

Remarks of  
**TAD STAHNKE**  
**DIRECTOR,**  
**FIGHTING DISCRIMINATION PROGRAM**  
**HUMAN RIGHTS FIRST**

Briefing of the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe  
(U.S. Helsinki Commission)  
“Hate in the Information Age”  
May 15, 2008

Thank you to the Commission Members and staff for convening this important and timely briefing, for the invitation to appear before you on behalf of Human Rights First, and for the opportunity to share our perspective on the dangerous threat that crimes motivated by hatred and prejudice pose to the 56 countries of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE). We firmly believe that racism, antisemitism, and related forms of intolerance and the violence this generates must be an important part of the human rights agenda. We thus thank and commend you for holding this discussion on “Hate Crimes and Hate Propaganda on the Internet.”

My name is Tad Stahnke, and I am the Director of the Fighting Discrimination Program of Human Rights First. Since 1978, Human Rights First has worked to protect and promote fundamental human rights. Our work is founded on the belief that equality is the cornerstone of human rights protection. Since 2002, Human Rights First has fought discrimination by seeking to reverse the tide of racist, antisemitic, anti-immigrant, anti-Muslim, and homophobic violence across the OSCE region.

In June 2007, we released our annual *Hate Crime Survey*, which documented a rise in violent hate crimes in many parts of Europe and North America. A preliminary review of data from 2007 suggests that many of these troublesome trends continue. In December, we published our *2007 Hate Crime Report Card*, which tracks official reporting systems as well as hate crime laws and their implementation in OSCE states. Although there has been progress in addressing these crimes in North American and some Western European countries, the response of the vast majority of governments in the region remains weak in the critical areas of monitoring, public reporting, legislation, and investigating and punishing violent incidents. Both reports are available at: <http://www.humanrightsfirst.org/discrimination/index.asp>.

I will cover in my remarks the incidence of hate crimes in OSCE countries, the government response to those crimes, and offer a few examples of the way in which the internet has been a part of the problem. I will then focus on several recommendations for the U.S. government to strengthen its efforts to encourage a more robust response to violent hate crime by other governments in the region.

## **I. Violent Hate Crimes on the Rise**

Hate crimes have been on the rise in many parts of the OSCE region, and this is being driven by a wide range of biases, including those on ethnicity, religion, and sexual orientation. Increasing fears of terrorism and anti-immigrant sentiment have contributed to growing xenophobia and intolerance throughout Western Europe, while extreme nationalist movements in Eastern Europe and the Russian Federation have increasingly expressed virulent racist doctrines through organized violence against members of ethnic and religious minorities.

The incidence of antisemitic attacks in Europe and North America remain at historically high levels. Beyond the still relatively rare cases of extreme violence, incidents throughout Europe continued to permeate the everyday lives of Jews in the form of intimidation and harassment, attacks on Jewish schools and on the children who attend them, as well as destruction of property at Jewish places of worship, cemeteries, and community centers. High levels of antisemitic threats and violence have occurred against a background of proliferating antisemitic discourse in both the public and the private sectors, promoted in several countries by local and national leaders through the mainstream media and the internet. In Eastern Europe and the Russian Federation, extreme nationalist political groups have adopted the language of 19<sup>th</sup> century antisemitism, backed by some sectors of dominant churches.

Violence against Muslims is a new and potent factor in the modern stew of racist and anti-immigrant bias. The rise of violence against Muslims in Europe has occurred in tandem with the adoption of anti-immigrant, racially motivated political platforms by both fringe and mainstream political movements. This new climate of chauvinism and xenophobia has made immigrants and those of immigrant origin particularly vulnerable as scapegoats for a broad range of social ills and political controversies. Violence against people of Middle Eastern or Asian origin who are thought, rightly or wrongly, to be Muslims builds upon preexistent racism and xenophobia that is both exacerbated and given an outlet in times of public distress over terrorist outrages. A result has been heightened

anxiety and rising violence against racial, ethnic, and religious minorities, as well as a new climate of exclusion.

As with other forms of hate crime, homophobic violence remains widely underreported, yet in countries in which lesbian, gay, bi-sexual, and transgender (LGBT) people have become more visible, their increased public presence has in some cases brought with it a rise in homophobic rhetoric and a violent backlash. Sexual orientation is still a basis for stigmatization and oppression, often with the open support of some in government, as well as by some influential political and religious organizations. Bias today towards those distinguished by their minority sexual orientation is vigorously promoted by both extremist and mainstream political and religious leaders across Europe and North America. Gay pride parades and events organized in a number of countries in Eastern Europe have resulted in violence from private actors and poor police protection.

Human Rights First has been particularly concerned about developments in the **Russian Federation**, and HRF staff traveled to Moscow in March to meet with civil society leaders and other public officials to discuss the dramatic upsurge in hate violence to which the government has responded inadequately. The SOVA Center for Information and Analysis, the leading NGO monitor of hate crimes in Russia, recorded 63 bias-motivated murders in 2007, a significant increase from the 55 such murders documented in 2006. Already in the first three months of 2008, the SOVA Center has documented 39 hate-based murders by neo-Nazi skinheads. While there are indications that the government has finally begun to take these crimes more seriously, there is the corresponding danger that an indiscriminate and harsh crackdown on neo-Nazi groups will only exacerbate the problem. Combating hate crimes within a framework of human rights and the rule of law presents particularly significant challenges in Russia where there are systemic problems with law enforcement and the criminal justice system. Hate crime victims – members of racial, ethnic, sexual, and religious minorities – are also marginalized from the mainstream of Russian society and subject to numerous forms of both official and private harassment and discrimination.

HRF has likewise been concerned about the situation in **Ukraine** where there has been a sharp rise in the number of racially-motivated violent hate crimes in the past 18 months. An HRF staff member just returned from a mission to Kiev to assess the situation as well as the government response. One NGO monitor there documented 86 violent hate crimes in

2007, including 5 racist murders. Already in the first three months of 2008, the same organization documented 44 violent hate crimes, including 2 racist murders. Some senior government officials have spoken out against xenophobic violence, although government acknowledgement of the problem has generally been inconsistent and some senior officials have made statements that suggest a denial of the nature and scale of the problem. Nevertheless, the authorities have taken several preliminary steps to address the problem, including by establishing a specialized agency within the security police for combating xenophobia and intolerance. Much more remains to be done.

In addition to the problematic developments we have seen in these two countries, we reported in our *2007 Hate Crime Survey* that bias-motivated violence, in all its various manifestations, is prevalent throughout Europe and North America. In a number of countries where systematic monitoring is undertaken, statistics show that hate crimes are on the rise and/or remain at troublingly high levels in **Canada, France, Germany, the United Kingdom, and the United States**, despite efforts in all of these countries to combat them.

- In **Canada**, where official statistics are limited to individual cities (official data on a national level is expected to be available in 2008), the data collection efforts of NGOs provide an important snapshot into trends in certain types of hate crimes. B'nai Brith Canada's 2006 annual survey reported a 12.8 percent rise in antisemitic incidents over the previous year, to 935 incidents—the highest level ever reported (and more than double the 459 incidents reported in 2002).
- In **France**, authorities reported in 2006 a decrease by 10 percent in the overall number of hate crimes in comparison with 2005, although crimes were increasingly of a violent character, and individuals were targeted in a larger proportion of the total cases. Despite the improvement as compared with 2005, the total of all bias offences remained extraordinarily high compared with the period of the late nineties.
- In **Germany**, the number of extremist crimes in 2006 reached the highest level of such crimes since the current monitoring system was introduced in 2001. These figures continue an upward trend of the last several years. In Berlin, one of Germany's most multicultural and cosmopolitan cities, police chief Dieter Glietsch told the press in December 2006 that violent neo-Nazi crimes had nearly doubled over the previous year. The severity of the problem was highlighted in the run-up to the World Cup, hosted by Germany, in which community and activist groups produced a "No-

Go" guide for German minority and foreign citizens that identified areas with a high incidence of racist violence.

- In the **United Kingdom**, a dramatic surge of racist and religiously motivated violence followed the July 7, 2005 bombings in the London Underground and on a city bus. Hate crimes rose by as much as 600 percent in London in the month following these bombings, but then returned to pre-bombing levels. Overall in 2006, hate crimes in the United Kingdom continued at a high rate, despite significant efforts by the central government and independent police authorities to monitor and combat them. Antisemitic incidents also rose dramatically in 2006, with the highest annual toll since the collection of statistics started in 1984. Henry Grunwald, the President of the Board of Deputies of British Jews remarked that “there is probably a greater feeling of discomfort, greater concerns, greater fears now about antisemitism than there have been for many decades.”
- In the **United States**, according to statistics of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, in 2006, there were 7,720 hate incidents involving 9,642 victims, 9,076 offences and 7,324 offenders. The majority of offences were racially motivated (51.8%), followed by religious bias (18.9%), sexual orientation bias (15.5%), ethnicity or national origin bias (12.7%) and disability bias (1.0%). The total number of hate incidents reported for 2006 represents a rise of 9% over incidents reported for 2005.

## **II. An Inadequate Government Response to Hate Crimes**

Human Rights First has advocated a vigorous government response to hate crime and has developed a set of ten recommendations (included as an appendix) for governments to combat them. In December 2007, we released our *Hate Crime Report Card*, which assesses the extent to which the OSCE participating states have implemented commitments in two essential areas: 1) establishing systems of monitoring and reporting, and 2) adopting and enforcing criminal law provisions to combat violent hate crimes.

### Systems of Monitoring and Reporting

Within the European Union, the Fundamental Rights Agency (FRA), the E.U.'s antiracism and human rights body has determined that only 13 of the 27 member states have criminal justice data collection systems that

are “good” or “comprehensive” in their coverage of hate crimes. These countries include: **Austria, Belgium, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Germany, Finland, France, Ireland, Poland, Slovakia, Sweden, and the United Kingdom.**

Outside of the E.U., our research has shown that there are no countries in southeastern Europe or the former Soviet Union with adequate systems of monitoring and regular public reporting expressly on violent hate crimes.

**Thus, nearly 40 OSCE participating states are failing in their hate crime data collection commitments.**

These failures are particularly problematic in countries like **Russia** and **Ukraine** where NGO monitors have documented an increasing number of cases of violent hate crimes, while official data has largely ignored the problem. Without accurate data, the increasing number of such crimes reported by NGO monitors and the media fall under the radar of policy makers. Similarly, **Greece, Italy, and Spain** are among those countries where the authorities do not produce any reliable data on violent hate crimes, but where unofficial reports suggest an increasing number of such cases. In **Cyprus**, officials justified the fact that they did not submit any data on racist crimes to the E.U.’s Fundamental Rights Agency on the grounds that there is no racism there. In the January 29, 2008 hearing that you organized, one witness stated that the authorities in **Turkey** similarly have not reported on any cases of hate crimes – despite evidence to the contrary.

### Criminal Law Provisions to Combat Violent Hate Crimes

While governments have an obligation to combat all crime, the hate crime concept is a simple acknowledgement of the greater seriousness of crimes motivated by racial, religious, or other hatred that harm whole communities. Hate crime legislation signals a society’s commitment to combat violent discrimination and gives force to this by providing for more severe penalties.

A growing number of the 56 countries in the OSCE are adopting legislation to expressly address violent hate crimes. At present, there are over 30 countries in which legislation treats bias-motivated violence as a separate crime or in which bias is regarded as an aggravating circumstance that can result in enhanced penalties.

However, 23 OSCE states still have no express provisions defining bias as an aggravating circumstance in the commission of a range of violent crimes against persons. These countries include: **Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Cyprus, Estonia, Germany, Greece, Holy See, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Luxembourg, Lithuania, Macedonia, Monaco, Montenegro, the Netherlands, Poland, San Marino, Serbia, Slovenia, Switzerland, and Turkey.**

Data from government bodies, NGOs and the media in a number of these countries, such as **Estonia, Germany, Greece, Ireland, Lithuania, Poland Serbia, and Switzerland**, indicate that hate crimes are occurring, but criminal justice authorities are unable to treat them as the more serious crimes that they are due to the lack of a legislative basis to do so.

Even where legislation exists, it is too often limited in terms of the forms of discrimination against which it protects. While aggravating circumstances provisions in most countries cover bias based on religious or racial grounds, provisions extend to sexual orientation bias in only 11<sup>1</sup> countries and to disability bias in only 7 countries.<sup>2</sup>

Effective enforcement of these provisions is difficult to gauge, although widely thought to be inadequate. Statistics on the use of bias crime sentencing norms, including those convictions resulting in enhanced sentences, are largely unavailable. Monitoring conducted by NGOs and intergovernmental antiracism bodies points to a general reluctance by criminal justice officials to bring charges using hate crime provisions.

In the **Russian Federation**, for example, although adequate hate crime legislation exists, it has been ignored in the prosecution of the vast majority of hate crime cases. Although prosecutors have brought an increasing number of hate crime cases before the courts in recent years, the number of hate crimes continues to surge unabated and only a small fraction are thoroughly investigated and prosecuted. Even when prosecuted, hate crime charges are not always vigorously pursued, with potentially severe consequences for Russian society. The acquittal on hate crime charges in the brutal racist murder of a nine-year Tajik girl, for instance, led a Russian human rights activist to suggest the verdict was “a

---

<sup>1</sup> Penalty enhancement provisions apply to crimes committed because of bias on the grounds of sexual orientation in: Andorra, Belgium, Canada, Croatia, Denmark, France, Romania, Spain, Sweden, United Kingdom, and in the United States (in certain states).

<sup>2</sup> Penalty enhancement provisions apply to crimes committed because of bias on the grounds of disability in: Andorra, Belgium, Canada, Romania, Spain, United Kingdom, and the United States (in certain states).

moral catastrophe for Russia that in the multinational society of a huge country could lead to nothing less than the collapse of the state.”<sup>3</sup>

In **Ukraine**, the criminal code does contain general provisions that allow for enhanced penalties when a crime has been proven in a court of law to have been motivated by hatred. Such penalty enhancement provisions (article 67) are at the discretion of the judge and have to date never been used. In three recent cases of violent hate crimes, prosecutors have successfully brought charges of incitement, under article 161 of the criminal code, in addition to the relevant article relating to the base offense (murder or assault). Though this approach has not been without challenges, it has highlighted to some extent the bias element in the crime. There are a number of draft amendments to the existing criminal law provisions related to bias-motivated violence currently under consideration in the parliament. One improvement would be to make penalty enhancement mandatory in cases where bias motivations have been proven in a court of law. If accompanied by strong political support, as well as the necessary training and resources for police, prosecutors and judges, such an amendment to the existing legislation could be a useful tool in sending a strong message of zero tolerance for violent hate crimes.

### Examples of Positive Steps Forward

Although there is much work for the governments of OSCE states to do, the past few years have certainly not been without some progress. To name a few recent positive steps taken by governments and parliaments:

- In **Belgium**, the Attorney General’s office issued an instruction in April 2006 on the need for police and the courts to recognize and identify racist and xenophobic violence. The police are now required to register common crimes with a racist or xenophobic motive under a separate statistical heading, a step that could lead to better public reporting on the incidence of such crimes.
- In **Canada**, where data collection and public reporting is currently limited to a number of individual police jurisdictions, the government has committed to plans to introduce a system of hate crime data collection and reporting at the national level in 2008.

---

<sup>3</sup> Salimjon Ajoubov and Bruce Pannier, “Russia: Verdict in Trial of Tajik Girl’s Murder Shocks Public,” RFE/RL, March 23, 2006.

- In **Croatia**, authorities successfully prosecuted their first hate crime case in 2007, using a new hate crime law against a man who attempted to throw firebombs at a gay pride parade earlier in the year.
- In **Norway**, where no hate crime statistics are currently available, the Minister of Justice reported in September 2007 that hate violence against gay men and others was increasing, and announced that police had begun to register such crimes.
- In **Ukraine**, the state security service created a special unit for combating xenophobia and intolerance. The foreign ministry also established the position of Ambassador-at-Large for combating racism, xenophobia, and discrimination.
- In the **United Kingdom**, the House of Commons released an unprecedented report in 2006 – the Report of the All-Party Parliamentary Inquiry into Antisemitism – following a year long inquiry into the nature and manifestations of antisemitism in the United Kingdom. This inquiry could serve as a model for other parliaments to use their authority to investigate the problem of antisemitic and other hate crimes in their own countries and commit their governments to action.

### **III. Incitement to Violence on the Internet**

For all the many benefits of the internet, it also allows messages of hatred to be transmitted instantaneously to thousands of people hungry for such material. Therefore, the response to hate violence must, while fully protecting freedom of expression, encompass a better understanding of and strategy to address the potential of cyberspace to incite such violence. At the same time, we have noticed in our work a tendency of some in Europe to focus on hate speech and extremist political views as an end in itself. In contrast, we look at the internet and other avenues of disseminating ideologies of hatred as a way to better understand the problem of violence, particularly incitement to violence.

My respected colleagues on this panel will undoubtedly have more to say on the specific nature of cyberhate as well as recommendations for action, but let me cite a few examples that come from our monitoring efforts in the **Russian Federation**, where neo-Nazis and other radical groups have an active presence on the internet.

- Perpetrators of violent hate crimes have increasingly sought to publicize their crimes on the internet and elsewhere through the use of cell phone and other videos, glorifying their own acts and encouraging imitation. The most extreme case was the alleged murders, recorded on video, of two men said to be of Dagestani and Tajik origin. The video footage, widely circulated in August 2007, showed the execution-style killings involving the beheading of one and the shooting of the other, with a Nazi flag in the background. The video was posted on the Internet in the name of a previously unknown neo-Nazi group with a demand for the expulsion from the Russian Federation of all Asians and people from the Caucasus.
- The internet has also been used as a means to target human rights activists – including those who are advocating that the perpetrators of hate crimes be brought to justice. In March 2008, a “death list,” which included the names and addresses of civil society activists and scholars who work on the problem of hate crimes in Russia as well as instructions to attack and kill them, appeared on an internet site. That site was eventually closed – in part thanks to appeals to the hosting company by human rights activists – although the death list subsequently appeared on numerous other web sites. By early May, all the sites hosting this particular death list (others had been posted before) had been shut down, yet the information had already been widely circulated, including through blogs and other internet forums that are still in operation.

#### **IV. Recommendations for Action**

The OSCE has been an important venue for governments and civil society actors to discuss the problem of hate crimes – including the influence of the internet – and to develop commitments and programs to combat them. We appreciate the important role that the United States, with the active leadership of the Helsinki Commission, has played in initiating and developing a tolerance and non-discrimination agenda for the OSCE. However, we recently traveled to Vienna to consult with the OSCE delegations of several key countries, and came away with the clear view that high level political attention to the tolerance agenda was dissipating and more vigorous advocacy efforts were necessary to preserve that agenda, let alone to expand and strengthen it to respond to continuing and new challenges.

We welcome remarks made recently by Kurt Volker, the Deputy Assistant Secretary for European Affairs. He said that “we need to reinvest also in the OSCE. That is the one place where all of Europe and Eurasia meets in one place, and where the values of freedom are squarely on the table thanks to the Helsinki Final Act. It is increasingly difficult to reach consensus in the OSCE, as some states have moved away from democratic societies. But we should meet this challenge with greater creativity and resolve, not less.”<sup>4</sup> Statements like these need to be made by more senior officials in order to correct the perception that the United States at the highest levels has lost interest in the OSCE.

In that spirit, we request that the Helsinki Commission use its influence to encourage the U.S. government to play a leading role to advance the OSCE’s tolerance agenda by advocating the following steps:

- **Enhance the capacity of the personal representatives on tolerance:** The Chairmanship’s three personal representatives on issues of tolerance have an important role to play in ensuring that states are meeting the commitments they have undertaken. We encourage support for the current efforts of the Finnish Chairmanship to ensure that they are provided with the political and administrative support necessary to carry out their duties.
- **Ensure continued support for the ODIHR’s Tolerance and Nondiscrimination Unit (TnD):** The capacity-building and other activities of the TnD unit are an important complement to the work of the personal representatives at the political level. In particular, we are encouraging efforts to ensure that the Law Enforcement Officer Program on Combating Hate Crime (LEOP) has the support it needs and that participating states are taking part in this program. It is also important to ensure that this year’s Human Dimension Implementation Meeting (HDIM) includes ample opportunity for states to account for the commitments they have undertaken on combating hate crimes. The U.S. should select a senior delegation head with ample time to consult with interested groups on how the HDIM can be used to advance the OSCE’s effort to combat hate crimes.
- **Begin preparations for a high-level conference on combating hate crimes in 2009:** The activities of the personal representatives

---

<sup>4</sup> These comments were made at at a conference entitled “Europe and Eurasia: New Faces, Old Problems, Familiar Solutions?” and can be found at [www.state.gov](http://www.state.gov). [need better cite]

and the ODIHR should be reinforced by periodic high-level meetings to generate political support for the implementation of commitments. We support the organization of such a high-level meeting in 2009. In order for such a meeting to be successful, it is important to proceed expeditiously toward identifying a host country, beginning discussions as to the agenda of the meeting and proposed outcomes, and taking steps to ensure high-level participation. There are advantages to focusing on violent hate crimes as a theme for this conference: this is a problem that poses serious threats across the region; it is also an issue that cuts across many forms of discrimination and intolerance and could thus bring together governments and a wide range of civil society actors toward developing a common program of action.

In our view, the U.S. government, with the advice and assistance of the Helsinki Commission, can be working on two additional fronts to combat violent hate crimes in the OSCE region:

**The growing problem of violent hate crime in Ukraine should be a more prominent part of the U.S. bilateral agenda, including in the context of U.S. support for Ukraine's membership in NATO.** The Ukrainian government's response to violent hate crimes being perpetrated by a burgeoning neo-Nazi movement needs to be strengthened. The United States is in a good position to provide both encouragement and tangible forms of technical and other assistance to help ensure that consistent attention is paid to this issue across all levels of the Ukrainian government. It is in the interests of the United States to try to ensure that all of our NATO allies have robust official responses to hate violence in their own countries. As mentioned above, one of our staff just returned from Ukraine yesterday and we would be pleased to consult further with members of the Commission regarding more specific recommendations in the coming weeks.

**The U.S. government can be doing much more to provide desperately needed support to build the capacity of NGOs in the OSCE region to combat violent hate crimes.** Even in countries where governments are committed to combating hate violence, human rights and community groups play important roles in tracking cases, linking police and prosecutors to targeted communities, and providing services for victims. Where governments are falling down on their responsibilities, NGOs can play an even more essential role. Yet, the capacity of civil society groups, especially in Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Republics, to engage in monitoring and advocacy is limited. Dr. Kathrin Meyer, the

ODIHR's advisor on antisemitism affirmed this problem to the Helsinki Commission when she testified in February. The U.S. government can begin to address it in three ways:

The U.S. should **provide extra-budgetary support to expand ODIHR's civil society training program on combating hate crimes**, focusing on training efforts inside countries like Russia and Ukraine where government responses have been weak.

**USAID should focus on combating hate crimes in the next phase of its democracy and governance assistance in Russia.** USAID is currently reviewing its human rights programs in Russia and, following an on-the-ground mission, is considering pursuing hate crimes as a priority issue. The challenges to improving the response to hate crimes in Russia are quite large, and a coordinated effort by USAID and others present on the ground in that country is necessary to advance the issue.

Building on the nascent capacity-building activities of ODIHR, USAID, and the State Department assistance funds for Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union, **the Congress should seriously consider establishing a long-term funding program for civil society groups to combat hate crimes in the OSCE region.**

On the specific issue of the internet, there are several areas where OSCE states have agreed to take action, some of which were articulated in the closing remarks of Ambassador Stephen Minikes, the Head of the U.S. Delegation, at the OSCE conference on hate speech, hate crime and the internet, held in Paris in June 2004. There, Ambassador Minikes stated there was agreement that **“participating States must vigorously investigate and, where appropriate, prosecute criminal threats of violence transmitted over the Internet. Likewise, participating States must vigorously prosecute perpetrators of all bias-motivated violence. Finally, given the complexities of such prosecutions, we believe there is a consensus on the need to train investigators and prosecutors on how to address bias-motivated crimes on the Internet.”** We would urge the U.S. government to follow up on the implementation of these commitments.

I would be happy to discuss these recommendations further with you, and answer any questions. Thank you again for the opportunity to present the views of Human Rights First.

## **Appendix: Recommendations to Governments**

### **A Ten-Point Plan for Combating Hate Crime**

1. **Acknowledge and condemn violent hate crimes whenever they occur.** Senior government leaders should send a strong and immediate political signal that violent crimes which appear to be motivated by prejudice and intolerance will be investigated thoroughly and prosecuted to the full extent of the law.
2. **Enact laws that expressly address hate crimes.** Governments should recognize hate crimes as the more serious crimes that they are while defining categories of bias motivation broadly. They should enact laws that provide enhanced penalties for crimes committed because of the victim's race, religion, ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, mental and physical disabilities, or other similar forms of discrimination.
3. **Strengthen enforcement and prosecute offenders.** Governments should ensure that those responsible for hate crimes 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.
4. **Provide adequate resources to law enforcement bodies.** Governments should ensure that police and investigators – as the first responders in cases of violent crime – have the resources and training to detect bias motives, and that prosecutors have been trained to apply the legal measures required to prosecute hate crimes.
5. **Undertake parliamentary or other special inquiries into the problem of hate crimes.** Such official inquiries should investigate ways to better respond to hate crimes, but also seek creative ways to deal with the roots of intolerance through education.
6. **Monitor and report on hate crimes.** Governments should establish or strengthen official systems of monitoring and reporting to provide accurate data, including on the victim groups targeted, for informed policy decisions to combat intolerance. These monitoring systems should include improved access to complaints procedures by individual victims and advocacy groups through the introduction of measures such as third party reporting.

7. **Create and strengthen antidiscrimination bodies.** Official antidiscrimination and human rights bodies should have the authority to address hate crimes through monitoring, reporting, and assistance to victims.
8. **Reach out to community groups.** Governments need to take steps to increase the confidence of minority communities by demonstrating a willingness to work more closely with human rights and community-based organizations in the reporting and registration of hate crimes and on measures to provide equal protection for all under the law.
9. **Speak out against official intolerance and bigotry.** Freedom of speech allows considerable latitude for offensive and hateful speech, but public figures should be held to a higher standard. Members of parliament and local government leaders should be held politically accountable for bigoted words that encourage xenophobia and violence and create a climate of fear for minorities.
10. **Encourage international cooperation on hate crimes.** Governments should support and strengthen the mandates of intergovernmental organizations – like the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe, the European Commission against Racism and Intolerance, and the Fundamental Rights Agency – that are addressing discrimination. Governments should also provide a detailed accounting on the incidence and nature of hate crimes to these bodies in accordance with political and other commitments.