ENGLISH only



SUPPLEMENTARY HUMAN DIMENSION MEETING

Prevention of Racism, Xenophobia and Hate Crimes through Educational and Awareness-Raising Initiatives

> 10–11 November 2011 VIENNA

> > FINAL REPORT

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	3
II.	SYNOPSIS OF THE SESSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	3
	Opening Session	4
	Working Session 1: Challenges and Perspectives for the Prevention of Racism and Xenophobia	
	Working Session 2: Challenges in Combating Hate Crimes, Racism and Xenophobia: Role of Awareness-Raising Initiatives and Public Discourse Working Session 3: Education for Tolerance and Mutual Respect and Understanding: Good Practices from Intergovernmental	9
	Organizations, Governments and Civil Society	
III.	ANNEXES	17
	Annex 1: Agenda	17
	Annex 2: Opening Remarks	19
	Annex 3: Keynote Speech by Mrs. Doreen Lawrence	23
	Annex 4: Biographical Information on Introducers and Moderators	27

I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The third Supplementary Human Dimension Meeting (SHDM) in 2011 was dedicated to exploring educational and awareness-raising initiatives as key mechanisms for preventing racism, xenophobia and hate crimes. The meeting sought to assess current practices and to explore new strategies. It brought together 159 participants, including 107 delegates from 46 OSCE participating States, 4 representatives from 3 OSCE Partners for Cooperation, 38 representatives from non-governmental organizations, and 4 representatives from international organizations.

The meeting was organized into three working sessions:

- Challenges and Perspectives for the Prevention of Racism and Xenophobia;
- Challenges in Combating Hate Crimes, Racism and Xenophobia: Role of Awareness-Raising Initiatives and Public Discourse; and
- Education for Tolerance and Mutual Respect and Understanding: Good Practices from Intergovernmental Organizations (IGOs), Governments and Civil Society.

Discussions focused on a variety of themes, including the prevalence of racism, xenophobia and hate crimes in the OSCE area and contemporary challenges in combating these forms of intolerance. Participants proposed a number of key recommendations and best practice initiatives targeting a wide range of stakeholders. While participants underscored the obligations of participating States to protect individuals from intolerance, racist violence and discrimination, they also encouraged other stakeholders including civil society, sporting associations, the media and international organizations to engage in capacity building, awareness-raising and educational initiatives.

II. SYNOPSIS OF THE SESSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This section summarizes the discussions which took place during the opening session and the three thematic sessions and presents recommendations made by participants. The recommendations were directed toward a variety of actors, in particular OSCE participating States, OSCE institutions and field operations, civil society actors and members of the media. These recommendations have no official status and are not based on consensus. The inclusion of a recommendation in this report does not suggest that it reflects the views or policies of the OSCE. Nevertheless, these recommendations are useful indicators for the OSCE to reflect on how participating States are meeting their commitments to promote human rights in these areas.

OPENING SESSION

Opening remarks were delivered by Ambassador Renatas Norkus, Chairperson of the OSCE Permanent Council and by Ambassador Janez Lenarčič, the Director of the ODIHR, followed by the keynote speech of Mrs. Doreen Lawrence, OBE, Founder and External Director of the Stephen Lawrence Charitable Trust.¹

Ambassador Norkus noted the prevalence of hate crimes, racism and xenophobia in the OSCE area and underscored that combating these problems is among the top priorities of the Lithuanian Chairmanship. He recalled that the Chairmanship had organized three high-level meetings on tolerance and non-discrimination issues. In addition, he said, the Chairmanship hoped to sponsor a Ministerial Council decision updating OSCE political commitments on these issues. He stressed the importance of education and awareness-raising as tools in combating racism and intolerance. He also pointed out that OSCE participating States have acknowledged that racism, xenophobia, anti-Semitism and other forms of intolerance, including against Muslims, Christians and followers of other religions, constitute a threat to stability and security throughout the OSCE region. In this regard, OSCE participating States have adopted a comprehensive range of commitments aimed at preventing and responding to this phenomenon while simultaneously promoting mutual respect and understanding.

Ambassador Lenarčič highlighted the threats to social stability posed by racism. He recalled OSCE commitments aimed at combating racism, xenophobia and hate crimes and noted the need for robust prevention programmes that include educational and awareness-raising initiatives. At the same time, he stressed that state authorities should ensure that such preventative measures and responses are congruent with the right to freedom of expression and do not criminalize speech. Ambassador Lenarčič mentioned a variety of programmes ODIHR has developed to assist OSCE participating States, including drafting educational guidelines for schools and the Training Against Hate Crimes for Law Enforcement (TAHCLE)² programme. In closing, he commented that the SHDM provided an opportunity to celebrate 2011 as the United Nations International Year for People of African Descent. In this regard, earlier in the day ODIHR had organized a roundtable event, with the assistance of the United States Mission to the OSCE that brought together representatives from the OSCE area who focus on issues affecting peoples of African descent and their communities.

The keynote speaker, Mrs. Doreen Lawrence, recalled her son's tragic death in 1993 in London and her 20-year quest for justice. Despite the time that has lapsed since his death, she said that this was the first time that she had recounted in their entirety the details of the racist murder of her 19-year-old son Stephen. Her contribution to the opening session emphasized the impact that hate crimes have on victims' families, communities, and

¹ The texts of the opening session speeches can be found in Annexes 3 and 4. For further information on Mrs. Lawrence's work in the area of combating racism and xenophobia, please refer to http://stephenlawrence.org.uk/.

² Further information on the TAHCLE programme is available at http://www.osce.org/odihr/77457.

broader society. Mrs. Lawrence also underscored her struggle to combat various forms of institutional discrimination and prejudice, which ultimately resulted in the adoption by Parliament in 1999 of 70 recommendations aimed at addressing racism, including in schools and by the police. This was followed by the adoption of the Race Relations Amendment Act 2000. Mrs. Lawrence also discussed the work and achievements of the Stephen Lawrence Charitable Trust.

SESSION I: CHALLENGES AND PERSPECTIVES FOR THE PREVENTION OF RACISM AND XENOPHOBIA

Introducer: Ms. Ilze Brands Kehris, Director, Office of the OSCE High Commissioner on National Minorities

Moderator: Ms. Floriane Hohenberg, Head of the Tolerance and Non-Discrimination Department of ODIHR

Working Session 1 offered the participants an opportunity to explore current manifestations of racism and xenophobia in the OSCE area, and to discuss current challenges and perspectives regarding their prevention.

The session's introducer, Ms. Ilze Brands Kehris, noted the timeliness of the meeting given the prevalence of and contemporary challenges in combating racism and xenophobia in the OSCE area. While these are not new phenomena, the challenges of confronting them have been compounded by contemporary events. New challenges include the continued economic crisis, which has resulted in the increased "scapegoating" of asylum seekers, migrants and other visible minority members, the portrayal of migration as a threat to local populations, the rise of right-wing political parties and groups expounding nationalist and xenophobic ideologies, and a wave of counterterrorism laws and policies which utilise ethnic profiling in the law enforcement and security sectors.

While a robust legal framework has been developed since World War II to combat racism and discrimination at both international and regional levels, there have been shortfalls in implementation and enforcement and the pace of progress has been slow. Ms. Brands Kehris underscored the engagement of key actors, including governments and civil society, in the fight against racism. She also encouraged the co-ordination of regional responses, both to develop common approaches and to share best practices.

In the subsequent discussion, numerous participants stressed the importance of supporting educational initiatives to combat racism and xenophobia. In particular, they called for reform of school curricula.

Dr. Massimo Introvigne, Personal Representative of the OSCE Chairperson-in-Office on Combating Racism, Xenophobia and Discrimination, also focusing on Intolerance and Discrimination against Christians and Members of Other Religions, noted that there is a danger that new forms of racism are being disseminated in public education systems.

Unlike older forms of racism, which were based upon false notions regarding race and eugenics, newer forms are increasingly tied to the notion of "ethno-culture". In this context, the concept of culture should be reclaimed and taught as one that is based on tolerance and respect for a diversity of cultures, rather than one based on ethnocentrism.

A number of participants expressed concern that the history of peoples of African descent, including the history of the transatlantic slave trade and the colonial histories of European states, is rarely if ever taught in public education systems in the OSCE area. Equally disconcerting, one said, is that Black Africans and peoples of African descent tend to be demonised and dehumanised when portrayed in school curricula. Several participants further expressed their concerns about the exclusion of African history from the public consciousness and from mainstream cultural forums such as museums. They called on participating States to support the creation of national days to commemorate the victims of the transatlantic slave trade and its abolition.

Hate speech and intolerance in public discourse also emerged as key themes. There were diverging views about the demarcation line between freedom of expression and hate speech. While participants noted the importance of condemning hate speech, intolerant discourse and the propagation of neo-fascist ideologies, there was little agreement about the role of criminal and/or civil legislation in prohibiting such speech. One delegate expressed concern regarding the spread of neo-fascist and neo-Nazi ideologies and noted an increase in public gatherings where these ideas are espoused.

There was also an appeal to participating States to revoke their reservations to Article 4 of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination (CERD).³ Other participants expressed their concern that hate speech legislation should be approached with caution given the potential for such reform to stifle freedom of expression and the media. It was recommended that legislation clearly and narrowly define unacceptable speech in accordance with international law and standards so as to avoid an overly broad application of legislation which may silence free speech.

"States Parties condemn all propaganda and all organizations which are based on ideas or theories of superiority of one race or group of persons of one colour or ethnic origin, or which attempt to justify or promote racial hatred and discrimination in any form, and undertake to adopt immediate and positive measures designed to eradicate all incitement to, or acts of, such discrimination and, to this end, with due regard to the principles embodied in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the rights expressly set forth in article 5 of this Convention, inter alia:

³ Article 4 reads as follows:

⁽a) Shall declare an offence punishable by law all dissemination of ideas based on racial superiority or hatred, incitement to racial discrimination, as well as all acts of violence or incitement to such acts against any race or group of persons of another colour or ethnic origin, and also the provision of any assistance to racist activities, including the financing thereof;

⁽b) Shall declare illegal and prohibit organizations, and also organized and all other propaganda activities, which promote and incite racial discrimination, and shall recognize participation in such organizations or activities as an offence punishable by law;

⁽c) Shall not permit public authorities or public institutions, national or local, to promote or incite racial discrimination." For full text please refer to http://www2.ohchr.org/english/law/cerd.htm.

Racist violence, and in particular hate crimes, were raised as serious and widespread problems. The tragic events in Norway were mentioned by a number of participants as an extreme example of racist violence. It was noted that the perpetrator chose to target Norwegian politicians in general and in particular those from the Labour Party for their work in combating xenophobia and racism.

Several participants also expressed concerns about ethnic profiling practices, in particular the targeting of peoples of African descent by law enforcement. Participating States were called upon to demonstrate, through both policy and action, their commitment to eliminating such practices. Institutional racism was also identified as a serious issue, with one participant asserting that there is widespread exclusion of certain groups in international forums and organizations, intergovernmental agencies and leadership positions.

Mrs. Lawrence, the opening session's keynote speaker, urged political leaders to take more decisive action in protecting all citizens from racist-motivated violence. One delegate pointed out the impact that the murder of her son and the resulting judicial inquiry has had both on the criminal justice system in the United Kingdom and on hate crime reform in the broader OSCE region. A number of other participants also referred to the testimony of Mrs. Lawrence, noting that it served as a stark reminder of the widespread impact of hate crimes and why it is necessary to combat racism in all of its manifestations.

The following specific recommendations were made in Session 1:

Recommendations to OSCE participating States:

- Participating States should implement OSCE commitments on the monitoring and reporting of hate crimes.
- OSCE participating States should collect and submit data regarding hate crimes to ODIHR for use in its annual report on hate crimes.
- When collecting data on hate crimes, participating States should produce disaggregated statistics based on ethnicity and religion.
- OSCE participating States that have not yet done so should enact laws that establish
 hate crimes as specific offences or provide enhanced penalties for bias-motivated
 violent crimes.
- OSCE participating States that have not yet done so should initiate law enforcement training programmes on responding to hate crimes, and should draw on the training expertise of OSCE institutions in this field.
- Participating States should uphold their commitments in the area of freedom of religion, anti-discrimination and freedom of expression.
- Participating States should support the creation of national days to commemorate the victims of the transatlantic slave trade and the trade's abolition.
- Participating States should ensure that school curricula is developed to reflect diverse histories, and in particular the histories of their student population.

- Political leaders throughout the OSCE region should condemn all forms of intolerance, racial discrimination, neo-Nazi and neo-fascist ideologies and develop national policies and strategies to address these issues.
- In order to uphold freedom of expression, hate speech legislation should clearly and narrowly define unacceptable speech in accordance with international law and standards, while protecting all other forms of expression.
- Participating States should consider revoking their reservations, if any, to Article 4
 of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial
 Discrimination.
- Participating States should uphold their commitments and legal obligations to prohibit racial discrimination and eliminate racial and ethnic profiling as law enforcement and intelligence strategies.
- Participating States should consider utilizing parliamentary and power sharing initiatives which bring representatives from diverse ethnic groups to work together on common policy and legislative objectives.
- The OSCE should organize a high level conference on the risks and challenges posed by the dissemination of neo-Nazi and neo-fascist ideologies.

Recommendations to OSCE Institutions and Field Operations:

- ODIHR should conduct training on addressing hate crimes for educators, members of the media, civil society, law enforcement and other members of the criminal justice sector including prosecutors and judges.
- ODIHR should address and combat racial/ethnic profiling under its tolerance-related mandate.

Recommendations to Civil Society:

- Civil society organizations should monitor and collect data regarding hate speech and hate crimes.
- Religious leaders should condemn all forms of intolerance, including racism and xenophobia.

Recommendations to Members of the Media:

- Members of the media should engage in ethical, balanced and professional reporting which contributes to a culture of tolerance and respect.
- Employers in the media sector should ensure that they uphold their legal obligations to prohibit racial and other forms of discrimination.
- Media outlets and providers should ensure that opportunities are provided to traditionally excluded groups to participate in media production processes, including in film, the visual arts, print and written media.

SESSION II: CHALLENGES IN COMBATING HATE CRIMES, RACISM AND XENOPHOBIA: ROLE OF AWARENESS-RAISING INITIATIVES AND PUBLIC DISCOURSE

Introducer:

Mr. William Gaillard, Advisor to the President, Union of European Football Associations (UEFA)

Moderator: Dr. Rafal Pankowski, Deputy Editor, Never Again Association

Working Session 2 offered the opportunity for participants to discuss awareness-raising initiatives in public discourse aimed at combating hate crimes, racism and xenophobia. The keynote speaker of the session was Mr. William Galliard, whose presentation focused on UEFA's commitment to implementing social responsibility in football and to taking a leading role to combat racism and xenophobia in society as well as in sport. Mr. Gaillard mentioned the limitations facing football associations in addressing some of the crimes surrounding football events. He stressed that these limitations need to be recognized in order to clarify the tasks and roles of national and international football associations.

Mr. Gaillard acknowledged that the challenges include institutional discrimination within UEFA as well as within national football associations in Europe. He stressed that UEFA has introduced various positive action programmes and policies that address institutional racism, and which are aimed at awareness-raising. Football, like any other sporting activity, starts at the local and amateur levels and is regulated by highly autonomous national football associations. These national associations are independent and it is their responsibility to address local issues and not the role of UEFA to intervene in an ad hoc manner.

Mr. Gaillard also mentioned the adverse impact of the current economic crisis on confronting the issue of racism in football. The fact that many European economies are making drastic cuts to public spending has meant that many social awareness programmes have been scaled down. This in turns helps to explain the current social crisis in this area and the subsequent increase in racist and xenophobic incidents at football matches. There has been a troubling resurgence of racism and xenophobia in some places where the problem was thought to have been eradicated. Mr. Gaillard called for greater attention and awareness on the part of football clubs and their supporters, as well as awareness of such problems by law enforcement agencies.

The advent of the Euro 2012 European Football Championship has allowed UEFA to devote attention and resources to combating racism in football. Currently, UEFA is investing three million Euros in partnerships with national football associations and NGOs across Europe. This indicates the commitment of the association to addressing the problem and eradicating racism in football once and for all.

This thought-provoking intervention generated a number of questions and reactions from participants. Interventions focused mainly on the role of UEFA in addressing hate crimes and incidents at stadiums and at events related to football matches. One issue of concern is the role of fan clubs in propagating racist and anti-Semitic sentiments. Participants also raised the lack of specific and adequate sanctions, which allows such practices to continue unabated. Freedom of expression was also discussed and a number of suggestions were made regarding the role of the State and how States should intervene to limit the spread of racist and hate-fuelled speech on the Internet and through the media.

A number of speakers offered suggestions to combat racism in football and sport and outlined some State initiatives in this regard. State authorities were encouraged to take such matters seriously. It was stressed, however, that football is not the root cause of hate crimes. Participants engaged in a discussion on the dissemination of hate on the Internet and how to prevent and respond to this phenomenon. Monitoring and shutting down websites that disseminate hateful content was the subject of a lively discussion among delegates. While some participants appealed to Internet providers to co-operate closely with civil society to remove hateful content from the Internet, others stressed the dangers of an approach that would give private companies the power to decide whether content is acceptable or unacceptable. All participants agreed that teaching young generations to be critical about the content of the Internet was the most sustainable approach.

The recently inaugurated annual football tournament the "Clericus Cup" was also provided as an example of a best practice in confronting prejudice and intolerance. The tournament's contestants are members of Roman Colleges, which are seminaries of the Catholic Church based in Rome. Increased contact among players helps to build bridges among communities, combat prejudice and foster tolerance and mutual understanding.

An example of a best practice initiative presented by one speaker was the implementation of comprehensive training against hate crimes for law enforcement personnel in Poland in 2009 that stemmed from ODIHR's Law Enforcement Officers Programme. This effort was complimented by hate crimes legislation. One delegate noted that the Russian Prosecutor's Office has been working in a very decisive manner to combat hate crimes and xenophobia. The Russian judiciary, this speaker said, has handed out serious sanctions and punishments for hate crimes, while Russian authorities act decisively when public order violations occur including during authorized demonstrations and gatherings.

While many participants agreed that stiff penalties for racist crimes are necessary, they agreed also that force alone is not sufficient in tackling the problem of hate crimes and xenophobia. Many speakers pointed out that prevention is also necessary. Prevention often works best when NGOs and governments collaborate in awareness-raising activities. A positive development mentioned by one participant is the increasing cooperation across the OSCE region between police forces and NGOs. Using football matches as a venue to draw attention to and raise awareness about hate crimes was cited as a good practice. At the same time, some participants deplored that elected officials and government representatives do not condemn harshly enough manifestations of intolerance and of hate taking place at sporting events.

Best practices from other sports were also highlighted. One delegate called attention to the "Rooney Rule" which has been implemented in American football leagues, as a positive example which might be utilized by other sporting associations. The rule requires that clubs must, at a minimum, interview one minority candidate for head coach positions. This rule has helped to overcome the networking challenge, break the "glass-ceiling" and has changed the demographic of senior leadership in the sport. Furthermore, it has helped to increase the percentage of head coach positions held by minority members from 6 per cent to 23 per cent.

Some participants mentioned concerns about gender representation in football and within the UEFA hierarchy. Gender was also raised as an issue in terms of women as mothers responding to and dealing with the impact of racist and hate incidents that their children may face. Mr. Gaillard responded to these interventions and stressed that gender is a key issue and that over one million women are registered footballers (out of a combined total of 34 million overall). He also noted that there have been no studies regarding women and hate crimes in sport. While men are the overwhelming majority of transgressors, a small number of women do participate in hate crimes and incidents. Mr. Gaillard encouraged women to participate in football and attend matches and noted that UEFA has a number of incentives encouraging family participation in football.

During the question and answer phase of the session, Mr. Gaillard was provided with an opportunity to address some of the specific questions and issues raised regarding UEFA initiatives and policies. He mentioned that UEFA attempts to solve the most glaring issues related to racism and xenophobia and reminded participants that incidents that occur outside of the football stadiums do not fall within the remit of UEFA. He also stressed that since UEFA is not a member of the Fédération Internationale de Football Association (FIFA), it does not intervene in FIFA events such as the World Cup and World Cup qualifiers.

There were a number of other themes raised by participants during the session. For example, one speaker noted that racist incidents at major football clubs draw far greater public attention than ones that occur at smaller clubs and, in this regard, it seems that smaller clubs seem to "get away" with xenophobic incidents. It was also argued that the fines that football clubs are subject to are too small to act as a deterrent and it appears that there are inconsistent policies regarding different sized clubs. In this regard, the speaker urged, sanctions should be specified and consistently applied. Given that footballers are role models, they need to set an example both on and off the field and players who make racist comments off the field should also be subject to sanctions for their actions. In the realm of proactive and preventative measures, participants encouraged the engagement of footballers in positive initiatives which bridge cultural divides and diminish social tensions.

The following specific recommendations were made in Session 2:

Recommendations to OSCE participating States:

- Participating States should implement hate crimes law enforcement training programmes.⁴ Such programmes should include modules on hate crimes, sporting events and best policing practices.
- Participating States should engage in Internet monitoring initiatives which target online hate speech.

Recommendations to UEFA and National Football Associations:

- Football associations should subject members who are involved in racist acts and/or speech to strong sanctions in order to act as a clear deterrent. Such sanctions should be consistently applied.
- Football associations should work in collaboration to agree upon appropriate and effective sanctions.
- Hate crimes awareness-raising and anti-racist initiatives in football should involve peoples of African descent.
- Football associations should consider utilizing affirmative action initiatives such as the "Rooney Rule" in their hiring processes.

SESSION III: EDUCATION FOR TOLERANCE AND MUTUAL RESPECT AND UNDERSTANDING: GOOD PRACTICES FROM IGOS, GOVERNMENTS AND CIVIL SOCIETY

Introducer: Mr. Oleg Smirnov, Chair of the Board, the Integration and Development Centre for Information and Research

Moderator: Ms. Felisa Tibbitts, Director, Human Rights Education Association (HREA)

The third working session presented participants with the opportunity to explore education and training as tools for preventing racism and xenophobia. Participants acknowledged that these tools are essential in the fight against intolerance and should be implemented in a comprehensive manner, targeting both formal and informal education and professionals in the media, law enforcement and criminal justice sectors. It was also noted that such an approach should be complemented and supported by a wide range of other strategies in monitoring and accountability involving legal frameworks and the protection of fundamental rights and freedoms.

The session's introducer, Mr. Oleg Smirnov, described one of the comprehensive education programmes that his organization has successfully implemented in the Crimean region of Ukraine. Despite numerous challenges, including widespread intolerance, ethnic and religious tension, and the repatriation and reintegration of over 300,000 Crimean Tatars to the area, the organization has integrated its programme the "Culture of

_

⁴ Op. cit., note 4.

Good Neighbourhood" throughout successive stages of the public education system in the region.

The key objectives of the programme are to build student competences and skills throughout their education, including the cultivation of social and cross-cultural competences, conflict resolution and effective communication skills. The course also aims to challenge prevailing stereotypes and to expose children to the diverse histories, cultures and religions which are represented in the region. Central to the organization's success was the mainstreaming of tolerance education throughout all phases of the education system and in different subject matters, teacher training and support, and the implementation of complimentary programmes targeting other community members. Mr. Smirnov underscored the importance of reaching out to and eliciting the support of parents, community members and State authorities.

Following Mr. Smirnov's presentation, a lively discussion ensued, which enabled participants from the United States, Ukraine, Greece, Austria, France, Hungary, the Russian Federation, Sweden, Italy, Poland, Slovenia, the Holy See, Cyprus, Ireland, Lithuania, Armenia and Moldova to share best practices and explore new strategies. There was widespread agreement that schools have an essential role to play in carrying out teaching and learning in ways that prevent and combat racism and xenophobia and that human rights principles and norms should be integrated in school curricula, practices and policy. Speakers also emphasised that programmes to combat racism and xenophobia should involve not only teachers, students and educational personnel, but also parents, community members and community-based organizations and municipalities. This strategy, however, can be a challenge in states where educational systems are highly decentralised.

In the area of curricula reform, one delegate encouraged participating States to include history lessons which address genocide and crimes against humanity committed on the basis of ethnicity, race and/or religion. The speaker pointed out that it is only by recalling the past that we can avoid the repetition of such atrocities. There was some divergence in opinion among participants regarding the role and nature of religious instruction and inter-religious education in the public sector. However, a number of interventions focused on the importance of teaching religion in a universal, neutral and objective manner that emphasizes a diversity of faiths.

Several delegates made reference to best practices in the area of educational integration and inclusion. In Greece, there are a number of pilot programmes targeting pre-primary and primary schools and aiming at integrating students from the migrant, refugee and Roma communities. In Hungary, it was noted that the State authorities have implemented a number of formal and informal civic education programmes. In the Russian Federation, a number of similar programmes have been implemented with the aim of introducing religion and secular ethics to students. In Poland, the Ministry of Education has sought the assistance of experts to train educators in confronting prejudice in the classroom.

Despite the showcasing of good practices, civil society representatives argued that very little progress has been achieved in these key areas. One participant, for example, called attention to the landmark European Court of Human Rights ruling in *D.H. and Others v. The Czech Republic*⁵, a case surrounding the systemic racial segregation of Roma children in the public schooling system. Despite the Court's ruling that the segregation of Roma children amounted to a breach of the non-discrimination protections in the European Convention on Human Rights, this issue remains a serious concern in a number of participating States.

Given the inconsistent application of human rights and tolerance education programmes throughout the OSCE area, it was suggested that increased co-ordination be sought in the region. One delegate called upon ODIHR to collect and publish best practices in the area of tolerance education. In this regard, participating States were encouraged to make use of the *Human Rights Education in the School Systems of Europe, Central Asia and North America: A Compendium of Good Practices*⁶. One participant proposed that regional standards might be created for the review of textbooks and learning materials to ensure that they are free from stereotypes, prejudice and hatred and, that they promote mutual understanding, respect and knowledge of one's own culture as well others. Finally, a speaker suggested that common definitions for such terms as tolerance, inter-cultural and human rights education be clarified and shared throughout the area.

While the discussion focused predominantly on the formal schooling system, participants asserted also that professional training and adult education initiatives are crucial in combating racism and xenophobia. Such initiatives include training and outreach programmes for parents and community members, anti-discrimination and hate crime training for law enforcement and educators, conflict resolution and cross-cultural communication training for educators, and diversity and cultural capacity training for members of the media.

The following specific recommendations were made in Session 3:

Recommendations to OSCE participating States:

 Participating States should implement comprehensive educational programmes which promote tolerance, anti-discrimination and human rights in pre-school, primary, secondary and post-secondary schools. Programmes should aim to mainstream human rights standards through subject courses and extracurricular

_

⁵ The Grand Chamber judgment (Application no. 57325/00) was issued on 13 November 2007. For online access to the full text of the judgment, please refer to http://cmiskp.echr.coe.int/tkp197/view.asp?item=1&portal=hbkm&action=html&highlight=57325/00&sessionid=82337635&skin=hudoc-en.

⁶ Developed jointly by ODIHR, the Office of the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights, the Council of Europe, the UN Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), and the Human Rights Education Association (HREA), the Compendium provides a comprehensive description and samples of successful initiatives in the field of human rights and democratic citizenship education. It is designed to serve as a tool for educational policy makers and educators in the formal education sector. For more information, including an online copy of the Compendium in English, please refer to http://www.osce.org/odihr/39006.

- activities. Complimentary initiatives including teacher training programmes and outreach projects targeting parents should accompany such programmes.
- Teacher training programmes should aim to build the skills of educators to address bias and prejudices in the classroom and to engage in conflict resolution processes.
- Participating States should conduct curricula, literature and learning material reviews to ensure that these teaching tools reflect the diversity of the student population, that they are free of prejudice and stereotypes and promote tolerance and non-discrimination. School curricula should include the history of peoples of African descent, the transatlantic slave trade, and the role of the participating States in colonization.
- Training programmes should be implemented targeting law enforcement personnel with a view to ensuring that all law enforcement agents are familiar with anti-discrimination concepts and standards. Such programmes should aim to eradicate racial/ethnic profiling in the law enforcement sector.
- Participating States should fulfill their obligations to explore ways to provide victims of hate crimes with access to counselling and legal assistance as well effective access to justice and remedies.
- Participating States should implement programmes aimed at integrating new immigrant students into local schools. Such integration programmes should target the wider community as well.
- Participating States should fulfill their legal obligations to prohibit racial discrimination in the area of education and ensure full access and inclusion for all students, regardless of their race, nationality or ethnicity.
- Participating States should create guidelines for educators on how to respond to hate crimes and/or intolerance in the classroom.
- Participating States should utilize ODIHR's Guidelines for Educators on Countering Intolerance and Discrimination against Muslims: Addressing Islamophobia through Education⁷.
- Participating States should increase transnational efforts to combat hate on the Internet, and to combat the use of information technology to propagate hate or hate crimes.
- Participating States should work to ensure that educators are representative of the diverse communities they serve. This diversity should be reflected at all staff levels in the education system.
- Participating States should ensure that schools are accessible, in a physical, linguistic and cultural sense to students with diverse backgrounds.
- Cultural diversity should be celebrated in the classroom and educators should integrate practices of tolerance and mutual respect in all aspects of school life, including in classroom teaching as well as through extracurricular activities.
- Participating States should consider creating regional standards for the review of textbooks and learning materials to ensure that they are free from stereotypes, prejudice and hatred and, that they promote mutual understanding.
- In the area of human rights and democratic citizenship education, participating States should utilize the good practices produced in the *Human Rights Education in*

⁷ The publication is available at http://www.osce.org/odihr/84495.

- the School Systems of Europe, Central Asia and North America: A Compendium of Good Practices⁸.
- In the area of educational policy and planning, participating States should make use of the Council of Europe's Education for Democratic Citizenship and Human Rights Education (EDC/HRE)⁹.
- Participating States should utilize the European Wergeland Centre's online library for resources in the area of human rights education.¹⁰

Recommendations to OSCE Institutions and Field Operations:

- ODIHR should conduct anti-discrimination and anti-hate crime capacity building training with civil society, members of the media, law enforcement personnel and other members of the criminal justice sector such as prosecutors and judges.
- ODIHR should design and implement projects on preventing racism, xenophobia, and hate crimes, and in particular educational, training and awareness-raising initiatives.
- ODIHR, in cooperation with the OSCE Representative on Freedom of the Media, should develop tools for media professionals on how to combat intolerance, racism and prejudice in the media and public discourse. These tools should include model codes of conduct for media professionals, and the collection of best practices in the
- During their official country visits, the Personal Representatives of the OSCE Chairperson-in-Office on tolerance issues should meet with representatives of the media and raise awareness of the impact of racism, xenophobia and intolerance.

Recommendations to Civil Society:

- Inter-faith and inter-communal initiatives and coalitions should be strengthened.
- Religious leaders should condemn all forms of intolerance, including racism and xenophobia.
- Community organizations involved in educational policy and planning advocacy should make use of the Council of Europe's Education for Democratic Citizenship and Human Rights Education (EDC/HRE)¹¹ and the European Wergeland Centre's online library.¹

⁸ Op. cit., note 9.

⁹ The EDC/HRE Pack is a collection of documents, strategies and support documents for educators, educational policy planners, advocates and community organizations. For more information, including online copies of the Pack, please refer to

http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/education/edc/3_RESOURCES/EDC_pack_en.asp.

¹⁰ For more information on the Centre's mandate and online resources, please refer to http://www.theewc.org/library/.

¹¹ Op cit., note 12.
¹² Op cit., note 13.

III. ANNEXES: ANNEX 1: Agenda



Supplementary Human Dimension Meeting PREVENTION OF RACISM, XENOPHOBIA AND HATE CRIMES THROUGH EDUCATIONAL AND AWARENESSRAISING INITIATIVES

10–11 November 2011 Hofburg, Vienna

AGENDA

Day 1 10 November 2011

15.00 – 16.00 OPENING SESSION

Opening remarks:

Ambassador Renatas Norkus, Chairperson of the OSCE Permanent Council, Lithuania's Permanent Representative to the OSCE

Ambassador Janez Lenarčič, Director, OSCE Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights (OSCE/ODIHR)

Keynote speech:

Mrs. Doreen Lawrence, Founder and External Director of the Stephen Lawrence Charitable Trust, Officer of the Order of the British Empire (OBE)

Technical information by **Ms. Floriane Hohenberg**, Head of the Tolerance and Non-Discrimination Department of the OSCE/ODIHR

16.00 - 18.00 <u>SESSION I</u>: Challenges and Perspectives for the Prevention of Racism and Xenophobia

Introducer:

Ms. Ilze Brands Kehris, Director, OSCE High Commissioner on National Minorities

Moderator:

Ms. Floriane Hohenberg, Head of the Tolerance and Non-Discrimination Department of the OSCE/ODIHR

18.00 - 19.00

Reception hosted by the Lithuanian Chairmanship

Day 2

11 November 2011

10.00 - 12.00

<u>SESSION II:</u> Challenges in Combating Hate Crimes, Racism and Xenophobia: Role of Awareness-Raising Initiatives and Public Discourse

Introducer:

Mr. William Gaillard, Advisor to the President, Union of European Football Associations (UEFA)

Moderator:

Dr. Rafal Pankowski, Deputy Editor, Never Again Association

12.00 - 14.00

Lunch

14.00 - 16.00

<u>SESSION III:</u> Education for Tolerance and Mutual Respect and Understanding: Good Practices from IGOs, Governments and Civil Society

Introducer:

Mr. Oleg Smirnov, Chair of the Board, the Integration and Development Centre for Information and Research

Moderator:

Ms. Felisa Tibbitts, Director, Human Rights Education Association (HREA)

16.00 - 16.30

Break

16.30 - 17.30

CLOSING SESSION

Reports by the Moderators of the Working Sessions

Comments from the floor

Closing remarks

17.30

Closing of the Meeting

ANNEX 2: Opening Remarks

Supplementary Human Dimension Meeting Prevention of Racism, Xenophobia, and Hate Crimes through Educational and Awareness-Raising Initiatives

Opening Remarks by Ambassador Renatas Norkus Chairperson of the Permanent Council Vienna, 10 November 2011

Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen,

It is a great pleasure to welcome you, on behalf of the Lithuanian OSCE Chairmanship, to the third Supplementary Human Dimension Meeting on the Prevention of Racism, Xenophobia and Hate Crimes through Educational and Awareness-Raising Initiatives.

OSCE participating States have acknowledged that racism, xenophobia and other forms of intolerance constitute a threat to stability and security throughout the OSCE region. Thus a comprehensive range of commitments have been adopted to promote mutual respect and understanding and to prevent manifestations of racism and xenophobia. However, ODIHR's annual report *Hate Crimes in the OSCE Region – Incidents and Responses* shows that racism, xenophobia still threaten the security of individuals and social cohesion across the OSCE region.

Combating intolerance and discrimination, especially through educational and awarenessraising measures, as well as freedom of expression and media are among the top priorities of the Lithuanian OSCE Chairmanship for this year.

Together with the ODIHR we have organized three high-level conferences on tolerance and non-discrimination this year: in March, we held a conference in Prague on confronting anti-Semitism in public discourse; in September in Rome, we organized an event on preventing and responding to hate incidents and crimes against Christians; and just two weeks ago here in Vienna, we held a conference devoted to countering intolerance and discrimination against Muslims in public discourse.

The strong interest shown in the 3 High Level meetings by the participating States and by civil society representatives reflects the importance of this topic for our Organization. Sharing experience and identifying best practices are the necessary steps to address these issues in line with the commitments we have undertaken.

As a *follow-up* to these important events, the Lithuanian Chairmanship intends to engage in building consensus on updating the OSCE political commitments in the field of Tolerance and Non-Discrimination, notably by adopting a Ministerial Council decision on Countering Manifestations of Intolerance in Public Discourse. In our view this decision could base on the recommendations of the 3 High Level meetings on this topic.

The Chairmanship is also pleased to see that other parts of the OSCE family have also devoted attention to promoting tolerance and non-discrimination. In May, the OSCE Parliamentary Assembly recognized 2011 as the *International Year for People of African Descent*. The Resolution (AS (11) Res 17 E) reaffirms the responsibility of parliamentarians to speak out against intolerance and discrimination and to raise awareness of the value of diversity.

To be more effective, prevention of and responses to racism and xenophobia need to be focused and concrete. We must step up efforts throughout the OSCE area to address all manifestations of intolerance, and in particular hate crimes, in a timely and robust fashion. If we fail in this effort, intolerance has the potential to degenerate into conflict.

Education and awareness raising initiatives are particularly powerful tools in combating racism and intolerance. It can prevent escalation and promote mutual respect and understanding. Actions in this field need to foster an appreciation of cultural, religious and ethnic diversity. Initiatives to combat racism and xenophobia are more effective if a broad range of actors, including public officials at a national and local level, civil society, church and religious leaders, sports or music celebrities are involved in the process. While a number of participating States have undertaken numerous efforts in this field, longer-term and more coherent approaches are needed if there is to be a real impact.

It is my hope that today's meeting will provide a good opportunity to take stock of progress in this area, share best practices and generate ideas for making concrete progress in addressing remaining challenges.

I wish to thank the ODIHR Director Ambassador J. Lenarčič and his team for having prepared this meeting.

I thank you for your attention and wish you every success in your discussions.

Address by Ambassador Janez Lenarčič Director of the OSCE Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights (ODIHR)

Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen,

It gives me great pleasure to welcome you here at this Supplementary Human Dimension Meeting on the 'Prevention of Racism, Xenophobia and Hate Crimes Through Educational and Awareness Raising Initiatives'.

This SHDM provides us with the opportunity to - **first** - examine contemporary forms of racist and xenophobic intolerance, including hate crimes and state responses to it; **second**, it will allow us to review what kind of measures states have put in place to prevent manifestations of racism and xenophobia.

Nearly fifty years since the adoption of the International Convention for the Elimination of all Forms of Racial Discrimination, racist sentiments and behaviour continue to threaten social stability across the OSCE region. The tragic events in Oslo and Utøya in July are vivid reminders of this fact. Contemporary manifestations of racism, xenophobia and hate crimes are, for some "minority" communities, daily realities as can be seen for example by incidents affecting many Romani communities across the region.

ODIHR's annual hate crimes report shows that despite the various efforts made by participating States, hate crimes remain a significant problem in the OSCE region. Every year, a large number of people are killed, attacked or injured, and many properties are vandalised and damaged as a result of racist and/or xenophobic sentiments. Preventing and combating hate crimes must therefore remain a priority for states in the OSCE region.

This places an extra burden of responsibility on state agencies to – now quoting from the MC Decision of 2006 – "address the root causes of intolerance and discrimination … through increased awareness-raising measures that promote a greater understanding of and respect for different cultures [and] ethnicities" (MC Decision 13/06).

Measures in this field – to prevent acts of intolerance – are necessary not only to protect the targets of hatred, but also to ensure social stability. Failure to do so can lead to deeprooted social tensions and conflicts and, in the worst-case scenario, conflicts that may degenerate into broader ethnic-based violence and a breakdown of the political order.

This is an outcome we need to avoid and one of the many ways to do this is through raising collective social awareness of this threat.

Effective prevention strategies must include educational and awareness raising initiatives. At the same time, state authorities will also have to make sure that their prevention measures and responses are compatible with the right to freedom of expression. Our collective preference in this organization is to deal with these issues through **robust prevention programmes** premised upon education and raising awareness in society about the dangers of racism, xenophobia, and hate crimes — and **not through the criminalization of speech**.

Participating States have acknowledged this and have sought the assistance of ODIHR in implementing a number of programmes:

- ➤ Let me mention here TAHCLE, our Training Against Hate Crimes for Law Enforcement;
- ➤ our Guidelines for educators to combat Anti-Semitism and Intolerance against Muslims, respectively, in school settings;
- ➤ and our ongoing hate crimes capacity-building workshops and trainings for state officials, NGOs, and civil society.

Other preventative measures include media awareness and monitoring, promotion of tolerance and mutual understanding through education, community engagement, and the

21

promotion of rights-based approaches in education and awareness-raising initiatives. **Various educational programmes** addressing intolerance in schools and local communities have been designed and implemented in the OSCE region over the past few years.

In addition, **political leaders** bear a special responsibility in raising awareness about the dangers and unacceptability of racism and xenophobia. They should vocally and clearly condemn racist and xenophobic sentiments when they are voiced in public and political discourse.

Adopting such a holistic approach can enable states to **counter calls** for the criminalization of speech as a response to intolerant public discourses which we see across the OSCE region. Any state intervention must be nuanced and sensitive enough to capture the subtleties and address the challenges involved.

Let me also mention that with the advent of major international sporting events in 2012 – the EURO 2012 and the Olympics -, it will be useful for us to hear about examples of awareness-raising and initiatives to **combat racism in sport**.

Ladies and gentlemen,

This SHDM also serves to celebrate 2011 as the Year for People of African Descent (YPAD) as proclaimed by the United Nations General Assembly in 2009. In this regard, earlier today, ODIHR organized, with the kind assistance of the US delegation, a roundtable event that brought together key participants focusing on issues affecting people of African descent and their communities across the OSCE region. We look forward to hearing their recommendations over the course of the next day and-a-half.

Thank you.

ANNEX 3: Keynote Speech by Mrs. Doreen Lawrence

10th November 2011

Prevention of Racism, Xenophobia and Hate Crime through Educational and Awareness-Raising Initiatives

I would like to thank OSCE for inviting me to attend this very important event and to talk about my story surrounding Stephen's murder and of how my son's name has made many major changes in the British justice system and beyond. What I have said many times is that I never set out to change laws or to be recognized when I go out, but just to get justice for my son who was murdered for no other reason than because of the colour of his skin.

Eighteen years and five months ago my son Stephen was killed as he made his way home on the 22nd April in1993. I must say this is the first time in eighteen years that I am about to tell the story from the beginning.

It was a Thursday evening and I had just arrived back from a field trip to Birmingham for my degree course. The day was very pleasant and I spent my spare time discussing my children with other mature students. I was happy and looking forward to going home as I had been away for the last two days.

I was picked up at the drop off point by my ex-husband at about 8.30pm. At arriving home I went up to see my son (16 years old at the time) who was still up and we chatted for a while and then my daughter (10 years old at the time) was asleep. Stephen was out as he was 18 years old at the time and therefore he was allowed to be out till 10.30pm during school the week. I was not concerned that Stephen was not in and I went and had a bath before having something to eat. I then settled down to watch the news and to wait for Stephen to come home before going off to bed.

As most parents would dread the knock on the door and then to be faced with someone who you were not expecting. It was a young man with his father from the area where we live. What was said has stayed with me all these years. I was not the one who opened the door my ex-husband did and I was still up stairs in the living room. All I heard was Stephen's name and I must have taken two steps at a time because I don't know how I reached down the stairs so quickly. I push my ex-husband out of the way as you can see I am 5ft 1ins and he is 6ft 2ins. The young man said your son and his friend were attacked near the bus stop down Wellhall Road. He mentioned the Welcome Inn pub and the bus stop. The father said I think you should call the police because they may have more information to give you.

I put on my coat over my nightdress and both my ex-husband and I got into our car to look for Stephen. Before we left I did call the police but they said they did not know what I was talking about because they had not received any information on this matter. We drove down to the area we were told and saw nothing. We thought maybe Stephen

had made his way to the hospital because it was not far away. We turned around and drove to the hospital. While my ex-husband went to park the car I walked into the hospital to look for Stephen. I knew the hospital well as I was often there for one thing or another. When you have children they are always doing something, either swallowing money, climbing trees or taking off the skin in an accident.

I walked into the hospital and went round to the accident and emergency department. When I first entered the hospital I did see a police officer and a young black man but I did not recognized him as I was looking for Stephen. I was just about to walk out of the hospital to say to my ex that Stephen is not here when he recognized Dwayne Brooks the young man that had been with Stephen. At the same time a medical staff member came out and asked Dwayne "what did they hit him with"? We were totally ignored by everyone. I asked if we could see Stephen and said we were his parents. A medical staff showed us into a room to wait.

It would be another fifteen minutes or so before they came back into the room to say that Stephen had died. After that I can not say the length of time that had passed before we made our way home. I should say during that time even though there was a police officer at the hospital he did not approach us to make any inquiry of who we were. We went home to find our other son awake. We had to break the news to him. The rest of the night is a blank. Early next morning our daughter woke to find her dad on the phone talking about Stephen passing and started to scream running up the stairs not knowing what to do.

The weeks that followed was heart breaking to see that the police showed no interest in finding Stephen's killers? The house and area where we lived we had been there for fifteen years without me having any idea of the racism that existed around me. One of things I noticed is how people around are able to hide their true feelings. This was clear after Stephen died because most of my neighbours completely ignored us, they did not say we are sorry about your son even though their children would have been in the same class at primary school.

The days turned into weeks then months without Stephen's killers being arrested. The reason the police gave was that there was a wall of silence. During that time we had people coming to our house saying that there know who the killers are; they would give us names and addresses all this information was passed directly to the police. People would leave notes with names on it on police cars. Within twenty four hours someone walked into a police station with information and the senior office who was working on the case turned the man away.

At one of my visits to the police station I copied the names down and handed it to one of the police officers who were in the room at the time. That officer proceeded to fold the paper into squares that was so small that it resembled the size of a postage stamp. This officer did not know that I was watching him and as I was about to leave the room I said "you are going to put that in the bin now aren't you". The officer was shocked to know

that I was watching him and he quickly smoothed out the paper and said that the police take all information seriously.

The coroner was able to demonstrate the folding of the paper at the inquest in 1997. This is just one of many incident of police institutional racism that took place over the years of police investigating Stephen's murder. At the inquest in 1997 a police officer who was in charge of the third investigation stood up and lied in front of the jury that as far as he was concerned, the first police investigation into Stephen's murder went well except for the relation between the family and the police liaison officers. Clearly that was not true and I believed that's what led to the setting up of the inquiry in 1997. I was outraged that a police officer who was working very closely with our legal team when we were mounting the private prosecution, and who lead us to believe that there were serious flaws in the first investigation, should say what he did. The Labour Party who was in opposition at time indicated that if they were to be elected at the next general election they would set up a public inquiry into the murder of Stephen. The Labour Party did win the election in 1997. The inquiry's brief was to "looking into the murder of Stephen Lawrence and lessons to be learnt".

The inquiry started with preliminary hearing in October 1997 and in full March 1998 at Elephant & Castle, London. The inquiry lasted nine months taking evidence from the police, community members and organizations who had an interest in race relation. The report had 70 recommendations and was presented to the House of Parliament on the 24th February 1999. The Labour Government accepted all the recommendations and a steering group were set up to implement the recommendations. The majority of the recommendations were for the police and institutions including schools. The sad thing is many of the recommendations are still out standing and those that were implemented have been rolled back relating to the police. In relation to schools the recommendation was for schools to report and record all racial incidents that happens alas this was never implement mandatory that left it open for some schools doing nothing. Schools who take the recommendation seriously sign up to the Stephen Lawrence Education Standard for primary and secondary schools.

For any of the recommendations to be implemented you have to rely on the Government to take the initiative to lead. In1999 when the 70 recommendation was announced the Government of the day accepted them and there were buzz from institutions. For the first time institutions felt they had a definition that they can work with "Unwitting". As the years has pasted it seemed to a rolling back of the recommendations with a complete about turn on "stop and search" or stop and account as they would like to call it now. Sir Ronnie Flannigan was tasked by the last Government to cut the bureaucracy of the form filling and recording of the stop and account recording. The percentages of stops are as high as it was before the Inquiry took place. Not much has change regarding reducing the number of stops for the ethnic minority especially young black men.

Two of the main changes are the Race Relation Amendment Act 2000 that brought all organizations included the police under the act and the Double Jeopardy that allows an individual to be tried again if they were found not guilty.

The struggles and fight over the years have taken their toll but the laws that were changed as a result of the Inquiry have made a remarkable difference to people.

You may or may not know that two out of the five men who were identified as being responsible for Stephen's murder will be going on trial in November. The investigation has been ongoing over the years. I can not say any more than that even though I am sure there are lots going on behind the scene.

My children had to grow up in the shadow of Stephen's case over the years and I can only say it is with the grace of God that they have grown up leading a near to normal life and have their own family.

What I can talk about is the work of the Stephen Lawrence Charitable Trust that was set up in Stephen's name in 1998 to support young people into the profession of architecture, an area that Stephen wanted to join. We are an educational charity that wants to support young people to achieve their aims in life. Since 1998 the Trust has not just focus on architecture but also on the built environment. What we do is to provide financial support to students entering university. To date the Trust has supported up to a 100 students at different stages of their education. The Trust support students in three different countries, Jamaica, South Africa and the UK. We now have eight students who are fully qualified.

The Trust will continue to focus on architecture and the built environment with us moving into providing the same level of commitment for other professions that have under representation. The Trust has its own purpose built building where our office is based and from where we can deliver our programmes. The building is well equipped with high tech equipment, lecture room, Mac and PC rooms. As we move forward the Trust is looking to be a Centre of excellence in delivery high quality educational programmes and for us to have the impact on social justice as Stephen's name has had on criminal justice.

The Trust is committed to providing opportunity and access to disadvantaged young people; fostering positive community relationships, and enabling people to realise their potential. Through creative methods the Trust addresses the causes of urban decay; youth disaffection and educational underachievement and support young people by developing pathways into aspirational and sustainable employment. We intend to do this through widening the vision of the Trust in Ready for Life, Job Ready, Professionally prepared, Ready for Business and Ready to Lead. We see this as creating a whole person, who is confident in themselves to achieve their aims and ambition in life. That is what we all want in life.

26

ANNEX 4: Biographical Information on Introducers and Moderators

Supplementary Human Dimension Meeting

PREVENTION OF RACISM, XENOPHOBIA AND HATE CRIMES THROUGH EDUCATIONAL AND AWARENESS-RAISING INITIATIVES

10-11 November 2011

Hofburg, Vienna

Biographical Information: Speakers and Moderators

Keynote Speaker:

Mrs. Doreen Lawrence, Founder and External Director of the Stephen Lawrence Charitable Trust, Officer of the Order of the British Empire (OBE)

Mrs. Lawrence was born in Jamaica and migrated to the United Kingdom at an early age. After leaving secondary school, she married and gave birth to three children: two boys, Stephen and Stuart and a daughter, Georgina. After raising her children, she returned to complete her studies as a mature student, embarking on a Bachelor of Arts in Humanities Honour degree in 1993. During the first year of her studies, her son Stephen was murdered in a suspected racially motivated attack. In the face of this tragedy, Mrs. Lawrence continued her studies while advocating for justice for her son. Part of her advocacy efforts involved challenging the manner in which the initial investigation into her son's murder was conducted, and in particular exposing institutional racism within the criminal justice system and policing practices.

After the initial investigation into her son's murder, five suspects were arrested but never convicted. Due in large part to her tireless efforts, in 1997 a judicial inquiry was conducted into the initial investigation by Sir William Macpherson. Published in 1999, the inquiry examined the original investigation into her son's murder, concluding that the police investigation into Stephen Lawrence's murder was seriously flawed due in part to a combination of institutional racism and professional incompetence. The final report set out seventy recommendations for reform, including recommendations aimed at eliminating racial prejudice and increasing fairness in policing and the criminal justice sector.

On 18 May 2011, it was announced that one of the original suspects, and another man, are to stand trial for the murder.

After completing her studies, Mrs. Lawrence worked as a Domestic Violence Advisor in the voluntary sector. In 1998, she continued her studies and in 1998 gained a postgraduate certificate in Counseling Skills and later obtained a diploma in Therapeutic Counseling.

In 1998, Mrs. Lawrence founded the Stephen Lawrence Charitable Trust in her son's memory and now acts as its External Director. The mandate of the Trust is to provide bursaries to young people who are interested in pursuing their studies in architecture, a passion and goal of her son Stephen Lawrence's. In addition to her work with the Trust, Mrs. Lawrence also established the Stephen Lawrence Centre, an organization dedicated to providing a broad range of professional and vocational skills to youth and support to a wide range of community groups and artists.

Mrs. Lawrence is a frequent public speaker, and has conducted numerous presentations in the educational and non-governmental sector. She has been awarded with five honorary degrees and is an Officer of the Order of the British Empire (OBE).

SESSION I: Challenges and Perspectives for Prevention of Racism and Xenophobia

Speaker:

Ms. Ilze Brands Kehris, Director, OSCE High Commissioner on National Minorities

Ms. Brands Kehris joined the OSCE High Commissioner on National Minorities as Director in 2011 and served as the chairperson of the European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights (FRA) Management Board since 2009. She was vice-chairperson of the Management Board of the European Union Monitoring Centre on Racism and Xenophobia (EUMC) from 2004 to 2007, and has since been a member of the FRA's Executive Board. She has also been a member of the Advisory Committee of the Council of Europe Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities since 2006, where she holds the position of first vice-president.

She was the Director of the Latvian Centre for Human Rights from 2002 until 2011, a non-governmental organization active in the areas of civil liberties, fundamental freedoms, human rights in closed institutions, asylum, anti-discrimination and minority rights. Her own research focus has been on minority rights, citizenship, anti-discrimination and intolerance.

Moderator:

Ms. Floriane Hohenberg, Head, Tolerance and Non-Discrimination Department, OSCE ODIHR

Floriane Hohenberg has been working for ODIHR since 2005. She has been the Head of the Tolerance and Non-Discrimination Department since 2009. From 2000 until 2004 she

was the Head of the Representation in Germany of the French Commission for the Victims of Spoliation Resulting from the Anti-Semitic Legislation in Force during the Occupation. Between 1998 and 1999 she participated in a study commissioned by the French government on the extent of the confiscation of Jewish assets in France during World War II.

SESSION II: Challenges in Combating Hate Crimes, Racism and Xenophobia: Role of Awareness-Raising Initiatives and Public Discourse

Speaker:

Mr. William Gaillard, Advisor to the President, Union of European Football Associations (UEFA)

As part of his responsibilities with UEFA, Mr. Gaillard advises the UEFA President on political matters and oversees all activities relating to external communications. This includes the international media, relations with the European government authorities as well as UEFA's social responsibility and charity programmes.

Educated, inter alia, at Sciences Po Paris, The Johns Hopkins School of Advanced International Studies and Harvard University, William Gaillard has had a multi-faceted international career in both the public and private sectors. His diverse professional experiences include his work as Chief of External Relations for the Multinational Force and Observers (1983), Head of External Relations for the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestinian Refugees (UNRWA) (1985) and Director of Communication and Political Affairs for the UN International Drug Control Programme (1990).

Mr. Gaillard joined UEFA in 2004 as the Director of Communications and Public Affairs and was appointed Senior Adviser to the President in 2009.

Moderator:

Dr. Rafal Pankowski, Deputy Editor, Never Again Association

Dr. Pankowski has served as deputy editor of "Nigdy Wiecej" (Never Again) magazine since 1996. He has published widely on racism, nationalism, xenophobia and other related issues. His publications include the books *Neo-Fascism in Western Europe* (1998), *Racism and Popular Culture* (2006) and *The Populist Radical Right in Poland: The Patriots* (2010). He currently works as a lecturer at Collegium Civitas and head of the Warsaw-based East Europe Monitoring Centre set up by the NEVER AGAIN Association in cooperation with the Football Against Racism in Europe network. He is the coordinator of the RESPECT Diversity campaign supported by UEFA in the lead up to the European Football Championships in Poland and Ukraine in 2012.

SESSION III: Education for Tolerance and Mutual Respect Understanding: Good Practices from IGOs, Governments and Civil Society

Speaker:

Mr. Oleg Smirnov, Chair of the Board, the Integration and Development Centre for Information and Research

Mr. Smirnov is a candidate in Philology (Odessa State University, 1991) and an associate professor of the Department of Inter-Language Communication and Journalism at Tavrida National University. He currently serves as head of the Board of the Integration and Development Centre for Information and Research (Max van der Stoel Award Winner in 2009) and the Regional Resource Agency "Crimea-Perspective". From 1997 until 2003, Mr. Smirnov was the Director of the programme "Integration of Formerly Deported Crimean Tatars, Armenians, Bulgarians, Germans, Greeks into Ukrainian Society" at the International Renaissance Foundation, where his responsibilities included the development of programme strategies, and project proposals.

Mr. Smirnov's research interests are largely focused on ethnic relations in Crimea, methods of early conflict prevention, education and the management of diversity practices in the Crimea region. He has participated in a number of diverse projects including the Council of Europe "Universities as sites of Citizenship" Project (1999 – 2000); the US Institute of Peace "School of Peace" Project at the Tavrida National University (2000 –2001) and the joint project initiated by the Tavrida National University and the George Mason University (USA) on the introduction of conflict resolution and peacebuilding courses for students of Crimean Universities (2000 – 2003). Mr. Smirnov has also been heavily involved in the OSCE High Commissioner for National Minorities initiatives "Management of Inter-Ethnic Relations in Crimea" (2006 – 2010) and "Supporting Inter-Cultural Education in Crimea" (2006 – 2013).

Mr. Smirnov has presented the results of his research at more than 30 international conferences. Throughout his professional career, he has remained committed to promoting intercultural educational methodologies in the region, and has worked with such diverse stakeholders as civil society representatives, national community leaders, school teachers and government officials.

Moderator:

Ms. Felisa Tibbitts, Director, Human Rights Education Association (HREA)

Ms. Tibbitts is co-founder and co-director of Human Rights Education Associates (HREA), and is also engaged as Adjunct Lecturer at the Harvard Graduate School of Education and the UN University for Peace where she teaches courses on human rights education. At the Harvard Kennedy School of Government she co-teaches a course with the director of the Carr Center for Human Rights Policy called "Human Rights Tools for Practice".

Ms. Tibbitts has carried out trainings in over 20 countries and provided technical assistance or served as a textbook author in educational initiatives in Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, China, Croatia, El Salvador, Estonia, Gaza, Kosovo, Northern Ireland, Morocco, Romania, Ukraine and the United States. Ms. Tibbitts has published numerous articles, manuals and book chapters in the area of human rights education and contributed to the development of policy documents for the United Nations.