



AS/Pol/Inf (2019) 08

14 June 2019

Apdocinf08_19

Committee on Political Affairs and Democracy

Protecting and supporting the victims of terrorism

Extracts of relevant hearings

Contents:

| | |
|---|-----------|
| Mr Jonas Knetsch, 20 May 2019, Paris | 2 |
| Mr Christophe Poirel, 20 May 2019, Paris | 4 |
| Mr Julien Rencki and Ms Julie Heisserer, 11 December 2018, Paris | 6 |
| Mr Travis D. Frain, 22 May 2018, Athens | 7 |
| Mr Brendan Cox, Ms Sajda Mughal, Imam Imran Muhammad and Ms Gabriella Battaini-Dragoni, 20 June 2017, Strasbourg | 9 |
| Ms Luciana Milani, 11 October 2016, Strasbourg | 12 |
| Mr David Anderson Q.C., 16 October 2016, Strasbourg | 15 |
| Mr Antoine Leiris, 16 October 2016, Strasbourg | 17 |
| Mr Bjorn Ihler, 26 September 2016, Reykjavík | 19 |

Speech by Mr Jonas Knetsch, Professor at the Jean Monnet University, St. Etienne, 20 May 2019, Paris

Introduction

Firstly, it should be noted that the model for compensating victims of terrorist acts varies from country to country. Some countries have specific compensation schemes for victims of terrorism whereas others treat victims of terrorism as victims of ordinary crime.

The French system is a mixed one in that there is both the Guarantee Fund for Victims of Terrorism and Other Offences (FGTI) and other welfare and social protection organisations (such as ONAC – the National Office for Veterans and War Victims), and alongside this, private insurance.

The FGTI does not compensate the material damage resulting from a terrorist act, this is covered by private insurance; it is a “mandatory guarantee” in all insurance policies (article L. 126-1 of the Insurance Code). However, since taking out private insurance is voluntary, people without insurance are not protected by this guarantee.

Current difficulties

Compensating victims of terrorist acts presents various challenges, due to both the strict definition of those entitled to financial compensation and the limits laid down for this compensation.

When can we start talking about an “act of terrorism”?

Before discussing the victims of terrorism, we must ask ourselves what is an “act of terrorism” in the first place? The French criminal code is informative in this regard, providing a definition of terrorism in articles 421-1 and 421-2: it differentiates between individual terrorist offences and ordinary criminal offences which constitute a terrorist act when committed in connection with a terrorist operation.

At this point, it could be said that victims of terrorist acts receive preferential treatment in comparison with other types of victims. However, the circumstances (the collective dimension of a terrorist act) justify this special status.

It is worth noting that FGTI action precedes the criminal court’s decision. Indeed, the FGTI must make compensation to the victims in a short time so that the legal qualification of the event is not yet certain at the time of the intervention of the fund. It is based on a reasonable belief that the event constitutes an act of terrorism.

Who are the victims of terrorism?

The FGTI usually acts on its own initiative in identifying the victims of a terrorist act. It has a list of victims, drawn up by the public prosecutor’s department and law enforcement agencies, which it uses as a basis for contacting the dependants of the deceased victims and the victims who have been physically injured. Anyone who thinks that they are a victim of a terrorist act may also apply directly to the FGTI.

Since 2016, the FGTI has differentiated between deceased, wounded and “associated” victims. This third category includes those who have been emotionally traumatised as a result of geographical proximity or exposure to risk.

To identify this type of victim, the FGTI has specified a geographical zone of possible exposure to terrorist risk. You can see this zone in the slide on screen (highlighted in green); it covers the route of the lorry as well as the pavement and the seaward traffic lane, for the whole time the lorry was moving. It is worth noting that this demarcation is somewhat arbitrary and problematic as people outside this zone still considered themselves to be have been victims (think, for example of someone who witnessed the attack from his or her balcony, or someone seated on the terrace of a nearby restaurant). What is at issue here is the extent of exposure to terrorist risk.

Another difficulty encountered by the FGTI in its examination of case files is those “jumping on the bandwagon”, people who claim to be victims of a terrorist act when they are not (with the aim of receiving compensation).

In any event, the FGTI assesses compensation claims on a case-by-case basis.

Limits on compensation – Scope of recompense

The compensation itself consists, according to article L 422-1 of the Insurance Code, in full redress for losses sustained from a personal injury. These losses are covered by the FGTI. This is then supplemented by the compensation for material damage and non-pecuniary loss arising from a personal injury.

Regarding compensation for the suffering of the direct victim's relatives

Here, both emotional loss (the non-pecuniary damage suffered by certain relatives of the victim), for which the compensation is between €3 000 and €30 000, and the damage caused by uncertainty and anxiety (€2 000-€5 000) have been recognised. Furthermore, the direct victim's right to compensation (for example, in the case of damage resulting from the fear of imminent death) can be transferred to relatives.

**Speech by Mr Christophe Poirel, Director, Human Rights Directorate of the Council of Europe
20 May 2019, Paris**

-The Council of Europe has played an active part in the fight against terrorism for decades. It has adopted several conventions to promote co-operation between member states in this area, the Additional Protocol to the Convention on the Prevention of Terrorism on foreign terrorist fighters being the most recent example.

-Protecting the victims of terrorism is an issue which came to the attention of the Committee of Ministers in the early 2000s following the attacks of 11 September 2001. As a result, in 2005 the Committee adopted guidelines to member states, recommending several lines of action.

-Your Assembly too tackled this issue at the time, adopting Resolution 1400(2004) on the “Challenge of terrorism in Council of Europe member states” which called on national parliaments to “adopt an integrated and co-ordinated approach to countering terrorism, including drawing up a legislative framework aimed at (...) protecting, rehabilitating and compensating victims of terrorist acts”.

-Following the resurgence of terrorist acts in Europe in the following decade, the Secretary General took the initiative of recommending the revision of the guidelines as part of the report he submitted to the 2016 Committee of Ministers session on “the fight against violent extremism and radicalisation leading to terrorism”.

-This initiative resulted in the Council of Ministers adopting revised guidelines in 2017. These aimed to improve the protection of victims of terrorism in the light of both the new forms of terrorism which have emerged and the ongoing discussions, in member states and at international level, on the protection which victims of terrorism should receive, in particular at the initiative of their representative associations.

-I will not discuss the content of the guidelines in detail. I will simply indicate that they contain 14 points which address, in its entirety, the issue of assisting victims of terrorism: the emergency aid they should receive (medical, psychological, social, material), the provision of information to victims, the assistance to be given to victims in the longer term, their compensation, the protection of their private and family lives, their dignity and safety and, lastly, the training of those dealing with victims of terrorism, public awareness raising and the role of victims in this process.

-Like all instruments developed by the Council of Europe, these guidelines comply with the relevant provisions of the European Convention on Human Rights.

-In order to promote implementation of the guidelines, the Steering Committee for Human Rights will hold a high-level workshop on the “protection of victims of terrorist acts” in Strasbourg on 20 June. This event will take place under the auspices of the French chairmanship of the Committee of Ministers which has just commenced.

-Ms Karamanli, your Assembly’s rapporteur on this subject, will be one of the workshop’s keynote speakers and I would like to thank her for that. I also welcome the preliminary draft report’s call for the revised guidelines to be proactively implemented in member states.

-This workshop will be an opportunity to present and discuss a number of good practices. Indeed, there are many initiatives which have been taken at national level. Two examples are the creation of a Directorate-General within the Spanish interior ministry for the support of victims of terrorism and the appointment in France of an interministerial officer to co-ordinate the work of the various ministries concerned.

-The workshop will also give victims’ representative organisations an opportunity to make their voice heard on the needs and expectations of victims and their families.

-In her very comprehensive and interesting draft report, Ms Karamanli highlights the problems relating to the definition of “victims of terrorism” (paragraphs 17-23). On this point, the revised guidelines of the Committee of Ministers provide quite a broad definition, noting that a victim is anyone who has suffered, as a result of a terrorist act, a direct attack on his or her physical or psychological integrity as well as, in appropriate circumstances, the victim’s immediate family.

-I was very interested to see the initiatives put forward by the rapporteur, especially:

- the creation of a network of the authorities responsible for providing support and assistance to victims in each Council of Europe member state, and a European charter on the rights of the victims of terrorism, to facilitate communication and co-ordination in Europe (paragraph 66),

- the setting-up of a network of victim support stakeholders and of an intergovernmental network of European Union and Council of Europe member authorities to improve the co-operation between them to support victims of terrorism (paragraph 101),
- the creation of a single European clearing house, available in several languages and adapted to persons with disabilities, a single telephone number, a single internet portal and possibly a European compensation fund (paragraph 101).

-Needless to say, the setting up of new initiatives and in particular new structures should be looked at, as it is in the draft report, through the lens of the actions taken or envisaged in other bodies, in order to create synergies and avoid duplication. Here, I am referring first of all to the European Union and the plan for an EU Centre of Expertise for the victims of terrorism (mentioned in paragraph 60 of the preliminary draft report), for which a call for tender was issued by the European Commission in early May 2019 with a view to setting up the centre this year. One of this Centre's objectives should be to evaluate "the necessity and feasibility of setting up an EU co-ordination centre for victims of terrorism".

-Clearly, we must deal with the issue of cross-border victims. The numerous terrorist acts committed within and outside Europe have shown that very often there are also foreign nationals among the victims of an attack. The attacks in Madrid, London, Berlin and Paris and more recently the events which unfolded in Sri Lanka, not to mention the Strasbourg attack last December, are just a few of the most striking examples.

Some European countries are already providing assistance to all victims, regardless of nationality or residence status.

At EU level, article 26 (rights of victims of terrorism resident in another member state) of Directive 2017/541 on combating terrorism states: "Member States shall ensure that victims of terrorism who are residents of a Member State other than that where the terrorist offence was committed have access to information regarding their rights, the available support services and compensation schemes in the Member State where the terrorist offence was committed."

Of course, these provisions apply only to European Union member states. This is, however, a pan-European issue too. The Council of Europe could serve as the forum for action at this level, whether through a legally binding text, on condition that member states find that appropriate, or via a non-binding text. The workshop taking place on 20 June in Strasbourg could be an opportunity to address this.

We should also note that the Victim Support Europe network is preparing a study for the European Parliament on the issue of cross-border victims. The results of this study will certainly be useful in assessing how best to deal with this issue.

-Initiatives concerned with promoting societal recognition and remembrance of victims of terror must also be encouraged. In this respect, I note that there are many examples of memorial ceremonies for victims (France, Belgium, Spain), silent marches (France, the Netherlands), monuments (Belgium), medals in recognition of victims of terrorism (France), proposals for creating national museums (Norway, France), and local and regional centres (Spain).

Some European countries commemorate the European Day of Remembrance of Victims of Terrorism on 11 March, which was instituted in 2005 at EU level following the Madrid attacks in 2004. However, it is important to bear in mind that in 2017 the UN designated 21 August as the "International Day of Remembrance and Tribute to the Victims of Terrorism".

-In conclusion, I would like to say that at present we are compiling member states' replies to a questionnaire which we drew up for the workshop on 20 June. We will gladly share these replies with Ms Karamanli if they would prove useful to her in finalising her report.

Exchange of views with Mr Julien Rencki, Director General of the French Guarantee Fund for Victims of Terrorism and other Offences (FGTI), and with Ms Julie Heisserer, responsible for European and international relations of the inter-ministerial delegation for victim assistance to the French Ministry of Justice
Extracts from the minutes, 11 December 2018, Paris

Ms Karamanli referred to the discussion she held in New York regarding the difficulty of finding a common definition for the victims of terrorism. Following her visit to Madrid on 14 November, which provided useful suggestions for the report, she focused on the French case and hoped the experts would provide the Committee with an update on what France is doing to support victims.

Mr Rencki outlined the activities of his organisation. A total of over 400 million euros had been paid out to 1 700 victims of terrorist attacks and 16 000 other victims of serious infractions. All compensation was tailored to the specific situation of the victims, and considered the physical, professional and moral damages. Current reforms aimed at offering perspectives of reconstruction of the victim's life and staff were trained to provide this kind of tailored and complete assistance. 800 home or hospital visits were carried out in 2018. He called for better co-ordination between national systems to face what he called globalisation of terrorism, also to avoid the risk of non-compensation, of double compensation, language problems and organisation of medical tests. In March 2018, France organised the first seminar on how to strengthen co-operation with other countries. In his view, a common legal framework at European level would guarantee adequate protection. He believed that the country of residence should be responsible for compensation and that some sort of financial solidarity should be in place in the event of major attacks.

Ms Heisserer pointed to a 152% increase in funding for the victims of terrorism in France, which also included support to civil society organisations and a network of 1 500 local centres to help victims. She stressed the importance of victims' commemoration through museums, memorials and medals.

Lord Blencathra recalled that some persons had complained about not being specifically treated as victims of terrorism and pointed out that people should be treated according to the consequences and not to the reasons for the act.

Ms Heisserer stressed the need to aid all victims, regardless of their nationality.

Mr Rencki reiterated that common infractions were included in his statistics.

Mr Zayadin pointed to the issue of definition of terrorism and whether this would also include State terrorism, as it was the case in Gaza.

Ms Karamanli pointed to the difficulty in including the problems related to State terrorism and the need to co-operate also at UN level, which she had the opportunity to discuss in New York in December. She also focused on what governments could do to prevent terrorist attacks in the first place, the important work on de-radicalisation, as well as commemoration of the victims and the need for a census.

**Speech by Mr Travis D. Frain, Victim of the attack at Westminster, London, in 2017
22 May 2018, Athens**

Thank you for the introduction and thank you esteemed members for giving me the opportunity to speak before you today. I have been asked to provide comment on my own experiences, and also more broadly upon the support that is available to survivors and others affected by terrorism in the UK. I'm sure we can all agree that following the events of last year, not just in the United Kingdom, but across Europe, this is a very important issue and I hope that by presenting to you today you may be able to act upon the points raised.

So without further ado I will start with my own case and move on to a discussion more broadly later, I will also be more than happy to take questions at the end should that be deemed suitable.

In March last year I was visiting London on a trip with a class from my University when I was hit by a car that had mounted the pavement and was heading towards the Houses of Parliament.

I apologise for the nature of the photos on this screen, I certainly don't like them either – however there is only a 13 hour difference between the top and the bottom and if I'm honest, I feel it is necessary that I show you this today as terrorism is an issue that personally, to many of us, is 'alien' and the feeling is often that it won't happen to us, of course until it does. I suffered relatively serious injuries, though not life threatening or changing and had two operations, 8 days in hospital, and then 6 months on crutches and a walking stick following my return home. Physiotherapy continued for a little over a year. Since the attack I have joined the board of Trustees for the Tim Parry Johnathan Ball Peace Foundation, something that I will touch on later, and I have joined as a founding member of the Survivors Against Terror network, through which I was invited today.

I have to be blunt with you all, frankly I feel it'd be a disservice to this Chamber if I wasn't. As awful as it sounds, I think we are always in some way subconsciously prepared for the fact that something may happen when travelling to a large city in today's day and age, much as you never truly believe such an incident will happen to you. What I wasn't prepared for was the way in which we were to be treated with what I can only describe as complete and utter indifference by the British Government and by other sections of society which you would have expected to care for people who have been through incidents of this nature. I can wholeheartedly say in my own personal experience that the hardest part of all, was not the attack itself or the psychological or physical injuries I received as a result, but rather it was the way in which we had to constantly and consistently fight to gain any real form of support – not only was this absolutely tiring, but having spoken to medical professionals I can say there is a real argument to be made to say that it seriously risks extending the minimum recovery period of those involved.

I had 3 other friends who were injured in the attack, and all 3 were discharged within the day and headed home – as I mentioned previously, I left the hospital after 8 days. As soon as we left London and headed to the North of England there was an immediate and very noticeable drop off in levels of care. We were not assigned a Police Liaison Officer and thus, upon leaving the hospital, we did not hear from the Police regarding the incident until around 5 months later, nor did we have any method by which we could effectively contact them in confidence.

This became a massive issue when we began to be harassed, harangued and threatened by a considerable amount of people online who claimed the attacks to be fake, to be false flags, or that we had merely falsified our own involvement in it. Some were eventually reported to the Police as death threats. I apologise for some of the language in these screenshots and I won't dwell on this issue much longer, other than to point out this small snapshot of some of these incidents on the screen, these are messages that I have never shown to anyone else before, though again as I've said I feel it necessary to show these to you today.

In a similar fashion to the issues regarding Police, were the local NHS services. During this time I was strongly urged by friends and family to take part in some form of psychological support. I must admit that personally I have always held quite old fashioned attitudes when it comes to mental health, however as almost everyone I knew was urging me to at least give it a try, I did. Under the National Health Service, myself and my friends had to spend over 10 weeks on a waiting list, despite letters sent on my behalf from my Doctor and the aforementioned Peace Foundation charity. Eventually I was given a phone appointment where I was told it was "probably time to get over it" and that if I wanted to sleep better, which was honestly one of the few issues I was facing in this area at that time, I should simply "drink a warm cup of milk before bed". With all due respect, my sleeping problems clearly did not come simply from an inability to get to sleep, they came from the trauma of having a person attempt to murder you and your friends, and come very close to succeeding. The only other options offered to us were a whole range of pills, which was not something I really wanted to get into as I simply did not feel it was necessary, or a shared group session with alcoholics, drug addicts, and people with other mental problems.

I faced similar problems with physiotherapy under the NHS, and for both this and other therapy I was eventually forced to go to private providers. As you might imagine, a 19 year old university student like myself at the time wouldn't exactly have the kind of money lying around that would be required to pay for such treatment, and as such I had to use my student finance payments for quite some time before fortunately using money donated to me by friends, family and others, to pay for it. To this day, we have yet to receive any money from any official government funds or compensation from the official Criminal Injuries Provider, CICA. And frankly, how could we be surprised? Even now, over a year since the attack we still haven't had any elected officials of any political party or position meet with us as victims. I understand how this may seem like a cheap point to make but let me give an example of how this can prove extremely frustrating – a few weeks following the attack there was a service held for victims in Westminster Abbey. This service was broadcast live across the country via the BBC, and amongst many others, a number of senior politicians such as the Mayor of London and the Home Secretary gave speeches. However following the service, when a private reception was held for the victims away from the cameras, attended also by the speakers, those politicians were nowhere to be seen.

Fortunately, we did receive some support from the charity previously mentioned, the Tim Parry Johnathan Ball Peace Foundation - they get their namesake from the two boys who lost their lives in 1993 to an IRA attack in Warrington in the North of England, and were founded shortly after it. The Foundation is one of the few providers of support to victims of terror and their families, and though they are unable to provide counselling or any medical services of that nature, they were able to assess and advocate on my behalf for the treatment that it was felt was needed, visiting in person very often and in all honesty being one of the few places where we felt someone genuinely had an idea of what you were going through and could sympathise. They operate a number of de-radicalisation and education programmes, but of course it was through their Survivors Assistance Network that I first came in contact with them. Sadly, despite this two man team seeing a 600% increase in referrals for support as a result of last year's attacks, to nearly 800 ongoing cases in total, the Government has still not confirmed their funding for this year, never mind an increase that perhaps would be expected, and thus they may soon be forced to begin redundancies; as deeply upsetting as that is to someone who has benefited solely from their support.

This point leads me in quite well to a discussion of the broader experiences of those affected by terror attacks in the United Kingdom, often not too dissimilar to my own. The Survivors Against Terror group that I was invited to this hearing through today is still very much in its infancy, having only been started at the end of January this year, though the hope is to grow a network of people who have been involved in these incidents and get a better idea of the issues facing them. As we speak they are conducting a comparative study, and though I am consequently unable to present this to you today, it should be finished in the June/ July region. In the meanwhile, on the screen behind me are quotes from other survivors that I personally have spoken to or who have given such statements in public, though this is clearly not conclusive I felt it necessary to provide a snapshot. Admittedly, the picture is rather mixed, depending often on the nature of the attack, their involvement, and location of the attacks as can perhaps be expected. From the Manchester attack for example, I have heard of many bereaved families say that the support they have received was more than adequate and can be funded by the massive amount of money raised in donations, over £21 Million so far. On the other hand a number of those who witnessed the events of that night, particularly the children, struggle to gain access to treatment under their local providers and also to gain funding for it from the One Love Manchester Fund. Of course conversely those injured in other attacks such as London Bridge and Parsons Green received drastically less in donations and thus there are the related issues with that.

Finally, another issue of comparative relevance is that of the memorialisation of these events, and how this can deeply affect victims, and sometimes even re-traumatise without the proper support mechanisms in place. When it came to the anniversary of the Westminster Attack a few months ago, there were no commemorative events held at all for victims to mark the anniversary and thus, for many, it has meant that they struggle to move on as the date was not marked and mentally, their experience continues. Instead, authorities agreed on a plan to simply project the words #LondonUnited onto a wall, which had the opposite effect of feeling like a punch in the gut, for lack of a better phrase.

I will have to bring this to a close as honestly it is probably an issue I could spend much, much longer talking about, but as I said at the start I would be happy to take questions and if anyone does wish to get in touch with me personally then they are happy to do so. If you mind, I will leave you with a quote from Human Rights Lawyer Jason McCue that I think sums up my position quite well, he said and I quote: "terror victims deserve more than just platitudes and sympathy. They need to be given the opportunity to be of value, given welfare support, enabled to have justice, and be given the opportunity to attain their own form of reconciliation or closure".

Exchange of views with Mr Brendan Cox, Founder of Jo Cox Foundation in the United-Kingdom, Ms Sajda Mughal, Executive director of the JAN Trust Organisation, and survivor of the 7/7 bombing in London in 2005 (both via video link), Imam Imran Muhammad, Trainer on the Me and You Education project in Manchester and Ms Gabriella Battaini-Dragoni, Deputy Secretary General of the Council of Europe
Extracts from the minutes, 28 June 2017, Strasbourg

The Chairperson welcomed all guests. He reminded the Committee that this exchange of views was part of the Committee's ongoing work on preventing extremism and combating terrorism, that a new motion on protecting and supporting the victims was recently tabled by the committee for which a Rapporteur would be appointed the next day.

Mr Cox focused his remarks on extremism in the context of far-right populism in Europe. Similarities between extremisms, whether they were Islamist inspired or extreme-right inspired were more important than what divided them: hatred towards others, the belief in exclusive societies and the willingness to use violence against innocent people. His first encounter with extremism took place when he was 18 just after the war in former Yugoslavia when he became involved in taking care of children whose families had been destroyed by ethnic hatred. He learnt then how quickly a society could go from normality to brutality. He then spent 20 years in charities and campaign groups to address civil war and genocides in several countries. He then thought that working internationally was the best option, for he assessed that the underpinning of democracy and of human rights were secured in the United Kingdom (UK) and in Europe. He reviewed that assumption three years ago when he saw a rise in hate-crimes, the growth of the far-right in Europe and the European response to the refugee crisis. Then, he and Jo Cox decided to concentrate more on the UK and Europe, by running for general elections, for Jo, and by being involved as campaign researcher, for him.

Concerning the drivers of rising of far-right extremism, this rise was caused by a mixture of factors, such as economic insecurity (low wages, cost of living), physical insecurity (by Islamist terror attacks), identity insecurity, which combine in a context of distrust of public institutions and of weaker communities (people no longer knowing their neighbours). The narrative built by far-right extremism was very simple and seductive. It consisted of pointing out the culprit of all these insecurities. To respond to this threat to our fundamental values, it must be taken all the more seriously that these insecurities were going to be on the agenda for more than a generation. They would not disappear after an electoral cycle, such the one in France with the victory of Emmanuel Macron or the disappearance of UKIP in the UK. Three courses of action should be taken. First, forces which fight against populism should be more united and able to articulate a common narrative about the kind of society and Europe they wanted, because far-right extremism was well organised. Secondly, how to engage with the "anxious middle": those Europeans who were more than 50% and were, according to the data, concerned with immigration, deterioration of public services, change of culture but were not racist – these figures were true for Europe except for Hungary; liberals should not look down at these people, as they sometimes did, and should not answer emotional speeches and to fears with statistics. Instead they should build a counter-narrative. Lastly, he said that what should be more often talked about was what people had in common and not what made them so diverse, which was for a long time a liberal narrative – "diversity and differences are good" – and an error. Commonality must now be stressed, not what divided people.

Ms Mughal touched upon her experience in terms of what happened to her on 7/7/2005 and wanted to give a practical example of what had been working at grassroots level to prevent extremism and terrorism. She also wanted to give a personal perspective of terrorism, particularly Islamic.

She described what happened on 7/7 and said that it was only when she returned to her house that evening that the news broke that it was a bomb and had been carried out by 4 Muslim men, killing 52 people, 'in the name of my religion, Islam'. She needed counselling, time off work, family support, and could not travel on tube; however the experience left her with a number of unanswered questions, why did this happen; how could these 4 men carry this act out in the name of her religion when she knew that this was not what Islam says; how could we have prevented 7/7 so we did not lose lives.

She therefore took the decision to change her life with the goal of stopping these things from happening and decided to work with those who could make the difference: women, mothers, homes and families, so she started working for the JAN trust, which worked to fight extremism from a grass roots level.

Internet played a huge part in extremism and radicalisation and the JAN Trust formalised research regarding extremism online and in 2012, published a report on *Internet Extremism: Working Towards a Community Solution*. This report showed that the Internet played a huge role in radicalisation and how Daesh were using the internet to recruit. Only 1 to 2% of people were 'radicalised in mosques, whereas the Internet was 90%.

The JAN Trust had set up the Web Guardians programme. Traditional counter terrorism efforts underestimated the powerful role women could play in preventing extremism and assumed that women lacked authority in society; in fact women were at the core of the home and of family matters and were the most effective guardians of their children. They were often the first victims but also the first to spot the first signs of radicalisation. 93% of them lacked IT skills but all wanted more information. Since its inception, 1 000 women had been helped and case studies of stopping joining groups had been well documented.

The recent attacks in the UK reminded us of the problem of Internet and online propaganda. As a survivor of a terrorist attack, she had strived to create a network to support victims of terrorism. Counselling and compensation played an important role, and it made a difference to have a platform to tell your story. All these things she had to struggle to do on her own. Echoing her own views, the Secretary General of the Council of Europe had highlighted the necessity of legal, psychological, medical and material support for victims.

Imam Muhammad started by saying that our prayers and thoughts are with all the victims and families of the victims who have been affected by the horrific, hateful and barbaric attacks, which have taken, place all around the globe at the hands of extremists. He said that the symbiotic relationship between the many forms of extremism especially between Islamist and the Far Right groups made it an obligation as members of the mainstream society that we do something to tackle these devastating ideologies.

His organisation, "Me and You Education", tried to disarm the extremities of society without curbing the very important conversations on issues which people from these fringes of communities were angry about. In the name of political correctness, main stream society had started to curb, shut down and muffle the very issues people wanted to talk about. The co-founders, Mr Dave Allport and Imam Irfan Chishti, had a combined experience of 40 years in countering the views of Islamist and the Far Right groups, bringing valuable insight to the process of radicalisation and extremism.

He worked for her Majesty's prison service as a Chaplain and worked with prisoners who had been convicted of terror offences, known as TACT offenders. He had first-hand experience of individuals who had committed, or tried to commit, horrific acts. However the reaction to the attacks in Manchester showed true human unity regardless of background, social status, religion or ethnicity.

The Me and You Education organisation showed, through training, that 'difference' could and did work together. To quote Jo Cox "we are far more united and have far more in common with each other than things that divide us".

He touched upon the fact that because of a few extremist Muslims, the rest were being targeted on all sides of society; the far right wanted them out, and the Islamists saw them as non-Muslims as they did not accept their extreme version of Islam. He also pointed out that the Muslim community had spoken out; the mainstream Muslim organisations in Britain had unequivocally condemned all the attacks.

It was important to try not to dehumanise those who had committed atrocities as deradicalisation could be successful if this was the case. In his diverse experience, as an Imam working in Muslim communities, as a youth worker engaging with the young people who were vulnerable to being groomed or radicalised, a Chaplain working in an environment where the convicted were kept to serve their sentences and as an Associate Trainer at Me and You Education through which, front line staff who worked with different fringes of society were trained in how to go about creating a more cohesive society where everyone felt valued, his conclusions were the same. That we were all much more similar than we were different. It seemed too simple a conclusion but it was often the most simple, most obvious things that could lead to long term solutions.

Mr Klich asked what could be done by national authorities and international organisations to improve the disarmament of extremism and radicalism which could lead to terrorism.

Ms Ævarsdóttir asked what a good narrative for liberals attached to human rights and rule of law would be.

Mr Cox replied that apart from the work of the security services, the best way for citizens to disarm extremism was to have closer communities, because it was very hard to hate the other when you knew the other. Concerning the common narrative that should be built, he favoured a patriotic narrative to counter the feeling of identity that Islamist or nationalist narratives gave to people ; a patriotic narrative being the values we share as a country and being inclusive instead of exclusive.

Ms Mughal said that to improve the fight against extremism, a multi community / multi agency approach would be needed: teachers, representatives of mosques, security and intelligence officers should work together to assess the risk of radicalisation and terrorism. As regard to "identity", she agreed with Mr Cox. Extremists used

that leverage very strongly when they recruited and they needed to be confronted by another narrative focused on a positive identity promoting human values.

Imam Muhammad quoted an Urdu couplet: “The ones who create instability and disunity / Give them the punishment of love affection”. Disarming extremists was a necessity. Until 2003, the struggle against extremism was fought against only one community. Since then, radical Islamism and far-right extremism had been treated in an inclusive way, which was a progress. However, the terminology, something which mattered, was still not always used in the right way. When the Home Office talked about “prevention”, it targeted “pre-criminal space”, whereas it should refer to “non-criminal space”. He agreed with Mr Cox and Ms Mughal concerning the issue of identity and stated that the best way to protect one-self against extremism was to know who one was and what one was. Whatever the narrative, it should stress that we all belonged to the human race, which was something that could not be changed.

Ms Chagaf said that prevention through social assistance, beginning at home, in each house, was the key to defeating extremism.

Mr Loncle stressed that extremism must be understood, but not excused. He did not believe that economic and social factors were a good explanation. Religious extremism had to be condemned, not only when it came from Islam but from all religions. The saying of Mr Cox was interesting: everyone is defending his own cause instead of trying to join and unite. Not doing it led to communities living apart, which was maybe more problematic in the UK. Living side by side was not living together. Therefore, he did not favour the ideology of difference, as at a certain point, communitarianism meant rejecting others. He pointed out the contradiction of internet which enabled people to be connected but at the same time could be used for recruiting terrorists. Lastly, he regretted that in France, the voice of the Muslim community was barely audible after the terrorist attacks in 2015 and 2016. He referred to a recent statement in the newspaper *Le Monde* by a French writer from Moroccan origin, Tahar Ben Jelloun, inviting and urging Muslims to take the floor and condemn these attacks, which they did not, as they scarcely joined the demonstration of more than one million people in 2015 that followed the attacks on kosher-supermarket and *Charlie Hebdo* newspaper.

Imam Muhammad recalled that he was in favour of challenging the Islamist ideology. He also replied to Mr Loncle that a fatwa carried out by 129 Muslim organisations worldwide clearly condemned the terrorist attacks on 7/7 and those that followed. He stated that the most respected imams from two Muslim organisations that represent 99% of the Muslims in the UK, the Muslim Council of Britain and the British Muslim Forum, gathered at Saint-Mary’s square where children were killed by an extremist. It took a lot of time for the media to come to the mainstream Muslims and listen to their voices. The so-called silent majority did speak out in the UK.

Ms Mughal said that the economic and social factors partially explained radicalisation. In the Middle East, terrorist organisations targeted people according to economic criteria in order to recruit them. She agreed with Ms Chagaf that prevention is always better than the cure. Lastly, concerning the reaction of the Muslim community, she said her organisation has been fighting against extremism, Islamist and far-right, for 12 years. She reminded the audience that in Manchester, after the terrorist attack, 130 imams gathered to condemn terrorism. In the UK, the “Muslim response” had been and was strong.

Mr Cox stressed that the Muslim community strongly denounced the terrorist attacks conducted on British soil in the past few months. He underlined the fact that all extremism should be treated equally, whether they were Islamist or far-right oriented. Citing the van terrorist attack at Finsbury Park against Muslims, he drew a parallel with the obligation put upon any Muslim to denounce terrorist acts when they were perpetrated by Islamists: the driver of the van was a white British citizen; why should he, who did not share anything with that man and who did not feel represented by him, stand and talk in order to dissociate himself from that man? The same question could apply to Muslims who did not see themselves to have anything in common with Islamist terrorists and did not feel to be in anyway represented by them.

Mme Battaini-Dragoni presented the main changes to the list of guidelines for the protection of victims of terrorist acts decided by the Council of Europe in 2017. The first one was a major switch in the way that it was now up to the State approach victims and their families and not to the victims to ask the State for help, support, services and, possibly compensation. What was now emphasised was a holistic approach towards the victims and their needs. A second basic principle of the revised guidelines: each member State must set up an appropriate legal and administrative structure at national level which would be able to have a prompt reaction towards the victims. Third breakthrough: the principle of compensation for the victims now lay within the State in which the attack was perpetrated. Two other elements were included in the revised guidelines: the importance of remembrance and the need to work hand in hand with civil society.

**Speech by Ms Luciana Milani, whose daughter was killed in the Bataclan attack on 13 November 2015
11 October 2016, Strasbourg**

Please allow me to share with you some of the thoughts that have matured within me over these difficult months. They are words spoken freely, in which it is perhaps difficult to identify a unifying thread. Nevertheless, they are reflections that I wish to share with you, as highly qualified persons, the representatives of the people of Europe.

I turn to you requesting your attention and your help.

The reason for my presence here, as a representative of my family, is to express our faith in the ideals of Europe. We have believed in these ideals and transmitted them to our children. The No Hate, No Fear campaign appears to us to be important as it attempts to give a new form to a European project in these difficult times.

I shall start by talking about myself and my family.

Happiness

In our life there is a before and an after. I was a happy woman, my children had no problems, I was in good health, and I had a job that I liked and that allowed me to live a comfortable life. So too for Alberto my husband, and Dario my son.

The tragic murder of our daughter propelled us into terra incognita. Her future was snatched from her, her companion Andrea was deprived of her love, and we were flung from the path along which we were travelling together. The past has also become difficult and controversial, it provides no consolation to us, at times it seems to us that we were only waiting for the tragedy. We have become witnesses to the atrocity of which the world is capable. We have had to redefine our existence and to find a new task in life.

Our daughter

Our daughter, our two children – but now I want to talk about Valeria, whose life was so cruelly taken, who was for us an inexhaustible source of joy. We can still today feel the echoes of that joy, which give us the strength to go forward. We owe this to her. We seek to be as she would have wanted us and as we were in the past.

Her killing must not make us worse people. We can't know what life will throw at us and some of it, perhaps most of it, does not depend on us. I see it as our task to face with courage the tragedy which life has confronted us with.

Hate

Hate is a destructive sentiment, which also has effects on the person who feels it. It burns up vital energies, it prevents one from living. In English, just as in Italian, one can be blinded by hate. We don't want to be blinded, we want to see and, if possible, to understand. My statement here serves this aim: to try and understand, to look for meaning, a lesson for the future.

I don't feel anything for the killers of 13 November. They are also dead, except for one of them. They were also young men, born in Europe, and more or less of the same age as many of their victims.

I rather feel a great pity for their families, for their mothers. Some of the families have more than one kamikaze son. What do these parents feel, what thoughts torment them? The death of their sons must also be a source of relentless pain for them.

The Bataclan Generation

What happened in Paris on 13 November was something new and terrible. Acts of terrorism usually seek to hinder the proper functioning of cities, infrastructure and centres of power. The targets are airports, underground systems, shopping centres and control centres. On 13 November it was not Paris as a functioning city that was struck but rather the urban community as such, comprised of people brought together by the fact of dining together, listening to music or going to a football match. Paris was struck through its people. The French and Italian press have spoken of the Bataclan Generation, a term which has on different occasions

been used to describe very different types of behaviour and individual profiles. All in all, the definition sounds very controversial to me.

The victims

People have talked of a generation dedicated to carefree hedonism. This is false.

We know, or have been told, who the 130 victims of the Paris attacks were: they were young people and less young people, women and men who worked in a very wide range of fields, who after a week at work went out to have fun. They came from 19 different countries, many were French, and many were European. These people turned into an object of hate for reasons which it is very difficult to fathom. Many of them were Muslims. We saw their families at the morgue. A great pain unites us with them.

European values

It was Europe and not only Paris that was the stage for the attacks.

This leads me to reflect on what has been defined as the European model, or also European values. But what is this model based on? It is certainly based on civil rights, but above all on work, that is on the social and economic capacity to involve increasingly wider circles of people in work.

It is because of work, or rather its growing scarcity, that the European model has entered a crisis. Exclusion from the workplace can easily heighten social exclusion, giving rise to a detachment from and antagonism towards those who are included, who for this reason alone may appear to be members of a privileged class.

The victims of 13 November were not privileged people. They were women and men with different lives working in different types of jobs. That some young workers may be perceived as an elite is a fact which should make us think and give cause for concern. This perception also gave ammunition to the killers.

Identity

At this moment in history Islamic terrorism appears to be an expression also of social exclusion.

I do not believe that religion is the only, or indeed the principal, foundation of identity. The identity of individuals is rooted in multiple elements, such as nationality, gender, age, cultural background, and the country in which they live... At this moment in history religious background has taken on a greater importance as a basis for individual identity. I don't think this is a good thing.

All religions can show two faces, one positive in which every religion recognises a shared humanity in other religions, and one negative in which identity is constructed against other communities.

Today the perception is spreading that membership of the Islamic faith is an obstacle to civil cohabitation and to the shared values underpinning our Western society. These values are based on the rights of the individual and access to employment.

Voices of Islam

In seeking to answer the question how our society can counter the fear generated by terrorism and avoid falling into the trap of hatred, I would say that it would be important to promote and disseminate condemnations of terrorism originating from our fellow citizens who profess the Islamic faith.

I think that if these voices were stronger and more numerous, they would make a significant contribution to the renewal of dialogue and reciprocal understanding.

Europe must find a voice

Our daughter, like many other young people who are loved just as much and were born more or less at the time of the fall of the Berlin Wall, is now once again hemmed in by many walls, in Austria, Serbia, Slovenia, Hungary, Calais, in Europe.

The Europe in which we as parents educated them, to which we as parents directed them in order to understand our immediate surroundings in the world, is not making its voice heard with sufficient force. The European institutions come across as opaque and distant from ordinary people.

After the attacks against Charlie Hebdo, the attacks of 13 November, and those in Brussels and Nice, I want to remember our fellow nationals who were killed barbarically in Dhaka; Europe's message of solidarity has not got through to the families of the victims. I say this with great sadness.

Empathy between persons and peoples

The campaign against the hatred and fear that are sweeping through our countries can only be successful if it is based on empathy between persons, peoples and their institutions. This empathy must feed this.

I think that this is very important. I think it is necessary to relaunch the idea of solidarity, commonality and civility, which has marked our development since the times of Ancient Greece. Schools do a great deal in this area, but that cannot be enough. We have to think once again of the Europe which has lived in peace for seventy years since the bloodshed of the Second World War and which has been able to overcome hatred and destruction by pursuing an ambitious project.

We must remember the victims of terrorism, the nine Italians who died in Dhaka and their families. We must remember Giulio Regeni and the campaign Truth for Giulio Regeni.

We want a Europe that will mourn alongside us.

**Speech by Mr David Anderson Q.C., UK Independent Reviewer of Terrorism Legislation
11 October 2016, Strasbourg**

Terrorism, Tolerance and Human Rights

For the last six years I have reviewed and reported on the operation of anti-terrorism laws in the United Kingdom, independently of government but on a fully security-cleared basis. This, in six minutes, is what I have learned.

Those laws need, firstly to be strong. They have to identify and punish the extremists who espouse violence – the thousands, in my country, who are motivated by either residual grievances in Northern Ireland, by the extreme right wing or by militant Islam.

The threat of terrorism curtails normal activities, heightens suspicion and promotes prejudice. That is precisely what the terrorist intends. If the authorities are powerless to act against it, some will be tempted to vigilantism. By prevention and by punishment, strong laws can help reduce the fear and hatred that the terrorist seeks to generate.

But at the same time, those laws must not alienate or render cynical the rest of the population, in particular the innocent and peace-loving millions in the communities from which terrorists seek their support. This matters particularly for Muslims, because as a minority group in most of our societies, they are especially liable to feel targeted by measures, however well-intended, that may seem to be designed more for them than for others.

It is not easy to reconcile those two imperatives – though I believe it is possible.

But we would be fooling ourselves if we thought that laws against terrorism, however strong and however sensitive, can do any more than treat the symptoms. Islamist terrorism is a global phenomenon, responsible for the great majority of the 28,300 deaths from terrorism last year, three quarters of them in five countries: Iraq, Pakistan, Afghanistan, India and Nigeria. And in the words of King Mohammed of Morocco, a direct descendant of the Prophet:

"Terrorists are taking advantage of some young Muslims – particularly in Europe – and of their ignorance of the Arabic language and of true Islam, to spread their distorted messages and misleading promises."

As Europeans, we have a responsibility not just to enforce laws against terrorism but to protect our own people – Muslims and Muslim converts – from the grievances and crises of identity that can render them vulnerable to the murderous ideology of Salafi jihadism.

The starting point, as it seems to me, must be tolerance: not perhaps the most inspiring of virtues, since it means putting up with things or with people whom we may not like. But if properly applied, a staging post to the higher objectives of trust and integration. An answer not just to terrorism but to the broader problem of how to live together.

But what should we tolerate, and what should we not? People resent newcomers who do not conform to their customs, but are unsure which of their own values they are allowed to defend, and which must give way to the perceived demands of multiculturalism or human rights. Too often, the wrong answers are found. Perhaps the newcomer will be told that he must fully assimilate to be accepted. Or, conversely, a blind eye may be turned to practices that ought never to be accepted.

I will suggest three principles – each of them founded on the universal democratic values that have been given shape, by collective inspiration over many years, in this city of human rights.

First, confidence in setting limits. The European Court reminds us that democracy is founded on tolerance – but also on pluralism and broad-mindedness. So everyone has an absolute right to believe what they like, to change their beliefs, and to share them with like-minded people. But tolerance does not extend to expressions of religious belief that unjustifiably restrict the rights of others. That is so whether you are a Christian who wants his child to be beaten, or a political party which seeks to elevate the law of God over the law of man. After all, as has often been said: "Democracy is not a suicide pact".

This means that as Matthew Wilkinson of the Cambridge Muslim College has written, Islam must adapt to being "one legitimate faith among many legally equivalent faiths", with the Shari'a existing as "a code of personal religious conduct rather than constituting the legal framework for the whole or even part of society".

Secondly, confidence in applying the laws we have. Radicalisers cannot be allowed, as they were in 1990s Britain, to incite murder, radicalise the young, finance violent jihad and train people for it. Failure to investigate or to prosecute corruption, forced marriage, female genital mutilation, sexual abuse and so-called honour crimes should never be excused, or tolerated, by misplaced respect for cultural difference. Certainly, we need to be alert to the risk of discrimination. But police or social workers should not have to fear accusations of racism when they investigate practices that are not tolerated by the law.

Police and others rightly value their links with the communities that they serve. But the vulnerable people in any community may be precisely those for whom so-called “community leaders” do not speak. Examples are the feminist Muslims, gay Muslims and ex-Muslims, described by Maajid Nawaz as “minorities within minorities”, who may be stigmatised and subjected to physical threats even in the West. Individual rights trump communal rights: these are people whom the law must protect.

My third principle is humility: an acceptance that the battle for hearts and minds is an impossible one to direct. If the state seeks to control or monitor “extremist activity” that poses no direct threat to the life, wellbeing or property of others, it will attract resentment and suspicion. And if things get to that point, it may actually be worsening the problem it is seeking to cure.

In short, “the power of reason as applied through public discussion” is preferable to “silence coerced by law”. The state may facilitate that discussion, even participate in it (though its views are not likely to be the most influential) – but not close it down.

So human rights do not hamper the fight against terrorism and extremism: they underline its legitimacy. And by practising tolerance but knowing its limits, we may still hope to emulate what King Mohammed described as:

“the countless examples, in human civilisation, of success stories which show that religious interaction and coexistence produce open societies in which Love, harmony and prosperity prevail.”

**Speech by Mr Antoine Leiris, whose wife was killed in the Bataclan attack on 13 November 2015
11 October 2016, Strasbourg**

Thank you and please accept my apologies for being late as my responsibilities as a father come first; it took me some time to get back from the day-care centre, I am sure that all the mothers and fathers who have children to whom they devote a lot of their time will understand that it is sometimes difficult to do everything in one day.

I have come to see you precisely because of this text and the follow-up to it, but in fact I would like us to accompany you. With regard to this hashtag and to the message that you want to convey beyond the beautiful image, beyond the image that is printed on the cover of magazines, because that image of a 35 year-old widowed father who is raising his son and who is letting go of hatred for love of his wife and for his son's future, is an image that does not reflect the complexity of what I experienced inside myself before making that choice. Nor it does reflect the complexity of assuming that choice every day since, because it is a complicated choice.

Terrorism aims to instil a lasting fear in those it has targeted and that fear comes from an outside factor, but it immediately resonates intimately, personally, and very deeply in each one of us, because fear, in fact, feeds on our wounds, our fantasies and it also, and perhaps mostly, feeds on our ignorance. If you prick up your ears, fear is music, the notes which compose it are written in an ink which is made up of what each and every one of us is, and you can shout as loud as you want, you will never be able to cover up the sound of that music because it is inside you. You must really listen to that music, you must really listen to it carefully, you must try to hear every one of its vibrations, its various movements, its variations; you must in fact try to hear it in order to be able to understand it and overcome it.

In order to overcome it, you must start with yourself and when I say yourself, you must start with yourselves, each of one of you, because as representatives of the people in the Parliamentary Assembly, you are also citizens, our fellow citizens. This responsibility you have to represent us must, in point of fact, not make you forget that you are also one of us and that, like us, you are scared of terrorist attacks. I think that this is something that you must accept if you want to be able to enter into a dialogue with our fellow citizens. I, in fact, asked myself a question during my journey here, and I think it important that there is a perception that you also belong to the community of people who may experience that fear.

On my way here, I asked myself which one of you has not already thought that this building could be an ideal target for a terrorist wanting to attack the heart of democracy. I asked myself which one of you does not think about it each time you go through the metal detectors or which one of you does not think about it when going to take your plane or train home. And perhaps, which one of you did not think about it even today when sitting in this room. I think that it's important to accept this fear because "don't be scared" is what is said to children at bedtime, but with them it's simple, all you have to do is to go and look under the bed in order to explain to them that there is no monster and to see that there is none. For us, monsters do exist, they have Kalashnikovs and explosive devices and they want us dead; it's reality, it's not a figment of a child's imagination. We have to learn to live with that reality. We cannot brush the fear aside. You cannot simply say "NoHateNoFear", you have to go beyond that, but it's a start anyway. These words can only be the beginning.

So, each one of you, do not refuse this fear, do not brush it aside, listen to it, probe it, accept it, it will be the only way you can overcome it, it will be the only way you can help our fellow citizens to not give in to it, because it must also be said that we are not powerless in the face of this- and I think here this initiative has a very important role to play. A few days after the attack, I saw Paris come to life again, I saw people taking the metro, I saw people going to work, going out, going to shows, concerts, I saw them having a drink at a street café. In fact, they did it in spite of their fear, and they were aware of that fear, but what they were not aware of, or at least what I didn't hear often enough and what I would like them to be told, what I would like them to be aware of is the strength which was the driving force behind them getting back to a normal life so quickly. I would like them to be aware of the fact that each one of those daily actions is today, really, an act of resistance, I would also like them to realise and to be told that, together, the army of those of us who think that life is sacred is bigger than those who idolise death.

I would also like all of us to become aware of the fact that the fear is not solely on our side, because, in order not to fear death, I think you must be really, utterly afraid of life. If you promise death to a terrorist, you give him the present that he is expecting. If you answer him with freedom, conscience, life, it is a way for us to make ourselves indestructible. I therefore think that our mission is precisely to embrace life fully in all its complexity. In the complexity of that life which we want to embrace every day, there is happiness, beautiful moments and then there are also moments of fear, doubt. Let us accept all that and try to think about it in order to overcome them.

Recognition for victims of terror is indeed very important, it is crucial for the victims, but also for the way our societies react to these acts. I was lucky enough to meet a wonderful person called Laura Dauci who works at the UN headquarters in Geneva and who lost her husband during the attack against the UN's headquarters in Baghdad, and that person is going to fight and she is going to travel all around Europe in the coming months precisely so that victims of terrorism are recognised in the same way in each European country, because there is a big difference between our countries.

In France, the situation is that you are recognised by the State and that victims of terrorism also receive compensation; this is therefore a situation which enables victims to be granted a status, even if afterwards they do not want to become trapped in it, in general this gives them a status and a place in the narrative, which often revolves around the attackers and not the persons who received the bullets that these attackers forcibly put in their body.

So, I think it is indeed a very important topic and maybe a matter which should be taken up by Europe, because we are in a political institution here, and on a very big scale. This is because it is vital, in view of the internationalisation and of the fact that Europe is especially targeted by terrorism, to be able to put in place common rules for recognition of the status of victims. It would make it possible to change the way in which these stories are told. Everything revolves around the terrorists and from the moment the victims are given their dignity back, as was the case in several European countries faced with terrorism in the past, the population's perception of terrorism changes. This is maybe something that the Council of Europe, Europe itself, should embrace, something which I think is crucial given the times we are living in. Thank you.

**Speech by Mr Bjorn Ihler, Norway, Academic, Activist, Writer and Filmmaker, an Utøya survivor
26 September 2016, Reykjavik**

Honourable President, Assembly speakers, representatives, ladies and gentlemen, good morning, and thank you all for having me!

Mr Ihler begins by telling what he experienced on the 22 July 2011, when Anders Breivik, dressed in a homemade police uniform, killed 69 and injured more than hundred young people participating in the summer camp organised by the Workers' Youth League (the youth division of the Norwegian labour Party), on Utøya Island. A couple of hours earlier, a car bomb explosion in Oslo had killed 8 people and injured more than two hundred.

In Breivik's eyes we were traitors to our culture. He made that clear in his manifesto. He feared the unfamiliar – what he saw as threatening changes in our society – the diversity we saw as valuable.

This is the worldview shared by terrorists, whether they are Muslim, communist, atheist, Buddhist, fascist or Christian. The ideology that some people, because they are different, or think differently, must be killed! This ideology is driven by fear, the fear of the unknown.

Terrorists claim to be powerful; they see themselves as heroes, fighting a just cause. Breivik declared himself a Knights Templar, fighting for the Aryan race and the Christian man - he was willing to sacrifice himself, but mostly us, for his cause.

In reality it is obvious he was driven by fear. The fear of what is unfamiliar to him - of diversity. The solution most often offered to deal with fear, as fear leads to hate, is violence; but violence only deepens entrenchment and reinforces the simplified idea of 'us' vs 'them' held dear by extremists; it causes pain and thus only adds fuel to the fire.

I now work closely with former extremists to better understand how we can work to end extremism directly from the source, from people who better than anyone understand both the paths into and out of extremism. As a former Neo-Nazi with whom I work closely with says, "hurt people hurt people" - pain can be real and it can be perceived, it can be individual but it can also be cultural. Let us build capabilities of dealing with issues in our societies by other means than by causing and dwelling on pain.

Fear itself is not always bad. The problem arises when people choose violence as the easy solution to it.

It is how we deal with fear, how we overcome it and make it familiar, which makes us different from terrorists. By leading the way in facing our fears, by truly being heroes – we overcome extremism.

The violent denial and fear of diversity – of people's right to be different, to have a different religion, a different background, to love whomever they love, of the right to hold dissenting opinions to what someone deems to be right - explains terrorism across the world.

It also explains the attacks in Paris, Copenhagen, Belgium and Orlando.

The fact is that most recent attacks in the West were all performed by locals, all denying the diversity of their own communities. By violently imposing their worldview through the murder of those they see as different they make that painfully clear.

But what does that say about our societies – that these terrorists grew up in our own backyards?

It makes it heartbreakingly evident that we have serious issues to resolve. That if we truly want to end terrorism we have to start with ourselves.

So how do we end this?

We do it by showing that we as humans are all created equal, worthy of equal rights. We do it by standing together, by standing up against the fear and hate, the narratives and stories that seek to divide us.

We have to lead by example, by showing extremists and terrorists how wrong they are, by being better than them, by believing in a better, less dystopian future than them, by being brave and leading the way against fear, into the unknown towards a better future through how we treat each other and how we speak of each other, with respect, with humanity and with kindness. With human rights, with freedom of expression and

opposition, with liberty and with trust. We pave the path to the end of extremism. This is the responsibility of every government, of every institution and of every individual.

We do it by introducing critical and complex thinking as extremism in itself is the violent rejection and denial of the fact that we live in complex, diverse communities, in cultures where change is, and always has been inevitable, where cultures have evolved and changed, where we have learned from each other and evolved, where diversity has brought us the strength to persevere.

In doing this we have to build what I call strong positive identities, identities where we are comfortable with who we are ourselves and with those we live with. Where we can live together in comfort, without fear, knowing that it's ok for me to be me and for you to be you even if we believe in different gods, come from different places, believe in different politics and love different people. Where we can accept the fact that we as people are diverse and still can live side by side without posing a threat to each other's identity. We have to accept our diversity, but also build bridges, learn to know each other, not as the ideas and preconceptions we have, but as people. Often when I speak, one of my recommendations is for people to reach out to each other at a human level, to break down barriers by reaching out and sharing a cup of tea with their neighbours - this may sound utopian, but by taking one step at the time, by one human learning to know another we change the world one mind at the time.

I am now a consultant, researcher and activist working to pave the path towards building societies where terrorist attacks as the one I barely survived, like the attacks we have seen far too many of this year, across the world - are a thing of the past. I do this through various means, by sharing my experience, my research, thoughts and ideas, through the development of policies, tools and toolkits to help both prevent extremism from taking root in our society, and to support extremists in leaving their extremism behind through intervention. If I in any way can assist you or your country in your efforts to combat the hate, fear and violence that drive and fuel extremism please let us join forces, you, me and all nations represented here work together.

Like I had to overcome my fears, like I had to learn not to flee every time I saw a policeman, break down at the sound of helicopters, or the sight of the flashing lights of ambulances we have to learn to overcome our fears, we have to learn to face each other as human – as equal – as beautiful in all our diversity.

We surely can't be more terrified of each other than I was in that moment when Breivik pointed his gun at my head and fired.

But here I am, five years later, not afraid of Breivik, not afraid of ambulances, helicopters or cops, but most importantly, not afraid of you, my fellow human beings. Let us join together, let us collaborate, let us show unity in the face of fear, violence and hate and truly fight for a future with #NoHateNoFear.