

**Anastasia Crickley**

**Special Representative of the Chair in Office of the OSCE on combating Racism, Xenophobia and Discrimination, also focusing on Intolerance and Discrimination against Christians and Members of Other Religions**

**Intervention at the Human Dimension Implantation Meeting, Warsaw.  
Tuesday 25<sup>th</sup> of September 2007.**

---

As Personal Representative of the Chair in Office of the OSCE on combating racism, xenophobia and discrimination also focusing on intolerance and discrimination on Christians and other religions it is an honour and a pleasure to address you briefly this afternoon. Combating intolerance and discrimination and promoting mutual respect and understanding is no easy task, particularly in situations where racism is increasingly justified, rationalised and questionable actions glossed over.

Addressing racism needs, in my view to go beyond the implementation which is based on mere compliance with legislation and International Commitments to an honest analysis of impact of implementation of these Commitments and legislation. Ambassador Strohal spoke eloquently and accurately about the need for implementation at last year's HDIM, this year as well as a need for continued focus on implementation I believe we also need to look at the impact of implementation.

Some implementation processes have progressed. EU member states have mechanisms for implementing the Directives on Discrimination in place by now. Plans or taskforces on Roma, Travellers or Sinti issues and state sponsored procedures to protect religious practice and beliefs are in place in the vast majority of participating states. However as already pointed out above honest measuring of impact of these is required to address the gaps between implementing mechanisms and lived experience on the ground. The reality of individual experience, or one groups experience, may not be the same as the extent of the problem but it is none the less a reality.

Action plans and implementations strategies have not done enough to address the discrimination experienced by Roma and Travellers in all participating states of the OSCE from the UK right through to the Russian Federation. Religious minorities are not always well protected by ostensibly fair religion registration procedures. In a context where migrants from Asia to Russia from Africa to Europe and from South to North America revitalise and reinvigorate and consolidate economies I believe that we cannot continue to ignore the discrimination experienced by migrants and to confuse assimilation, insertion with integration which requires respect and inclusion.

Responding to discrimination also requires careful consideration to ensuring participation by those affected at all levels in society. Participation in effect involves power sharing.

Political parties and states are part of rather than the controllers of political engagement. Not all voices can emerge easily from the party political processes either. For example women and minorities are seldom visible in equal numbers (although participation in political parties must be possible and open). Civil Society Organisations of Minorities, Migrants and those discriminated against don't have to speak with one voice to be coherent just as there are many organisations of the majority populations and many political parties. On the other hand the role and space of civil society is not the role and space of government.

In my experience the gap between democratic rhetoric and commitment to real participation is widening. This conveniently shuts out or sweeps under the carpet concerns which sit uneasily with state political agendas, or dominant religious and cultural consensus. Shutting things out does not make them go away.

Mechanisms do exist however to help bridge gaps between rhetoric and reality, between implementation and impact. The election monitoring of ODHIR is a very concrete case in point. The joint Council of Europe EU Declaration for Political Parties at Times of Election is also a useful instrument. Systems in place in some participating states to ensure the presence of Minorities among elected politicians can play a useful role, as can consultative instruments including faith/state dialogue to ensure that the voices of those often excluded are heard in policy making arenas which some member states have established.

Speaking of mechanisms whether the Personal Representatives of the Chair in Office or otherwise they can only be judged, recourses notwithstanding in the light of the political will to engaged with them, and in the light of the overall political framework within which they operate. If those need to be addressed then shooting the messenger can only prove to be a very ineffective way of attempting to address intolerance, racism and discrimination in all its forms including also discriminations against religions. Inclusion is in everyone's interest, inclusion that recognises people from discriminated groups as women and men not as numbers with invariably male characteristics. The needs of women cannot be address through OSCE commitments or in any other way unless they are specifically named. Inclusion as I have tried to indicate in my short input means power sharing, participation and engagement, looking outside the protective armoury of ones own position, and historical situation to an honest analysis of the current impact gap. Participating states have many opportunities to share such analysis at the various OSCE fora.

I look forward to such dialog with you all during this HDIM in the sprit of the ever relevant Helsinki Final Act.