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Human Rights First is a nonprofit, nonpartisan international human rights organization based in New York and Washington, D.C. To maintain our independence, we accept no government funding. The Fighting Discrimination Program has been working since 2002 to reverse the rising tide of racist, anti-Muslim, antisemitic, anti-immigrant, and homophobic violence and other bias crime in Europe, North America, and elsewhere. We report on the reality of violence driven by discrimination, and work to strengthen the response of governments to combat this violence. We advance concrete, practical recommendations to improve hate crimes legislation and its implementation, monitoring and public reporting, the training of police and prosecutors, the work of official anti-discrimination bodies, and the capacity of civil society organizations and international institutions to combat violent hate crimes. Our 2008 Hate Crime Survey provided a comprehensive overview of hate crime in the 56 countries comprising the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe. For more information on the program, visit http://www.humanrightsfirst.org/discrimination or email FD@humanrightsfirst.org.
Overview

Human Rights First remains concerned by acts of violence and other forms of intolerance against Muslims in Europe and North America, to which governments have often been slow to respond. In recent years, bias-motivated violence against Muslims has come in the form of personal assaults in the streets and attacks on places of worship and on immigrant-run businesses. Such acts are occurring as national debates—often dominated by unfounded suspicions of Islam as a threat to security and national culture—rage on in many countries.

While similar patterns of racist and xenophobic violence are visible in many parts of much of Europe, North America, and the Former Soviet Union, one of the most prominent news-making stories of 2010 came from the United States, where the heated atmosphere around two developments—the planned construction of an Islamic community center in the vicinity of “Ground Zero” in New York, and the “Burn a Koran” ceremony organized by a fringe congregation in Florida—provoked nationwide debates about Islam and Muslims in the United States.

The problem of anti-Muslim violence is complex, due to the multiple dimensions of discrimination involved. A single act of violence or discrimination may encompass intolerance based on the victim’s religion, ethnicity, or gender. However, intolerance is often directed at Muslims and other minorities expressly because of their religion. Victims of such racially and religiously motivated violence have sometimes been foreign nationals or those perceived to be “outsiders.” Yet, even members of Muslim communities who are citizens or long-term residents have also faced harassment and violence in many parts of Europe and the United States.

The effects of such acts of violence are exacerbated by the fact that they are taking place against a background of a climate of hostility toward Muslims. Obstacles to freedom of religion, widespread discrimination, and anti-Muslim rhetoric in mainstream media and political discourse are an important part of the context in which violent acts are being perpetrated. Intolerant public discourse that goes unchallenged fosters indifference to abuses committed against members of minority groups and promotes impunity for perpetrators of violent hate crimes against them. Such factors erode the confidence of victims of hate crime to report their victimization to the authorities and seek justice from the police and the courts.

Governments must respond vigorously to hate crimes against Muslims, and safety and security of all persons must be made a policymaking priority. In order to strengthen state responses to hate crimes against Muslims, Human Rights First calls on governments to speak out forcefully against all violent hate crimes, to take measures to hold the perpetrators of such violence accountable before the law, and to examine shortcomings in existing monitoring and reporting systems as well as legal frameworks for addressing such crimes. States should also implement programs to improve communication between law enforcement and affected communities in order to build trust and improve reporting of and response to hate crime. To date, few governments have developed the tools to adequately address violent hate crimes against Muslims and those thought to be Muslims.
Violence against Muslims

Attacks on Individuals

Individuals who fear violence cannot move freely in the towns and cities where they reside. Even where hate crimes do not involve severe violence, the result may be progressive marginalization and exclusion, preventing those under threat from the exercise of a range of rights. Fear of violence—compounded by the lack of trust in state authorities to respond to it adequately—may deter people from venturing out even to places of worship.

In 2009 and 2010, accounts of individual cases continued to highlight the high exposure of visible minorities distinguished by particular clothing or other signs of faith. Severe incidents, particularly murders, remain rare. Lower-level assaults and day-to-day harassment occur far more frequently, although often go unreported. Some examples include the following:

- In October 2010, a French pensioner chased after a Muslim woman around a shop, ripping her niqab and proclaiming that such garments should be banned in France. The attacker, a retired female teacher, was tried and ordered to pay 800 Euros in damages to the victim, a citizen of the United Arab Emirates.¹

- On August 25, 2010, in New York City, USA, a city cab driver Ahmed Sharif was stabbed multiple times by an intoxicated passenger who allegedly asked if the driver was Muslim. The 21-year-old perpetrator was detained and charged with attempted murder, assault, aggravated harassment, and possession of a weapon. Hate crime provisions were included in the charges that were upheld in January 2011, while the trial is scheduled to resume in March 2011.²

- On June 9, 2010, a 13-year-old girl was burned and robbed in Grangewood Park, London, United Kingdom. The victim’s hair was set on fire, she was cut with glass, and smashed against a tree by thee teenaged women. The victim’s mother said anti-Muslim slurs were uttered by attackers during the assault. The alleged attackers, aged 18, 15, and 14, were apprehended and charged with administering poison with intent to injure, aggrieve, annoy, assault, and false imprisonment. The trial is scheduled to start on March 25, 2011.³

- In April 2010, Abida Malik and Asif Ahmed were targeted by up to 20 men on a train to Nottingham in the United Kingdom. The attackers called the couple terrorists, and kept Ahmed Malik in a headlock, imitating a “citizen’s arrest.” His wife wears the hijab.⁴

- On July 1, 2009, 32-year-old Marwa El Sherbiny was fatally stabbed 18 times during court proceedings in Dresden, Germany, by her 28-year-old neighbor, Alex Wiens, a Russian-born German citizen, who reportedly claimed to be a supporter of the National Democratic Party of Germany, a right-wing neo-Nazi organization. Wiens was on trial for having previously insulted El Sherbiny for wearing the Islamic headscarf. Sherbini’s husband defended his wife, attacking the assailant, but he too was stabbed and then shot in the leg by a security guard who mistook him for the attacker. El Sherbiny’s murder aroused anger in Germany, her native Egypt, and throughout the Muslim world. On November 11, 2009, Wiens was sentenced to life imprisonment, the maximum sentence possible under German law.⁵

- On May 10, 2009, inmates at Ranby Prison in Nottinghamshire, England, made a bomb out of fireworks, a fishing rod, and detonators, intending to kill fellow Muslim prisoners. The inmates threw the bomb in the room where worshippers wash their hands and feet before the Friday prayer. The device came within moments of exploding when a prison officer removed it from the facility.⁶

Attacks on Places of Worship, Centers of Islamic Culture, and Cemeteries

Mosques and other places of worship are easily identifiable targets of anti-Muslim hate crime. Some examples of acts of vandalism and arson include the following:

- In January 2011, police arrested a 30-year-old man on suspicion of arson after a series of attacks on several mosques in different districts of Berlin, Germany. No one was injured in the
attacks, but the fires caused property damage in every case. A mosque of the Ahmadiyya community was set ablaze in the early hours of January 8, and two other mosques were targeted in similar attacks late in 2010. A comprehensive police investigation led to the capture of the main suspect.  

Four teenagers were arrested in Stoke-on-Trenton, United Kingdom, after putting a gas pipe into the local mosque in an attempt to set the building ablaze on December 3, 2010. The incident was treated by the police as a deliberate racist attack. While the building sustained no structural damage, the attempted arson was treated as a case of criminal damage. Two more men were taken into custody a week after the initial arrests.  

More than 30 tombstones were knocked down or broken, and swastikas were drawn on the gravel paths at a Muslim cemetery in Strasbourg, France, on September 23, 2010. The local mayor denounced the vandalism as an “unbearable racist act.” Local religious leaders attributed the act to the extreme right movement.  

On August 23, 2010, unknown perpetrators drew a swastika and attempted to set fire to the courtyard gates of Seit-Settar mosque in Simferopol, Ukraine. The night guard was able to put out the fire and called the police, who arrived the following morning. On December 25, 2010, the mosque was the object of another arson attempt, when the fire partially damaged the walls and completely destroyed the mosque’s roof. Nobody has been charged in the incident. One local Muslim leader said that vandalism on Muslim holy sites in the Crimea are not properly investigated.  

On October 8, 2010, a Muslim cemetery in the city of Komotini, Greece, was desecrated. About ten gravestones were smashed, spurring a spontaneous demonstration by around 30 members of the Turkish minority living in the city. A government spokesperson had quickly condemned the act, attributing the vandalism to a marginal hate group.  

In Tennessee, USA, a suspicious fire damaged four pieces of construction equipment at the site of a future mosque in Murfreesboro on August 28, 2010. An investigation as a possible hate crime was initiated. The incident was thought to be connected to proposals to expand the Islamic Center of Murfreesboro, which has existed for 30 years. The expansion proposals are currently being challenged in county courts, with the next hearing scheduled for April 13, 2011.  

On August 23, 2010, unknown perpetrators tried to set on fire a mosque in the Groningen neighborhood of Selwerd, the Netherlands. Offensive graffiti was sprayed on the walls. In March 2010, the mosque was besmirched with blood, and a wild boar’s head was left near the premises.  

In June 2010, unknown perpetrators knocked down 15 head stones at a Muslim cemetery in Zlatoust, Russia. The police was informed of the vandalism by the relatives of the deceased. No leads have been reported in the case.  

On April 10, 2010, a mosque in Karlovo, Bulgaria, was burned down. Police investigators were investigating the incident as a case of arson or accidental short circuit. Members of the Muslim community in Karlovo and the Chief Mufti’s office in Bulgaria believe the incident was a hate crime.  

Data on Violence against Muslims  

Despite numerous international commitments to develop data collection systems, there is still a lack of official statistics on the incidence of violent hate crimes, and in particular hate crimes against Muslims.  

For its 2009 annual hate crime report, the OSCE’s Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights (ODIHR) was informed by seventeen countries that they collect data on anti-Muslim violence, but ODIHR received actual data from only two participating States, Austria and Sweden. (Austria reported zero incidents.) In addition, Germany and Spain provided information about specific anti-Muslim incidents. It is clear that systematic data on anti-Muslim hate crimes remains scarce in the OSCE region.
Human Rights First is aware of publicly available data on anti-Muslim violence from five countries (see table). In most of those countries, moreover, only limited data has been made public and official statistics do not represent the real level of violence due to underreporting or underrecording of incidents.

Underreporting remains one of the most serious problems, as victims refrain from reporting attacks to the police. A report by the Open Society Institute, described in more detail below, observed that 64 percent of Muslim hate crime victims in 11 E.U. cities did not report the crime to the police.\(^20\) The European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights (FRA) found that between 53 and 98 percent of Muslim hate crime victims, depending on the country and population considered, did not report their victimization to the police. Meanwhile, the FRA research also indicated that 1 in 10 of all Muslims surveyed (11%) was a victim of racially motivated ‘in-person crime’ (assault, threat or serious harassment) at least once in the previous 12 months.\(^21\)

In addition to underreporting, true levels of anti-Muslim hate crime can be misrepresented by underrecording of incidents: where police fail to record reported incidents as hate crimes or to identify anti-Muslim bias as a factor in such crimes.

The data deficit proves a challenge to comprehensive and well-founded policy decisions to combat the problem of hate crime violence. Lack of detailed reporting on hate crime incidents also makes it impossible to have an accurate picture of official responses to anti-Muslim incidents by the police and courts.

Comprehensive nongovernmental data, while no substitute for official monitoring, can often be a useful complement. Yet such data is limited as well, as few NGOs across the region monitor and publicly report specifically on anti-Muslim hate crimes. The number of such NGOs is growing, however.

Nongovernmental organizations from nineteen countries submitted relevant information on bias-motivated attacks to ODIHR for their 2010 report.

### Governments that engage in official monitoring of hate crimes with an anti-Muslim bias:

- **Austria** monitors “Islamophobic” crimes within the framework of its reporting on right-wing extremism and released data for the first time on two such cases in the 2007 reporting. In 2008, the government reported 12 incidents of such crimes,\(^22\) and zero in 2009.\(^23\)

- **Canada** produces official data on hate crimes perpetrated against Muslims. In 2008, authorities reported a slight drop in hate crimes targeting “the Muslim faith.” In 2008, 26 incidents were reported, compared to 29 in 2007 and 46 in 2006.\(^24\)

- Authorities in **France** do not report explicitly on violence against Muslims, but their reporting of racist and xenophobic hate crimes offers a window into the problem of anti-Muslim violence, with 33 percent of reported incidents perpetrated against people of North African (Maghreb) origin, who are predominantly Muslim. In 2009, authorities reported 1,026 racist or xenophobic hate crimes, a 219 percent increase from 2008 (467).\(^25\)

- **In Sweden**, the National Council for Crime Prevention (Brå) reported a 28 percent decrease in “Islamophobic” hate crimes in 2009, recording 194 incidents (down from 272 in 2008), which was the first time the number of incidents dropped below 200 since official monitoring of “Islamophobic” crimes began in 2005.\(^26\)

- **The United States** has long been systematically monitoring anti-Muslim crimes. For the reporting year 2009, Federal Bureau of Investigation reported 107 “anti-Islamic” incidents, registering a slight increase from 2008 (105).\(^27\)
A Climate of Hostility

Obstacles to Religious Freedom

There are a range of obstacles to religious freedom faced by Muslims. Among these concerns are discriminatory policies, laws, and legislative proposals—such as the denial of permits to build or operate mosques and religious schools or the denial of the right of men and women to wear certain religious symbols and clothing.

- Requests for permits to build mosques were increasingly debated and scrutinized across the United States, particularly in the wake of the national debates in the summer of 2010 over the construction of an Islamic Center in downtown Manhattan. For example, the Islamic Community Center of Phoenix, Arizona, found resistance from the neighborhood and some members of the city government even though the building of the mosque has been going on for years. Vandals broke into the new building, spilling paint on the floors and breaking windows. The Center’s chairman of the board stated that the “Ground Zero dispute” was partly to blame for the problems. In DuPage County, Illinois, the County Board proposed a ban on opening new religious facilities in unincorporated residential areas following proposals to expand or build three Muslim sites. The request by the Irshad Learning Center for a conditional permit for a place of worship and school in Naperville was denied (on the grounds of being inconsistent with the subdivision) and the potential expansions of Islamic centers in West Chicago and Willowbrook were also debated. Muslim groups concerned claimed discrimination was at the heart of these debates.

- In November 2009, the Swiss population voted in a nationwide referendum to ban the construction of minarets on mosques in Switzerland. The referendum campaign was fraught with anti-Muslim rhetoric and images associating Muslims with violence. U.N. High Commissioner for Human Rights Navi Pillay condemned the ban as “discriminatory, deeply divisive and a thoroughly unfortunate step for Switzerland to take, [which] risks putting the country on a collision course with its international human rights obligations.” Complaints over the ban have also been filed with the European Court for Human Rights.

- The European Commission on Racism and Intolerance (ECRI) reported that Muslims in Spain face difficulties in obtaining building permits for mosques. ECRI also highlighted the discrimination faced by North African Muslims in the labor market and the often ignored right of Muslim pupils to receive religious instruction based on Islam.

- In Estonia, ECRI reported in 2009 on problems of the Azerbaijani community in obtaining permission to build a mosque in Tallinn.

- In September 2010, the French senate overwhelmingly approved a law banning any veils that cover the face. Council of Europe Commissioner for Human Rights Thomas Hammarberg raised his concerns over the nature of the “identity debate” in France, reminding the French authorities that “such discussions could be helpful if those taking part avoided the trap of promoting one single identity which defines who is included and by extension who is excluded.” Similar legislative action had been taken in Belgium in April 2010 and in Spain in June 2010.

- In Germany, Muslim women reported discrimination in employment and housing following the passage of legislation in certain German States banning the wearing of headscarves in all or some parts of the public sector. The Council of Europe’s main antidiscrimination body, the European Commission for Racism and Intolerance (ECRI), cited in 2009 that almost two-thirds of Muslims in Germany reported experiencing
some form of discrimination over a twelve-month period.38

**Discrimination and Hate Speech**

Various reports continue to highlight in particular the widespread discrimination against Muslim individuals and the underreporting of such instances:

- In May 2009, the Fundamental Rights Agency (FRA) released a report detailing discrimination against Muslims in the E.U. It found that 1 in 3 Muslims surveyed had experienced discrimination in the previous 12 months. More troubling still, those who responded affirmatively had experienced, on average, 8 incidents of discrimination in the past year. The report found discrimination most common in employment and in relation to private services such as restaurants or when trying to obtain a loan or open a bank account. Young Muslims between the ages of 16-24 experienced the highest incidence of reported discrimination, raising grave concerns about the long term impact of discriminatory experiences. Despite the prevalence of discrimination, underreporting was widespread, as 79 percent of Muslims did not report incidents of discrimination against them.39

- In December 2009, an Open Society Institute report on Muslims in 11 European cities similarly concluded that “levels of religious discrimination against Muslims are widespread and have increased in the past five years.” Specifically, OSI found significant discrimination in the education, housing, and transport sectors, as well as in the provision of goods and services. Specific examples of discrimination abound. The report also found that discrimination by the police remained a concern for young Muslim men. The report concluded that such discrimination is a “critical barrier” to Muslims’ full and equal participation in European society.40 A series of city-specific reports produced by Open Society Institute provides further in-depth look at the eleven cities across Europe.

Xenophobic rhetoric in the public discourse contributes to the marginalization of Muslims and is amplified by acts of discrimination and the inadequate mechanisms in place to address them.

There is a longstanding strain of political discourse in Europe that has projected Muslim immigrants as a threat to European security, homogeneity, and culture. The situation has worsened in recent years in the context of official government responses to terrorist attacks. The rise of racist and religious violence against Muslims in Europe has occurred in tandem with the adoption of anti-immigrant political platforms by both fringe and mainstream political movements. Radical political leaders have sought to legitimize xenophobia and have contributed to the growth of popular anti-Muslim sentiment and intolerance across Europe.

Anti-Muslim hate speech is a major means of extending a climate of intolerance in Europe and North America. Public debates on immigration and

---

**“Burn A Koran” in Florida, USA**

In summer 2010, a reverend with a 50-person congregation in Gainesville, Florida, capitalized on the wave of Muslim-bashing and fearmongering over the “ground Zero mosque” debates in New York City and announced plans to publicly burn a Koran to mark the anniversary of the 9/11 attacks.

The controversy surrounding the “Burn A Koran Day” prompted a wave of public outcry from individuals as well as political, military, and faith leaders. The planned “Burn A Koran Day” was eventually cancelled and overshadowed by interfaith events demonstrating solidarity and commitment to tolerance and diversity.

In the days and weeks leading up to the proposed “Burn A Koran Day,” more than twenty religious organizations in Gainesville, Florida, united in hosting a series of events to affirm religious solidarity. Religious leaders incorporated Muslim, Jewish, and Christian scriptures into worship services focusing on peace and understanding. Religious leaders also called on state and local public officials to speak out against bigotry.

The Mayor of Gainesville declared September 11th “Interfaith Solidarity Day” and issued a statement condemning the “offensive behavior that has been directed at Muslim neighbors and those of the Islamic faith worldwide.”
the status of Europe’s minorities can have a racial and religious cast and be dominated by aggressive “us versus them” discourse, which has weakened the sense of security and threatens the physical well-being of Muslim communities. Intolerant public discourse that goes unchallenged fosters indifference to abuses committed against members of minority groups and promotes impunity for perpetrators of violent hate crimes against them.

Reports released in 2009—2011 by the European Commission against Racism and Intolerance (ECRI) and from European NGOs also document concerns over anti-Muslim rhetoric:

- In Austria, ECRI noted that far-right parties “engage in overtly anti-Muslim rhetoric,” particularly during election campaigns, while the overall “situation with regard to racism and discrimination against Muslims remains problematic.”

- In Belgium, ECRI cited a number of recurring concerns affecting Muslim communities, such as “electronic chain mail, and in particular e-mails containing messages denigrating Muslims.” The Commission also observed “some factions of public opinion [that] make no distinction between terrorists, religious extremists and the Muslim population as a whole,” which often leads to prejudices and discriminatory practices.

- The public rhetoric of extreme right-wing parties in the Czech Republic became an issue of concern for ECRI. For example, following the death of the Czech Ambassador to Pakistan in a terrorist bombing in late 2008, the National Party’s website “published sweeping verbal attacks on all Muslims.”

- In Denmark, the European Network Against Racism has reported that all four Muslim parliamentarians have been the victims of hateful public rhetoric denigrating them personally.

- While highlighting the willingness of most French politicians to take a firm stance against racism and intolerance, ECRI nevertheless reported a number of cases of “verbal excess” by leading politicians exploiting stereotypes of minority groups, including Muslims.

- ECRI noted a rise of Islamophobic discourse in Norway, in particular in the realm of political and public debates, which have been characterized “by frequent associations made between Muslims on the one hand, and terrorism and violence on the other, and by generalizations and stereotypes concerning perceived cultural features of persons of Muslim background.” Often such negative perceptions are translated into discriminatory acts against Muslim minorities of Norway.

International norms protecting freedom of expression rightly allow considerable latitude for offensive hate speech. There are political and education tools that public leaders can use to confront hateful discourse without restricting freedom of expression.

**Recommendations**

There is a need for immediate action to fight anti-Muslim violence. Human Rights First recommends the implementation of our Ten-Point Plan to combat hate crimes, including those targeting Muslims, which calls on States to:

1. **Acknowledge and condemn violent hate crimes whenever they occur.** Senior government leaders should send immediate, strong, public, and consistent messages 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.** Recognizing the particular harm caused by violent hate crimes, governments should enact laws that establish specific offenses or provide enhanced penalties for violent crimes committed because of the victim’s race, religion, ethnicity, sexual orientation, gender, gender identity, mental and physical disabilities, or other similar status.

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 instructions and resources to law enforcement bodies.** Governments should ensure that police and investigators—as the first responders in cases of violent crime—are specifically instructed and have the necessary procedures, resources and training to identify, investigate and register bias motives before the courts, and that prosecutors have been trained to bring evidence of bias motivations and apply the legal measures required to prosecute hate crimes.

5. **Undertake parliamentary, interagency or other special inquiries into the problem of hate crimes.** Such public, official inquiries should encourage public debate, investigate ways to better respond to hate crimes, and seek creative ways to address the roots of intolerance and discrimination through education and other means.

6. **Monitor and report on hate crimes.** Governments should maintain official systems of monitoring and public reporting to provide accurate data for informed policy decisions to combat violent hate crimes. Such systems should include anonymous and disaggregated information on bias motivations and/or victim groups, and should monitor incidents and offenses, as well as prosecutions. Governments should consider establishing third party complaint procedures to encourage greater reporting of hate crimes and conducting periodic hate crime victimization surveys to monitor underreporting by victims and underrecording by police.

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

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 discrimination 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 that are addressing discrimination—like the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe, the European Commission against Racism and Intolerance, and the Fundamental Rights Agency—including by encouraging such organizations to raise the capacity of and train police, prosecutors, and judges, as well as other official bodies and civil society groups to combat violent hate crimes. Governments should also provide a detailed accounting on the incidence and nature of hate crimes to these bodies in accordance with relevant commitments.