograde and obsolete phenomenon, opposed to progress, social evolution and the secularism of the State. These are attitudes that, in addition to being reductive, forget the living dimension of religions and their traditions as well as their central role in forming consciences, and that fail to take into account the fact that inter-faith dialogue gives evidence of and value to the nature of identity as diversity.

Recent events throughout the world have provided evidence of the unchanged, and occasionally increasing, geopolitical importance of religious traditions and have also demonstrated the difficulties experienced by leaders in understanding and dealing with this reality. I am referring here to the problems experienced by international, European and national institutions in properly understanding the implications of the religious element as a factor of national and/or ethnic identity. One sees here evidence of a certain sluggishness at the social, cultural and political level that makes clear the difficulty the international and European political class is experiencing in finding and proposing cultural instruments of dialogue for use in overcoming conflicts.

On the other hand, never so much as now have national States, local communities and Europe as represented by its array of institutions and its citizens been in such need not only of laws and norms for punishing those who persecute their own fellow citizens solely because they profess a different religion but also, and above all, of changing the manner and ways of living within European society, from the lowest social level to the highest institutional level so as to make religious acceptance and tolerance values informing not only religious discourse but also civil coexistence.

It is within this area having to do with the education of conscience that the associations and persons with responsibility for inter-faith dialogue have a fundamental task

to perform as actors within civil society and not only as representatives of the world religious community.

We are asking that there should be more opportunities for encounter and dialogue, at all social levels, beginning with the younger generations and the schools and extending to initiatives designed to help people to get to know one another and to familiarize themselves with their own diversity along with their religious or cultural specificity.

Encounter and knowledge alone provide the proper means for sweeping away prejudice and bias, along with false condescension in areas of coexistence, with a view to combating radically and profoundly the increase and spread of fundamentalist doctrines of various kinds.

Only the courage to inject inter-faith and inter-cultural dialogue into civil discourse will enable our societies to combat aggressiveness and ignorance and will make it possible for all citizens to live their differences without fear and without the risk of erecting new walls and building new ghettos.

Inter-faith dialogue and attention to the multi-religious aspect is surely an area in which civil societies can meet for constructive work.

There is also, in addition to the social and cultural value, an ethical and political value in working together with religious representatives — the value of affecting the personal and collective memory of European citizens and of all Europeans. The aim should be not to display the past as a kind of ghost but, on the basis of a shared memory, to experience together reconciliation, to acknowledge one's own responsibilities, personal and collective, in coexistence, and to find in the conflicts, persecutions and extermination carried out against minorities in the name of religious diversity the strength and the will to change a reality consisting of exclusion and intolerance.

The recognition, through inter-faith dialogue, of one's own responsibilities to minorities or different religious groups is also a sign of civilization and democratic growth and not only of inter-faith coexistence.

By way of concluding on a positive note, I should like to suggest a few possible areas of commitment:

- The search for formative instruments for use in educating all citizens and reminding them that the cultural, ethical and spiritual confines of Europe and of the States that now comprise and will comprise it extend beyond their own affiliations and their own horizons as identified with the traditions of western Christianity alone;
- The improvement of the debate between faiths and institutions and the freeing of that debate from commonplaces and simplistic argumentation;
- The education of all citizens, beginning with their school years, in respect for diversity and in tolerance towards migrant groups belonging to religious traditions different from the western Christian traditions;

- Work in the “multi-religious” sector to counter the kind of ignorance that perceives religious diversity as something dangerous or unacceptable to European and western culture;
- The combating in all countries of the fear of losing one’s own monolithic identity through an opening to others, and the provision of the necessary instruments to counter the concept according to which nationalism and religion are inseparable in establishing personal identity;
- A call for respect for all religious traditions as a necessary complement to political and civil growth;
- The creation of comprehensive and reliable instruments of information regarding all religious faiths of a kind that are accessible to all religions so as to reduce ignorance and neglect in respect of different religious traditions (failings that are frequently at the root of immaturity, superficiality and social insecurity), and to explain the diversity of religious rights, dietary laws and calendars.

PC.DEL/805/04
13 September 2004

ENGLISH only

**The Role of Governments and Civil Society in Promoting Tolerance,
Respect and Mutual Understanding, Particularly through Interfaith
and Intercultural Dialogue and Partnerships**

at OSCE Conference 13/14 September 2004 Brussels

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

Email: sajid@imamsajid.com, imamsajid@yahoo.co.uk

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.)

I am honoured -- and deeply humbled -- to be invited to speak to you this afternoon on the very important and timely topic on "The Role of Governments and Civil Society in Promoting Tolerance, Respect and Mutual Understanding, Particularly through Interfaith and Intercultural Dialogue and Partnerships"

Muslim Council of Britain (MCB) message

From the very outset I wish to give you greetings from the British Muslim community and their representative body Muslim Council of Britain (MCB), congratulating you for organising this conference I quote from the message of Mr Iqbal Sacranie the Secretary General of MCB: **He says:**

"I am pleased to learn from MCB Central Working Committee member Imam Dr Abduljalil Sajid that he will be attending as an invitee of the British Foreign Commonwealth Office and contributing to this timely conference on "The Role of Governments and Civil Society in Promoting Tolerance, Respect and Mutual Understanding, Particularly through Interfaith and Intercultural Dialogue and Partnerships"

The Muslim Council of Britain (MCB) is a national umbrella organisation that serves and represents British Muslims by sharing in the common good of our society as a whole. The MCB works with a number of government forums such as the Inner Cities Religious Council and the Race Relations Forum and many other major faith communities to promote the well being of all. Cultural diversity and religious pluralism inspire healthy competition between communities and nations, and God enjoins us to direct that competition towards the seeking of the common good for all humanity. Co-operation, Solidarity and partnership between governments and non governmental agencies and among the faith communities mean that competing human communities strive to understand and reach out to one another in pursuit of a united human ethic and vision.

With respect to the theme of your conference - "Tolerance and the Fight against Racism, Xenophobia and Discrimination" - the Muslim Council of Britain affirms both its relevance and urgency. We note with regret, however, that since the 2001 UN World Conference against Racism, Racial Discrimination, Xenophobia and Related Intolerance in Durban, Europe has witnessed the continued spread of all these social diseases. Herein lays your challenge. Today, the entire community of nations look, with expectation, to see what models you adopt and how well you succeed in curing these ills.

The Muslim Council of Britain wishes you every success in your deliberations and reaffirms its unreserved support for your noble endeavours. The Muslim Council reiterates its own commitment to the way of peace and pro-existence in its quest for the common good of all. On behalf of the Muslim Council of Britain I wish you every success with your conference and look forward to receiving a full report from Imam Abduljalil Sajid"

Introduction

I would like to begin by listing in abstract terms the principal functions of government in the current context:

- 1) to formulate and implement legislation, with support, regulation and enforcement as necessary**
- 2) to lead public opinion and understanding**
- 3) to allocate resources**
- 4) to manage its own departments in ways that are efficient and exemplary. Also, governments can indirectly reduce intolerance through social policies that affect the circumstances in which intolerance arises, for example by reducing poverty and social exclusion.**

I would make a similar short list with regard to civil society institutions, having regard particularly to NGOs and the voluntary and community sector:

- 1) to mobilise pressure on the government**
- 2) to affect and educate public opinion**
- 3) to set up exemplary projects which can be copied elsewhere**
- 4) to cater for the needs of those who are the victims of intolerance.**

Having outlined an analytical framework such as the one above I would give examples from Britain. Islamophobia Report published on second June 2004 at the start had a box entitled Recognising Progress and I would cite from it several examples of government action to be welcomed. I would then cite examples of good work by NGOs. For this I would use the list of projects that MCB has engaged in, but mention other projects too, for example the use of humour, as in IHRC's Islamophobia

Awards, and the production of analytical reports, as in the work of the Commission on British Muslims and Islamophobia.

The bullet points from MCB are as follows:

- the launch of MCBDirect, a groundbreaking Islamic web portal to deal with the vast amount of requests we receive for information.
- the imaginative Books4Schools initiative to equip schools with the materials – books, artefacts, multimedia resources and support notes – that teachers need in order to present pupils with a correct understanding of Islam and Muslims
- close monitoring of all media, leading to a range of corrections, apologies and undertakings
- production of material on new legislation about religious discrimination, in cooperation with MDUK and The Muslim News, and organisation of workshops on this subject in Bradford, Cardiff, London and elsewhere for imams, community workers, solicitors and other advice providers.
- meeting with the Attorney General, Lord Goldsmith, to secure the release of Muslims held without charge and in atrocious and degrading conditions by the Americans at Guantanamo Bay
- securing an explicit commitment from government ministers that no attempt will be made to introduce a ban on hijab in public or in a school
- regular bilateral quarterly meetings set up with the Secretary of States for certain government departments including the Home Office, Foreign and Commonwealth Office, Education and Skills, Trade and Industry and Media and Culture, to review issues of concern to the Muslim community
- encouraging more Muslims to go into the teaching profession
- the organisation of fringe meetings at each of the major political parties' annual conferences to highlight Muslim issues and concerns
- work with the Mayor's Office and the Greater London Authority to ensure that the Muslim community is able to participate fully in the political and cultural life of the capital
- helping to ensure that the good name of our affiliate Interpal was cleared by the Charity Commission of any wrongdoing, in spite of the sinister campaign to prevent them from carrying out their vital humanitarian work in Palestine.
- inauguration of an MCB leadership development programme over six months for professionals with a commitment to community work.

Other more specific points that you may wish to make in your talk are:

1. **Discrimination** – which is in essence dehumanising the other – is unfortunately a global phenomenon and it is therefore imperative that all Governments take this issue seriously
2. Ample evidence of discrimination in the UK - see, for example, Dr Tariq Modood's seminal '**Ethnic minorities in Britain: disadvantage and diversity**' (PSI)
3. Increasing evidence of religious discrimination in Britain - against both Jews (BOD analysis) and Muslims (Runnymede report and follow-up report)
4. Admirably, our government appears genuinely to value diversity and is making noises/taking steps in the right direction - how many Muslim countries have an equivalent of the CRE, for example?
5. But there are institutional barriers ('indirect discrimination') and to overcome these affirmative action (in terms of positive discrimination/quotas) may need to be considered (morally questionable although a recent precedent does exist in relation to increasing number of New Labour female MPs)
6. Outlawing religious discrimination - whilst maintaining the right to legitimate criticism - would also be a positive step and is on the cards
7. None of these legislative measures will however change beliefs and attitudes- this needs opportunities for shared identities to emerge which will critically depend on facilitating discussion and debate, and the formation of genuine human relationships
8. The latter need to be fostered at every opportunity: school (space in curriculum and resources would help – mention Books4Schools), at work (staff training) and in local neighbourhoods (libraries, shopping precincts, surgeries, places of worship, etc)
9. To facilitate this engagement, minority communities need to be empowered to play an active role and examples of best practice should be celebrated and promoted widely by government departments
10. Minority communities also need to have the space and opportunity to draw from within their tradition's resources to embrace the challenges that they/we as a society face - for example, there is a desperate need for rethinking and theologically sound positions to merge on the nature of the relationship between Muslims and atheists/agnostics (the majority within Europe) or with homosexuals etc. - this however requires resources to free up our most brilliant thinkers
11. There must be space for faith communities in liberal secular, societies
12. Lastly, there is also an imperative on faith communities to tackle problems to do with discrimination within their own communities - Pakistani Muslims are some of the most racist people I have come across (second only to Saudis!) Mahatma Gandhi's

quote that "Civilisation is judged by its treatment of minorities" may also be of some use.

Some Examples from Sunday Telegraph July editions by "Will Cummins"

1) 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*)

2) 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*)

3) 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*)

4) 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)

Promote Tolerance, Respect and mutual understanding

The Qur'an not only conveys a message of peace, tolerance, and compassion; it provides mankind with a global framework respect, co-operation, mutual Understanding and a charter for inter-faith dialogue. It repeatedly stresses that all peoples on earth have had their prophets and messengers, and that multiplicity of every kind — religious, cultural, or ethnic — is part of God's magnificent design: *"And among His wonders is...the diversity of your tongues and colours"* (30: 22); *"To each [community] among you We appointed a law and a way of life. And if God had so willed, He could have made you one community: but [He willed it otherwise] in order to test you...So compete with one another in doing good works, for to God you will all return, and He will inform you about that wherein you differ"* (5: 48).

This means that prophetic guidance is not limited to any one community, period, or civilisation. So Muslims — if they are true to their faith — do not claim a monopoly of the truth, or a monopoly of revelation: *"And indeed, within every community have We raised up an apostle [with this message]: 'Worship God and shun the powers of evil'"* (16: 36). Like Jesus, the Prophet Muhammad did not come to establish a new religion, but to recapitulate the teachings of those prophets, or messengers, who had preceded him. He came to remind us of our status in the divine scheme of things as God's servants and deputies. As the **Prince of Wales** said, in "A Reflection on the Reith Lectures for the Year 2000," we have failed to live up to this "sacred trust between mankind and our Creator, under which we accept our duty of stewardship for the earth."¹

The actions of a few Muslim fanatics have been interpreted as vindicating the old idea that Islam promotes violence. All too often in the media the word "terrorism" is coupled with the adjective "Islamic." If Islam were really, as some suppose, a religion of fire and sword, why would *"the true servants of the Most Merciful"* be defined in the Qur'an as *"those who walk gently on earth and who, when the ignorant address them, say 'Peace'"* (25: 63)? Why would Muslims be admonished to greet one another, on all occasions, with the words, "Peace be with you and God's mercy and blessings"? It is clearly stated in the Qur'an: *"There shall be no compulsion in religion"* (2: 256). This disproves the fallacy that Islam imposes on the non-Muslim

¹ *Temenos Academy Review*, 4 (2001), 13-18, at p. 13.

the choice between conversion and the sword. According to the Qur'an, "*God does not love aggressors*" (2: 190), and war is only permitted in self-defence, or in defence of religion. If people did not have such a right, then, "*monasteries and churches and synagogues and mosques, in which God's name is much remembered, would surely have been destroyed by now*" (22: 40). This means that military action is justified against an enemy who destroys a place where God is worshipped. It is also said in the Qur'an that those who are oppressed, or who have been unjustly driven from their homelands, have a duty to fight.²

However, when the opportunity for peace arises, Muslims are encouraged to be forgiving and to seek reconciliation, for mercy and compassion are God's chief attributes: "*Whoever pardons [his foe] and makes peace, his reward rests with God.*" (42: 40). This is why Muslims are taught to dedicate themselves constantly to God's service with the words, "*In the name of God, the Merciful, the Compassionate.*" Since the word *Islam* means "submission," from the same root as *salâm*, "peace," a Muslim is simply a person who attempts to find inner peace by submitting to God's will: "*He guides to Himself all those who turn to Him — those who believe, and whose hearts find their rest in the remembrance of God — for, truly, in the remembrance of God hearts do find their rest*" (13: 27-28). War in itself is never holy, and if the lesser *jihad* of war is not accompanied by what the Prophet Muhammad called "the greater *jihad*," the struggle to control the lower instincts and the whims of the ego, then war may be diabolical.

The following principles may be derived from the Qur'an.

First of all, Muslims should not ridicule the beliefs of others: "*But do not revile those whom they invoke instead of God, lest they revile God out of spite, and in ignorance: for We have made the deeds of every people seem fair to them. In time, they must return to their Lord, and then He will make them understand what they have done*" (6: 108).

Secondly, Muslims should not associate with those who ridicule our faith: "*Do not take for your friends such as mock at your faith and make a jest of it...they are people who do not use their reason*" (5: 57-58).

Thirdly, when Muslims address those who do not share our beliefs, we should speak with courtesy: "*And do not argue with the followers of earlier revelation otherwise than in a most kindly manner*" (29: 46).

Fourthly, Muslims should invite people to use their reason, appealing to the intellect to interpret God's words, because there is no contradiction between faith and reason: "*O People of Scripture, why do you argue about Abraham, seeing that the Torah and the Gospels were not revealed till long after him? Will you not, then, use your reason?*" (3: 65).

Above all, within the bounds of propriety — no backbiting or blasphemy — there must be freedom of opinion and discussion both with those who hold other religious

² Seyyed Hossein Nasr, *Traditional Islam in the Modern World* (London: Kegan Paul International, 1987), pp. 27-33.

views and with those who share our faith — for if we cannot appreciate diversity within our own religious community, we will certainly not be able to value religious diversity.³ The Prophet Muhammad is reported to have said: “The differences of opinion among the learned within my community are [a sign of God’s] grace.” If Muslims were to follow these principles, they would become once again a “community of the middle way” (Qur’an, 2: 143), exercising moderation and avoiding all extremes.⁴

It needs to be said, however, that before one can begin to apply these principles there has to be the willingness to listen and to engage in dialogue, and there has to be some degree of mutual respect and equality between the two parties. When there is a gross disparity of wealth, power and privilege, such as exists between Israel and Palestine, dialogue is very difficult. In fact the arrogance and selfishness of the rich nations, and the ever-widening gap between them and the rest of the world, generate feelings of resentment and discontent. In Islam a rich man does not merely have a duty to distribute some of his wealth to the poor, but the poor have a *right* to a share in his wealth. The discrepancy between the rich nations and the poor is now so great that the wealth of the world’s three richest families is said to be equal to that of 600 million people living in the world’s poorest countries.⁵

We now have to make a choice — individually and collectively — between confrontation and dialogue, between destruction and construction, between war and diplomacy. True global cooperation will not be possible until we recover an awareness of the ecumenical, ecological and ethical principles that are at the heart of every spiritual tradition. In most of the world’s trouble spots — in Palestine, Kashmir, Gujarat, and Chechnya — Muslims have been massacred and tortured and denied their most basic rights — freedom, independence and dignity of life. In Iraq thousands of children have died of cancer as a result of international community’s sanctions, or as a result of polluted drinking water and malnutrition, and thousands more may now be in danger of losing their lives due to occupation of foreign armies. In Afghanistan thousands of innocent people died as a result of US bombing. Not unnaturally Muslims feel that they have been treated unjustly by what is euphemistically called “the world community.”

Those who see religious, cultural and ethnic diversity as a blessing, and who share the view of the **Chief Rabbi Jonathan Sacks** that “no one creed has a monopoly of spiritual truth; no one civilisation encompasses all the spiritual, ethical, and artistic expressions of mankind,”⁶ must find the middle way between religious fanaticism and

³ Bhikhu Parekh made this point with reference to cultural groups in *Rethinking Multiculturalism: Cultural Diversity and Political Theory* (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2000), p. 337. Much of what he says about multiculturalism is also true of religious pluralism.

⁴ See Yusuf al-Qaradawi’s essay on “Extremism” in *Liberal Islam: A Sourcebook*, ed. Charles Kurzman (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998), pp.196-204; and the chapters on “War and Peace in the Qur’ân,” and “Tolerance in Islam” in Muhammad Abdel Haleem, *Understanding the Qur’ân: Themes and Style* (London and New York: I.B. Tauris, 1999), pp. 59-81.

⁵ Cited in Rumman Ahmed, “My Identity and Me: An Exploration of Multiple Identities and their Contribution towards a Faith Position,” *World Faiths Encounter*, 28 (March 2001), 50.

⁶ *The Dignity of Difference* (London: Continuum, 2002), p. 62.

fanatical secularism. It is essential, as **His Royal Highness Prince Hassan of Jordan** has said, that we promote a dialogue of civilisations,⁷ and that we should not allow extremists to hijack Islam or any other religion.⁸ It is vitally important, especially in the light of current events, to refute those shallow secularists who regard religion itself as inevitably divisive, and to rediscover the ethical principles upon which all the great spiritual traditions are based. It is not simply a matter of respecting religious differences; we have to recover the practical spiritual wisdom that unites us and makes us human. As **Martin Luther King** said, "our loyalties must become ecumenical rather than sectional. Every nation must now develop an overriding loyalty to mankind as a whole in order to preserve the best in their individual societies."⁹ This vision of a just and peaceful multi-religious society can never be achieved without the active cooperation of the mass media.

Civil Society Defined

Civil society is a mix of unity and diversity. Cranston (1980) notes that while it "requires a fair measure of shared adhesion to the same social and moral values," it yet contains a "plurality of groups and individuals who have severally their own interests and aims." He argues ideology is antithetical to such a society, threatening, in particular, the civility that is often associated with civil society, especially to the degree that ideology attempts to generate zealous devotion to the aims it wishes to impose upon the society. In this light, it should be unsurprising that classical Islamic society, wherein the religion was an organic and vital way of life, had a thriving civil society, while the modern attempts to redefine Islam as an ideology overlook or attempt to suppress this necessary aspect of society. In contrast, the western societies we could have a government utterly secular, in the sense that no religion was established nor was any religion suppressed, and yet the society itself was imbued with a firm religious foundation through the largely religious nature of the civil society.

Islamic Civil Society in History

Before I proceed with the claim that civil society is lacking in the modern Muslim world, it is worthwhile to take a glance back at Muslim history and to note that this was not the case in the "**Golden Era**" of the classical Islamic society. The greatness of that society, this audience surely appreciates, went far beyond military victories and *shari'ah* scholarship. The great achievements in the sciences, medicine, agriculture, urban growth, and international relations of all sorts were underpinned by a successful infrastructure that included that third sector independent from the state and financial institutions such as today would be called "big business."

That infrastructure was developed in a highly decentralized manner. This fact and its significance are sorely under-appreciated today. For example, many people will point to the support of the sciences given by the Muslim rulers and wealthy patrons as an

⁷ Speech given at a conference on "**Islamic Responses to Terrorism**," given at the Al-Khoei Foundation, London, 25 October 2001.

⁸ See interview with Shaykh Hamza Yusuf Hanson in *The Guardian*, 8 Oct. 2001.

⁹ Martin Luther King, *Where Do We Go From Here? Chaos or Community* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1967), p. 190.

explanation for the scientific progress of the golden era. Such support was valuable, but it could not have been as successful as it was if the state had directly controlled the institutions of learning and research. Rather, those institutions were made independent through the establishment *awqāf*. The independent charters of the establishments, together with their generous endowments, enabled these institutions to be effective in ways that the state-controlled universities and research centers of the Muslim world cannot.

The same was true of the hospitals and clinics, in some cases even roads and canals upon which the great Islamic civilization was constructed. I have been struck by the similarities between these institutions and the private foundations that play such an important role in the vitality of Western civil society. The most important difference between those institutions and their modern Western counterparts for our purposes is that the modern West includes civic associations that are democratically organized and operated. The organizations are independent of the government, voluntarily organized to address the quality of the life of the citizenry both directly through social action and indirectly through consultation with the government. The members of these organizations form a popular electorate which directly elects the leadership and whose approval is required on the most important issues. Even the religious associations in the West employ this democratic structure.

The Failure of Civil Society in the Muslim World

Having defined civil society, we can quickly see the lack of same in the modern Muslim world. The question has properly been asked, how can we expect Muslims to take an interest in the election of political leaders when they take no part in the election of their mosque boards? The *awqāf* that exist in the Muslim world today are barely worthy of the name. Where they exist at all they are not truly independent endowments but are under the—often direct—control of the governments. A major issue in many Muslim countries, for example Pakistan, is the problem of corruption. (See, e.g., Menon 1995, 1996). Corruption and waste are the unavoidable corollaries to politically controlled benefits. Prof. James Buchanan of George Mason University received the Nobel Prize for his demonstration of how the problem of "public choice" affects these issues. Actors in politico-economic systems pursue their own interests at the same time that they are entrusted with care of the public or corporate interests. System designs that provide for a confluence of these interests tend to avoid corruption and waste while system designs that provoke a divergence of these interests lead to corruption and waste.

Techniques for Developing a Bottom-Up Civil Society

In my introduction, I asserted that "familiarity with democratic process and civic action are best inculcated at the neighborhood level. Once they become second nature to the participants, they can conceivably carry them into a national forum." As is so often the case we must not separate the ends from the means. Instead of organizing and supporting top-down structured organizations pushing for "democracy" in the Muslim world, we must establish bottom-up organizations that will initially deal with the immediate concerns of their members and then spawn veterans who can form organizations with broader aims for the reform of society. The most obvious place to start is with the mosques themselves. This is what happened in the Muslim republics

of the Soviet Union in days of its decline and immanent demise. Former government bureaucrats who had hidden their secret commitment to Islam would, upon retirement from government service, set themselves up as independent imams and conduct prayer services and religious educational activities independent of the "official" mosques with their state-appointed imams.

After the mosques, there come the schools and then later social service agencies and civic groups aimed at social betterment. The schools are the key element in the chain. It is through education that massive social change is wrought. But unless the schools themselves are structured as marketplaces of learning rather than as means of simple indoctrination, we engage in a self-defeating process. The students must be approached as independent agents being taught the essentials of independent original thought, rather than vessels to receive the pureed contents of our conclusions.

Note how the ever-recurring theme of *ijtihad* arises again. We should treat every student as if we had hopes that he or she would some day become a *mujtahid*. Only if we are successful in this enterprise can we then expect them to go forth and create the kind of civil society of which I am speaking. Once they create it at the local level and the people become acclimated to their role as Allah's *khalifah* can they move on to transforming society on a larger scale.

But who is to do this work? And how? Surely, it should be obvious that the vanguard of the Islamist movement have been Western educated Muslims who, out of their experience in the West have developed a greater commitment to Islam than they could have had in their native lands. This has been true across the political spectrum, whether of those like Sayyid Iqbal, whose experience in the West inculcated a hatred for it, and a desire to reject what he perceived as corruption at its core, or to Ismail al-Faruqi whose experience gave him a critical appreciation of its strengths and the desire to "take back" that which we had given to the West. I previously mentioned the retirees in the former Soviet Union who played a role in establishing the Islamic revival in the Muslim commonwealths that have spun off from that fallen empire with no traditional formal religious training. Similarly, we note how so many of the leaders of the Islamic revival throughout the Muslim world are not traditionally trained imams, but engineers and doctors. It is from this same pool that we can develop the vanguard of the Islamic civil society movement.

And how shall we do that? Again, the means should reflect the ends. We must develop civil institutions to promote these ends. I will leave the details to other places and times, and even other thinkers. But I will give just one obvious example: We need multiple foundations offering scholarships to Muslim students in all disciplines who manifest an interest and a capability in developing Muslim civil society from the bottom up. Each such institution could have its own standards for deciding which students are most promising. In addition to scholarship grants that would enable them to attend the schools of their choice, they would participate in seminars in which they would be exposed to the principles I have addressed here as well as to whatever other aspects of "Islamization" and "civilization" are deemed important by the sponsoring organizations. Among them, these foundations would fund and facilitate the development of a diverse corps of young Muslim men and women prepared to return to their home countries and establish the grassroots civil society of which I have spoken.

The necessity of mutual cooperation for seeking common good:

In my faith tradition the Holy Qur'an commands believers for interfaith co-operation **"to come to common grounds"** (3:64). As a Muslim I have been ordered to build good relations with all people of the world (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 (4:114); do good to others (28:77) and not to break promises made to others (16:91). The Holy Qur'an tells believers that those who do good deeds and help others are the best creation (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 (22:40). The Holy Qur'an is full of many examples but time does not permit me to dwell on this

Religious Foundations for Diversity and Pluralism:

Through my reading of the sacred text of the **Qur'an and Sunnah**, I have come to conclusions that are relevant to the application of the Qur'an to contemporary society, particularly with regard to democracy and pluralism. **First**, one of the core principles of Muslim belief is **shura**, which means consultation. This was how the Prophet consulted with his companions on making decisions for his society. In the Qur'an, shura is mentioned twice, as a fundamental belief, just like prayer, and as a practice, according to the time in which one lives. In our times, genuine **shura** means genuine pluralism of points of view, and democracy. **Second**, this view of shura changes the concept of Jihad, which we hear so much about from the fundamentalists.

The foundations out of which an Islamic perspective on any topic should arise are nothing less than the authentic sources of Islam, the Qur'an and the traditions of the Prophet Muhammad (Peace Be upon Him). Both the Qur'an and the Hadith embrace and affirm **Ikhtilaf**, i.e. differences in belief, perspectives and viewpoints, as being natural and an essential part of the human condition. A denial of the right of others to hold beliefs and views, which are different and incompatible to one's own, is tantamount to a denial of Allah himself. In the Holy Qur'an, chapter 10, verse 99, Allah, the Sublime, declares:

"If your Lord had so desired, all the people on the earth would surely have come to believe, all of them; do you then think, that you could compel people to believe?"

And again in Qur'an, chapter 11, verse 118, Allah, the Sublime, declares:

“And had your Lord so willed, He could surely have made all human beings into one single community: but (He willed it otherwise, and so) they continue to hold divergent views.”

Both of these verses establish the principle of freedom of belief, thought and expression in Islam. At the conclusion of the first verse, the Prophet Muhammad (PBUH) is himself reproved for transgressing this principle by being over-enthusiastic in convincing others with regard to the truth of Islam. Thus the Qur'an stresses that the differences in beliefs, views and ideas of humankind is not incidental and negative but represents an Allah-willed, basic factor of human existence. The challenge which the principle of freedom of belief and thought in Islam holds for us is to develop clear ethics and find mechanisms to manage and deal with the differences of beliefs and theologies that exist. This is the challenge that religious pluralism holds for us. All basic freedoms (freedom of Religions, Freedom of Speech, Freedom from fear (prejudice and hatred) and freedom from want (hunger/starvation) have been guaranteed by God Al-Mighty to all creations irrespective of their place of birth. Islam plays great importance to human dignity and civil society based on rule of law.

Peace and Justice:

Islam is a religion of peace and justice. This fact is borne by both Islamic teachings and the very name of “Islam.” The term Islam essentially means to submit and surrender one's will to a higher truth and a transcendental law, so that one can lead a meaningful life informed by the divine purpose of creation, and where the dignity and freedom of all human beings can be equally protected. Islamic teachings assert the basic freedom and equality of all peoples. Islam stresses the importance of mutual help and respect, and directs Muslims to extend friendship and good will to all, regardless of their religious, ethnic, gender, cultural, linguistic or racial background.

Islam, in fact, makes of peace at every greeting, which Muslims exchange whenever they meet by saying, "Peace be unto you" (**Assalamu 'Alaykum**). The Muslim also utters this statement at the end of every ritual prayer. From its inception, the Qur'an emphasized peace as an intrinsic Islamic value. In fact, the terms "Islam" and "Peace" have the same root, **salaam**. Furthermore, God has chosen the word peace (**salaam**) as the Muslim's greeting to remind believers as one of God attributes.

Islam commands Muslims to be just and fair in all circumstances even if it may go against oneself or their next of kin. The universe is constructed on what the Qur'an calls the *mizan*, or a balance. That balance is justice. The Glorious Qur'an says: "And the Firmament has He raised high, and He has set up the Balance (of Justice), In order that ye may not transgress (due) balance, so establish weight with justice and fall not short in the balance" [*Al-Qur'an 55:9*] Justice is essential to maintain the balance of the human mind. Whenever any human being is deprived of justice, the mind is inclined to imbalance. The greater the injustice, the greater is the likelihood of imbalance. That is the reason the Glorious Qur'an warns against allowing hatred to cloud one's judgment and sense of justice. The verses of Qur'an confirm the uncompromising stand on Justice: "O you who believe! Stand out firmly for justice, as witnesses to Allah, even as against yourselves, or your parents, or your kin, and whether it be (against) rich or poor: for Allah can best protect both. Follow not the

lusts (of your hearts), lest you swerve, and if you distort (justice) or decline to do justice, verily Allah is well-acquainted with all that you do." (4:135).

Multiculturalism

I see no incompatibility between multiculturalism and Britishness. Britishness must be part of multiculturalism. "Who are we British? For a long time the UK has been a multicultural state composed of England, Northern Ireland, Scotland and Wales, and also a multicultural society... made up of a diverse range of cultures and identities, and one that emphasises the need for a continuous process of mutual engagement and learning about each other with respect, understanding and tolerance." In other words, dual identities have been common, even before large scale immigration.

We further wrote: "To be British means that we respect the laws, the parliamentary and democratic political structures, traditional values of mutual tolerance, respect for equal rights..."

But Britishness does not mean a single culture. Integration is the co-existence of communities and unimpeded movement between them, it is not assimilation. Britishness is a strong concept but not all embracing.

Multiculturalism is not dead, in fact it has been reasserted by government policy in the form of 'valuing diversity'

Multiculturalism is not dead, in fact it has been reasserted by government policy in the form of 'valuing diversity'

Neither is it incompatible with an appreciation or knowledge of British cultures. To suggest otherwise is to turn back the clock on race debates thirty years.

To understand multiculturalism is to appreciate that it means many different things. To some it is merely sampling different cultures, such as a carnival or a mela [South Asian festival]. To others, it is the road to challenging structural inequalities.

One of Britain's strengths is its diversity. Our political system is founded on different values. White British culture itself is incredibly diverse. But we cannot have cultural diversity without tackling inequalities.

Multiculturalism is sometimes taken to mean that different cultural communities should live their own ways of life in a self-contained manner.

This is not its only meaning and in fact it has long been obsolete.

Multiculturalism basically means that no culture is perfect or represents the best life and that it can therefore benefit from a critical dialogue with other cultures.

In this sense multiculturalism requires that all cultures should be open, self-critical, and interactive in their relations with other each other.

This was the basic message of report on multi-ethnic Britain (The Future of Multi Ethnic Britain, Runnymede Trust 2000). As argued in the report, Britain is and should remain a vibrant and democratic multicultural society that must combine respect for diversity with shared common values.

Commission of Racial Equality (CRE) Gov Poll May 2004

Nine out of 10 people agree that being British does not mean being white, according to a new survey.

The study, by the Mori Social Research Institute, shows that more than half of Britons (59%) believe the UK has good race relations. The figure rises to 67% among ethnic minorities.

The survey entitled Voice of Britain is released on Thursday to mark the 25th anniversary of the Commission for Racial Equality.

Its findings come amid fears of a growing far-right leaning across Europe and following concerns that after the terrorist attacks on America on 11 September anti-Muslim feeling would grow.

There is evidence in the survey of widespread respect for diversity in Britain, with four in five (78%) agreeing it is important to respect the rights of minority groups.

'Encouraging'

More than half (57%) say people should do more to learn about the systems and culture of the ethnic groups in this country, although one in four disagree (27%).

There is also a rough consensus among all ethnic groups on the rights and responsibilities of those who migrate to the UK.

More than two thirds (69%) of the GB population, and half (51%) of ethnic minority people, think ethnic minorities need to demonstrate a real commitment before they can be considered British.

Three-quarters of both white (77%) and ethnic minority communities (76%) believe immigrants who do not speak English should be made to learn it.

"These are encouraging results. "Britain is confident about its multi-culturalism."

Forgiveness: A different outlook and a new start:

In Islamic history one may find an outlook of a different nature. When the Romans conquered any country, the first thing they would do is massacre. When the Muslims entered any country, they would give guarantees of life, property and honour to all the non-belligerents. Even in war Muslims are not allowed to kill an old person, a woman, children, or those who are crippled or disabled. Not only that, even trees are not to be cut and crops are not to be burnt. The entirety of Islamic history does not know of the

concept of mass killing or massacre of enemies. One cannot find one single example of any Inquisition or ethnic cleansing on the name of Islam

I draw your attention to look to the actions of the Holy Prophet of Islam when he entered Makkah as victor. **Everyone was offered amnesty and complete forgiveness.** When Caliph Umar entered Jerusalem he was not even prepared to pray in a Church for fear that those who came after him may treat the place as a mosque and take it away from the Christians. But when the Crusaders took the city of Jerusalem there was a total massacre of the population. What happened in Spain? Not a single Muslim or Jew was left unexecuted or un-exiled. It was the same in Sicily where all the mosques were demolished. Even in the last century the same practice was adopted in Bosnia, Kosovo and Chechnya and many other parts of the world.

Islam condemns and rejects all forms of terror, killing without due process of law, injustice, corruption, tyranny and oppression. There is no justification for the usage of terms such as 'Islamic terrorists'. As a Muslim we must take account of our deeds by other Muslims on the name of Islam. **I feel ashamed when I hear that Muslims are breaking the Law of Islam. I sincerely apologise to those who have suffered due to any senseless actions of so-called Muslims. I seek forgiveness from Allah for any mistake done and ask forgiveness from my fellow beings.** However, we must find the root causes of the challenges of Terrorism, hatred and hurt.

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 Qur'an 41:34)**

If you fight falsehood with falsehood it is falsehood that prevails. If you replace vice with vice, it is vice which triumphs. If you change evil by evil, it is evil which is victorious. Islam says that evil is to be eliminated by good. If you pursue this

technique then you would only be able to fill the earth with goodness, justice, peace and feeling for humanity. Islam has struck at the roots of fanaticism. If you reflect upon the system that Islam has given, you would find that fanaticism has no place in it and that idealism is the lifeblood of it. In the Qur'an it has been mentioned that the mission for which this Muslim nation has been created is that you call people to goodness. As far as the wrong (**munkar**) is concerned, you are permitted to eliminate it. But as far as the truth and virtue (**ma'ruf**) is concerned, it is not to be enforced by power.

One can very easily see that Islam has clearly discriminated between idealism and fanaticism. It has done everything to generate in us a real, noble, virtuous idealism, and to protect us from the evil influences of fanaticism. The Holy Prophet (peace be upon him) has said that Islam is a religion of the middle path.

The Qur'an has called the Muslim nation '**Ummat al-Wusta**', the people of the middle and model nation, the people who maintain balance and equilibrium in all their affairs. Adhering to idealism, protecting and avoiding the extremes of fanaticism - this is the middle path and it is this path which Islam invites to all humanity. Through education, diplomacy, dialogue and firmness Muslims are urged to deal with extremism and fanaticism in the world.

We are dealing with here is a very serious problem of hatred, fear and prejudice. Deep-rooted hatred can only be fought with dignity, diplomacy, education, understanding and dialogue. Unless the roots of hate are addressed there will be irrational people who will continue to commit such heinous evil crimes against humanity. Let all sensible people stand for peace, justice and make concerted efforts to eliminate all injustices and exploitations in their part of world. I believe that without a revival of moral values, nurturing a shared sense of forgiveness and understanding may be we face an even greater challenge. We must pray to overcome hatred and violence in ourselves. Let us rededicate ourselves to peace, human dignity, and the eradication of the injustices that breed rage and vengeance. It requires multi-religious co-operation of all decent people from all shades and all sections of our communities from all over the globe.

Global Ethics and Interfaith Dialogue:

In 1993, the Parliament of World Religions adopted a declaration called *Towards A Global Ethic*, affirming that a common set of core values is found in the teachings of the world's religions and that this core should form the basis of a global ethic. The principles of the global ethic include:

- No new global order without a new global ethic,**
- A fundamental demand: every human being must be treated humanely,**
- Commitment to a culture of non-violence and respect for life,**
- Commitment to a culture of solidarity and a just economic order,**
- Commitment to a culture of equal rights and partnership between men and women,**
- Transformation of consciousness.**

The final principle is quite interesting and deserves some additional attention. The declaration describes this point as follows:

“Historical experience demonstrates the following: Earth cannot be changed for the better unless we achieve a transformation in the consciousness of individuals in public life. The possibilities for transformation have already been glimpsed in areas such as war and peace, economy, and ecology, where in recent decades fundamental changes have taken place. This transformation must also be achieved in the area of ethics and values. Every individual has intrinsic dignity and inalienable rights, and each also has an inescapable responsibility for what she or he does or does not do. All our decisions and deeds, even our omissions and failures, have consequences.”

Human Rights, Civil Society and Rule of Law:

As Muslims, our starting point lies in revelation, which is addressed to humanity in its entirety. The Qur’anic paradigm acknowledges human diversity (Qur’an 49:13) but insists that human beings are born with an inner propensity (*fitra*) that, if appropriately nurtured, drives each and every one of us on a perpetual quest for truth and beauty. Islamic Law (*Shariah*) exists to facilitate our individual and collective quests to realise such truth in our lives. Its core aims, as with all morally responsible legal frameworks, are to protect individuals and society from harm and facilitate their individual and societal development in all that is good. This translates into certain key social objectives that aim to safeguard and promote core human rights, namely:

Belief and expression (cf Qur’an 2: 256)

Life

Intellect

Honour

Property.

These basic human rights, whether arrived at through secular rationalistic modification of natural law (as is the case with the *Universal Declaration of Human Rights*) or through a faith-based approach (as is the case with the *Universal Declaration of Islamic Human Rights*), reaches broadly similar overall conclusions. Some of the major ideas associated with democracy and human rights are in harmony with Islamic thought. The rule of law, a cardinal principle of democratic governance, is central to Islamic jurisprudence. Centuries ago, Islam recognised that all decisions, acts and procedures of public authorities at all levels cannot be valid or legally binding save to the extent they are consistent with the law’. This is, of course, linked to the concept of ‘due process’. As in any society based upon democratic norms and procedures, Islamic law states that **“you cannot deprive a man of life, liberty or property except by due process of law”**. The emphasis given to virtuous, honest and upright Rulers themselves should not obscure us to the other side of Muslim history.

The tension however lies in the societal manifestation of such rights and freedoms. In liberal cultures, such as those found in the post Judeo-Christian west, the plane of emphasis is primarily on safeguarding the rights of individual expression. More traditional societies, in which religion still exerts greater authority, will tend to emphasise the importance of protecting societal interests (cf *hisba* Qur’an 3:104 and 3:110). This latter phenomenon is of course hardly surprising since the term ‘religion’ is linguistically derived from the Latin ‘religio’ meaning ‘to bind’.

It should thus be possible, irrespective of our starting points, to agree on many areas of common co-operation. These include, above all, a commitment to seeking truth, respecting the right of individuals to hold the beliefs that they do and a commitment to promoting peace and mutual understanding. The media, as perhaps the most powerful force in the world today, can and must be central to driving forward this common agenda.

I am reminded of the words of Professor Hans Kung “**No peace among nations without peace among the religions and no peace among the religions without dialogue between the religions**”. I add “**No peace without Justice and no Justice without forgiveness and compassion**”. Dialogue and agreement must be conscientiously applied and maintained, so to create bonds of love, care, trust and confidence. Its prerequisite is proper education and learning from one another. We must speak and act truthfully with compassion. We must treat others as we wish others to treat us. Every human being must be treated, fairly, humanly and with dignity without any fear or discrimination. A group of concerned Muslims and non-Muslims on the invitation of Prince Hassan Bin Talal, Professor Rajmohan Gandhi and Dr Cornelio Sommaruga met in Caux on 26-29 July 2002 at Mountain House, Caux (Switzerland). **Please see The Caux Dialogue: Peace, Justice and Faith: An honest conversation. See www.caux.ch**

I admire the work of **Prince Hassan El Talal** over the years for promoting better understanding between different faiths and advocating dialogue for resolving conflicts. His short book “**Continuity, innovation and Change**” is a *must* read for every Muslim. I not only share his vision but also say that he represents true Islamic scholarship in the current debate on the issue of World peace. The building of peace requires an attitude of sanctity and reverence of life, freedom and justice, the eradication of poverty, dissolution of all forms of discrimination and the protection of the environment for personal and future generations. The ideals of peace include fundamental and global directives such as:

- *Do not kill i.e. have respect for life;
- *Do not steal i.e. deal honestly and fairly;
- *Do not lie i.e. speak and act truthfully;
- *Do not commit sexual immorality i.e. respect and love one another.

I confirm that Islam is faith of moderation and girder of unity for all mankind and blessing for mankind because Muslim model communities where:

- *All of God’s creation – whether human, animal or the environment – is valued and respected;
- *Where people want more to serve others than to get what they can for themselves;
- *Where no one has too little or too much;
- *Respecting the right of others to disagree with us;
- *Being sensitive and courteous to all.

Human dignity is an acknowledgement of the divine presence in each and every one of us and unites us into a single family. We believe in “Thinking globally but acting locally.” We live in an increasingly inter-netted world where it is now possible,

thanks to the development of mass media, to communicate across language, cultural and religious barriers to the extent that has never previously even been imaginable.

Yet, the paradox of our time is that despite these remarkable developments in IT and communication, there are important gulfs that separate people and in so doing, as recent international developments have shown, threaten the stability and security of our world.

It has been argued that from an Islamic viewpoint, there must be a common moral basis for mutual understanding both in general terms and in relation to the role of the media. For Muslims, there is an imperative to understand the reasons underpinning diversity, recognise that this diversity is inherent within the Divine plan, commit to searching for truth and upholding justice, respect for the rule of law, engage in dialogue and, finally, where differences cannot be resolved through these means, to respect differing viewpoints. Such a framework is, I believe, in essence common to all refined moral codes. The world will not change for the better unless the conscience of individuals is changed first.

It is imperative that these differences or tensions are not buried out of the fear of political correctness. There is a need for us all, to do more to understand the standpoints of those of other traditions and this is unfortunately very true of many Muslims today who simplistically and often unfairly reject the western world and its media as being immoral and decadent. This is something that we in the Muslim Council of Britain (MCB) are trying hard to change – and this underpins our motto – of ‘seeking the common good’. For further details see www.mcb.org

Europe and the question of Muslim Identity:

The Muslim presence was a constant factor in European history from the 7th Century (CE), after the origin of Islam. The new Muslim presence, however in the Western Europe dates back sixty to seventy years due to the international situation soon after two world wars and international migration of population. Following the fall of the Berlin Wall, Europe now had a prominent Muslim population. There have been many Muslims in Eastern Europe for some centuries; it's not the same in the West where large numbers of immigrants arrived during the last sixty to seventy years or so. According to the latest statistics, **France** has about 5 million Muslims, half of them French citizens. Those who don't become citizens of their host countries are mainly Algerians, Moroccans and Tunisians. In **Germany**, there are 4 million Muslims, of whom 3 million are Turks. **Belgium** has about one million and the **Netherlands** about the same number. **Great Britain** estimates its Muslim population to be about 2 million, almost all with British nationality. They come from Pakistan, India, Bangladesh and the Near East. Sixty-five percent hold British nationality and citizenship. In 1987, **Spain** had 150,000 Moroccans plus many other foreigners. In 1999, the number had risen to about 250,000, the majority of whom came in through the back door. **Italy's** most recent statistics: a total of 522,000 immigrants. 130,000 come from Morocco, 59,000 from Albania, 48,000 from Tunisia, 33,000 from Senegal, 25,000 from Egypt. Available statistics concerning the number of Muslims present in Italy, don't take into account the illegal immigrants coming from North Africa, naturalised foreigners, and Italian nationals converted to Islam. Countries such as **Bulgaria**, **Hungary** and **ex-Yugoslavia** have had Muslim communities ever since

their occupation by the Ottoman Empire. **Please see attach Appendix on Europe's Religious population attached at the end of this paper.**

The Muslim presence in Europe will produce in time a truly "European Islamic Culture" disengaged from the Arabic culture of North Africa, Turkey and Indo-Pakistan, although it is okay to refer to them for inspiration. This new culture is just in the process of being born and moulded. As is the case in Europe, through thoughts relating to dress code to artistic and creative expression, a whole new culture is being mobilised with a European energy while taking into account national customs and simultaneously respecting Islamic values and guidelines. Some Muslims in certain associations of some European countries had been receiving the message that toleration of their presence comes at the price of their religious practice. This rhetoric, mainly from the political personas and the media appeared to confirm such a conclusion. So they conclude that it is better to be isolated. It is only very recently that through analysis, debates, external and internal discussions that it became apparent that nothing in the letter or the spirit of the European legislation was in opposition to a peaceful and complete practice of the Muslim religion. The laws do not say what some would like to say or interpret. Essentially, what the practicing Muslims wanted was to protect their faith and to be assured about their right to practice their religion.

An increasing amount of Muslim associations are committed to transmitting a civic awareness to their members. Some citizen training programs are in the process of being internally structured or in collaboration with certain institutions that specialise in this area. Whoever makes the effort to discover the initiatives and come into contact with the work of the Muslim associations will notice the consciousness, maturity and energy, which drives a great number of these Muslim associations. They have gone beyond any obstacles without compromising their religion to achieve a true citizenship, which commits them to becoming truly aware of their obligations and rights in the European setting. Relationships are strengthening with other social and political players on the local level and discussions are being organized. Such initiatives are new, growing and frequent, especially in France, Holland, England, Italy, Belgium and Germany.

Mutuality, trust, cultural Diversity:

The word mutuality describes the quality of a two way relationship with mutual respect; mutual recognition, mutual acceptance, with overtones of mutual benefit and ownership shared. Mutuality is fundamental to everything we do in Britain. Mutuality requires us to respect and to be relevant to our partners, and each other. Mutuality is about engaging in Dialogue (honest conversation) and recognising that enhancing communication is about more than delivering information. Mutuality is about creating opportunities and building trust among people. Mutuality is about seeking new and open ways of engaging with worldwide community.

Unity, Diversity and Hope:

We have seen that history has not ended and civilisations have not clashed even after 11 September 2001 and Gulf War I or II. Institutions, nations, groups and all decent individuals must work together and shape the modern world as peaceful place. It is our collective responsibly to give the hope and make this happen.

We should pledge to increase our awareness by positive thinking in understanding one another. We must pledge to be courageous defenders of peaceful teachings and interpretations of Islam and to be exemplary peacemakers in our personal, family and social conduct of our lives in order to socially beneficial, peace fostering, bridge-builder and nature-friendly way of life.

Remember, Remember, Remember. Evil is not in the body. Evil is in the mind, therefore harm nobody. Just change the mind.

Lord You said and your word is true! Love is stronger than hate. O God Almighty You are peace and from You peace comes. Bestow upon all of us your peace and make our final destiny in your eternal abode of peace. **Let there be respect for the earth, peace for is people, love in our lives, and delight in the good, forgiveness for our past wrongs and from now on a new start.**



IMAM Dr Abduljalil Sajid
Muslim Council for Religious and Racial Harmony UK
The Brighton Islamic Mission
8 Caburn Road Hove BN3 6EF (UK)
Tel: 01273-722438 FAX: 01273 326051
Mobile: 07971 861972
email: imamsajid@yahoo.co.uk, sajid@imamsajid.com

Appendix 1: Documents from Government to promote better understanding

1.1) What progress have been made to improve the situation in the light of Local Government Associations' document "Partnership for the common Good: Interfaith Structures and Local Government Good Practice Guidelines- issued on October 2003 and full text can be found at www.lga.gov.uk and www.interfaith.org.uk

1.2) Local Government Associations' document entitled Faith and Community: A good Practice Guide for local authorities? If yes what action has been taken? Full document can be seen at www.lga.gov.uk and www.interfaith.org.uk

1.3.) Home Office's consultative document issued to all Local authorities titled "Working together: cooperation between Government and faith communities" on Feb 2004 and published on 29 March 2004? Document can be found at http://www.homeoffice.gov.uk/docs3/workingtog_faith040329.pdf Home Office Press Release can be found at http://www.homeoffice.gov.uk/n_story.asp?item_id=895

1.4) Local Government Associations' document entitled "Guidance on Community cohesion - What actions has been taken? Full document can be seen at www.lga.gov.uk and www.interfaith.org.uk

2. We do know that some of the local authorities (district and city Councils) have appointed officers which have been given explicit responsibility for faith issues as part of their jobs descriptions (although I think LB Camden and LB Lewisham are the only authorities that currently have someone with the explicit role known as of faith officer). Authorities which have officers who have been playing a significant role on the faith or inter faith fronts include as follows without any order:

- 1) LB Camden (**Nina Rahel**, Senior Policy Officer, Faith Communities)
- 2) LB Kensington and Chelsea (**Rumman Ahmed**, Community Relations Adviser)
- 3) LB Barnet (**Chris Henshaw**, Principal Equalities Adviser)
- 4) Blackburn with Darwen (although **Fawad Bhatti** recently moved from his post as Interfaith Development Officer)
- 5) Birmingham City Council (**Deepak Naik**, Policy Implementation Officer)
- 6) Bristol City Council (**Robin Kidson**, Cabinet Services Manager)
- 7) Calderdale Council (**Sail Suleman**, Racial Harassment Officer)
- 8) Cambridge City Council
- 9) LB Croydon (**Dr Tariq Shabeer** - though more faith involvement in social enterprise than inter faith work per se as his title indicates: Economic Programme Manager (Social Enterprises Business Adviser))
- 10) LB Islington (**Clive Clarke**, Community Development Officer. **Joe Ahmed Dobson** working as a part-time Faith adviser who is carrying out a mapping exercise for the authority at the moment)
- 11) Royal Borough of Kingston Upon Thames (**Andrew Bessant**, Head of Dem Services and Partnership)
- 12) Leicester City Council (**Paul Winstone**, Policy Officer)
- 13) North Lincolnshire Council (**Linda Smithson** in the Chief Exec's office)
- 14) London Borough of Southwark (**Joe Ahmed Dobson**, Multi-Faith officer and Co-ordinator. His post, however, is not directly authority funded, but he is based in the council's offices.
- 16) Suffolk County Council (**Andy Yacoub**, Diversity Officer)
- 17) City of Westminster (**Bill Murray**, Policy Manager)
- 18) Wolverhampton City Council (**Harun Rashid**, Senior Policy Adviser, Chief Exec's Office)

Appendix 2: European Religious Population

Country	Population	Catholic	Protestant/Anglican	Orthodox	Eastern	Hindu	Jewish	Buddhist	Other	None or Atheist
Albania	3 451 130	96 712		987 270		2 269 148				
Andorra	87 970	87 966							677	
Austria	8 290 891	7 070 242		8 171 538					207 814	
Belgium	10 488 966	8 236 574	1 870 370							
Bosnia Herzegovina	3 987 616	630 740	143 640		1 771 422			1 430 847	209 167	
Bulgaria	8 150 626			2 807 654				1 967 288	183 777	
Croatia	4 581 315	3 360 370	18 774		1 050 550			66 772	126 642	
Czech Republic	10 287 760	4 770 807	413 203		398 370				1 078 624	4 117 956
Denmark	5 374 324		2 729 538		37 746				187 057	
Estonia	1 106 740							2 000		
Finland	5 154 836		4 686 652		37 846				430 337	
France	65 126 187	27 397 817	182 844		2 264 436		307 202		2 581 107	
Germany	81 287 360	37 367 864	28 728 478		7 947 627				22 802 090	
Greece	11 150 706			10 120 307		100 726			929 673	
Hungary	10 741 182	4 420 336	628 376						1 290 042	
Ireland	4 448 744	4 448 744								
Italy	60 678 568	32 540 897	108 470 14						1 122 277	
Latvia	2 734 646									
Lithuania	3 217 531		2 747						468	
Luxembourg	420 571	410 260							11 817	
Malta	4 248 718	39 420		4 209 707					20 591	
Netherlands	16 251	36 416							1 872	
Norway	4 450 204	5 298 872	3 966 576		478 348				3 176 399	
Poland	4 450 727	40 114	2 821 908						440 571	
Portugal	10 644 184	36 771 870	1 107 326						797 864	
Romania	21 870 147	9 588 278	267 944						797 864	
Russia	141 894 547	1 170 360	1 317 272	19 781 344		18 549 000		448 200	448 824	
Slo. Repub.	2 171 111	20 967							252	
Slovak Rep.	5 407 734	5 250 864	403 640		227 446				340 598	207 972
Slovenia	2 070 860	1 600 148							467 206	
Spain	40 206 736	18 077 680							1 176 247	
Sweden	8 806 558	75 778	8 458 343						348 215	
Switzerland	7 288 715	2 367 870	2 915 434						1 500 420	
Turkey	67 506 770					67 506 770			247 367	
UK & Ireland	59 271 426	9 471 592	17 646 296 57		1 184 646		340 076	200 500	2 168 898	18 268 704
Ukraine	460									
Uzbekistan	21 206 099	448 242	117 040	9 567 740		1 403 627			1 781 964	
Total (approx)	711 757 357	29 424 970	91 862 848	176 874 324	35 267 185	1 800 000	7 679 202	3 367 220	42 191 544	26 169 812
Percent of total Population		4.1%	12.9%	24.8%	4.9%	0.25%	1.08%	0.47%	5.9%	3.7%
Other world religions in Europe										
Baha'i	120 000	40 000								
Jain	10 000									
Sikh	250 000									
Yezidi	10 000									

World Conference on Religions prepared the above chart of European Religious Population for peace (WCRP) Europe in connection with the inauguration of WCRP EU Religious Leaders Council on December 2002 see www.religionsforpeace.org. For British Religious official Census please see www.statistics.gov.uk

Appendix 3: Some Useful Websites:

Muslim Council of Britain (www.mcb.org.uk) for a wide range of comment and useful statistics

Muslim Directory (www.muslimdirectory.co.uk) for substantial lists of contacts and links

Muslim News (www.muslimnews.co.uk) for a substantial archive of news items, articles and comment

Muslim Voices pages at the *Guardian* (www.guardian.co.uk/muslimvoices) particularly for views of international affairs

The **Honest News** site (www.honestnews.com) has substantial discussions of Islamophobia in the media.

On Islamophobia, the first port of call is the **Forum Against Islamophobia (FAIR)** at www.fairuk.org.uk. Amongst other things FAIR has a valuable news service whereby subscribers receive free of charge, several times a week, a selection of news items.

Runnymede Trust (www.runnymedetrust.org) there is extracts from the 1997 Islamophobia report

Islamic Foundation (www.islamic-foundation.org.uk)
Islamic Solutions (www.islamicolutions.com)
Islam Online (www.islamonline.net)
Islam for Today (www.islamfortoday.com)
Islam in the United States (www.islam-usa.com)
Council on American-Islamic Relations www.cair-net.org
Muslim Heritage (www.muslimheritage.com)
Muslim Family Network (www.al-usrah.net)
Ummah (www.ummah.org.uk/what-is-islam)
Ummah News (www.ummahnews.com)
Virtual Classroom (www.thevirtualclassroom.net)
The Interfaith Network for the UK (www.interfaith.org.uk)

Faith Communities Unit (www.homeoffice.gsj.gov.uk)

Local Government Association (www.lga.gov.uk)

Inner Cities Religious Council (www.odpm.gov.uk)

Young Muslims UK (www.ymuk.net)

Forum of European Muslim Youth and Student Organisations (www.femyso.com)

Soul for Europe: E-mail: soul@cec-kek.be www.cec-kek.org

Oxford Centre for Interfaith Studies:
oxfordcentre@interfaithstudies.org www.interfaith-center.org

World Faiths Development Dialogue: wffd@btinternet.com www.wffd.org.uk

World Fellowship of Inter-Religious Councils: upasana-dn@satyam.net.in

World Council of Muslims for Interfaith Relations:
raoifanahmad@yahoo.com www.cpwr.org

OSCE-Conference on Tolerance and the Fight against Racism, Xenophobia and Discrimination
Brussels, September 13 & 14, 2004

Session 3: Combating discrimination against migrant workers and facilitating their
integration into the societies in which they are legally residing"

proposed title: "How do Third Country Nationals perceive their participation into mainstream
society?"

Marie-Claire S.F.G. FOBLETS (Professor ordinarius at the Universities of Leuven, Brussels and
Antwerp in Belgium)

DRAFT:

Since the 1980's, immigration from outside Europe has been part of the debate surrounding
European construction. Immigration from outside Europe has become - together with racial
discrimination - a major political issue in a number of European states in the last fifteen years.
European policy relating to immigration from outside Europe carried out in recent years relates
to two domains of activities: 1. the entry, movement and residence of third-country nationals
(TCNs) on the national territories of the members States; 2. the integration and the participation
of newcomers and TCNs into mainstream society. My short exposé concentrates on the latter
domain.

TCNs in Europe are⁴, and will undoubtedly remain⁵, an essential structural component of its
population. The *de facto* existence of immigration and the foreseeable response of post-
Maastricht and post-Amsterdam Europe to this problem has to be addressed though from the
point of view of TCN: What do TCNs, and with them the growing number of people of
immigrant origin residing in Europe, expect from post-Amsterdam Europe. What are their
aspirations? In my oral exposé I have briefly reported on the findings of a recent exploratory
study (conducted 2000-2003) that gives voice to TCNs concerning their experiences and
expectations relating to law.⁶ To what extent do TCNs turn to the judicial system of the country
of residence (in *casu* Belgium) to settle their disputes? What is the sort of litigation they engage

⁴ TCNs represent a considerable demographic potential in the Union. The current working population of TCNs
comprises several millions of people, distributed throughout the Member States of the Union. They are active in both
the labour and consumer market.

⁵ Immigration will certainly continue, despite all the political efforts of most Member States governments to put an
official stop to it. The two main (legal) reasons that currently put an obligation upon States to continuously allowing
new immigration are, on the one hand, the Member States' humanitarian obligations to allow families to reunite
under Article 8 on family life of the European Convention on Human Rights and Article 19 on family life contained
in the European Social Charter; and on the other hand, their obligations, with respect to their commitment to the
Refugees Convention of Geneva of 28 July 1951 as amended by the Protocol of 31 January 1967 to admit persons
seeking asylum.

⁶ Published in: M.-C. FOBLETS, e.a., *Wat denken personen van vreemde origine over recht en gerecht in
België? Les populations d'origine immigrée face au droit en Belgique* [What are people of foreign origin expecting
from law and justice in Belgium?], Ghent, Academia Press, 2004 (ISBN 90 382 0623 2°

in, their frequency, the arguments used, the familiarity with the law, the strategic use of it, etc.? The study is as far as I know the first systematic examination in Belgium, since the Treaty of Amsterdam, of the expectations of TCNs concerning the specific role of law and justice in their lives, both as individuals and as a group, and in their relations with the mainstream society.

In my oral exposé I have briefly charted some of the main legal techniques that in practice during the past ten years have shown fairly efficacy in facilitating the integration of TCNs in the society in which they are legally residing. Preference has been given to the techniques and experiences that are considered successful by TCNs themselves and thus to be encouraged.

Due to limitation of time, we have developed just a few ideas that can count among the main findings of the research.

Two preliminary findings:

- * negative experiences weigh heavily: negative experiences of law and justice clearly have a much greater, i.e. much more decisive impact on one's view of the legal system, than positive experiences. Policy makers and legislators have to be extremely conscious of it: if foreigners and parties of foreign origin turn away from the law, for being disappointed in the way their rights are being handled in practice, and therefore no longer trust those who are supposed to enforce them, then efforts to amend the content of rules and regulations lose much of their significance;

- * the gap between the rule and its application: people do not so much perceive the rules themselves as unjust, but the way in which they are implemented. People feel discriminated, not so much by the normative content of the law itself, but in the way the law is being applied. Some laws are even considered offering excellent examples of good legislation (i.e. anti-racist and anti-discrimination laws);

Basic findings:

- * Family reunification: the administrative (and judicial) procedures are perceived as far too complex;

- * Family reunification: there is a crucial lack of cultural sensitivity on part of the administrative authorities i.a. relating to traditional family ties and notions of solidarity among kins;

- * Family reunification: there is an urgent need to set up integration programmes for the partner who is the newcomer (language trainings, trainings in citizenship, etc.);

- * Right to asylum: abuses of the asylum procedure are inevitable as long as Europe is showing unrealistically severe in matters of border control;

- * Right to asylum: the access to a 'humanitarian' resident status should anyhow be facilitated;

- * Regularization of resident status: nobody leaves his or her country on a voluntary base. That awareness of that reality calls for solutions that grant people a right to stay, even if they do not *sensu stricto* meet the requirements of the law on the long terms residence of foreigners. People should be given a fair chance to regularize their status;

- * Access to the labour market: discrimination is still perceived as a main obstacle, both in terms of recruitment as in relation to fair chances to make promotion, once someone is being *de facto* employed;
- * Access to the labour market: there is an urgent need to increase the combat against unfair treatment both in the area of education and in the area of employment. Severe anti-discrimination laws are a prerequisite. Professional advice and legal aid (free legal clinics) count among the conditions 'par excellence' if the purpose (intention of the policymakers) is to enforce compulsory anti-discriminatory legislation, whether via penal or by means of civil regulations.
- * The protection of one's cultural identity: people show a strong desire to continue living according to their own culture, both in the private and to a certain extent also in the public sphere. They are determined to transmit their cultural values to the next generation(s). There is much uncertainty though about the way this is to happen: who represents the community, how does the group transmit its own values to the younger generation, and who keeps the control over the knowledge required for this transmission, etc.? Public authorities stand to gain from a greater 'cultural sensitivity' in this realm: cultural diversity has become a daily reality, it can no longer be considered to be a temporary exception. People are entitled to feel respected by public authorities in their being 'different': equal but different.
- * Nationality: relaxation of Nationality laws, i.e. facilitation of the way(s) to get the nationality of the country of habitual residence makes no sense as long as people who have indeed acquired that nationality do (still) not feel 100% accepted as full 'citizens'. Nationality is thus considered from a pragmatic point of view: it does not correspond to one's 'first' identity, but is rather conceived of as a facilitator, i.e. an access to all types of facilities and benefits that are usually restricted to country nationals;

PC.DEL/896/04
22 September 2004

FRENCH only

Conférence O S C E sur la Tolérance et la lutte contre le racism e, la xénophobie et la
discrim ination

Bruxelles, 13 – 14 septem bre 2004

Intervention de l'Ambassadeur Stéphane HESSEL, Président de la délégation française à la
conférence mondiale sur les droits de l'Homme

Session 3

Une forte poussée migratoire amène un nombre croissant de personnes à chercher à obtenir accès dans des pays réputés plus riches en ressources et en emplois. Les politiques d'accueil de ces migrants et de leur intégration dans les sociétés où ils résident sont de celles qui, à juste titre, ont suscité le plus de critiques et causé le plus de frustrations et de discriminations.

Il est urgent que les Etats membres de l'OSCE reconnaissent :

1. Que le droit d'asile, droit sacré reconnu par les grands textes nationaux et internationaux, est très imparfaitement reconnu. Les conditions dans lesquelles les demandes sont instruites sont souvent scandaleuses et mettent les requérants face à des discriminations intolérables ;
2. Que la répartition des familles de migrants sur le territoire des Etats d'accueil conduit à des concentrations qui rendent l'intégration de ressortissants de communautés ethniques, religieuses ou linguistiques problématique, allant parfois jusqu'à la création de véritables « ghettos »
3. Que les efforts faits sur le plan éducatif, linguistique et civique pour favoriser l'accès des jeunes issus de l'immigration au logement, à l'emploi, à la formation n'ont pas progressé au rythme souhaitable ;
4. Qu'un trop grand nombre d'immigrants en situation irrégulière par suite de circonstances indépendantes de leur volonté se voient refuser leur régularisation.

Or l'immigration et l'intégration dans les sociétés subissant une crise démographique est une richesse à laquelle les Etats membres ne doivent en aucun cas renoncer, s'agissant notamment de personnes dont le combat pour la liberté les a amenés à l'exil. Les exemples sont nombreux de leur apport économique et culturel aux pays d'accueil.

Les mesures à prendre sans tarder dans ce domaine comportent :

1. La révision des méthodes d'examen des demandes d'asile ;
2. La promotion d'associations de migrants dans les lieux où ils résident en grand nombre et leur mise en relation avec des associations nationales de défense des droits de l'homme ;
3. L'adoption de mesures législatives donnant accès aux étrangers résidant régulièrement dans les pays d'accueil aux élections municipales, aux responsabilités syndicales et civiques ;

4. Le renforcement des ressources mises à la disposition des écoles, des établissements sanitaires, des agences pour l'emploi dans tous les quartiers ou régions abritant une proportion élevée –plus de 20 %- de familles de migrants dans la population.

En revanche les familles d'immigrés doivent être invitées

1. A adapter leurs comportements aux règles en vigueur dans les pays d'accueil, ainsi la règle du pays d'accueil laïc qu'est la France de bannir les signes religieux des lieux publics doit être reconnue comme légitime par les immigrés ;
2. A maintenir le contact avec leur langue et leur culture d'origine qui constituent pour le pays d'accueil un moyen précieux de développer ses relations internationales.

Enfin la mise en place d'une régulation des flux migratoires entre pays de l'OSCE et pays tiers ne peut se concevoir que par un dialogue confiant et constructif entre les autorités de ces pays, y compris les autorités régionales et municipales, afin de faire de la migration pour les pays d'origine des migrants un moyen de développer leur économie : les ONG compétentes du Nord et du Sud ont ici un rôle important à jouer.

On Tolerance

ENGLISH only

B. M. Zupančič⁷

OSCE CONFERENCE ON TOLERANCE AND THE FIGHT AGAINST
RACISM , XENOPHOBIA AND DISCRIMINATION

(Brussels, 13 and 14 September 2004)

“Promoting Tolerance, Respect for Diversity and Non-Discrimination through
Education and Media, Particularly among the Younger Generation”⁸

En quoi consiste cette liberté qui est sagesse ?

Jacques Maritain⁹

⁷ Judge of the European Court of Human Rights in Strasbourg. The opinions expressed herein are strictly author's own. Copyright © 2004 by B.M. Zupančič.

⁸ Speech delivered to OSCE, Brussels, September 14, 2004.

⁹ DU REGIME TEMPOREL ET DE LA LIBERTE, OEUVRES COMPLETES, Vol. V., Allion, Hany, A. et R. Mougel, Nurdin, Schmitz, Eds., Editions Universitaires Fribourg Suisse, Edition Saint-Paul, Paris, 1982, p. 349.

I

Introduction

The best way to promote tolerance is to promote new and more adequate social values: values that people can positively identify with, values that appear on the horizon of the progressive social change, values that give people hope that the society of tomorrow will be better than the society in which they live today. When there is hope that the society of tomorrow will be better than the society of today, people do accept social change and are ready sacrifices to adapt to it.

Of course, new values are not easily created. Moreover, their social integration takes place during the passage from older to younger generations.

Intolerance is largely a consequence of erstwhile, passé and obsolete – but often institutionalised values. Sociologically speaking, there are three prevalent reactions (the three “R”s) to these inadequate and dysfunctional residual values. Ritualisation through all kinds of social rites re-confirms attachment to old values; resignation is an inner emigration and denial of unacceptable social, political etc. reality. However, it is the rebellion and the revolt of the young, think of May 1968, which instigates the creative social conflict. It paves the way for the assimilation of more or less radical new and possibly more adequate values.

As I said, the important changes in the hierarchies, in the structure of priorities concerning integrated and institutionalised values happen only during the transition from older to younger generations. In psychoanalytical language, the explanation is that values are adopted through oedipal identification of the child with the parent of the same sex. This process is intense up to the age five. Thereafter, the educational system and the social setting, too, have their say.

As the American experience testifies, integration of a foreign social group, because of the inter-generational influence, will take about three biblical generations or about one hundred years. Clearly, social attitudes adopted and actively promoted by the media and the educational system – often as a form of ‘political correctness’ – are of enormous help.

Since the true attachment to values, i.e. their inner assimilation and integration is not only a cognitive process – it calls for positive identification that is all the more deep-seated the less it is conscious –, it can happen only in the passage to younger generations. Therefore, values instilled in the educational process and especially so of the very young will hold fast if only they are socially more

feasible and more adequate than the values of the children's parents and grandparents. Likewise, the impact of the media on the impressionable young and the deliberate promotion of a certain hierarchy of values are more compelling when compared to their impact with regard to the older generations.

General and diffused attitude of tolerance promoted by media on the one hand and the focused promotion of informed tolerance through educational system on the other, speed up the process.

Yet, when with the passage of time the younger people will become older, they will of necessity compare the values they have nominally adopted – with the social, inter-personal daily reality in which they must live. Even values convincingly instilled, for example, if they are too ahead of their time, will be downsized by the reality principle according to the popular motto 'if everything else fails lower your standards'.

Tolerance, in other words, is a fundamental social value. Human being is a *zoon politikon*, a social animal. If he were genetically pre-programmed to be misanthropic and intolerant of others, human being could not live with others. Most probably some level of intra-species tolerance, as the late Konrad Lorenz would have called it, is an integral part of our genetic make-up.

The issue, therefore, is not whether we are tolerant or not; the issue is how much of diversity and dissimilarity can we tolerate. It is easy to love those who are similar to us. Yet, as Jesus also says, demonstrate your capacity for love in showing love for those who are different!

Let me share with you a story describing an aspect of social integration, of assimilation and of tolerance. It really happened about twenty years ago about twelve miles north of New York City in a town called New Rochelle. Every so often I used to stop there at a small liquor store and buy a bottle of California red wine. The shop was a mama-and-papa arrangement run by two elderly Greeks from Crete. Their college age son, born and raised in the States, occasionally helped in the store. One Friday evening I walked into the store and found both father and mother on the verge of crying. I asked for an explanation. The mother then told me that their son fancied a Porto Rican girl.

I did not dare to betray my inner smile; I knew all too well how hard were the historical conditions, having lasted for centuries, under which Cretans had under Turkish invasion succeeded in preserving their genetic and cultural identity. Kazantsakis, in his novel *Captain Michalis*, describes it consummately. As for certain Jewish groups, for them too, intermarriage be it Diaspora or at home, was – and this is a historical fact not to be perceived lightly – a form of suicide.

So, the first-generation Cretan boy fancied a Porto Rican girl. I tried to offer some comfort to the immigrant parents. In a rather professorial manner I said: "See, you must understand. This is America. They have it in their Constitution. It says: 'We believe all people are born equal.. ' " Alas, no sooner had I uttered these few words, when the old man belligerently rose from behind the counter. With both hands he leaned onto it and forward towards me. He gave me a defiant stare, even today I can still remember that exasperated look, and he cried out like a wounded animal: "Yes, but the young idiot believes it.. !"

Of course, this is a story about the generational gap between the immigrant parents and their child born and raised in a more tolerant environment. It is a story about the child in the process of abandoning the residual and dysfunctional values of his parents. It is a story about the impact of the educational system and of the media. It is also a story about tolerance in a society made of successive waves of immigrants coming in from all corners of the globe. After all, what could be more tolerant than to love somebody from a different racial and cultural group?

As I said, this 'tolerance' had been accomplished in the transition between the two generations. It was clearly due to the influence of educational system that had actively promoted it as well as to the general social climate, which advertises the idea that racial differences are only skin-deep. This new-found tolerance was brought about in the face of the boy's parents and their historically inherited hierarchy of values. Still, both parents were surprised to find out that their son was now lost to a different mentality; subjectively at least, their desperation felt as supremely justified.

Yet, is this a sad story? I do not think so. The old Cretans' intolerance was due to past conditions that were no longer applied – such is the significance of 'residual values' –, and their son's attitude was well adapted to a completely different social reality, i.e. the one in which he will have spent his life. Were the son's falling in love with a foreign girl to happen in Crete, the parents would have at their disposal all kinds of social pressure in order to coerce him into abandoning what his heart had commanded him.

There is, however, an absent protagonist in the above story. She is essential but we tend to overlook her presence. This is the Porto Rican girl. How did she feel when confronted with the prejudices of the boy's parents? Did she feel alone and guilty because she had seduced a boy who is not Porto Rican? How would she feel had this happened in Crete? Did she feel vindicated by the prevailing American social climate declaring the parents' prejudices regressive?

This is an inter-racial story concerning tolerance. Yet, do we believe that intolerance here and now concerns only inter-racial relations, in Europe say vis-à-vis Arabs, Turks, Roma people and all those who are the unwilling projection screen for the negative identification, who have no choice but to play the role of the Lacanian 'Other'? In the European Court of Human Rights we deal with all kind of specific issues arising out of other forms of radical social change.

Take the example of a trans-sexual woman who feels like a man or a man who feels like a woman and has decided to declare himself as such? Twenty years ago such and other forms of 'coming out' would be unthinkable. Previously, social pressures have driven many thousands of desperate individuals into a complete internal exile or even suicide. The same applies to alternative sexual orientation, alternative religious orientation etc. Yet, today, how do the parents react if their grown-up child declares himself a Buddhist? Many of the regressive social pressures of yesteryear are no longer available and their intolerance is thus less compelling.

Behind the positive story of tolerance there is what I would consider the most basic human right, i.e. the right to become and then be what one truly is. Karl Jung spoke of this as the 'realization of the Self'. Self-realization and self-actualization implies a freedom to experiment with one's identity and the search for the identity that will release mental health and creativity. To be mentally healthy is simply to be in the process of becoming what one is capable of becoming. The rest is neurosis, madness, destruction. Moreover, to have the right to become and to actively live what one truly is –, is merely a social component of an individual's critical search for his true potential Self.

This search is not an abstraction. It implies the removal of a host of internalized irrational prejudices which induce the feeling of guilt as a reflection of prevalent social prejudices. In Crete the boy would feel guilty. In such conditions it takes intelligence and great courage to dare to become what one potentially and truly is.

This is a process called 'individuation.'

The attitude vis-à-vis authority in any specific social context determines how much courage an individual must have in order to succeed in affirming his or her individual identity in open collision with the collective consciousness. The greater the courage required the more young people will succumb and be forced to surrender their as yet vague hope for actualising their true identity. They will perhaps never find their true Self let alone actualise it. As socially disconfirmed individuals they will continue to 'live' their over-determined, pre-programmed, that is, borrowed identities. They will feel as having been stolen from

themselves. If they are not permitted now to first discover themselves, and then to actualise themselves, they will in turn later traumatise their own ‘significant others’.

For not to have the opportunity to become what one is, leads to some form of mental malady or at least malaise. The clear absence of true wisdom in most modern societies – Erich Fromm used to call it “folie à million” – is simply consequence of the collective interaction of the individual carriers of Freud’s civilisational neurosis.¹⁰

How very different would in fact be our freedoms and our democracies and our rules of law if they were lived by people who were truly themselves!

II

Tolerance and the Social Ideal of Sympathy

Tolerance is nothing unless it is a form of sympathy. Sympathy is a weaker form of socialized love. Jacques Maritain gives the following description of what he calls *l’amour d’affection directe*:

[U]n amour qui va à un objet voulu en lui-même et pour lui-même ; tel est l’amour de l’intelligence pour le vrai ; ou l’amour de l’homme droit pour le ‘bien honnête’ ; ou l’amour d’amitié que nous avons pour nous-mêmes et pour autrui.¹¹ Et quand je connais autre chose que moi, quand j’ai en moi la connaissance la forme d’autre chose, ou bien il y a en moi une inclination ou sureffluence affective vers cette chose que je me veux parce qu’elle m’est bonne, et je fais procéder en moi comme un poids spirituel qui m’entraîne vers cette chose afin de me l’incorporer, afin qu’elle soit à moi: amour d’affection réfractée, ou de concupiscence ; ou bien il y a en moi une inclination ou une sureffluence affective vers cette chose à qui je veux du bien parce qu’elle est bonne, et parce qu’elle est à

¹⁰ They say that the last words of Lacan were: “Ils sont tous pour l’asile... !”

¹¹ Maritain, SEPT LEÇONS SUR L’ÊTRE (1998), IV, Explications sur l’être en tant que l’être, 5 (in fine), n. 2, at p. 598

In English translation :

“[A] love which wills an object in and for itself. Such is the intellect’s love of truth, or the upright man’s love of ‘moral good’ the *bonum honestum*, or the ‘love of friendship,’ we entertain for ourselves or others.” Maritain, PREFACE TO METAPHYSICS, SEVEN LECTURES ON BEING, (names of translators not available), A Mentor Omega Book, The New American Library of World Literature, New York, 1962, p. 71, n. 2.

moi comme moi-même, et je fais procéder en moi un poids ou une impulsion spirituelle par où j'entraîne toutes choses et moi-même vers cette autre, qui me devient un moi, une subjectivité, et à laquelle je veux être en quelque façon uni réellement comme à moi-même : amour d'affection directe, ou d'amitié.¹²

If the question be whether this intense commitment and belonging may be dispensed to all around us, the answer is of course no. But this “no” is not what one might imagine, i.e. it is not an absolute dismissal of its possibility. Years ago Harvard's Roberto Mangabeira Unger has put forward what he had called the political “ideal of sympathy.” This political ideal is the social form of Maritain's metaphysical love, *amour d'affection directe*, i.e. an integral part of what here we aspire to as “tolerance”.

[T]he political analogue to personal love is the idea of community. The elements of the idea of community are the same as those of personal, but [not romantic!] love; [1] the complementarity of [interests and] wills, and [2] the capacity to give to others and receive from them the acknowledgment of [their] concrete individuality. [...] The sentiment of sympathy differs from love in its conditions as well as in its context. Love is so strong that it may allow the lover to acknowledge the concrete individuality of the loved one and to perceive him as a complementary will despite an opposition of values between the lover and the loved.

Sympathy is weaker. As the association becomes less intimate and total, it depends increasingly on shared ends to achieve the recognition of concrete individuality and the complementarity of wills. [Thus] community is held together by an allegiance to common purposes. The more these shared ends

¹² Maritain, *op.cit.*, IV, Explications sur l'être en tant que l'être, 7 (in fine), p. 601.

In English translation :

“And when I know something other than myself, when by knowledge I possess in myself the form of something else, either I have a tendency or affective overflow toward that object which I will because it is good for me, and I produce in myself, as it were, as spiritual weight which draws me toward it that I may incorporate it into myself, that it might be mine – this is the love of refracted affection or desire; or I have a tendency or affective overflow toward this object to which I will good because it is good, and I produce in myself a spiritual weight, or impulse, by which I draw all things and myself to this other being which for me becomes an ego, a subject, and to which I wish to be in some way or other really united, as to myself. This is the love of affection or of friendship.” See, Maritain, PREFACE TO METAPHYSICS, SEVEN LECTURES ON BEING, A Mentor Omega Book, The New American Library of World Literature, New York, 1962, IV, 7 (in fine) at p. 74.

express the [universal] nature of humanity rather than simply the preferences of particular individuals and groups, the more would one's acceptance of them become an affirmation of one's own nature; the less it would have to represent the abandonment of individuality in favor of assent and recognition. Thus, it would be possible to view others as complementary rather than opposing wills; furtherance of their ends would mean the advancement of one's own. The conflict between the demands of individuality and of sociability would disappear. Each person, secure in his individuality, would be able to recognize his own [universal] humanity in other persons. Moreover, in this community individuals would have to live together in a situation sufficiently varied, intimate, and stable to allow them to know and treat each other as concrete persons rather than [mere] role occupants. To the extent that a community acquired these features, it would become a political realization of the ideal of sympathy.¹³

However, sympathy toward others depends – because the recognition of universal humanity in others presupposes the recognition of one's own concrete individuality, as Unger calls it – primarily on a positive existential attitude.

If that attitude be a commonplace alienation from one's own true Self, we shall of necessity have the problem of intolerance. If that attitude, in contrast, be a side product of one's dwelling in Being, i.e. in consequence of a breakthrough to one's true Self, Jacques Maritain speaks of un être [qui] se connaît lui-même, et peut dire ego –, it is then possible that “sympathy” become a form of love dispensed to all that surround us.¹⁴

¹³ Unger, Roberto Mangabeira, KNOWLEDGE AND POLITICS, The Free Press, N.Y., 1975, p. 221 But see ibidem, p. 220: “The social order cannot be governed by a principle of love as long as it continues to rest upon the antagonism of private interests and the system of private property [over the means of production] as the device for working out this antagonism.”

¹⁴ »Eh bien, quand un être se connaît lui-même, et peut dire ego, quand il a en lui, par la connaissance et la réflexion sur ses actes, la forme de son propre être, ce qu'il a ainsi en lui selon l'être intentionnel de connaissance, c'est la forme de cette inclination radicale elle-même, de cet amour « naturel » de lui-même qui lui est consubstantiel, et qui se double dès lors d'une inclination psychique (ou « émanée ») c'est-à-dire procédant de la connaissance, amour naturel encore mais comme mouvement de la volonté ; en d'autres termes me connaître moi-même c'est connaître un bien que j'aime (déjà) radicalement (d'un amour consubstantiel) et vers lequel j'efflue dès lors selon l'être spirituel d'amour en le constituant ainsi formellement subjectivité, moi à moi-même, et en entraînant toutes choses vers lui. Ainsi

This is how Maritain describes it in 1934:

Et à un degré plus élevé, incommensurable, nous constatons une inclination à surabonder en connaissance ou à surabonder en amour, et dans ce deux cas il y a en même temps auto-perfectionnement du sujet, cette acquisition d'une perfection nouvelle accompagne dans tout se qui est créé la surabondance dont je parle, mais elle n'est pas de soi (*ex vi notionis*) impliquée par elle. Formellement c'est la surabondance comme telle qui importe ; la surabondance de connaissance exprime la perfection d'un être qui est d'une certaine manière, qui est soi-même ou les autres en vertu d'une existence supra-subjective (d'ordre intentionnel chez toutes les créatures); la surabondance d'amour dit la générosité d'un être qui tend d'une certaine manière, qui surefflue vers quelque chose – soi-même ou les autres – en vertu d'une existence supra-subjective (d'ordre intentionnel chez toutes les créatures) qui est un exister par mode de don.¹⁵

je m'aime moi-même naturellement d'un amour émané qui est un amour d'affection directe ou d'amitié. » Maritain, op. cit., pp. 600-601 (emphasis added).

English translation: "Now, when a being knows itself, and can say ego when it possesses in itself by knowledge of its acts and reflection upon them the form of its own being, what it thus possesses in itself according to the intentional being of knowledge is the form of this radical appetite itself, this natural love of itself which is consubstantial with it, and which is now reduplicated by a psychical appetite, an elicited appetite, that is to say an appetite proceeding from knowledge. In other words, to know myself is to know a good which I already love radically with consubstantial love, and toward which I henceforth overflow according to the spiritual being of love, thus formally constituting it a subject, I to myself, and drawing all things toward it. I thus love naturally with an elicited love which is a love of direct affection, that is of friendship." Op. cit. supra n. 11, pp. 73-74.

¹⁴ Maritain, op. cit., pp. 599 and 600 (emphasis in the original).

English translation: "At an incommensurably higher degree in the hierarchy of being there is a tendency to overflow in knowledge and in love. And in both cases the subject at the same time perfects itself. This acquisition of a new perfection accompanies in every creature the superabundance of which I am speaking. But it is not of itself (*ex vi notionis*) implied by it. Formally it is the superabundance as such which is essential. The superabundance of knowledge expresses the perfection of a being which, in a particular fashion, is: which is itself or other things in virtue of a supra-subjective existence (which, in all creatures capable of knowing, is an existence of the intentional order). The superabundance of love utters the generosity of a being which tends in a particular fashion, which overflows toward something, itself or others, in virtue of a supra-subjective existence (which, in all creatures, is an existence of the intentional order) – existence as a gift." Op. cit. supra, n. 11.

III

The Right to Tolerance as a Universal Human Right

Young people today are more than ever before aware that they live in danger of being, like the generations before them, stolen from themselves. More and more they perceive the activation of their own identity, their personal and effective becoming, as their truest human right. Needless to say, this also is the most universal human right.¹⁶

The social elite of the twenty-first century is being forged in this process –, in which the rejection of pre-programmed and regressive prejudices, the principal form of modern but quiet and subversive revolt, not unlike the one Camus described in his *‘L’homme révolté’*–, is a question of individual courage.

Those among our children who will not succumb and surrender their hope to become what they can be – will grow to be moral leaders of the next generation.

Moreover, only societies actively promoting tolerance will have the prospect of releasing the creativity residing in the deepest nuclei of their innovative individuals. Bertrand Russell said that if we knew where ideas are coming from, science would be moonshine. But it is now finally patent, that creativity, inventiveness etc., are derived only from the genuine personal liberation and inner freedom giving rise to the liberated Nietzschean dance of ideas. This is the quintessential capital and fuel of every community and national economy.

But I must say it clearly. All social, legal and psychological formulations of the right to become and be and live one’s true Self are in the last analysis a moral issue. We speak here of the transcendental right to be what one is. To be human, is to transcend what one is and to continue becoming what one may be.

What could be more basic?

Therefore, from the ethical point of view promotion of tolerance is not an issue of benevolent social policy. It is a categorical moral imperative.

This imperative entails a higher level of internalized freedom. The process of acceding to that level is a complex psychological process of what

¹⁶ See, for example, Shashi Tharoor, *Are Human Rights Universal?* 16 *World Policy Journal* Volume XVI, No.4, Winter 1999/2000 and Thomas M. Franck, *Are Human Rights Universal?*, 80 *Foreign Affairs* I, pp. 191-204 (Jan./Feb. 2001); Shashi Tharoor, *Are Human Rights Universal?* 16 *World Policy Journal* Volume XVI, No.4, Winter 1999/2000.

psychoanalysis may also call *individuation*, i.e. liberation from the pressures of the collective consciousness. Recently, this process has been described in minute detail by Marie-Louise von Franz in her work entitled "The Golden Ass of Apuleius."¹⁷ Yet we cannot comprehend the individual process of the courageous leaving behind of regressive social values as independent of what is going on in the society at large. To put it tersely, the social correlative of individual inner liberation is tolerance.

Should the necessary changes in social attitude procrastinate, should they delay this progress –, the national and evermore the international, legal systems will intervene. Here we speak of more aggressive as well as regressive, archaic violations of human rights. Since these interventions inexorably do go in the right historical direction, they inevitably do speed up and do intensify the process of normative integration, i.e. creation of new and truly shared values.

These new values, when assimilated, also provide for a much higher level of social cohesion. The abandonment of *passé* residual values with their detrimental inhibitory influence, just as in the story concerning the two elderly Cretans, is perhaps a small price to pay in order to open the horizon of a new and better community of internally free and more originally and creative individuals.

¹⁷ Marie Louise von Franz, THE GOLDEN ASS OF APULEIUS, THE LIBERATION OF THE FEMININE IN MAN, Random House, London 1992.



PC.DEL/921/04
28 September 2004

ENGLISH only

OSCE Conference on Tolerance and the Fight Against Racism, Xenophobia and
Discrimination

Statement by Sheila Rogers, Chief Executive of the UK Commission for Racial Equality

My task today is to discuss some of the work of the CRE around young people and to share some examples of good practice projects within communities in Great Britain.

For those of you unfamiliar with the Commission for Racial Equality let me explain briefly what we do.

We are a specialised anti-discrimination organisation, funded by Government, but independent from it. Specifically it is our responsibility to

- work to eliminate discrimination on racial grounds
- to promote equality of opportunity and, importantly, to promote good race relations in Britain.

We work in the fields of employment, education, and housing, the provision of goods, facilities and services. We are a regulator and an enforcement body. We will use the power of persuasion where it is appropriate to bring about equality and eliminate racism and we will use the power of the law where necessary.

Yesterday you heard our Minister Fiona McTaggart acknowledge the challenge of how to promote an integrated society within increasingly diverse populations. We at the CRE share that challenge. It is one which particularly demands our attention in the field of education, and in the work we aim to do with young people.

I would like to draw a parallel between the theme of this conference – dialogue and partnerships – and what we at the CRE are striving to achieve with our work on the integration agenda, which we define as a combination of equality and interaction.

Nowhere is this more important than in our schools; but as a commentator in yesterday's Guardian Newspaper said 'Schools are raising young people to pass exams not to face the world.' This is an important point because the reality of the world for many young people is racism and discrimination.

We at the CRE believe that unless we eliminate racial discrimination and harassment we will fail to build a strong civil society with safe and cohesive communities in which our young people learn to understand and respect difference, yet share common values and are confident in their identities as citizens.

To bring about equality with interaction there are a range of approaches which can be adopted, but first we need to acknowledge the things which work against such a vision – poverty and alienation, feelings of powerlessness, segregation, anti-social behaviour and racial and religious discrimination. We believe it is important to accept that creating cohesive communities is the responsibility of us all – both majority and minority communities and that young people are central to the achievement of this vision.

- We must ensure that our young have the opportunity to learn from other cultures and to interact positively with young people from other ethnic and racial groups.
- We must make sure that no young person is denied an opportunity because of racism or discrimination and that they are involved in the decisions that affect them
- Schools need to promote dialogue and informed debate among students from all racial groups on issues around diversity and good relations.
- Young people themselves need to be encouraged to take responsibility for the promotion of good race relations within their student body.

And

- The curriculum must be sensitive to and reflect the different realities of children's lives.

Because

- Children who come from different places have different histories
- The poetry and literature of all backgrounds can help enrich the learning environment
- Schools need to take account of the varied dietary, cultural and religious needs of their pupils - including Gypsy and Traveller children.
- Schools need to take seriously their role in promoting diversity and good relations, involving the communities in which they are located.
- And let's not forget the very important role that sport can play in breaking down barriers.

Let me share with you some specific examples of good practice that we at the CRE have come across through our community conflict project - the Safe Communities Initiative.

1. From Boyhood to Manhood - a project that works with young men excluded from the education system, through mentoring and developing life skills and building self-confidence.
2. The Young Mediators Network, which trains young people across Britain in mediation skills, which they can then use in school and community environments.
3. In Camden in London a project which aims to help young people make informed choices about whether or not to participate in gang culture.
4. A project supporting young people's development as current and future community leaders.

5. An initiative bringing children together from two mono-cultural schools (one white, one Asian) through the medium of sport and with the support of professional football players.
6. A school making a positive use of links with local communities by involving parents and linking learning to cultural and faith issues.

There are many more examples of how education can contribute to the breaking down of barriers and an increasing understanding among young people of the causes, effects and realities of racism and discrimination.

One final example of an initiative which has great potential to bring about change. In 2000, as Minister M cTaggart mentioned yesterday, the British Government amended the Race Relations legislation to place a duty on public bodies, including schools, to develop proactive measures to bring about greater equality. This was a radical and significant legislative response to tackling institutional racism within the public sector. We at the CRE are beginning our assessment of how effective these public duties have been in bringing about change. Certainly it is a model which many others are watching with interest.

Let me finish with one thought. Schools, parents, communities, the public sector and young people themselves must work to increase interaction among and between communities.

To fail to do so will lead to a lack of understanding; it will increase distrust between people and create resentment and often violence, all of which can contribute to the rise of extremism within communities, sometimes reflected in political structures, and often fuelled by some parts of the media. What this can create for young people, indeed for us all, is a vicious circle of racism and hatred which, once in place, is often very hard to break down. We owe it to them to help make sure this doesn't happen.

PC.DEL/851/04

14 September 2004

O S C E C onference on T olerance and the F ight against R acism , X enophobia and
D iscrim ination
B russels, 13 and 14 S eptem ber 2004

ENGLISH only

Promoting Tolerance, Respect for Diversity and Non-Discrimination through Education and Media, Particularly among the Younger Generation

Gert Weisskirchen

Brussels, 14 September

The productivity of a society can be measured by how creatively its members respond to the conflicts that arise from any form of coexistence with others. A society that does not allow room for various ways of life denies those who belong to it opportunities to learn from each other. The distinctiveness of original personalities directly mould the living character of a society. This is the source of freedom: each individual exercising their right to determine autonomously how they want to live. However, because – and to the extent that – they have to rely on other people to do this, these individuals may be expected to give reasons that justify the resources they use to realise their goals. This is fair to other people. And here is the deeper significance of the idea of justice, as Immanuel Kant argues: free human beings entitled to equal rights coming together for the purposes of enduring mutual support.

“Freedom is always the freedom of those who think differently” (Rosa Luxemburg).

Throughout his philosophical work, John Rawls developed categories based on an incontrovertible insight: that human beings are capable of learning morally, examining arguments reasonably, articulating their own convictions publicly and acting with a sense of responsibility. In doing so, they may find themselves in conflict with their fellow citizens.

John Rawls distinguishes three main types of conflict

- + “those deriving from irreconcilable comprehensive doctrines;
- + those deriving from differences in status, class position, or occupation, or from differences in ethnicity, gender, or race;
- + those deriving from the burdens of judgment.”

These are the causes of the well founded differences of opinion that occur between reasonable individuals.

In constitutional democratic societies, it is possible to respond to all three types of conflict in such a way that their inherent destructive potential is defused. The idea of tolerance is rooted in this approach.

In Latin, *tolerare* means “to bear” or “to endure”. Historically, tolerance originated when the strong made a pragmatic offer to the weak to limit the use of force so that both sides could “bear” each other. Tolerance therefore spanned the field between power and morality. It showed its double aspect early on: it can serve as an instrument of domination and it can support emancipatory demands. This conflict has given rise to three different concepts: the tolerance that merely permits others to follow their own beliefs, and the tolerance that actively respects and values others. These concepts have encouraged people to pursue their yearning for freedom and cooperate with others to establish democracy as a humane form of social life. As citizens in an ethically pluralist community, they have created norms that are generally valid. They also have a reciprocal obligation to discuss the reasons for their actions when they take political measures. This right to justification is the irrefutable basis on which discourse between citizens rests. Among themselves, citizens will follow the precept of tolerance because it allows them to deal more productively with social conflicts. Neutrality should be expected of the state so that its temporarily elected representatives only allow their actions to be guided by reasons capable of finding general and reciprocal assent, and not by disputed value judgements.

What form should tolerance assume in societies that are modernising at varying speeds? Is it not possible for the rapid acceleration or abrupt braking of social change to throw people off track, disorient them or fill them with fear? How can tolerance be maintained where trust has been shattered?

Is it not at such moments that the limits restraining the use of force break down? Previously, citizens may have taken reasonable decisions mandating their state representatives to deploy force, though only subject to public scrutiny and solely using appropriate resources that could be accounted for. But once democracy has revealed how fragile it is, how can it regain the assent of civil society?

It is in conflicts with such profound implications that the virtue of tolerance particularly shows its real strength. Tolerance is a product of shared learning. This product multiplies its value when people from different backgrounds encounter each other with open minds and are curious to discover their differences. This sets off a process that enriches the individual’s personal identity. Tensions grow between shared contextual and fundamental interests and diverse ethical and political pluralisms. These conflicts are perceived individually, managed

at the social level and have an impact on the consciousness of the individuals involved in the learning process.

What concept of tolerance is best able to cope with today's conflicts? On its own, the permission majorities once granted certain minorities to maintain their separate cultures may have been adequate for the conflicts of the pre-modern period. Authoritarian systems were dominated by hierarchical power relations that were sufficient to reproduce themselves. Modernity demanded mutual respect, which the members of a society have a reciprocal duty to show each other. Under democracy, the law-bound nation state has a legitimate monopoly on the use of force. The second modernity, in which we are now living, is able to compensate for the processes of decentring and the erosion of power. Action by civil society is becoming more urgent if we are to keep the limits on the use of force in place. A new division of labour is emerging between the state and the citizen. The modular components of which society is constructed are becoming more reflexive. With the second modernity, the cognitive and emotional capabilities of society's citizens are growing. They are its producers and, at the same time, its product. Simultaneously, the societies of the second modernity are clearly characterised by increasing levels of internal complexity. More and more, they are attracting people from all over the world who migrate to them, increase their prosperity and enrich their cultures.

Tolerance can only survive in the long term if it also takes account of these changes. The second modernity relies on the mutual esteem of people who do not see a dialogue between culturally diverse ways of life as a threat to their own identities. Each individual belongs to various groups at the same time. Many paths lead to the sites where identity is constructed. The core of freedom is the individual human being deciding for themselves which different priorities to select as they search for the building blocks of their own identity.

People's search for a self-determined identity is likely to be all the more successful the wider the range of the opportunities open to them to integrate into a particular society. Discussing this question, Amartya Sen writes in the UNDP Human Development Report 2004: "The inclusiveness of a society will depend greatly on bringing clarity to the role of choice in identity and to the need to [place] 'reason before identity'."

All citizens in a democratic society must be able to take part in debates about its condition and its future. This right must also be guaranteed to those who have migrated to that society. This is essential because citizenship rights cannot be linked to ethnic criteria. It is necessary to secure inclusiveness in order to create structures of power that give everyone the

opportunity to assert their rights. This will create a climate that opens up social discourse, making it possible for different models of the future to be recognised as having their own value. If it does not prove possible to open up a society, if it even demands of minorities that they simply accept conditions as unchangeable, that society will become repressive.

Repressive tolerance calls on minorities to tolerate injustice. This makes democracy hard, inflexible and therefore more fragile.

Democratic states in the second modernity can cope better with their growing internal conflicts because their citizens possess a greater wealth of personal competences, which they have acquired in open learning processes. These competences develop when people are willing to engage with the multiplicity of cultural liberties. However, integration does not mean these different models of the future just standing together without connecting. They must learn to comprehend one another. Each should learn to appreciate the values the others represent.

Might not, as John Locke feared, a tolerance that goes too far destroy the normative principles of society, especially if “unbelievers” were to call them into question? John Rawls has given the following answer to this apparently irreconcilable conflict: “The political conceptions are seen as both liberal and self-standing and not as comprehensive, whereas the religious doctrines may be comprehensive but not liberal.” Fundamentalism in any form, whether religious or political, is intolerant and cannot demand to be treated with tolerance.

In his study “Terror in the Mind of God”, Mark Juergensmeyer investigated the tendencies towards violence that are present in all the great religions. His conclusion is that it is not religion “in itself”, but contexts in which religion plays a major role that can lead to the taboo on killing other human beings, which is proclaimed by all religions, being partially suspended, provoking and producing violence. The fragmentary, selective interpretation of religious doctrines can suggest a one-sided view of the world characterised by a struggle between Good and Evil that is conceived in quasi-cosmic terms. Events that are part of an eternal scheme evade human categories and are impossible to respond to reasonably. This is why the great advances made by the Enlightenment have been so invaluable to humanity. Since that time, it has been possible for politics to be separated from religious promises of salvation. Nevertheless:

A democratic society needs normative principles. However, these should not consist exclusively of the values of just one group. If this were the case, society could not be either

just or inclusive. In the second modernity, political integration requires agreement that society is based on a set of moral convictions, provided that these moral convictions can be shared. If not, the results will be exclusion and disintegration.

As long as it remains committed to liberty and embedded in the idea of justice, tolerance will keep watch to ensure that no truth, and no religion, forces people to submit to systems that are not prepared to justify themselves in a reciprocal fashion.

Tolerance can be acquired through learning. The likelihood of a person acting tolerantly in a conflict with another person or group depends on their skills and experience of how it is possible to resolve conflicts peacefully and democratically. This in turn demands the greatest possible cooperation between all parties to the conflict. A complex mix of personal competences is required: the ability to listen actively, analytical skills and creativity.

One key factor is an understanding of the need to accept that other constructions of reality are equally plausible. People who have learned to reconcile differences and move on to solutions from which all benefit are more likely to act constructively by deploying their skills in a conflict than people who feel overwhelmed by situations of this kind and tend to use force when they encounter them.

This is why an education in tolerance should consist of two essential phases:

- + It is necessary to create awareness so that difference is acknowledged and the fundamental right of each individual to the construction of their own difference recognised.
- + Conflict resolution has to be learned and the relevant skills acquired by examining solutions from which all concerned benefit.

During their training, teachers should study how conflicts can be managed so that the conflict resolution strategies they pass on to their pupils will promote socially productive action.

Learners will perceive themselves as more tolerant if they acquire and consolidate the following competences during the learning process:

- + Dialogue and communication skills
- + The capacity to adopt different perspectives
- + The capacity to use opportunities for constructive, democratic conflict resolution

Tolerance is always shown toward a concrete party to a conflict in a concrete context. The skills demanded by tolerance can therefore only be acquired on the basis of a comprehensive understanding of one's own identity. Confidence and a strong sense of self make a person tolerant. Anyone who can judge their own worth accurately will also be able to respond self-reflexively to their own emotions. Identity, as the product of our ability to define ourselves,

involves comparing ourselves with others. This, in turn, is closely associated with the capacity for open-minded social behaviour.

Education in tolerance will be a key that unlocks the door to an enlarged conception of democracy in future. Either society succeeds in living with the increasing differences between people in such way that they become able to manage their conflicts democratically and non-violently, or the prospects for humanity will be gloomy indeed.

Where do we go from here?

I hope that we will adopt an action plan against anti-Semitism in Cordoba – or Qurtuba, as it was known at the time of the Caliphate. Cordoba: the city of the great Jewish thinker Maimonides. He was forced to leave his homeland when Christian fundamentalism began to drive Islam out of Spain, and with it the Jewish community. Highly esteemed along the coasts of the Mediterranean, both in Europe and in the Arab world, Maimonides found exile at Al Fustat, modern Cairo.

What could we do in Cordoba to send out a signal in the battle against anti-Semitism and fight for tolerance?

One idea could be for the OSCE to set up a competition to find outstanding projects in which young people are working courageously to help those who are under threat of persecution. Any group from one of the OSCE countries could enter this competition, and the projects would be documented on film, something that could be done by film schools. The films would then be judged by a jury, with well known filmmakers choosing the prize-winners. They could include Steven Spielberg from the west of the OSCE area, Ingmar Bergman from the north, Elim Klimov from the east, Andrzej Wajda from the centre and Roberto Benigni from the south. Arte, the French-German television arts channel, would then broadcast the films about the winners.

This competition would help spur young people to stand up bravely and be counted when their fellow human beings find themselves in danger. We need signals of this kind. If we are to make the world a better place for all of us to live in.