

**PROMOTING TOLERANCE AND UNDERSTANDING  
IN THE OSCE REGION: THE ROLE OF THE  
PERSONAL REPRESENTATIVES**

---

---

**HEARING**

BEFORE THE

**COMMISSION ON SECURITY AND  
COOPERATION IN EUROPE**

ONE HUNDRED ELEVENTH CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

OCTOBER 14, 2009

Printed for the use of the  
Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe

[CSCE 111-1-9]



Available via <http://www.csce.gov>

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

WASHINGTON : 2012

76-080 PDF

---

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office  
Internet: [bookstore.gpo.gov](http://bookstore.gpo.gov) Phone: toll free (866) 512-1800; DC area (202) 512-1800  
Fax: (202) 512-2250 Mail: Stop SSOP, Washington, DC 20402-0001

COMMISSION ON SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH COMMISSIONERS

HOUSE

ALCEE L. HASTINGS, Florida,  
*Co-Chairman*  
EDWARD J. MARKEY, Massachusetts  
LOUISE McINTOSH SLAUGHTER,  
New York  
MIKE McINTYRE, North Carolina  
G.K. BUTTERFIELD, North Carolina  
CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH, New Jersey  
ROBERT B. ADERHOLT, Alabama  
JOSEPH R. PITTS, Pennsylvania  
DARRELL E. ISSA, California

SENATE

BENJAMIN L. CARDIN, Maryland,  
*Chairman*  
CHRISTOPHER J. DODD, Connecticut  
SHELDON WHITEHOUSE, Rhode Island  
TOM UDALL, New Mexico  
JEANNE SHAHEEN, New Hampshire  
SAM BROWNBACK, Kansas  
SAXBY CHAMBLISS, Georgia  
RICHARD BURR, North Carolina  
ROBERT F. WICKER, Mississippi

EXECUTIVE BRANCH COMMISSIONERS

Michael H. Posner, Department of State  
Michael C. Camuñez, Department of Commerce  
Alexander Vershbow, Department of Defense

**PROMOTING TOLERANCE AND UNDER-  
STANDING IN THE OSCE REGION: THE ROLE  
OF THE PERSONAL REPRESENTATIVES**

**OCTOBER 14, 2009**

**COMMISSIONERS**

	Page
Hon. Benjamin L. Cardin, Chairman, Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe .....	1
Hon. Alcee L. Hastings, Co-Chairman, Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe .....	3
Hon. Christopher H. Smith, Ranking Member, Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe .....	3

**MEMBERS**

Hon. George V. Voinovich, U.S. Senator from the State of Ohio .....	4
Hon. Gwen Moore (D-4) a Member of Congress from the State of Wisconsin .....	27

**WITNESSES**

Andrew Baker, Personal Representative on Combating Anti-Semitism, [USA] .....	5
Adil Akhmetov, Personal Representative on Combating Intolerance and Discrimination Against Muslims, [Kazakhstan] .....	8
Mario Mauro, Personal Representative on Combating Racism, Xenophobia and Discrimination, [Italy] .....	11
Floriane Hohenberg, Head of Tolerance and Non-Discrimination Department, Office of Democratic Institutions and Human Rights .....	15

**APPENDICES**

Prepared statement of Hon. Benjamin L. Cardin .....	30
Prepared statement of Hon. Alcee L. Hastings .....	32
Prepared statement of Hon. Christopher H. Smith .....	34
Prepared statement of Andrew Baker .....	36
Prepared statement of Adil Akhmetov .....	43



# **PROMOTING TOLERANCE AND UNDERSTANDING IN THE OSCE REGION: THE ROLE OF THE PERSONAL REPRESENTATIVES**

**October 14, 2009**

COMMISSION ON SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE  
WASHINGTON, DC

The hearing was held at 10 a.m. in room 208/209 Capitol Visitor Center, Washington, DC, Hon. Benjamin L. Cardin, Chairman, Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe, presiding.

*Commissioners present:* Hon. Benjamin L. Cardin, Co-Chairman, Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe; Hon. Alcee L. Hastings, Chairman, Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe; and Hon. Christopher H. Smith, Ranking Member, Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe.

*Members present:* Hon. George V. Voinovich, U.S. Senator from the State of Ohio and Hon. Gwen Moore (D-4) a Member of Congress from the State of Wisconsin.

*Witnesses present:* Andrew Baker, Personal Representative on Combating Anti-Semitism, [USA]; Adil Akhmetov, Personal Representative on Combating Intolerance and Discrimination Against Muslims, [Kazakhstan]; Mario Mauro, Personal Representative on Combating Racism, Xenophobia and Discrimination, [Italy]; and Floriane Hohenberg, Head of Tolerance and Non-Discrimination Department, Office of Democratic Institutions and Human Rights.

## **HON. BENJAMIN L. CARDIN, CHAIRMAN, COMMISSION ON SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE**

Mr. CARDIN. Good morning, everyone, and let me thank particularly our guests, the three personal representatives of the OSCE Chair-in-Office for being with us today. This is an extremely important opportunity for the Helsinki Commission in promoting tolerance and understanding throughout the OSCE region.

Let me start off by saying how proud I am of the role that the United States Helsinki Commission has played in furthering tolerance within the OSCE region. It was our Commission that pressed very hard for the OSCE participating States to face the issue of the rise of anti-Semitism. We promoted resolutions; we organized special presentations at the OSCE Parliamentary Assembly meetings.

I particularly want to acknowledge my three colleagues that are here; each played a critical role in advancing the issues in the Parliamentary Assembly which led to action within the OSCE framework in Vienna and at the OSCE Ministerial Meetings.

My Co-Chair, Congressman Hastings, was very instrumentally involved in getting other delegations to join the U.S. delegation in those efforts during the early days. Congressman Smith was one of the leaders in promoting resolutions and discussions with our colleagues, and Senator Voinovich has been a true champion on this issue, raising this at every opportunity to advance an effective strategy to deal with the rise of anti-Semitism.

We are very pleased—as a result of this action, there were special conferences and we were able to reach consensus on declarations. I particularly was proud to be part of the U.S. delegation in Berlin when the Berlin Declaration was entered into. We can point to many parts of the consensus that was obtained in Berlin. It was a remarkable achievement to get all 56 participating States to agree on a common declaration to fight anti-Semitism.

One clause I was particularly pleased was included was one in which the participating States unambiguously declared that international developments and political issues, including those in Israel and elsewhere in the Middle East never justify any Semitism.

From our beginnings, we were able to expand the strategies against all forms of intolerance—having followup meetings, developing reporting requirements so that we could get information—I particularly would acknowledge the work that the OSCE's Office of Democratic Institutions and Human Rights did in those days in helping us get the information necessary—and then promoting best practices among the different states, including offering technical assistance.

We were extremely pleased with the creation of the three personal representatives of the Chair-in-Office. So we welcome the three of you together. Having you here at one meeting with us is a special opportunity for the U.S. Helsinki Commission. We want you to know how important we believe your work is. We believe it is critically important. But particularly in these times, when international events, including the worst economic downturn since the end of World War II puts additional pressure and importance on the work that you do. We want you to know that we will be supportive of your actions; we want to hear your strategies; we want to know how we can do more.

Just on a personal note, yesterday—or I guess it was the day before yesterday—the Commission had a delegation participating in the fall meeting of the OSCE PA, held in Greece. And some of us had a chance to visit a Roma camp on the outskirts of Athens. If you ever need more reminders of how important the work you do for people whose voices otherwise would not be heard, I think that visit just underscored the importance of the work being done by OSCE to fight intolerance.

Before introducing the three special representatives let me turn to my colleagues: First, the Co-Chair of the U.S. Helsinki Commission and the former President of the OSCE Parliamentary Assembly, Congressman Hastings.

**HON. ALCEE L. HASTINGS, CO-CHAIRMAN, COMMISSION ON  
SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE**

Mr. HASTINGS. Thank you very much, Chairman Cardin. I am deeply appreciative of your remarks and echo them. And in the interest of time, since we have four presenters, I will ask that my full statement be included in the record, and I look forward to hearing from the personal representatives on their contributions to this effort. As you indicate, this is a particularly unique hearing in that we have all three of the personal representatives on tolerance here, and that doesn't happen all the time.

I'd underscore the remarks that you made by pointing to the fact that the Helsinki Commission has provided, and continues to provide on the issues before us this morning, an outstanding amount of work under your leadership. In all we have convened now nearly a dozen hearings on various aspects of intolerance in the OSCE region. But I will leave at that and ask that my full statement be made a part of the record.

Mr. CARDIN. Without objection. All the statements will be included in our record today. Congressman Chris Smith, the Ranking Republican.

**HON. CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH, RANKING MEMBER,  
COMMISSION ON SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE**

Mr. SMITH. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I do want to thank you for convening this extremely important hearing and to have four such distinguished witnesses here today to give us their insights.

Mr. Chairman, it was the spring of 2002 that this Commission held a hearing—began a series of hearings, in fact—on the escalating anti-Semitic violence in Europe, which put the fight against anti-Semitism on the OSCE's agenda. I too look at my three colleagues and myself—we were the ones who took this issue up and pushed it and tried to ensure first at the Parliamentary Assembly and then at the OSCE itself that this became a core agenda issue—combating anti-Semitism—which then led to the other emphasis as well on the persecution of Christians as well as Muslims.

And I do believe that we, our Commission has played a very important role in ensuring that the focus and the scrutiny not diminish in any way and that we do everything humanly possible to combat every form of this pernicious hate.

I do ask that my full statement be made a part of the record; I would just note that it is disturbing that many of the participating States have yet to provide the kind of documentation to ODIHR that they have promised over and over again. And it's all about implementation. We know what we have to do; we just need to do it.

We know with the Muslims that probably one of the worst manifestations of anti-Muslim hate was experienced in Srebrenica; we all remember the hatred toward Muslims that was expressed there; the genocide that occurred when 8,000 men were summarily executed in the course of just a couple of days just because they were Muslim. Those kinds of things need to be "never again." And we need to do all we can to build up the institutions in each participating State so that we can hopefully not just mitigate but prevent

these kinds of activities before they even begin. So I thank you again for this hearing.

Mr. CARDIN. Thank you, Congressman Smith. Senator Voinovich?

**HON. GEORGE V. VOINOVICH, U.S. SENATOR FROM THE STATE OF OHIO**

Mr. VOINOVICH. Thank you. First of all, I'd like to thank my colleagues for inviting me here for this hearing, and I'd like to thank the personal representatives for coming here and Ms. Hohenberg for being here today.

I think we've made great progress in recent years in our fight to promote tolerance and nondiscrimination through the OSEC region. As has already been said, the Berlin Declaration passed and we were able to get tolerance and nondiscrimination in the core budget of ODIHR. But I believe that if we're going to be really successful, we must dot the i's and cross the t's as we aim to achieve a more tolerant world. This means having the OSCE/ODIHR making more extra-budgetary funding requests for tolerance and nondiscrimination projects, and having OSCE member states answer that call.

I believe this begins with the three of you that are sitting down here and your counterparts in ODIHR leadership in laying out a strategic plan of goals and objectives. For example, do you feel that ODIHR Director Janez Lenarčič and tolerance and nondiscrimination head Ms. Hohenberg are being responsive to your respective needs and concerns as personal representatives of the OSCE Chairman-in-Office? Does each of you personally have the resources, the funds, to carry out your respective responsibilities?

What is your candid assessment of the resources needed by the OSCE and ODIHR in order to complete your respective goals in promoting tolerance of Jews, Muslims and Christians throughout the OSCE region? Are the OSCE and ODIHR staff members that you work with in Warsaw sufficient to get their work done? What is your assessment of the personnel resources available at ODIHR?

I understand from my staff that the only way OSCE member states can provide additional assistance to ODIHR activities is when such funds are formally requested through an electronic extra-budgetary OSCE project request. Is this process effective? Is the OSCE bureaucracy requesting funds for projects you deem to be of high priority needs: for example, for police, for training for prosecutors, for judges? And most important I think is education, education, education. Do the countries you're working with have the money so that they can get information out in their respective countries about educating people in terms of those issues that you're concerned with?

From conversations with my good friend Rabbi Baker, I understand that there continues to be need for financial investment as well as good data going into OSCE's online tolerance information system data base, TANDIS, that records incidents of intolerance in the OSCE region. How could we diplomatically ensure that OSCE states fulfill their commitment regarding data collection, and putting it into the electronic system? And what level of continued financial requirement is required to ensure the success and efficacy of this electronic data base?

Basically, what I'm hopeful for is that in the next several months of really laying out what needs to be done and the resources you need to have to be effective in getting your job done. Once we've identified that, then we can go from there to figure out how we can try to respond to your needs. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CARDIN. Thank you, Senator Voinovich. Let me introduce the three special representatives: First, Rabbi Andrew Baker, who serves as the Personal Representative on Combating Anti-Semitism. Rabbi Baker is Director of International Jewish Affairs at the American Jewish Committee. Since his appointment by the Greek Chair-in-Office earlier this year, he has made country visits to Latvia, Bosnia, Herzegovina, and Spain.

Ambassador Adil Akhmetov serves as the Personal Representative on Combating Intolerance and Discrimination against Muslims. He was appointed in June. The Ambassador is Secretary of the Committee on International Relations, Defense and Security and a member of the Senate of Kazakhstan.

Mario Mauro serves as Personal Representative on Combating Racism, Xenophobia and Discrimination, also focusing on Intolerance and Discrimination against Christians and members of other Religions. A member of the European Parliament, he is a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee and is a member of the Delegation for Relations with the United States. He previously served as one of the European Parliament's Vice Presidents.

And last, I want to note the presence Floriane Hohenberg, Head of the Tolerance and Nondiscrimination Department of ODIHR, who is accompanying the personal representative on their trip to the United States and Canada. We welcome Ms. Hohenberg as a resource during this hearing. Thank you very much for being here.

We'll start with Rabbi Baker.

**ANDREW BAKER, PERSONAL REPRESENTATIVE ON  
COMBATING ANTI-SEMITISM, [USA]**

Rabbi BAKER. Sen. Cardin, thank you very much. It's a great honor to be here but also a pleasure to be here before you, before Congressman Hastings, Senator Voinovich, Congressman Smith.

I don't know if I'm blessed or cursed with the memory of knowing how these processes began, in going back some years now, but I do know how most of these efforts—the existence of this department at ODIHR, the presence here of these personal representatives—almost all of these efforts in combating intolerance started here; started with the Helsinki Commission and efforts from Members of Congress to push the bureaucracy, and it wasn't easy. So when we look back, I think there's much we can take some pride in and, again, expressing thanks to you.

I also want to thank, of course, the Greek chairmanship because they've afforded me this opportunity, and have really given me the freedom and the flexibility to take up this issue. As you've indicated, I have already issued three formal country visit reports, but since then I've also paid visits to Romania and to Slovakia and have schedule one more visit to Hungary in November. So this is all part of this process.

Let me, in light of that, just present a few of the main concerns in combating anti-Semitism that have become apparent to me this

year from those visits, from discussions as well with Jewish community leaders. And I'll present here somewhat of an abridged version of my written testimony.

An essential element of the problem in many countries is the presence of anti-Semitism in public discourse. It is offensive, pernicious in its own right, but it can also contribute to a climate which poses a security threat to Jews and to Jewish institutions. A capacity to counter this anti-Semitism is frequently lacking.

In my testimony, I review what you have in various countries, but those experiences show that successful prosecution, conviction of these laws tends to be quite limited. Many European countries do have laws which restrict or punish hate speech. They are intended to address incitement against religious or racial hatred as it may appear in public speeches, in newspapers, in other media, on the Internet. It includes, of course, fomenting anti-Semitism and, in some cases, also Holocaust denial. Rarely is the problem the legislation itself, but rather it is the infrequent and often unsuccessful record of employing it.

Putting it simply, many hate speech laws have the unintended consequences of letting political leaders off the hook. In the United States and in other countries with strong free speech protections, manifestations of racism, of anti-Semitism, of other extremist views in public discourse are generally addressed—and frankly, in many cases, can only be addressed—by strong and swift rebukes from political and civic leaders. In this way, such hateful speech can be marginalized, isolated.

But in countries with legislative remedies, some political leaders will refer to the legal process as a reason or an excuse not to speak out. As we see in practice, these legal decisions often take months. In Spain, you had two cases; each took more than 7 years before they were actually adjudicated in a complete path.

And in the meantime, there is no clear message being delivered that such hateful speech is unacceptable. Consider, too, that among some mainstream political leaders, they fear the success of extremist movements. So one could say they see calculated benefits in remaining silent or leaving this somewhat ambiguous.

There are also special problems with countries with of a Communist or authoritarian past. Because all speech was once monitored and controlled, prosecutors and judges today may be reluctant to pursue these cases of hate speech even though laws exist on the books.

There needs to be, I think, some education here, at least within this framework; that it's possible to control or prosecute hate speech while still maintaining, in all other areas, a vigorous policy of protecting free speech.

In any case, in nearly all places, anti-Semitic speech is understood to be included within these larger categories. But virtually no penal code includes a specific or detailed description of anti-Semitism, which means it's not always recognized—certainly not always recognized by prosecutors or judges or even by official ombudsmen. I think we saw one example in the case recently in Sweden where this Commission spoke out and, yet, in the end, the official ombudsman determined this was not even fitting within their legal definition of what could be sanctioned.

A second area to focus on is a concern about monitoring, and I know it was already referenced by you. Frankly, monitoring anti-Semitic incidents in many countries is frequently lacking or it is incomplete. The newly released ODIHR study on hate crimes—I'm sure you'll hear a bit about from Floriane—reveals that many governments are still lax in monitoring and recording hate crimes or aggregating the results in a way that lets us understand who are the victims, who are the perpetrators?

But the problem is especially acute when the goal is to combat anti-Semitism. In countries where hate speech is not restricted, government authorities are unlikely even to monitor such incidents. And the poor record in many countries that do have such laws frequently deter citizens from coming forward and filing suit.

Physical attacks may be monitored, but this still ignores the anti-Semitism that appears in the press, in newspapers, on media, on the Internet, in public demonstrations. And, of course, in anonymous hate mail that Jewish leaders receive.

Frankly, when these incidents are not recorded or they're under-reported, it conveys the misimpression to political leaders that the problem itself is not so important. Now, as we've said, governments need to be encouraged to do a better job of monitoring and recognizing anti-Semitism, and we should do everything to urge them to do so and to live up to their commitments.

But frankly, in the interim, we can do more to assist local Jewish leadership, other NGOs in various OSCE countries or regions to develop their own monitoring standards. And if they do so in a standardized and internationally recognized way, then public authorities, as we've seen for example in France and the U.K., can accept their results. I had a meeting in Sofia. I already saw an eagerness on the part of Jewish leaders from six Balkan countries to come together for the purpose of organizing a central place to do monitoring.

Finally, another main point to raise goes to the very question of defining anti-Semitism. In 2004, when the European Monitoring Center conducted its first study of anti-Semitism, it recognized that over half the countries—half of its monitors in the E.U. countries had no definition of anti-Semitism and of the remainder, there was no definition in common. So out of that grew a formal working definition adopted in 2005 of anti-Semitism.

It's a definition—I've appended it to my testimony that explains what it is, explains by example how it manifests itself today. It also identifies those aspects of anti-Semitism that relate to the demonizing of the state of Israel or anti-Semitism in which Jews are held responsible for actions of the state of Israel.

It is now the official working definition of the successful organization the European Union Fundamental Rights Agency. And it's been adopted in various places by the U.S. Special Envoy [to Monitor and Combat Anti-Semitism], at the State Department, by parliamentary groups in the U.K. and in Germany and certainly by ODIHR and all of its documents and its training of law enforcement.

It's something that I've had the opportunity in my own meetings with officials to share and I have to say for the most part, they are very responsive to having this. I think we should not underesti-

mate the fact that you do have officials in various places who don't know what anti-Semitism is or all of its manifestations today.

If I can generalize from at least these five country visits, the tenor of those visits, I would say that thus far, the discussions were much more collaborative and pragmatic than confrontational in nature. I think in all cases, there was an acknowledgement of the problem and even if—if governments felt they were dealing with it, a recognition that the problem could get worse and that they were eager to make available, have made available to them additional resources.

We have seen the academic materials, the educational materials that ODIHR has developed in terms of combating anti-Semitism. They've already been developed, I think for 10 countries and three more are in the process. At some of my visits where this is not in operation, there was an eagerness to accept, to put to use, develop these materials for themselves in these countries.

Of course, they need some resources to develop them but you have, already, a willingness to take advantage of them and education ministries that are willing to implement them as part of school curriculum. Also, an interest in ODIHR police training work. My most recent visit in Romania, the state secretary of the interior, a career policeman who headed up the police department in Bucharest in an earlier job felt, yes, they had a fairly good hold on these problems.

But they could use help and he is eager for Romania to become part of this training program. Again, what we've also—what I've also discovered—it has to go beyond just police. Prosecutors, judges also need to have a familiarity with the nature of hate crimes. I think this is something that ODIHR is prepared to do. We can learn more from Floriane, from Ambassador Lenarčič. But again, it's going to require resources.

And I think if we don't take it beyond police training to prosecutors and judges, then it simply stops. Finally, I would say I think that the efforts—and I may be specifically focused on the problem of anti-Semitism, but I think the efforts, more generally, of the mandates of the three of us are mutually reinforcing. And clearly, in many cases, the solutions or the programs that are needed to address the problem are similar across the board.

So even though the phenomenon of anti-Semitism is frequently unlike other forms of intolerance where you can have strong anti-Semitism in a society with virtually no Jews, for example, nevertheless the—the techniques to be employed to get at that problem often can be helpful across the board. Thank you very much.

Mr. CARDIN. Thank you, Rabbi Baker. Ambassador Akhmetov?

**ADIL AKHMETOV, PERSONAL REPRESENTATIVE ON COMBATING INTOLERANCE AND DISCRIMINATION AGAINST MUSLIMS, [KAZAKHSTAN]**

Amb. AKHMETOV. Mr. Chairman, Mr. Co-Chairman, distinguished members of the Helsinki Commission, ladies and gentlemen, it's an honor and a great pleasure to address you here today. As I see the focus of my mandate is raising awareness on intolerance and the discrimination against Muslims in addition to what I have submitted in written form earlier for the hearing record.

I would like to draw your attention to the following. In spite of the—in spite of tangible progress achieved in countering intolerance the discrimination against Muslims, many participating States of the OSCE still experience mounting waves of anti-Muslim bias and hostility, even 8 years after 9/11. In this regard, I will focus on two issues that are the call of the OSCE's mandate, hate crimes against Muslims and the context in which they take place.

As ODIHR's annual report on hate crimes in the OSCE region reveals, there is little reliable official or unofficial statistical information on hate crimes motivated by anti-Muslim bias. Although 15 participating States informed ODIHR that they collect data on anti-Muslim hate crimes, only Austria and Sweden submitted figures on such crimes in 2008.

In the absence of information, how can democracies respond to the needs of their people and ensure that safety and the freedom of movement are guaranteed for all citizens? ODIHR's report shows clearly that many states throughout the region do not implement commitments they have made in relation with data collection.

Now, let us try to answer the following question. Why are crimes against Muslims underreported and under-recorded? The first reason is that many states do not disaggregate data and specifically, do not record this specific type of crime. Recommendations from numerous OSCE meetings, for example, the Supplementary Human Dimension Meeting on Effective Implementation of Hate-Crime Legislation stress the need for states to disaggregate data.

But in fact, the implementation of this legislation has failed. The second reason is that victims of hate crimes do not report to the police because they are afraid of being victimized by the law enforcement and sometimes because they fear that their status may be disclosed. According to a recent survey of the Fundamental Rights Agency, 11 percent of the respondents of the survey had been victim of racially motivated in-person crime, assault, threat, or serious harassment at least once in the previous 12 months.

But between 53 percent and 98 percent of them, depending on their country of residence, did not report it to the police. This indicates that there is a need for increasing the capacity of law enforcement officers in dealing with hate crimes against Muslims. I would like to also encourage participating States to benefit from ODIHR's law enforcement officers training program on hate crimes as much as possible.

A third reason could also be that there are not enough civil society organizations that are equipped to support communities. Although states bear the primary responsibility of addressing hate crimes, civil society organizations have an important role in play rooted in communities. They have privileged access to victims and therefore can assist victims by reporting to the authorities and by providing medical or psychological care after attacks.

NGOs from only 10 participating States provided ODIHR with information on anti-Muslim hate crimes in their countries, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Spain, Switzerland, Ukraine, United Kingdom, and the United States. I would like now to draw your attention to an aspect of the problem that is even more complex to grasp.

I have witnessed that some media and some political parties use anti-Muslim rhetoric with a view to sell more news, to gain more attention or to attract more votes. In my opinion, this is a very short-sighted strategy. No individual, no group and no society can ever profit from increased intolerance within society. This year, I have witnessed campaigns against establishing Islamic schools and building mosques or minarets.

Sadly enough, the words I have heard and I have read remind me of those that were employed against Jews in the 1930s or in 1940s. No need to stress that in this framework, Islam is often represented as a political ideology which is incompatible with the principles of democracy and human rights.

I would like to draw your attention to the next point. How can ODIHR, OSCE provide assistance as intolerance the discrimination against Muslims have devastating effects, not only on the daily lives of the Muslim communities but also leads to tensions in the society and the international relations to remedy this negative and disturbing phenomenon?

I encourage the participating States to benefit from the experience and assistance of ODIHR in developing educational tools to counter specific forms of intolerance, country-specific resources—resource books on Muslims in the OSCE regions and the guidelines for educators should be widely used and disseminated.

Ladies and gentlemen, I would like to draw your attention to the following. Yesterday, I had a number of meetings with U.S. and European community. They mentioned that hate crimes against Muslims continue to be significant national concern even after the election of President Obama. The latest FBI report, 2007, on hate crimes showed that number of crimes against Arab-Americans, Muslims, and Sikhs has increased four times since 2000.

Many Muslims have been murdered, calmly shot in the head as if it was somebody's vendetta. In 2001, the White House signed terrorist financing laws, without consulting the Congress, to expand the Treasury Department's unilateral authority to freeze the assets of Muslim charity organizations and granted the department with virtually unchecked power to designate groups as terrorist organization.

The laws provide the government with the right to shut Muslim charity organizations down, often without allegations of criminal wrongdoing and criminal prosecution. The laws have disproportionately affected Muslim charities and violate rights for free and fully practice of their religion.

They have restricted Muslims from zakat donation, one of the core pillars of Islam. The American Muslims are restricted from providing material support for their religion and making charities. American Muslims complain that with these laws, the government affects the institution through which they practice their religion.

During yesterday's meetings, NGOs protecting Muslim rights also stressed that funding for their activity is not sufficient, not only to raise the question but also to address it at Federal and state levels. NGO-government relations are left for mechanisms to communicate and work jointly to find the best solution.

This is what I heard yesterday and they requested to convey this information to you and I am doing this. Thank you for your attention.

Mr. CARDIN. Well, thank you very much for your testimony. Mr. Mauro?

**MARIO MAURO, PERSONAL REPRESENTATIVE ON COMBATING RACISM, XENOPHOBIA AND DISCRIMINATION, [ITALY]**

Mr. MAURO. Thank you, Chairman. Let me thank you for the invitation to address such a distinguished audience. Today's hearing should be seen in the framework of the continuous leadership of the USA and in particular, of the U.S. Helsinki Commission on issues related to tolerance and nondiscrimination in the OSCE. In this regard, it seems to me symbolic that I am here together with Ambassador Akhmetov and Rabbi Baker for the joint country visit of the three OSCE personal representatives on tolerance issues.

As you are aware, my mandate is broad. It covers two areas: racism and xenophobia, including specific challenges faced by Roma and Sinti, and intolerance and discrimination against Christians and members of other religions. In the limited time available, I will mention both issues. I will highlight current trends, successes and positive aspects, as well as the challenges ahead.

Since my appointment as personal representative, we have witnessed an unprecedented collapse of the global economy which has affected all societies across the OSCE region. However, some groups have felt the impact of the economic collapse much harder than other. Due to their already vulnerable position, the effects of the economic crisis on migrants, refugees and minority groups within the OSCE region were especially harsh and have contributed to worsening their already unstable situation.

In a depressed economy, migrants or minority groups are seen by the majority as competitors for jobs and social services and thus as a threat to their livelihoods or standard of living. This results in labeling minority group members as a burden to society.

When such discourse is prevalent, it can lead to an increase in racist and xenophobic rhetoric. Such accusations can in return lead to increased racist sentiments and can worsen the social exclusion of migrants and minorities.

Additionally, the lack of leadership of mainstream political parties throughout the region in highlighting the positive contribution of migrants to national and local economies and to essential maintenance of their societies' infrastructures is also a matter of concern. Such attitude at best acts as a barrier to the full participation of migrants and minority groups in societies. It also gives implicit condolence to the acts of discrimination and hatred toward migrants and their families.

Accounts of such attitudes and incidents can be found in various reports including the ODIHR Annual Report on Hate Crimes in the OSCE Region. In this regard, I wish to stress that ODIHR's report reveals that even if hate crimes and incidents based on racism and xenophobia are widespread throughout the OSCE region, there is no comprehensive and reliable data on the phenomenon.

For example, only 15 participating States have to this day sent to ODIHR official information on hate crimes based on racism and

xenophobia during 2008. It is important to stress that the data gathered by the FBI will be available later this year. This shows that participating States are, in this regard, not living up to their commitments. And we all know that if states want to devise effective policies, they need comprehensive and reliable data.

The situation looks even worse with regards to Roma. Only one participating State, Sweden, has sent official data on hate crimes against Roma. At the same time, we know that the past years have seen a rise in manifestations of intolerance and violence against Roma in several OSCE participating States.

Reported incidents of violence, including those resulting in deaths, seem to be not isolated cases but signal a worrying trend. The violence against Roma and Sinti takes place in an environment of open anti-Roma hate speech, somehow tolerated or unabated by the mainstream. Such rhetoric garnishes public support, especially during electoral campaigns.

ODIHR's Status Report on the Implementation of the Action Plan on Improving the Situation on Roma and Sinti within the OSCE Area was issued last year. It elaborates on the progress made thus far, and on the remaining challenges confronting participating States as regards to fulfilling their commitments toward Roma and Sinti.

It also identified the negative trends in a number of areas, and an increasing gap between the Roma population and the majority, in fields such as education, housing and employment. The report also points to the challenges of discrimination, marginalization and segregation which still prevail for Roma and Sinti children when they enroll in local school systems.

Recognizing the importance of early education as an instrument for preventing social exclusion and marginalization, and for effecting a long-term improvement in the situation of Roma and Sinti, the Ministerial Council last year adopted a decision on enhancing OSCE Efforts to Implement the Action Plan on Improving the Situation of Roma and Sinti within the OSCE Area.

There are many problems inhibiting effective responses to racism and xenophobia. Amongst the most prominent ones are institutional barriers and challenges, which can sometimes impede positive policies and good intentions. Worse still, in some countries, it is the state policy that institutionalizes racism and discrimination.

In such cases, seemingly neutral policies or legislation have discriminatory effects on certain groups of population, who are often already marginalized or socially excluded. Situation of Roma and Sinti in many OSCE participating States provides an illustration of this worrying trend.

Another example of institutional racism is the policy of ethnic or racial profiling by law enforcement agencies. Examples of such practice have been well documented by nongovernmental as well as intergovernmental organizations in a large number of OSCE participating States and it is safe to say that no country has a clean record in this regard.

Despite a number of good practices and initiatives aimed at addressing the root causes and effects of racism and xenophobia implemented across the OSCE, there still remains a worrying gap between the politically binding human dimension commitments and

the actual implementation of these commitments across much of the OSCE region.

A strong and unequivocal stance against racism and xenophobia, including anti-Roma hatred and violence is urgently needed. States and relevant stakeholders must unite in their efforts and use all existing frameworks and resources to combat such phenomena and prevent further escalation of violence against those vulnerable groups of the population.

Since in December 2004, the Bulgarian OSCE Chairmanship appointed a Personal Representative on Combating Racism, Xenophobia and Discrimination, also focusing on Intolerance and Discrimination against Christians, a number of OSCE tolerance-related decisions and declarations were adopted, which included specific commitments and references to the fight against prejudice, intolerance and discrimination against Christians.

It is important to recall that these commitments are based on and reflect a dual approach defined by the participating States, defining and devising policies that guarantee the principle of equality and fight all forms of intolerance, addressing broad concepts like racism and intolerance in societies while at the same recognizing the specificities of different forms of intolerance such as intolerance against Christians and members of other religions.

I believe that more than any other, the mandate of the Personal Representative on Combating Racism, Xenophobia and Discrimination, also focusing on Intolerance and Discrimination against Christians and Members of Other Religions encapsulates this concept well, both in terms of opportunities and challenges deriving from it.

One example of the complexities and challenges faced is the increasing “racialization of religion”, which reflects the complex relationship between race and religion and their public perception. The concept suggests that a racial connotation can be extended to a religion, a religious group, or a belief system, although its adherents may include people of many races.

Regarding intolerance and discrimination against Christians, I am pleased to report that the first event entirely devoted to intolerance and discrimination against Christians was held in Vienna in 2009, in March, when ODIHR hosted a roundtable on this topic. The roundtable attracted more than 100 participants, including many representatives of religious communities, experts and researchers in the OSCE area.

This is a testimony to the fact that the OSCE offers a unique forum to address these issues, unique firstly, because of the specificity of the commitments and second, because of the OSCE’s inclusive geographical scope. The roundtable provided a platform to discuss and better understand the nature and scope of the problem, the study of which had been limited and is now considered by many to be in its conceptual and defining stages.

The roundtable concluded that intolerance against Christians is manifested in various forms throughout the OSCE region and called for improved collection of data on intolerance and discrimination against Christians. This is all the more evident when one looks at the data provided by this year’s Hate Crimes Report prepared by ODIHR. Only three participating States submitted infor-

mation and statistics to ODIHR on intolerance and discrimination against Christians.

Nonetheless, religious communities and civil society reported episodes of vandalism and violent acts directed at Christians and their properties, including places of worship and cemeteries. Desecration of places of worship seems to be a particularly common feature of intolerance and discrimination against Christians in many parts of the OSCE area, including Western Europe, the Balkans and Eastern Europe.

Episodes of intolerance and discrimination committed against members of other religions, such as the Sikh community, were also reported. In some parts of the OSCE area, Christian churches and members of other religions face very basic problems, such as the prohibition of acquiring legal status, praying freely and disseminating literature.

It is important to focus on this issue as intolerance and discrimination of religious communities is closely linked to their limitations of freedom of religion or belief. In this context, I would like to commend the United States for collecting comprehensive and disaggregated data on hate crimes against Christians and members of other religions. Thank you for your attention.

Mr. CARDIN. Well, let me thank all three of you for your testimony. There's some common themes here that all of you have mentioned that we can do a better job in collection of data and that we do—need to do a better job in monitoring the activities in our own community. Let me just make a note of the fact that in the United States, we do have good collection of data information. But there are gaps.

I introduced legislation this past week for collection of data on violence against the homeless. We just don't know the statistical information. We know it's on the rise and I think before you can develop a concrete strategy, you need to know the facts. And that's why collection of data becomes so important and it also helps us on the monitoring issues.

We've had a lot of activity over the last, I guess now, 5 or 6 years on commitments made to fight all forms of intolerance and to have action plans. It seems like we are still struggling on the collection of data, that we're not doing anywhere near a strong enough job in that regard.

Ms. Hohenberg, we have you here as a resource. I would like to get you involved in the discussion as to what suggestions you might have to strengthen the ability of states understanding their responsibilities on the accurate collection of information so that we can share information and best practices?

Maybe I'll start with Ms. Hohenberg just to give you a chance to perhaps—it's wonderful to have ODIHR here. We want to make sure that the support for the three personal representatives was uniform and significant and we know that ODIHR has filled that need under very tough budgets. So we thank you for your participation.

**FLORIANE HOHENBERG, HEAD OF TOLERANCE AND NON-DISCRIMINATION DEPARTMENT, OFFICE OF DEMOCRATIC INSTITUTIONS AND HUMAN RIGHTS**

Ms. HOHENBERG. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I really appreciate the opportunity to say a few words about the findings on our report on hate crimes and responses by states. And I think this will allow me to touch upon an essential matter, which is support and I'm thinking of political support—support from experts as well as financial resources.

As the three personal representatives have already mentioned, the information we have received for the Hate Crime Report is very—is very patchy. It is not comprehensive. It's mostly unreliable and cannot be compared. We have received 47 responses from participating States to a questionnaire we had sent last year, which is actually a good level of responses. It's rising.

However, only 42 participating States mentioned that they do collect data. And out of these 42, we have received statistics only from 15. And then when you look at the different forms of intolerance, you see that among these, there are huge disparities. I will just go through the numbers, the figures because I think they are quite striking.

Only 15 participating States report on racism and xenophobia; one on Roma and Sinti; eight on anti-Semitism; two on intolerance against Muslims; three on intolerance against Christians; zero on intolerance against members of other religions; three on LGBT groups; and two on persons living with disabilities.

In the years ahead, I think ODIHR, together with the participating States, will have a lot of work to do. Our mandate is to support states to live up to the commitments and these commitments are quite clear. I think OSCE has a very extensive and sound body of commitments in hate crime prevention and response.

We offer technical assistance in terms of training, in terms of data collection, in terms of improving legislation. In particular, when it comes to data collection, we would like to develop, for next year, guidelines for participating States and how to set up data collection systems. Since we have received, actually already, requests from particular participating States to help them establish such a sound monitoring system, we will continue carrying out training for police as well as to start carrying out training for prosecutors and judges.

We will also continue developing educational materials for teachers on fighting anti-Semitism as well as discrimination against Muslims because as we all know, hate crimes do not happen in a vacuum but do take place in a context.

So I think for us to be effective and to be able to carry out a mandate effectively, it will be important in the years ahead to have clear political support, I think, from participating States and to have numerous occasions, participating States reminding their peers that they have to live up to their commitments in terms of data collection and in general, in response and prevention of hate crimes.

The second aspect, I think, will be important for us is that we can still draw on the expertise of those who already have a lot experience in responding and preventing hate crimes. And the last

one, which I think is crucial, are the financial resources for ODIHR. I think my Director, Ambassador Lenarčič, has already—on many occasions—

Mr. CARDIN. We'd be disappointed if you didn't bring up the financial—

Ms. HOHENBERG. Yes—expressed appreciation—I start with the appreciation for the U.S. extraordinary contributions. I think in particular for the Tolerance and Nondiscrimination Department which, I think, would have never started this pioneering work in Europe and hate crimes without the financial support.

Unfortunately, we can deplore that the contributions have decreased progressively and have ceased completely in 2007. So we really hope that this financial support will resume in the year ahead and that we will be able to carry out the task that we have—actually have been given to us by participating States.

Mr. CARDIN. And we agree with that. Senator Voinovich has been one of our leaders on this issue on the appropriations process but we absolutely agree that the mandate of ODIHR has been expanded over the years and the reliability of the budget support has not been there. We need to do a much better job.

I just want to get some response as to what migration has—the number of—increase of migration has had on the concerns on discrimination. There's significant intolerance against immigrants in all of the member states. With tough economic times, those pressures can grow even stronger and we—some of you have mentioned that the minorities and communities, well, they've only grown as a result of migration.

So I just want to get your assessment as to how that has impacted your missions—for any one of you who might want to talk about the migration issue.

Mr. MAURO. Thank you, Chairman. Only a brief consideration in the sense that surely it's clear, for example, that religion is not the solution for the problems of—for the political problems. But at the same time, it is not correct, for example, for the political level to try to solve the problems fighting religions.

And this is one of the facts linked to the difficulties in the relationship between the immigrants and the different countries because it's clear in different countries that in great difficulties linked to the economic crisis. For example, a lot of parties search—tried to solve their problems attacking immigrants.

And for example, in some countries of Europe, this fact created the condition for a great tension that is new for these countries, it is absolutely not usual for the traditional and for the normal level of the political debate in these countries. It's new and it's very important to underline, to stress this fact because it's clearly potentially effect with the very important consequence for the future.

At the same time, when these position become the normal position of a new generation, it becomes also a problem of the system of the education and for example, this is very clear in a lot of European countries that are—that have not the attitude to have a lot of immigrants. If it's possible to make also a consideration about your introducing speech, it's very important when Mr. Voinovich said education, education, education.

It's absolutely the fact that we need in a very particular manner. But at the same time, we need for a better strategy—to favor the strategy of education. And I think that try to improve the extra-budgetary strategy talking about the efforts of ODIHR is a good intention but I am a politician and normally I know, that the only manner to improve extra-budgetary strategy is to create the condition for which it become a budget line and not extra-budgetary.

And this is, I think, one of the most important problem in the OSCE activity because we need to become a budget line of the activity and I think that the prestigious Commission—Helsinki Commission of the U.S. Congress is very important to obtain this result.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Mauro, before I turn over to my colleagues, I want to ask you one specific question. I hoped you would clarify a comment that was made at the Warsaw Human Dimensions Implementation Conference, which I believe all three of you were—I think you were participating about those who dress in clothes that could be perceived by the community—religious garments that could be perceived as being extremist, saying that perhaps it's understandable violence against individuals.

I would like you, if you could, to clarify that statement. Obviously, we're all concerned about protecting everyone's freedom and the practice of wearing religious garments is one that is protected under Helsinki principles.

Mr. MAURO. Yes, very briefly, as probably my colleague, Akhmetov, just clarified this point—for example, Islamic fundamentalism is an ideology, it is not the Islamic religion. Fundamentalism used the name of God for a project of power. If we try to combat this phenomenon, but we use a strategy aimed to combat the Islamic religion, surely we don't use the right strategy. Therefore, in this way we would make a big mistake which will cause big consequences, improving in our societies inopportune tensions.

I think that when we consider a religion dangerous for the pacific coexistence, we create the condition for new tensions. In this sense, it's very important to clarify, to give a right interpretation of the potentiality of religion and of the institutional and public role of religion.

Mr. CARDIN. But you do acknowledge that society needs to protect the safety of all of its citizens and that you cannot justify action against individuals because of the manner in which they are dressed, as part of their religion.

Mr. MAURO. Yes, in general, I think that we are obliged to guarantee the safety and the security in our society and we have to discover if beyond religious motivation, there is a project of power. This is true not only in case of religious problems or tensions. For example, we can consider the phenomenon of migration. I'm Italian and I have a lot of relatives in this country that were immigrants a long time ago.

They are free and they are happy because surely, USA institutions, long time ago, made a battle against the Italian mafia in order to safeguard their rights to be free citizens. I think that in Europe and in the OSCE region, we are obliged to do this kind of battle in order to give to all the men and women the possibility to

live their religion separated from the misuse of religion for a project of power.

Mr. CARDIN. I agree with your statement, but I just caution—I mean I think of Hasidic Jews and attacks on Hasidic Jews because they look different and they're practicing their religion. They have every right and they're protected under OSCE principles. I think of the Muslim population and the garments that they wear. They're protected under Helsinki. I just distinguish that from the manner in which they dress from the actions that radicals propose. I think it's a separate issue.

Mr. MAURO. I fully agree. I think that to try to find this equilibrium is exactly our job.

Mr. CARDIN. Congressman Hastings.

Mr. HASTINGS. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman and I thank our presenters. Regrettably, I have a hearing that has started that I have to go to, so I will uncustomarily not ask any questions and pass along all to Congressman Smith and Sen. Voinovich any opportunity. But I do not wish to fail to thank the representatives for the work that they do and to acknowledge that there seems to be rife in the OSCE, almost a denial of the fact that these issues of major consequence exist in a variety of countries in the OSCE region.

And it's particularly disturbing because it would appear to me that we are making progress but it's by comparison to the problem, the progress is too slow and I don't quite, at this point, know where we go with the impending issues such as the migration problems that all of us understand enhance racism and xenophobia and anti-Semitism and one feeds off of the other.

The economic downturn creates additional pressures on individuals and societies. And these things are not going to diminish overnight. And so the personal representatives have extraordinary work ahead of them and I would definitely hope that we can complement them as we have in the past by continuing to put a light on what is obviously an ongoing problem of major consequence. And I thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CARDIN. Thank you very much, Congressman Hastings. Congressman Smith?

Mr. SMITH. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Rabbi Baker, in your country report on Spain, you pointed out that there were three surveys that showed an alarming degree of anti-Semitism, including one by the Spanish Education Ministry that reported that 50 percent of adolescent students said that they did not want to, quote, "sit next to a Jew."

You also pointed out that the negative views are frequently amplified in the Spanish press. You say most manifestations of anti-Semitism are to be found in the press, but also that there's an intertwining of opposition to Israeli politics and anti-Semitism. That line of demarcation has been fudged.

We'll all recall because all of us, I think, were there, when Natan Sharansky made that very impassioned, very incisive speech at the Berlin Conference on anti-Semitism, when he talked about disagreements with Israel are legitimate, that within the Knesset obviously, there are very robust debates as there ought to be, as there is in the U.S. Congress. But that doesn't spill over into hatred. And

yet, those differences are often used as a pretext for hatred and you seem to have found it, to a great degree, in Spain.

So my question—and I have a number of questions and I'll lay them all out and then you know, our distinguished panelists can answer them, what can be done vis-a-vis Spain? The Spanish situation seems to have evaded much scrutiny over the years. You do point out that there are upwards of 40,000 Jews, relative to the 44 million population of Spain. You know, it's a small minority but sometimes, the smaller the minority, the more extreme the ability of others to persecute and discriminate.

I'd also like to ask the three reps, do the three of you dialogue? For example, in the Central Asian countries, there are significant numbers of instances of discrimination against Christians, especially particular denominations.

And I'm wondering if—do you talk to Mr. Mauro and vice versa, to you know, so that when you are talking to authorities in the Central Asian countries, and where there is a dominance of Muslim belief but there are also some pious Muslims who are discriminated against there, do you raise the issue and say you know, these states have an obligation to protect these minorities? So do you talk to each other?

Bosnia, it seems to me, would present a classic case where all three of the world's great religions could collaborate further. Mustafa Cerić was in town last week, the grand mufti of Bosnia-Herzegovina. And, you know, I believe he is an outstanding religious leader who has made it very clear that the entity voting is now leading to very, very bad consequences.

And, you know, it's a relic of Dayton; it needs to be reformed so that the parliament can function. And even in your statement, Rabbi Baker, you pointed out that Bosnia has yet to pass legislation restituting former communal and private property. Obviously draft legislation won't move until there is a real functioning parliament. So it seems to me that there is an opportunity to remedy a large number of these religious issues if you get a functioning parliament up and running in Bosnia.

And so I wonder if there is any talk of, you know, working together on Bosnia and making that a focus because there you have large numbers of Muslims, large number of Christians and a not insignificant number of Jewish people who live there. If you can touch on that it is perhaps a test case that you might want to raise.

And, finally, Mr. Mauro, if you could speak to the issue of discrimination and intolerance by both Western European elites, which I believe is bad and getting worse in terms of dismissiveness toward Christian beliefs and the socialist trends toward all people of all faiths, including Christians. We know that Chavez's Venezuela is not in the OSCE space but we know that he and other socialists have really declared war on religion, most recently with his decree about religious teaching in schools in Venezuela.

We know Spain has a disproportionate, perhaps positive impact on many countries of Latin America, and we wonder how much of that influence may be manifesting here in our own hemisphere—but this idea of the Western European elites and also the socialists with regard to religion who have very little tolerance for things religion.

Rabbi BAKER. Thank you for the opportunity to expand on this and respond, Representative Smith. Spain, as we found, is a country where the Jewish population is less than one one-hundredth of 1 percent, so if someone is interested in attacking a Jew in Spain, they probably have work to do to find one. But, at the same time, we also know that you don't need a Jewish population even to have anti-Semitism. I think that there were these sort of limited surveys that showed a rather strikingly high degree of negative views toward Jews.

And in discussions with the government officials, it was an opportunity really to, again—to me it is a puzzling question why. In most cases, the general assumption was, it is what comes through the media. Maybe not only, I mean you have a very traditional Catholic country from the days of Franco and elements there may contribute to an anti-Jewish sentiment—even its legacy of an inquisition centuries ago. But no question the way the media portrays, largely it portrays the Middle East conflict in a very negative way toward Israel and I heard from officials—again, they are really surmising this—that that has an impact on how Spanish citizens view Jews or how kids do in this one quick survey.

Some of the things that are taking place try to get at this issue: There is a very serious and comprehensive survey that an arm of the, the Foreign Ministry, Casa Sefarad Israel institution, is undertaking. So at least that ought to give a clearer picture, not only of attitudes but maybe a better understanding of why those attitudes exist.

Mr. SMITH. Point of clarification on the media: Is it the socialist media? Is it the general across the board or all media?

Rabbi BAKER. I think that people would say, it's across the board, that there is a general attitude in society that is often reflected in the media. I'm not an expert; presumably there may be more newspapers than others. I think we would also say that when you don't have context, you don't have reference, then there is a conflation between Israelis and Jews often. So even if it might not be viewed as necessarily a critical article, if the image is soldiers and I mean that is the only image that conveys something.

It was pointed out to me, during one of my conversations informally, it is not in the report, but with an official in the Justice Ministry who said in passing, you know, I've been invited to many conferences on Islamophobia; I've never been invited to a conference on anti-Semitism. And I think the sense of perhaps people not really knowing and understanding and appreciating this is an important thing that we can get at.

I was heartened by the fact that there was an openness in the human rights office in the Foreign Ministry to try to do something, recognizing, too, media plays a critical role; perhaps bringing together media, organizing a conference that would be perhaps a neutral umbrella that can bring them in; focusing on not only Jews, but other minorities in the media but a way again of getting at this. So perhaps, again some of it could be with the support of ODIHR, the representative of freedom of the media, independent sources; we could move there. But it is a troubling situation.

I met with teachers of the Holocaust. They're eager; they're enthused in doing this and at the same time, in January, this year,

which was the date in which it is commemorated, we heard stories, well, because of the war in Gaza we can't do it. We have principals telling us don't do it this year, or saying what you need to do is focus on the plight of Palestinians as though there's an equation. So this was a troubling thing.

I would comment, too, regarding Bosnia, because again it has a very small Jewish community. I think it feels comfortable, historically rooted, but you see in the society and echoes to I think taking up this issue, the discussions can be broader ranging than just the issue of anti-Semitism. You have now a kind of fixed ethnic division policy. You have a program, one of the most complicated things to understand is how education works in Bosnia and Herzegovina. There was not one education minister to meet with; there was I think 13. In all of the different regions, you have an institution; I think they refer to it as two schools under one roof.

It was a way, after the war, to try to bring things back to in a temporary stage to some normalcy. But what it meant it is, ethnic groups go to school in the morning: one group in the morning, one group in the afternoon. So they're growing up without any kind of direct interaction. It will only reinforce an ethnic division. As I say, Jews are so small they don't really fit in this picture. But I think it points to the difficulties that you've identified.

And then, finally, when you ask about our conversing together among the three of us and so on, I hope we will do more. I mean, we obviously suffer from the fact that I'm in Washington; Senator Akhmetov is in Astana; Mr. Mauro is in Milan or Brussels or Strasbourg. But, you know, to get us all together, I mean, in a way, this hearing not only provides an opportunity for us to speak to you but for us to speak to the three of us because at least we'll be together for a couple of days here and in Canada.

Amb. AKHMETOV. So regarding the discrimination of Christians in Central Asian countries, including Kazakhstan, I would say that Kazakhstan is historically located on the crossroads between Asia and Europe. And you know that it is a very multinational country: 130 nationalities and minorities live under the same roof, under one roof. And more than 40 confessions are there. And we acquired our independence in 1991 and since then, not a single clash has ever been registered.

Simply our constitution prohibits any kind of discrimination. And as you know, during the Soviet period, not only mosques and churches and synagogues—all of them were banned, but now, they're coming up. And Jewish synagogues are there; Orthodox churches are there; mosques are there. And there is no problem between these religions.

On the other hand, our president initiated Congress of World and the Traditional Religions and we have held three congresses already, beginning in 2001, and then in 2003 and then in 2009. The third one was very representative: 77 delegations came from all over the world. And by the way, Simon Peres, the president of Israel, participated. And he gave a speech, and I would say he was very positive about the interreligious, intercultural dialogue in Kazakhstan.

And historically, Kazakh people are tolerant, and once, we became minorities ourselves, because during the Soviet period,

after—during the Second World War, Stalin deported a lot of Caucasians to Kazakhstan—and not only Caucasians—the Koreans from the Far East. And during the development of virgin lands, a lot of Ukrainians came to Kazakhstan, a lot of Belarusians, Uzbeks and everybody is there. But tolerance is there—not a single clash, thank God. And we enjoy this peaceful coexistence. And everybody understands that the stability of Kazakhstan depends upon the stability of the interethnic and interreligious and intercivilizational dialogue.

And in my new capacity, I participated in the last Congress in Astana. Then I participated also in Krakow Congress in Poland and also, another Congress in Geneva, initiated by the custodian of two mosques—Saudi Arabian king's initiative. And wherever I was, I drew one truth: Leaders of religions should accent, should underline, their common values, not differences.

The same idea was stressed by President Obama when he gave his speech in Cairo. And it was a triumphant speech, I would say, and we were very impressed—not only Kazakhstani people, but people all over the world, and I think Americans, too. Because he gave the values that Muslim culture, Muslim civilization contributed to the world civilization. And his speech is a very good example.

And in this context, I would like to mention one thing. We have a sister city in the United States: Tucson, AZ. It is still our sister city with Almaty. And I represented Almaty in Tucson, AZ, for 3 years. And I know that America is a very multinational country. And every year, Tucson celebrates “Tucson, Know Yourself.” One day, they celebrate—they demonstrate, there, clothes, costumes; the second day there, cuisine; and the third day there, culture, songs, dances and everywhere. I even won a prize there with my wife.

And this understanding should be there. You see, if we accent on the common values, then of course—if we bring up our children on the basis of common values between religions, between cultures and between civilizations—and much depends upon education and on bringing up children from the cradle. There is a Kazakh saying: What you have tasted in your nest, you will hunt when you fly. The second meaning is, we should bring up our children properly, see?

On the other hand, I would like to cite the Quran—and President Obama also cited the Quran; not only the Quran, but other scripts. There is one I had: Islam is the religion of Prophet Abraham, it is the religion of Moses; it is the religion of other prophets until Mohammed; and Mohammed respected all his predecessors.

And why this understanding is missing? It is lack of knowledge. It is lack of education. If we bring up our children, if we bring up our citizens on these common values, a lot of things will be eliminated. And I'll give you one more example: While I was in Tucson, I was very surprised—every American knows who John Wayne was—prominent actor who played a lot of roles in cowboy films. And he left a will before his death. And he died of cancer; he smoked.

And I'm quite sure most of the Americans stopped smoking because his video was broadcast time and again and time and again. And today, one person created this kind of value. And that's why

common values should be broadcast widely and very often. We shouldn't think that if one article was published and everybody reads and everybody just comes to—he is guided to the right part—no. These kinds of values should be, time and again, repeatedly propagated on TV, in newspapers—common values.

And when common values are shared by everybody, I think a lot of problems—a lot of challenges are solved easily. It is because of misunderstanding. Those guys, for example, who target Muslims, I am quite sure they don't know anything about the content of the Bible, content of the Torah or other books, scripts. And the Quran says a Muslim who doesn't respect other—every script, every same books, he is not a Muslim, see?

These kinds of common values should be shared by everybody. And unfortunately, this is missing. And much depends on us, upon the rulers, upon the bureaucracy, upon the government, and we should pay much attention to this area, I think.

Mr. CARDIN. Well-said.

Mr. MAURO. Thank you, Ambassador Akhmetov for your very interesting question, but also for your very political question. It's clear that asking something—

Mr. CARDIN. I think you need to push your button one more time.

Mr. MAURO. I'm sorry. It's clear that asking something about the strategy of the socialists in Europe to a politician, all right, is [laughter] not so simple to answer. But I must win the temptation to answer as a politician, all right. I am here in another role. And it's important for me to clarify that surely, in Western Europe and union, there is a debate about, for example, the concept of liceity because it's clear that in European culture, religion and politics are absolutely separated.

But at the same time, it's possible to verify that there is a war of the politics against the religion. Why? For example, because now, there is in Western Europe a great debate about the future of our welfare—of our welfare state. And the Christian confessions, for examples—they have a very important role in the education and the health sector. For this reason, it may be possible that sometimes, there are some laws that created difficulties to the Christian confessions for their role in the education and the health sector.

It's important debating of that to create the condition to not be ideological because it's clear a debate in the interest of the new generation. And for this reason, I think that this level of the problem is over discrimination, surely not of persecution. I think that is very important to understand the difference, because we, in this moment, have the risk to create a greater emphasis talking about the debate about liceity in Western Europe.

Surely, it's a level of the debate not new for the European system because also in the past, we have had great shock between the political power and the churches. But exactly for this reason, there is now in European culture great equilibrium. And I think it's in our common interests to preserve this equilibrium.

Mr. CARDIN. Thank you very much. Senator Voinovich?

Mr. VOINOVICH. Thank you. I'm interested that you're all going to different places and you rarely have a chance to get together. And I would hope that you would spend some time together. You

each have a symbiotic relationship that if you're going to achieve your respective responsibilities, I think that by your working together, you can make it easier for each of you to be successful.

I'm really interested in you coming back to us with some kind of prioritization as to the things that you would—that make the most difference, and also how those would be funded. For example, one thing that I'm kind of disappointed to hear is, Rabbi Baker, you said that there is finally a definition of anti-Semitism that's agreed to.

Is there a definition of anti-Muslim? Is there a definition of anti-religion that people could agree to, so that when you say to a country, we want you to keep track of incidents dealing with this, that they know what it is that they're supposed to be looking for? And you have this TANDIS system, but the question is, if I'm supposed to keep track of something, what is it that I'm supposed to keep track of?

So you've got to have some definition, I think, across the board. Second of all, how do you go about monitoring that? And I'd be interested in hearing from Ms. Hohenberg—your ideas. How do you—once you have that information, how do you have a system in place where you can get the monitoring to take place? And that seems, to me, to be an issue that has to do with the political leadership.

That is, is this important enough—so behind this, I think that through the international organization—the OSCE—it should be emphasized that this is a very important issue and that we've seen that where we have not paid attention to this, bad things happen; they get out of control. And so you want to do everything you can to make sure that it doesn't occur. Second of all, I would like to know a list of the requests that you have made through the electronic, extra-budgetary OSCE project requests, and how many of them have been entertained.

Senator Cardin and others worked very hard to take and put the discrimination—tolerance and non-discrimination on the core budget. Now, why did we do that—we did that because the willingness to pay for this is an indication that it's a priority of the organization. And so I have—you know, in our Foreign Operations report, we have the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe mentioned in our appropriations.

The committee supports the role of the OSCE in advancing U.S. interests, including the promotion of human rights, democratic governance, and the rule of law, as well as efforts to combat human trafficking, sexual exploitation of children, and anti-Semitism and other forms of intolerance.

The committee expects the Department of State to provide adequate funding to ensure continued U.S. leadership within the OSCE, including the OSCE's extra-budgetary education and police training initiatives. And then it goes on to say, "combat terrorism in Europe and Eurasia," but the fact of the matter is that, if you talk about going beyond that.

And it seems that as Parliamentarians, we ought to be trying to get Parliamentarians to say this is important enough to put this kind of language in to indicate that they're supportive of this effort. So you know, I'd like you to comment on—and Ms. Hohenberg, do the people that are responsible in each of these areas have enough

staffing to get the job done, and what requests have you made and how many of them have been entertained?

Ms. HOHENBERG. Thank you very much for your questions. I think they're all absolutely topical. I will start with the first one on the definition—the working definition on anti-Semitism and other definitions that would indeed allow for collection data that is comparable across the region. Unfortunately, the situation is such that definitions that are used in each state are different because they are based on the legal framework—on the existing laws.

And so in lots of states, you have different definitions, of course, on hate crimes, on the categories that are included and disaggregated, and as well, on the—how the definition of—how hate crime is defined. Sometimes it's the perception of the offender; and sometimes it's the perception of the victim; sometimes, it's the perception of the law enforcement. So you have the whole range, I would say, of cases, which make, actually, the little data we receive absolutely not comparable.

So of course, we would welcome—for international agencies, it's wonderful to have unique definitions because it allows for comparisons, but it is, indeed, not the case. And it's very difficult to advocate for that, since states—

Mr. VOINOVICH. So an OSCE effort to kind of have a common definition would be helpful?

Ms. HOHENBERG. It would, probably. The question would be if it would be realistic—if, given the political situation, it would be realistic to obtain such a definition. But indeed, for the sake of having comparable and comprehensive data, it would indeed be the case.

On the money train, because it's very closely connected to that, how to put in place, in participating States and by governments, because we all know that it is a primary responsibility of states, reliable and comprehensive systems to collect data. And I think, again, ODIHR can provide technical assistance, but as long as there's no political will and there is no leadership on these issues, this doesn't bear fruit.

So this is why, I think, we are very much in favor of having this human dimension event where strong delegations advocate for strong and sound monitoring systems, and as well, why we are very much in favor of working very closely with the personal representatives. They are the political arm; they are those who can open the doors and convince and advocate for change in governments. And ODIHR can come after to provide the necessary followup.

Mr. VOINOVICH. Can I ask you something? Do you have—is it information that's available to us of the extra-budgetary requests that you've made? Is that part of the records of the OSCE, and can we find out which ones you've made and which ones have been entertained? Could you get that for us?

Ms. HOHENBERG. Yes, well, what I can tell you is that, since the request was distributed to participating States a week ago, I don't have the overview on the pledges that have been made so far, and I think states are only starting, now, to think about—but for tolerance and non-discrimination, we have three categories of program. The first one is a general program called "Prevention and Response

to Hate Crimes,” including training, data collection, legislative assistance, et cetera.

The second program is on educational materials and raising awareness on stereotypes and bias. These include, in particular, initiatives aimed at combating stereotypes about Muslims and Jews. And a third area, which is actually closely connected to tolerance and non-discrimination is the area related to freedom of religion and belief because—

Mr. VOINOVICH. That was what, again, I’m sorry?

Ms. HOHENBERG. Freedom of religion and belief, because inter-religious dialogue, religious discrimination and religious intolerance is, indeed, quite closely linked with the other topics. But these documents can be put in the records of this hearing, I think.

Mr. VOINOVICH. Well, as I say, I’d like to say which ones have been entertained and, as part of a kind of a consensus as to what are the priorities and, in order to achieve those priorities, the kind of resources that will be necessary to make this possible. I know I’ve seen the educational materials a couple of years ago. I was quite impressed with them. But I understand from you, Rabbi Baker, that some of countries pay for it and others say they like it but they don’t have the money to pay for it. Is that right?

Rabbi BAKER. Well, we heard that in—certainly, in Latvia, for example, they’d like to develop the materials. They don’t have the funds they can apply to it. I think other governments may be coming forward to help them. I think there was a desire of groups in Hungary to also have such materials developed for their youths. I suspect—

Mr. VOINOVICH. Pardon me, but the materials that I’ve seen, I don’t know why—I don’t know if you’ve seen them or not, Mr. Chairman—but they had various countries, but they’re pretty much, very much in the same format, and very interesting. What I’m saying is that, you’re saying that Latvia’s got to develop them; couldn’t they take the materials coming from OSCE and basically say these are good or change them, and then—

Rabbi BAKER. Well, in fact, that’s what happens. You know, you have a basic kind of template or framework, it needs to be translated into the local language, and then elements in it will reflect the history in that country. So there needs to be at least some educational partner to assist in putting that together. I don’t think that’s an enormous difficulty.

Then you have to have the support from an education system. And again, in this case, there’s an open door that would employ it and put it into the—primarily, it’s the secondary school curriculum—and then print enough material and train teachers to use it. So there are several steps. I don’t think it—we’re not talking something that would take years to do.

If—and it seems, and I follow from what Floriane said, that it seems to have been the practice that I can—when we visit, we can open doors, for whatever reason—and I want to say, I hope it’s all positive and on the merits—there’s an interest in ministries being forthcoming in response. So I think we should seize those moments to be able to say OK, let’s put this in place. Or in some cases, it needs to be at least financially supplemented. There’s not enough materials printed to really make its way through the schools, for

example. So you know, in some cases, it's simply the government picking up responsibility for it.

Mr. VOINOVICH. Well, it seems to me that you do the doable. And each of you, as you go around, you find countries that you're dealing with recognize there's a problem, they want to do something about it. They seem to be receptive. And if they are, then we should take advantage of it. Now, there are others that may not be as supportive, but let's start working on the ones that are receptive to it and help them do the job. And as they move along, maybe others will then start to follow in line.

One of the thoughts I had, if we have this—I haven't talked to your Ambassador yet about a special meeting in April sometime—a question of anti-Semitism. The issue would be to single out countries that are doing a good job. In other words, we always bang people over the head; let's congratulate countries that are doing a good job and let them kind of set the precedent. And other people are there and they say hey, they're doing it; maybe we should be doing that. I'm anxious to have you come back and make your recommendations to us on how we can help you to do a better job with the job we're asking you to do. Thank you.

Mr. CARDIN. Thank you, Senator Voinovich. We've been joined by Congresswoman Gwen Moore.

**HON. GWEN MOORE (D-4) A MEMBER OF CONGRESS FROM  
THE STATE OF WISCONSIN**

Ms. MOORE. Thank you, Senator Cardin, and I want to thank the U.S. Helsinki Commission, for allowing me to sit in on these meetings. I am so delighted to be here with the personal representatives, the representative of the chair of the personal representatives on combating anti-Semitism, intolerance and discrimination against Muslims and intolerance and discrimination against Christians and members of other religions. Did we leave anybody out?

It's so amazing to me, and I think we have really—Mr. Chairman, we have really done a great deal in the OSCE region to really combine all of these intolerances into one effort to demonstrate to everyone in the OSCE region that intolerance, as Martin Luther King said, intolerance and injustice to one person is injustice to everyone. And if we could get that message out as a coherent message that there's—we're all stakeholders in anti-discrimination against each other, I think we will have gone a long way.

My specific questions—one, perhaps, is to Miss Hohenberg. Given the organizing principle of all religions to say, you know, my way is the way, you know—Allah is the way, you know, Jesus is the way, no religion is the way, that we need to follow the Jewish traditions of thousands of years and that is truly the only way to go—given that, to what extent is our operations, our educational materials, our briefings, do they involve religious communities and religious leaders in terms of raising their consciousness about continuing to practice their own religions, but to also make them aware of how their messages can feed some intolerance?

Ms. HOHENBERG. Thank you very much for your question, Congresswoman. The educational materials that have been developed by ODIHR to combat stereotypes and bias against Jews and that have been, now, developed to combat stereotypes against Muslims

actually do not—I would say do not talk about religion. It's really about representations, of misrepresentations of history, of the contributions. And it's about putting facts and giving information on the reality of the contribution and the existence of communities within societies.

This is the first part of my answer. The second part is, indeed, ODIHR's also developed teaching guidelines on teaching about religions in public schools. These guidelines that were developed 2 years ago were developed after ODIHR and another number of international actors, actually, had realized that their—that intolerance would be nurtured by ignorance—by ignorance about other religions.

So these guidelines set the rules or give indications to educators on how they can inform about other religions in schools. They would, in no case, I think, replace religious teaching done by community leaders. This is simply something different that is supplementary and complementary—in no way something that replaces religious teaching. I hope I have answered your question.

Ms. MOORE. Anyone else like to respond to that? I see Rabbi chomping at the bit, and I do have a question for you, too.

Rabbi BAKER. I do want to say that I think that the special nature of the OSCE is it's where civil society sits at the same table as governments, and civil society may be broader than just religious representation, but it includes that. So I think you do have religious groups, as well as other non-governmental groups, that are sitting around the table in part of these discussions.

I think as Floriane said, the programs may not be focused on religious groups, but the goal, of course, is quite inclusive.

Ms. MOORE. There's a bell ringing for somebody. When the bell tolls, it's probably—

Mr. CARDIN. The Senate has a vote on.

Ms. MOORE. If I can just ask one followup question? Rabbi, I was really intrigued by a comment you made, wanted you to expand on it a little bit, about—it was sort of a caution—beware of these hate crimes legislation and the unintended consequences. We, in the House, took a vote on hate crimes and we had some, you know, members who are fairly progressive in a lot of ways giving us that same caution. Can you just expand a little bit on your precaution against hate crimes legislation?

Rabbi BAKER. Well, yes. It was really more a focus on what we see—we wouldn't see in this country, but we see in various places in Europe—where you have laws that are designed to restrict hate speech. So it's not in terms of hate crimes themselves, but we are trying to control the kind of hateful speech that you'll find in newspapers, on the Internet and so on. I think we have a tradition in the United States of confronting that kind of speech with public rebuke—with strong speech in return.

I think in some societies, based on the history, based on other aspects, there are laws that prohibit certain kinds of speech. So for example, in Germany—some other European countries as well—Holocaust denial is prohibited. We can debate theoretically, is that a good way to get at the problem, but on the ground, I think what we have seen in different places is that those laws don't necessarily work very well. Not many people are prosecuted or convicted, and

even some who are, the fines are so small, the process takes so long, you can question whether they're deterred by it.

And finally, I think we've seen some examples in some societies where political leaders use it as a way to get off the hook. They don't have to speak out strongly because they can say we have a prosecutor, he's investigating—so it's really more that—you know, those specific types of laws that I refer to.

Ms. MOORE. Thank you.

Mr. CARDIN. Well, thank you very much, Congresswoman Moore. And let me again thank all of our Special Representatives and our Representative from ODIHR. The work you're doing, as I said at the outset of this hearing, is extremely important. It's at the highest priority of the U.S. Helsinki Commission, and I think the U.S. Government has made this one of its highest priorities.

It was good to have you all here. If we were the reason for the three of you to get together to talk more about common strategies, that was a very important part of our strategy here. Each of you brings great talent. And Mr. Ambassador, I think the way that you summarized the answer to Congressman Smith's question is what we all believe. And it was a very important message that we need to echo and strengthen. And I did have a chance, when I was in Kazakhstan, to see the embracement of tolerance by your—religious tolerance by your leadership.

And that is a model, I think, for certainly, the region and I think, internationally. So we thank you for your individual work that you're doing and we just urge you to coordinate as much as possible so that talent can be utilized. And we certainly appreciate the work that ODIHR does in coordinating and staffing this effort. And Sen. Voinovich's point about the budget issues, I think, is of interest to our commission and we'll do the best we can to make sure that you have the resources to carry out the work that you're doing.

We always look forward to conferences. I think the point that was raised, also by Senator Voinovich, which is that, as we look to new conferences, we need to figure out ways in which avoid an exercise in rehashing, but move forward and advancing. And I thought his point about showcasing the best states and best practices is something that we need to explore and look into, because that could help, I think, all three representatives in your work. And with that, let me again thank you on behalf of the U.S. Helsinki Commission and our hearing stands adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 11:55 a.m., the hearing was adjourned.]

## APPENDICES

### **PREPARED STATEMENT OF HON. BENJAMIN L. CARDIN, CHAIRMAN, COMMISSION ON SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE**

Today the Helsinki Commission meets to consider the phenomenon of intolerance in the countries of Eurasia and North America, comprising the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe. It is fitting that the Commission serve as the venue for this public hearing with these experts as it was here that Members of Congress first pressed for OSCE engagement in the face of escalating anti-Semitism and related violence that gripped many participating States, including the United States, earlier this decade. Indeed, much of the OSCE's work in this field has been undertaken in response to initiatives by Commissioners pursued through the OSCE Parliamentary Assembly.

Over the years we have witnessed a resurgence of various forms of intolerance and discrimination in the OSCE countries. Concerns over these developments prompted the participating States in late 2004 to establish mechanisms for monitoring these trends throughout the OSCE region. At the same time agreement was reached for the designation of three experts, with distinct mandates, to work proactively at the direction of the OSCE Chair-in-Office. The personal representatives on tolerance were to enhance the visibility of OSCE efforts to combat intolerance, aided by their ability to tap into the highest political level of the organization through its chairmanship.

The work of the three personal representatives has taken on heightened urgency as we face the worst global economic downturn since the end of World War II, a situation that only contributes further to the vilification of certain individuals in society because of their race, ethnicity, religion, socio-economic or other status. This is exemplified in our own country by a forty percent increase in hate crimes targeting persons perceived to be immigrants, in part fueled by anti-immigrant political sentiments and a more than fifty percent increase in hate groups.

The dangers of not addressing intolerance and discrimination were disturbingly highlighted by the recent murder of an African-American security guard at the US Holocaust Memorial Museum in Washington DC by a White supremacist. I personally have been engaged in efforts to address these negative trends by working to strengthen hate crimes and anti-discrimination laws in Congress.

In recent years, the participating States have agreed to numerous commitments aimed at combating intolerance and promoting understanding. Additionally, in the historic 2004 Berlin Declaration, the participating States declared "unambiguously that international developments or political issues, including those in Israel or elsewhere in the Middle East, never justify anti-Semitism."

In the OSCE region and beyond, outlandish and irresponsible articles alleging that Israelis have been engaged in organ harvesting continue to appear in print, reminiscent of Soviet disinformation campaigns of the Cold War era aimed at fomenting anti-American

sentiment. ADL's report on attitudes toward Jews in seven European countries released earlier this year was most revealing. Spain, a country featuring prominently in that report, is one of the countries visited by Rabbi Baker in his capacity as the personal representative on combating anti-Semitism.

I look forward to his observations on developments there and elsewhere in the OSCE region and learning more about the activities of Ambassador Akhmetov and Mr. Mauro within the context of their respective mandates.

**PREPARED STATEMENT OF HON. ALCEE L. HASTINGS, CO-CHAIRMAN, COMMISSION ON SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE**

Mr. Chairman, I would underscore the leadership role the Helsinki Commission has provided and continues to provide on the issues before us this morning. Indeed, we have convened nearly a dozen hearing on various aspects of intolerance in the OSCE region. In addition to the longstanding concerns over anti-Semitism and related violence you have described, The Commission has paid increasing attention to the scourge of racism prevalent in many OSCE countries today, a phenomenon to which I can personally attest. With great frequency we received reports of violence against individuals based on their color be they of African or Asian descent or counted among the Roma, the single largest minority in Europe. As the decade of Roma inclusion (2005-2015) approaches its midpoint, many Rom feel anything but included.

Earlier this year, The OSCE's Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights (ODIHR), the Council of Europe's European Commission against Racism and Intolerance (ECRI) and the European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights (FRA) issued a joint call on governments, intergovernmental organizations and civil society to intensify efforts in addressing racism and xenophobia. Among their specific recommendations was a call for political leaders and other public figures to speak out against all forms of violence motivated by racial hatred or xenophobia; an encouragement for governments to provide specific training to law enforcement personnel, prosecutors and the judiciary in order to enhance their effectiveness in dealing with racist, xenophobic and other hate crimes; a call for governments to cooperate closely with civil society in the monitoring of racist, xenophobic and other hate crimes, and intensify their efforts to collect data and statistics on such crimes and incidents; and a call for governments to ensure that victims of discrimination and hate crime have access to effective remedies to address grievances.

While these steps are important, for too many victims they come too late or have fallen on deaf ears. Recall the case of the horrific murder of Marwa el-Sherbini, a 32-year old pregnant Muslim woman from Egypt living in Germany who was stabbed to death in a Dresden courtroom in July. Her attacker was in court for insulting her in 2008, apparently because she was wearing the Muslim headscarf. Members of a neo-Nazi gang in St. Petersburg, Russia are on trial for a series of murders, including the slaying of an expert who was assisting authorities in investigations of attacks by similar groups. Among those targeted were foreigners from at least five countries. Members of a racist gang in Moscow were jailed last year for killing 18 foreigners over the course of a little more than a year.

Then there is the case of two-year old Natálka Sivkova who suffered burns on 80 percent of her body when an extremist group targeting Roma firebombed her home in the Czech Republic. In Hungary, five-year-old Rom, Robert Csorba and his father were riddled with bullets to prevent them from escaping their fire-bombed home.

Mr. Chairman, racist attacks such as these have become all too commonplace in the OSCE region, underscoring the need to redou-

ble efforts to aggressively prosecute those responsible for such crimes even as we seek to promote tolerance and understanding. I look forward to hearing from the personal representatives on their contributions to these efforts.

Thank you.

**PREPARED STATEMENT OF HON. CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH,  
RANKING MEMBER, COMMISSION ON SECURITY AND CO-  
OPERATION IN EUROPE**

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and good morning to our witnesses and everyone joining us this morning.

Mr. Chairman, it was in the spring of 2002 that this Commission held the hearing on escalating anti-Semitic violence in Europe, which put the fight against anti-Semitism on the OSCE's agenda. I recall you were present that morning, Mr. Chairman, and Rabbi Baker was a witness. That day we Commissioners received a real education in the shocking increase in anti-Semitic hate in Europe; and then we acted against this evil. We reached out to like-minded parliamentarians in Europe, including Gert Weisskirchen of Germany, John Mann of the UK, and together put the issue on the OSCE Parliamentary Assembly's agenda and from there carried it to the OSCE.

This led to a series of high-level conferences on combating anti-Semitism, which took place in Vienna, Berlin, Cordoba, and Bucharest. At these conferences and elsewhere, the OSCE countries have undertaken a considerable body of commitments to combat anti-Semitism. And the Parliamentary Assembly and the OSCE remain engaged in the fight against anti-Semitism: this year alone there has been a roundtable on combating anti-Semitism, and a supplementary human dimension meeting on hate crimes.

Yet the will to continue fighting anti-Semitism seems to have diminished, and few participating states have met their commitments. At recent conferences, it has become clear that some participating states want to subsume the fight against anti-Semitism into a general campaign against intolerance. What a mistake that would be—not only is anti-Semitism a very distinct form of hate, but the very purpose of this move to generalize is to relativize anti-Semitism—something we must never do. As to unfulfilled commitments, the Vienna conference in 2003 focused on collecting data on anti-Semitic hate crimes—to combat anti-Semitism effectively, we had to learn more about it. Sadly, six years later, most participating states still have not provided basic data on anti-Semitic incidents, nor on anti-Christian or anti-Muslim incidents.

For these reasons it is essential that the high-level conference now being planned for 2010 tackle the problem of implementation, and that it maintain a distinct focus on anti-Semitism.

Finally, I am very glad that the struggle against anti-Semitism led the OSCE to appoint Personal Representatives, and that, since 2004, that has included Personal Representatives working to combat intolerance against Muslims, Christians, and members of other religions. I'd like to urge the incoming Kazakh chairmanship to reappoint all of the personal representatives. Intolerance of Muslims and Christians are both different from anti-Semitism, but they are both grave problems in many OSCE states: only 14 years ago intolerance against Muslims enabled genocide in Bosnia. Intolerance against Christians is a complicated matter—a grave problem, but its manifestations very different in Central Asia, Western Europe, and the Balkans.

I know the personal representatives have done great work, and have been indispensable in focusing attention on the issues within their respective mandates, and so I look forward to hearing from each of them.

**PREPARED STATEMENT OF ANDREW BAKER, PERSONAL  
REPRESENTATIVE ON COMBATING ANTI-SEMITISM, [USA]**

I want to express my appreciation to the Members of the Helsinki Commission for holding this hearing today and for giving me the opportunity to share with you some thoughts drawn from my work as the Personal Representative of the OSCE Chair-in-Office on Combating Anti-Semitism.

I also want to thank the Greek Chairmanship for affording me this opportunity to address an important and difficult problem and for supporting my efforts throughout the year. They have always been helpful and have allowed me the freedom and flexibility to take up this issue throughout the OSCE region. As there has been a recent change in the Government in Athens, I should like to convey my particular gratitude to former Foreign Minister Dora Bakoyannis. At the same time I am sure that the new Government of Prime Minister George Papandreou will continue to support the fight against intolerance and anti-Semitism during the remaining months of the Greek OSCE Chairmanship.

Let me present to you a few of the main concerns in combating anti-Semitism that have become apparent to me this year—based on the results of the several country visits I have already conducted, as well as discussions with Jewish leaders and NGOs.

ANTI-SEMITISM IN PUBLIC DISCOURSE

An essential element of the problem in many countries is the presence of anti-Semitism in public discourse. It is offensive and pernicious in its own right, but it can also contribute to a climate which poses a security threat to Jews and Jewish institutions. The capacity to counter this anti-Semitism is frequently lacking.

Many European countries have laws which restrict or punish hate speech. They are intended to address incitement to racial or religious hatred which may appear in public speeches, in books, newspapers and other media, and on the Internet. This includes fomenting anti-Semitism and, in some cases, Holocaust denial. Rarely is the problem the legislation itself, but rather it is the infrequent and often unsuccessful record of employing it.

By way of example and drawing from some of my country visits and other personal experience,

- In Spain there have been only two successful cases of prosecuting Holocaust denial in the last twenty years, and both of them took over seven years to adjudicate. In a country where the Jewish population is less than one one-hundredth of one percent the society is likely to know Jews only from their depictions in the press and media. As it is generally accepted that the Spanish media frequently depicts Israel in a negative light, some officials have suggested that this contributes to the population's low opinion of Jews.

- In Lithuania in 2004, the General Prosecutor opened a case against the publisher, Vitas Tomkus, after his newspaper ran a series of articles entitled "Who Rules the World?" loosely based on the Protocols of the Elders of Zion and illustrated with Nazi-like cartoons. Political leaders, although privately disgusted with the articles, remained publicly silent as the months-long investigation proceeded. A year later, when the case came to trial Mr. Tomkus

was found guilty. But he was not required to appear in court and the \$1,000 fine had little deterrent value to this multi-millionaire publisher. Such articles still appear regularly in his newspapers.

- During this last year the Jewish Community of Greece appealed to a 1979 hate speech law in its case against the author Kostas Plevris, who wrote that the Holocaust is a “profit making myth” invented by the Jews. He was initially found guilty, but the decision was reversed on appeal. In July in an event that underscored faithfulness to Holocaust history, the Greek Foreign Ministry held a public ceremony in Athens where it honored Greek Holocaust survivors.

- Last week I sat in the Jewish Community offices in Bucharest while the President of the Jewish Federation described the personal attacks on him in the newspaper of the right-wing Greater Romania Party. Nearly two years have passed since he filed suit, but so far the public prosecutor has not responded. (Ironically, on my first visit to Romania in 1993, I sat in the same room and heard the late Rabbi Moses Rosen describe similar personal attacks on him from the very same newspaper.) I met later with the Justice Minister/Foreign Minister Catalin Predoiu during this visit, who readily acknowledged the lack of clarity in the law and its limited effectiveness. To his credit the Minister used the occasion of my visit to issue a statement stressing the moral obligation of public officials to speak out against acts of anti-Semitism.

- We also witnessed a similar example of this problem in Sweden earlier this year, when the newspaper Aftonbladet published a report from Gaza claiming that Israeli soldiers were harvesting organs from Palestinians they had killed. This updated version of the medieval blood libel charge led members of this Commission to denounce the article as anti-Semitic and to call on European leaders to do likewise. The Swedish Foreign Ministry maintained that its press freedom laws did not even permit public officials to criticize the article, but an official ombudsman did have the authority to investigate and bring charges if it was determined that racial incitement laws were violated. It was quickly decided that they were not.

- The Internet is often cited as an unchecked source for all manner of hate speech including anti-Semitism. Even those countries with some experience at reining in extremist material in traditional media admit to difficulties when it comes to this source. But it is not only impressionable young people—the most frequently cited target—who are affected by it. Three years ago the Government of Latvia and its Jewish Community reached an agreement on legislation that would resolve all outstanding property restitution claims. But by the time the bill reached Parliament, opposition to the legislation—much of it spread via the Internet and anti-Semitic in nature—so unnerved its Members that it failed to pass. During my visit to Riga Latvian authorities conceded that whenever the subject of Jewish property restitution is raised in public they anticipate a spike in anti-Semitism.

We can certainly reach some general conclusions from these examples.

Put simply, many hate speech laws have the unintended consequence of letting political leaders off the hook. In the United States and other countries with strong free speech protections,

manifestations of racism, anti-Semitism, and other extremist views in public discourse are generally addressed (and can only be addressed) by strong and swift rebukes from political and civic leaders. In this way such hateful speech is marginalized and isolated. But in countries with legislative remedies some political leaders will refer to the legal process as a reason or excuse not to speak out. As we see in practice those legal decisions are generally months or years away. In the meantime, there is no clear message being delivered that such hateful speech is unacceptable. Consider too that even some decent, mainstream political leaders, fearing the success of extremist movements, see calculated benefits in maintaining an ambiguous stance.

The OSCE Representative on Freedom of the Media, speaking at a Roundtable on the problem of anti-Semitism that we convened in March, also cited special difficulties in countries with a Communist or authoritarian past. Because all speech was once monitored and controlled, he argued, prosecutors and judges are often reluctant today to pursue cases or impose penalties on those who violate hate speech laws despite having legislation to do so. Some of them have difficulty understanding that it is possible to limit some forms of speech while still vigorously protecting the principle itself.

In nearly all places anti-Semitic speech is understood to be included within the larger categories of inciting racial, ethnic or religious hatred. But virtually no penal code includes a specific or detailed description of anti-Semitism, which means it is not always recognized by prosecutors or judges or (as witnessed in Sweden) by official ombudsmen.

Where they do exist, Holocaust denial laws are not uniform. In some places denial alone is illegal; while other countries require proof that the denial of the Holocaust is part of an intentional effort inflict pain on survivors or members of the Jewish community. As a result prosecution under such a law can also vary widely.

#### MONITORING ANTI-SEMITISM

Accurate and recognized monitoring of anti-Semitic incidents is frequently lacking or incomplete. The newly-released ODIHR Hate Crime Report reveals that many governments are still lax in monitoring and recording hate crime data or in disaggregating the data they do have so as to better understand who are the perpetrators and the victims. But the problem is especially acute when the goal is to combat anti-Semitism. (A summary of the findings with regard to anti-Semitic incidents is appended to this testimony.)

In countries where hate speech is not restricted, government authorities are unlikely to record such incidents. The poor record in many countries which do have such laws frequently deters citizens from even filing suit. Physical attacks on persons or the vandalizing of synagogues and cemeteries may be monitored (although with all the same gaps and limitations of hate crimes more generally), but they still ignore the anti-Semitism that appears in the press, on television, at public demonstrations, on the Internet and in anonymous hate mail. When these anti-Semitic incidents are not recorded or are underreported it conveys the misimpression to political leaders and policy makers that the problem itself is not so important.

Governments must be encouraged to do a better job of monitoring and recording anti-Semitism, and we should continue to do everything to urge them to live up to their commitments. But in the interim we can do more to assist local Jewish leadership in various OSCE countries or regions to develop their own monitoring centers and to do so in a standardized and internationally recognized way so that public authorities can accept their results.

#### A WORKING DEFINITION OF ANTI-SEMITISM

In 2004, when the European Monitoring Center (EUMC) conducted its first study of anti-Semitism in the then 17-member European Union, it recognized the need for an operative and common definition of the phenomenon. At the time more than half of its national monitors had no definition at all, and of those that did no two were alike. In light of this the EUMC, now the EU Fundamental Rights Agency, developed a working definition, which has been adopted by the ODIHR, by the US State Department Special Envoy for Combating Anti-Semitism, and by Parliamentary Committees in Germany and the UK, among others. This definition (a copy of which is appended to this testimony) provides an overall framework for understanding what it is and offers a series of examples designed to aid police, monitors and NGOs in their work. It also describes where animosity toward the State of Israel also becomes a form of anti-Semitism.

In some countries the working definition is part of police training programs, as it is in ODIHR's Law Enforcement Officers Program (LEOP) manual, which trains police to respond to hate crimes. In nearly all meetings during my country visits I shared the definition with government officials, who welcomed it. Those of us who are focused on the problem may not fully realize that a lack of understanding on the part of these officials is not uncommon. While physical attacks on identifiable Jewish targets may be easily recognized as anti-Semitic in nature, certain public discourse or the vilification of the Jewish State may not be so readily identified. Therefore, increasing the circulation of this working definition is a useful tool that we can promote.

#### PROGRAMS OF ODIHR AND THE OSCE

If I can generalize from the tenor of the five country visits I have conducted thus far, I can say that the discussions were far more collaborative and pragmatic than confrontational in nature. There was acknowledgment that this problem is real and genuine interest in finding ways to better understand it, to combat it and to prevent it.

ODIHR's Tolerance and Non-Discrimination Department has developed educational programs designed to combat anti-Semitism for use in secondary schools. In Slovakia and Spain we heard positive reactions from teachers and administrators. (There are at present ten country-specific versions of this curriculum and three under development.) We saw interest in adopting the program in other countries. The only thing that prevents their increased use is the limited extra-budgetary funds available to ODIHR to put them into practice.

We also saw interest in making use of the ODIHR police training programs. Here the pioneering work of the LEOP program needs to be revived, which will require both funding and the reactivation police trainers. We also saw that while providing police with the tools to recognize and investigate hate crimes is essential, it is not sufficient. Prosecutors and judges must also become familiar with the problem and recognize that these crimes must be treated in a special way. This is also something that ODIHR, provided it has the necessary resources, can undertake.

In closing I would like to acknowledge the help and support of ODIHR Director Ambassador Janez Lenarcic, Director of its Department on Tolerance and non-Discrimination Floriane Hohenberg, and its specialist on anti-Semitism Norbert Hinterleitner. Their support for my work as Personal Representative and for that of my colleagues has been essential, and it has been throughout a genuine partnership.

#### APPENDED ITEMS:

From the forthcoming ODIHR publication, "Hate Crimes in the OSCE Region: Incidents and Responses—Annual Report for 2008":

—There is limited official information available on anti-Semitic hate crimes in the OSCE region.

—Nineteen participating States reported that they collect such data: Austria, Belgium, Canada, Croatia, Czech Republic, France, Germany, Italy, Liechtenstein, Moldova, Netherlands, Poland, Russian Federation, Serbia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, United Kingdom, and the United States.

—But only eight (Austria, Belgium, Czech Republic, France, Germany, Italy, Sweden, and the United Kingdom) submitted figures for 2008 to ODIHR.

—Austria and the Czech Republic reported an increase in incidents compared to 2007. Germany, Italy and the United Kingdom reported a decrease. (The other three countries did not report comparable figures from 2007).

—There are non-governmental sources for data on anti-Semitic crimes in 2008 in many OSCE participating States, including Austria, Belgium, Canada, Czech Republic, Germany, Greece, Italy, Russian Federation, Ukraine, United Kingdom and the United States.

—In only four cases (Austria, Czech Republic, Germany and Italy) were there sufficient 2008 data to enable ODIHR to compare NGO figures with official data from governments. In two cases the unofficial data contained twice the number of anti-Semitic incidents reported in official statistics.

—ODIHR collected media reports indicating that anti-Semitic incidents took place in 2008 in Austria, Belarus, Belgium, Canada, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Lithuania, Moldova, Norway, Poland, Romania, Russian Federation, Slovakia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom, and the United States.

The relevant newsletters and media reported little on the South Caucasus region and on Central Asian countries and, since the participating States did not submit figures regarding anti-Semitic hate crimes, ODIHR has no reliable information concerning these.

## A WORKING DEFINITION OF ANTISEMITISM

(Adopted by the EUMC January 28, 2005)

The purpose of this document is to provide a practical guide for identifying incidents, collecting data, and supporting the implementation and enforcement of legislation dealing with antisemitism.

Antisemitism is a certain perception of Jews, which may be expressed as hatred toward Jews.

Rhetorical and physical manifestations of antisemitism are directed toward Jewish or non-Jewish individuals and/or their property, toward Jewish community institutions and religious facilities.

In addition, such manifestations could also target the state of Israel, conceived as a Jewish collectivity.

Antisemitism frequently charges Jews with conspiring to harm humanity, and it is often used to blame Jews for “why things go wrong.” It is expressed in speech, writing, visual forms and action, and employs sinister stereotypes and negative character traits.

Contemporary examples of antisemitism in public life, the media, schools, the workplace, and in the religious sphere could, taking into account the overall context, include, but are not limited to:

- Calling for, aiding, or justifying the killing or harming of Jews in the name of a radical ideology or an extremist view of religion.
- Making mendacious, dehumanizing, demonizing, or stereotypical allegations about Jews as such or the power of Jews as collective—such as, especially but not exclusively, the myth about a world Jewish conspiracy or of Jews controlling the media, economy, government or other societal institutions.
- Accusing Jews as a people of being responsible for real or imagined wrongdoing committed by a single Jewish person or group, or even for acts committed by non-Jews.
- Denying the fact, scope, mechanisms (e.g. gas chambers) or intentionality of the genocide of the Jewish people at the hands of National Socialist Germany and its supporters and accomplices during World War II (the Holocaust).
- Accusing the Jews as a people, or Israel as a state, of inventing or exaggerating the Holocaust.
- Accusing Jewish citizens of being more loyal to Israel, or to the alleged priorities of Jews worldwide, than to the interests of their own nations.

Examples of the ways in which antisemitism manifests itself with regard to the State of Israel taking into account the overall context could include:

- Denying the Jewish people their right to self-determination, e.g., by claiming that the existence of a State of Israel is a racist endeavor.
- Applying double standards by requiring of it a behavior not expected or demanded of any other democratic nation.
- Using the symbols and images associated with classic antisemitism (e.g., claims of Jews killing Jesus or blood libel) to characterize Israel or Israelis.
- Drawing comparisons of contemporary Israeli policy to that of the Nazis.
- Holding Jews collectively responsible for actions of the State of Israel.

However, criticism of Israel similar to that leveled against any other country cannot be regarded as antisemitic.

Antisemitic acts are criminal when they are so defined by law (for example, denial of the Holocaust or distribution of antisemitic materials in some countries). Criminal acts are antisemitic when the targets of attacks, whether they are people or property—such as buildings, schools, places of worship and cemeteries—are selected because they are, or are perceived to be, Jewish or linked to Jews. Antisemitic discrimination is the denial to Jews of opportunities or services available to others and is illegal in many countries.

**PREPARED STATEMENT OF ADIL AKHMETOV, PERSONAL REPRESENTATIVE ON COMBATING INTOLERANCE AND DISCRIMINATION AGAINST MUSLIMS, [KAZAKHSTAN]**

Chairman!

Ladies and Gentlemen!

It is a great pleasure to be with you at this high-level meeting today.

I was appointed to the mandate of the Personal Representative of the OSCE Chairperson-in-Office on Combating Intolerance and Discrimination against Muslims in June, 2009 by the OSCE Chairperson—in - Office.

This year in this capacity I have participated 3 fora on inter-religious and inter-cultural dialogue:

one in Astana (Kazakhstan) in July;

the second in Krakow (Poland) in September;

the third in Geneva (Switzerland) September 30-October 1, and in accordance with my mandate I also attended the Human Dimension Implementation meeting in Warsaw held this fall.

Intolerance and discrimination against Muslims, which is sometimes called as Islamophobia or anti-Muslim racism, make up a great challenge to our democracies and social cohesion, as well as threatens international peace and security.

On the other hand the problem of 'hate crimes' against Muslims across OSCE participating States sometimes is a problem imposed on vulnerable minorities by those in power. Hate is being sown from above, and in discussing how to deal with that, we have to start not with the perpetrators of physical acts of violence—mainly poor people from poor neighbourhoods - but the instigators of hostility in the engine rooms of power.

The campaigns taking place all across OSCE participating States against mosques, Islamic schools and cultural meeting places are systematic and organised. Many are led—or supported—by elected politicians from powerful anti-immigration parties that are daily allowed to promote Islamophobia in the name of freedom of speech, while freedom of speech for Muslims is denied.

Unfortunately, various surveys and human rights reports indicate that despite of all efforts of participating States to promote and protect human rights for every one, acts related to racist and xenophobic attitudes, in particular, those targeting Muslims, persist in many parts of the OSCE region.

However, anti-Muslim prejudices and negative stereotypes are centuries old, the international community has very recently recognized it as a specific form of intolerance and called on the States take preventive and responsive measures. That is why it is very important that OSCE intensifies its efforts to raise awareness of this phenomenon.

The acts of intolerance and discrimination against Muslims are driven by a combination of racism, xenophobia, and religious intolerance, specifically hostility towards Islam and its adherents. Therefore, in practice, it is difficult, if not possible, to draw a clear-cut line between issues of intolerance against Muslims and issues in relation to racism and xenophobia, as well as violations of freedom of religion. Nor can we address these issues separately.

There are several observable trends across the OSCE region in relation to intolerance and discrimination against Muslims. For instance, Muslims in political discourse and media are very often portrayed as a threat to the security and cultural identity of some participating States. In this regard, Islam is represented not as religion but a political ideology, which is incompatible with the principles of democracy and human rights. Muslims are quite frequently accused of not willing to integrate into the society. This has led to the adoption of some assimilation policies, which in some cases aimed at restricting cultural and religious expression. One of the extreme forms of these policies is discriminatory administrative obstacles or even attempts to adopt laws, which prevent building of minarets.

Some anti-terrorism measures, partially influenced by the prevailing negative stereotypes and prejudice, have had disproportional impact on the enjoyment of civil and political rights by individuals with Muslim background. In particular, the racial profiling, including stop and search measures targeting only Muslims, surveillance of mosques and charities, and no fly lists, has not only violated fundamental freedoms of many people, but also reinforced already existing climate of intolerance against a particular group of people.

Another observable trend is the increase of hate crimes against Muslims, which should be taken into account in the context of general climate of intolerance. As the upcoming ODIHR annual hate crime report indicates several hate crimes against Muslims were committed during 2008 in many participating States. In spite of this, there are still very few States, collecting and maintaining data on hate crimes against Muslims. ODIHR also underlines that civil society organizations dealing with intolerance against Muslims have very limited capacity to regularly monitor and report anti-Muslim hate crimes. According to another report issued by the EU Fundamental Rights Agency, hate crimes against Muslims are grossly underreported and non-registered. In order to address this situation, I urge participating States to improve their hate crime data collection mechanism and benefit from ODIHR's Law Enforcement Officers Training Programme on Hate Crimes as much as possible.

Intolerance and discrimination against Muslims have devastating affects not only on the daily lives of the Muslim communities, but also on the society where they live. Intolerance and discrimination against Muslims leads to demarcation and creation of tensions in the society. To remedy this negative and disturbing phenomenon, sound strategies and educational approaches must be developed and vigorously implemented. For this purpose, I encourage the participating States to benefit from the experience and assistance of ODIHR in developing educational tools to counter specific forms of intolerance.

Increasing understanding and respect for cultural and religious diversity would be the first step in identifying criteria for good practices in combating intolerance and discrimination. My recommendations are the following:

1. It should be acknowledged that intolerance against Muslims is not a problem of a specific minority, but a human rights problem concerning everyone.

2. The historical, cultural and psychological depth of the issue of discrimination and intolerance always needs to be taken into full consideration.

3. There is also a need for an intellectual and ethical strategy to avoid political exploitation of the issues related to discrimination and intolerance.

4. Various forms of intolerance and discrimination need not be subject to an artificial hierarchy. Discrimination is discrimination and must be condemned and dealt with whatever the underlying motive might be. Within this framework, there should be synergy in efforts dealing with different forms of discrimination.

5. Integration policies should address the social and economic needs of Muslims in the countries that they are residing. Such policies should promote integration through participation, not assimilation. This will lead to better understanding and better integration, thus to lessening of mutual mistrust.

6. Fight against terrorism should be conducted with in the line of the internationally recognized human rights standards. This would increase partnership and cooperation between Muslim communities and security officers and contribute to the prevention of radicalization which may lead to violence.

7. Senior government leaders should send immediate, strong, public, and consistent messages that violent crimes which appear to be motivated by prejudice and intolerance against Muslims will be investigated thoroughly and prosecuted to the full extent of the law.

8. Recognizing the particular harm caused by violent hate crimes, governments should enact laws that establish specific offenses or provide enhanced penalties for violent crimes against Muslims.

9. Governments should ensure that those responsible for hate crimes against Muslims are held accountable under the law, that the enforcement of hate crime laws is a priority for the criminal justice system, and that the record of their enforcement is well documented and publicized.

10. Governments should maintain official systems of monitoring and public reporting to provide accurate data for informed policy decisions to combat violent hate crimes against Muslims. Such systems should include anonymous and disaggregated information on bias motivations and/or victim groups, and should monitor incidents and offenses, as well as prosecutions.

11. Governments should conduct outreach and education efforts to Muslim communities and civil society groups to reduce fear and assist victims, advance police-community relations, encourage improved reporting of hate crimes to the police and improve the quality of data collection by law enforcement bodies.

12. Members of parliament and local government leaders should be held politically accountable for bigoted words that

encourage discrimination and violence and create a climate of fear for minorities, including Muslims.

13. Governments should support and strengthen the mandates of intergovernmental organizations that are addressing discrimination—like the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe, the European Commission against Racism and Intolerance, the Fundamental Rights Agency, UN Alliance of Civilizations Initiative and Organization of Islamic Conference—by encouraging such organizations to raise the capacity of and train police, prosecutors, and judges, as well as other official bodies and civil society groups to combat violent hate crimes.

Thank you for your attention!





This is an official publication of the  
**Commission on Security and  
Cooperation in Europe.**

★ ★ ★

This publication is intended to document  
developments and trends in participating  
States of the Organization for Security  
and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE).

★ ★ ★

All Commission publications may be freely  
reproduced, in any form, with appropriate  
credit. The Commission encourages  
the widest possible dissemination  
of its publications.

★ ★ ★

**<http://www.csce.gov>**

The Commission's Web site provides  
access to the latest press releases  
and reports, as well as hearings and  
briefings. Using the Commission's electronic  
subscription service, readers are able  
to receive press releases, articles,  
and other materials by topic or countries  
of particular interest.

Please subscribe today.