



AS/Pol/Inf (2016) 17rev
19 January 2017
Apdocinf17rev_16

Committee on Political Affairs and Democracy

Hearings organised in 2016 under the Initiative Terrorism: #NoHateNoFear

Hearing

Reykjavik, 26 September 2016



Joint Hearing

with the Committee on Legal Affairs and Human Rights
Strasbourg, 11 October 2016



This document is also available on the Parliamentary Assembly Extranet website (restricted area for Members)
<http://assembly.coe.int/extranet>.

**Speech by Mr Pedro Agramunt,
President of the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe
26 September 2016**

Dear Chairperson,
Dear Colleagues, Ladies and Gentlemen,

It is an honour for me to be here in Reykjavik and to have the chance to exchange views with you. I would also like to take this opportunity to thank our host, Speaker Einar K. Guðfinnsson, for his warm welcome and hospitality.

I am extremely grateful to the Icelandic Parliament and to the Vice-Chairperson of the Political Affairs Committee, our dear friend Karl Garðarsson, for having supported the idea of organising a hearing on my new initiative, terrorism: #NoHateNoFear. I would also like to extend a special thanks to Mr Bjørn Ilher, who decided to share his testimony with us today.

Dear Mr Ilher, thank you very much for being with us.

In my opening speech for the European Conference of Presidents of Parliament, which took place in Strasbourg last week, as well as in my discussions with the President of the Stortinget, I mentioned the shootings on Utøya Island as “a defining moment in the eyes of the European public”.

It is a defining moment because Europe understood that hatred and intolerance will stop at nothing. Not even at the hopes and dreams of young people striving to create positive changes in society.

What happened in Utøya is simply unacceptable. We must put in place the necessary conditions to prevent a similar tragedy from ever happening again.

I would also like to express my full support for the initiative to declare 22 July “European Day for Victims of Hate Crime”, in order to show our solidarity to all those who suffered as a result of crimes committed in the name of hatred.

Thank you once again for being here and for the important work you are doing.

Colleagues, Ladies and gentlemen,

The tragic events in Paris, Tunis, Istanbul, Brussels, Utøya, and, unfortunately, many others, have become the symbol of hatred prevailing over humanity.

Each one of them reminds us that violence and terrorism have forced their way into our daily lives, and that this threat is real, it is here, and demands a firm and unified response.

It is unbearably painful to think about the 69 young women and men, their enthusiasm and their common desire to build a better world, who died in Utøya; to think about the smiles that many children had on their faces while watching the fireworks in Nice on French National Day; or, again, about the joy and happiness surrounding the wedding ceremony in Gaziantep on 20 August 2016 – and then everything changed.

We feel sad, angry, impotent, helpless.

But we have to react, and play an active role in preventing and responding to this blind and brutal terror.

When I took up my mandate as President of the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe in January 2016, I identified the fight against hatred and terrorism as one of the priorities of my term.

But how can we do this?

How can we combat people driven by hate, immune to reason and deaf to common sense?

How can we respond to terrorists' attempts to destabilise our society, to destroy our way of life by sowing the seeds of fear and hate among our citizens?

I believe the answer is “simple”: Hatred will not stop hatred. We should resist and defend our principles and ideals with even greater vigour.

We should not give in to hatred.

We should not give in to fear.

We have to combat violence and terror, but this fight must be waged with due regard for the values which unite us: human rights, democracy and rule of law.

As politicians, we have the duty to take responsibility for our citizens who have elected us as their representatives: we have to reassure them, show an example, speak out and take clear and open stands against intolerance, racism and hatred, in all their forms and manifestations.

The idea behind the #NoHateNoFear initiative is that it could serve as a tool at everyone’s disposal to spread this message.

I would therefore like to rally as many people as possible around it: journalists, students, politicians, representatives of civil society, academics – in order to say a resounding NO to fear and hatred.

By propagating suspicion and mistrust, terrorists want to turn members of our society against each other; they want to divide us, to make us weak and to discourage us.

But they are wrong; they will only make us stronger and united.

I hope you will all join the #NoHateNoFear initiative.

Thank you.

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

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.

**Speech by Mr Pedro Agramunt,
President of the Parliamentary Assembly
11 October 2016**

Dear Chairpersons, Dear colleagues,
Ladies and Gentlemen,

Thank you very much for being here today and for your support to our #NoHateNoFear initiative.

When I launched this initiative in June 2016, I wanted to pay tribute to the victims of terrorist attacks. For me the most appropriate way to do this was to invite parliamentarians to watch the video prepared by the BBC with the moving words taken from the letter Antoine Leiris published on Facebook in the wake of the Bataclan attack in November 2015.

I am sure that almost all of you have read his words: “Vous n’aurez pas ma haine”, “You will not have my hatred”.

When I read them for the first time, I was deeply moved and impressed by the strength of this message.

I started asking myself so many questions.

- Would I be able to spread the same message if I found myself in a similar situation?
- How can we reassure and show a moral example to our citizens in the face of this general sense of fear and hatred terrorists are trying to create?
- Would our society be able to take with it this message and give a democratic response to the terrorism threat?

This is how #NoHateNoFear was born. Thanks to this message, I was able to develop a new initiative inviting all members of society not to give in to hatred and fear, but to resist and defend – with even greater vigour – our principles and ideals.

We shall not let terrorists win.

I am therefore honoured that Antoine Leiris, whose message lies at the very heart of the creation of this initiative, is with us today.

There are a growing number of persons who have given us strong moral leadership after these terrible terrorist attacks.

We are privileged to also have at this meeting Ms Luciana Milani Solesin. She has shown extraordinary engagement towards maintaining the memory of her daughter, Valeria, while working hard on building hope and isolating hate within our society. This work is an inspiration for all of us.

We are entering new ground in knowing how to respond to terrorist attacks and I am sure our third speaker, eminent UK Barrister, Queen’s Council, Mr Anderson, will help us to identify how society can deal with the fear terrorism generates and to avoid the trap of hatred.

All our three speakers fully embody the spirit of the #NoHateNoFear initiative.

Thank you very much for being an example to all of us.

I do not wish to take up any more of your time, as I am sure we are all keen to hear your messages to us.

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

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**

Terrorism, Tolerance and Human Rights

1. 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.

2. 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.

3. 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.

4. 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.

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

6. 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."

7. 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.

8. 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.

9. 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.

10. 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.

11. 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".

12. 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”.

13. 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.

14. 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.

15. 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.

16. 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.

17. 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**

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.