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THE STATE OF ISLAMOPHOBIA IN EUROPE

ENES BAYRAKLI • FARID HAFEZ

This is the second edition of the annual *European Islamophobia Report (EIR)* which was presented for the first time in 2015. New countries are included in this year’s *EIR*; while 25 countries were covered in 2015, the report for 2016 includes 27 country reports. *EIR 2016* is the result of 31 prominent scholars who specialise in different fields such as racism, gender and Islamophobia Studies. In the years to come we will attempt to include more countries in our report. Our final aim is to cover and monitor the developments of Islamophobia in all European countries.

Islamophobia has become a real danger to the foundations of democratic order and the values of the European Union. It has also become the main challenge to the social peace and coexistence of different cultures, religions and ethnicities in Europe. The country reports of *EIR 2016*, which cover almost all the European continent from Russia to Portugal and from Greece to Latvia, clearly show that the level of Islamophobia in fields such as education, employment, media, politics, the justice system and the Internet is on the rise. Since the publication of the last report there is little improvement. On the contrary, one can see from the country reports that the state of democracy and human rights in Europe is deteriorating. Islamophobia has become more real especially in the everyday lives of Muslims in Europe. It has surpassed the stage of being a rhetorical animosity and has become a physical animosity that Muslims feel in everyday life be it at school, the workplace, the mosque, transportation or simply on the street.

The refugee movement and the turmoil it has created in Europe, the unprecedented rise of far right parties all across the continent and the UK’s Brexit decision, which took many by surprise, have revealed the importance and relevance of this report, which covers incidents and developments in 2016. The short-term political significance of Islamophobia is as much relevant as Islamophobia’s structural dimension. As mentioned before, small successes can be witnessed in some European countries yet great challenges lie ahead for deepening the values of human rights and freedom of religion in Europe.
The Rise of Islamophobia

As a survey conducted by the Chatham House Europe Programme shows, public opposition to any further migration from predominantly Muslim states is by no means confined to Trump’s administration (implementation of the ‘Muslim-Ban’). Respondents in Austria, Belgium, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Italy, Poland, Spain and the UK were presented with the statement ‘All further migration from mainly Muslim countries should be stopped’. As the report reveals, the majorities in all but two of the ten states agreed to this statement, ranging from 71% in Poland, 65% in Austria, 53% in Germany and 51% in Italy to 47% in the United Kingdom and 41% in Spain. In no country did the percentage that disagreed surpass 32%.1

The findings of this report go hand in hand with similar surveys on this topic. The Ipsos Perils of Perception Survey 2016 found that the current and the future Muslim population in Europe are enormously overestimated in most countries. Out of the list of all 20 countries where respondents overestimated the Muslim population by more than 10%, 12 are European, while the USA and Canada are among the remaining 8 countries. When asked “Now thinking about 2020, out of every 100 people, about how many do you think will be Muslim?”, the top 20 countries where proponents overestimated the Muslim population again were in majority European (11). The average guess in France is that 40% of

---

the population will be Muslim in 2020 when the actual projection is 8.3%. Italy comes third with 26% overestimation, and Belgium and Germany fourth with 24% overestimation.3

Connecting this to a survey conducted by the Pew Research Center, we can suggest that this overestimation is connected to unfavourable views regarding Muslims. The report states,

“Opinions of Muslims vary considerably across Europe. Half or more in Hungary, Italy, Poland, Greece and Spain have a very or somewhat unfavorable view of Muslims. And in Italy (36%), Hungary (35%) and Greece (32%), roughly a third hold very unfavorable opinions. Majorities in the other nations surveyed express positive attitudes about Muslims. Nonetheless, at least a quarter in each country have negative views of Muslims.”4

These numbers are not shocking if we look at the incidents of Islamophobia and its pervasiveness in power structure across Europe. Muslims are seen as the enemy ‘within’. There is wide consent in Western societies to Muslims not being seen as equal citizens. Othering and differential treatment may also overlap with the dehumanization of Muslims. Thus, physical attacks and political restrictions can often be carried out and even defended in an atmosphere of wide distrust and enmity. Islamophobia is by no means confined to the working poor or the middle class, who have been misinformed about Islam and Muslims. It is especially true for the so-called educated elite. Discriminating policies like the ban of the hijab for certain professions, the ban of the niqab in public, bans of minarets and other laws restricting Muslim’s freedom of religion speak volumes. If politicians can take such decisions and the media, along with large parts of society, accept them, why should we wonder about the strong opposition to immigration of Muslim people in Europe?

Hence, these numbers reveal the necessity of the EIR, which looks at the challenge of Islamophobia from a qualitative and not a quantitative research perspective. Its aim is to document and analyse trends in the spread of Islamophobia in various European nation states. There cannot be a claim of full comprehensiveness, since European nation states by majority still lack data collection. Hence, a central recommendation of the EIR is that Islamophobia or anti-Muslim hate crime should be included as a category in European nation states’ statistics – a development that has not occurred as of yet. The EIR’s primary contribution is to reveal the tendencies of Islamophobia and to give representative examples of its overall unfolding in the investigated states.

Recognition of Islamophobia

There are various definitions of Islamophobia. However, the definition of Islamophobia used by the *EIR*, as defined by its editors, is as follows,

“When talking about Islamophobia, we mean anti-Muslim racism. AsAnti-Semitism Studies has shown, the etymological components of a word do not necessarily point to its complete meaning, nor how it is used. Such is also the case with Islamophobia Studies. Islamophobia has become a well-known term used in academia as much as in the public sphere. Criticism of Muslims or of the Islamic religion is not necessarily Islamophobic. Islamophobia is about a dominant group of people aiming at seizing, stabilising and widening their power by means of defining a scapegoat – real or invented – and excluding this scapegoat from the resources/rights/definition of a constructed ‘we’. Islamophobia operates by constructing a static ‘Muslim’ identity, which is attributed in negative terms and generalised for all Muslims. At the same time, Islamophobic images are fluid and vary in different contexts, because Islamophobia tells us more about the Islamophobe than it tells us about the Muslims/Islam”.5

We think that with this definition, we clearly address many of the suspicions, which are put against the term as such. As a matter of fact, while supranational institutions such as the OSCE embrace the terminology Anti-Semitism, the OSCE still refuses to use Islamophobia, which we see as part of the problem. Again, we recommend that Islamophobia/anti-Muslim Racism or anti-Muslim hate crime should be included in the collection of “equality data” in all European states. Institutions such as the OSCE need to establish solid monitoring and recording mechanisms for discrimination, hate crime and hate speech towards Muslims. In order to have reliable data, it has to be segregated by bias/category and also segregated by gender. This is even more problematic in countries that do not allow collection of data on religion or race. This seemingly egalitarian approach in reality hides the discrimination of Muslims. Also, response mechanisms seem to be unclear and not adequately used. When there is an incident of discrimination/hate crime/hate speech, there are different response mechanisms available, yet, none of these are familiar to the vast majority of Muslim citizens of European countries. Thus, we recommend that response mechanisms should be made more available, accessible and clear. Last but not least, an empowerment of the Muslim community is needed to strengthen critical citizenship and help European states deepen their democracies.

THE STATE OF ISLAMOPHOBIA IN EUROPE

Policy Recommendations for European Countries

The authors of every respective national report have suggested specific recommendations regarding the country they have covered. The following list of recommendations serves to underscore some of these recommendations and to add some additional suggestions on the supranational level.

We think it is important for civil society to understand that Islamophobia is a problem of institutional racism. The illusion that Europe is a post-racial society prevents large parts of European societies from recognising the severe challenge of Islamophobia to local societies. The focus has to shift from Muslims’ actions to those of European societies. Racism, including Islamophobia, tells us more about the racists than about their imagined scapegoat or their victims. Hence, Islamophobia reveals aspects of Europe and the internal problems European societies continue to face. A recognition and a critical consciousness of this societal disease is of utmost importance to be able to create more just societies in Europe. At the same time, Muslims must be allowed to enjoy their spaces of freedom like other dominant religious and political groups in European societies without being securitised or criminalised. The securitisation of Islam, especially policies countering violent extremism and their impact on the freedom of religion of belief for Muslims, and even freedom of movement or free assembly have to be challenged by all democratic forces in Europe. Communities must be consulted and human rights frameworks must be respected. National security is not among the criteria that should permit the limitation of freedom of religion or belief.

We especially urge politicians to speak out against Islamophobia as one of the most pressing forms of racism in our days. Europe needs more courageous politicians who do not only challenge the politics of right-wing populist parties, but also challenge institutionalised forms of racism targeting Muslims in the fields of employment, education, state bureaucracy, and media. We also call for journalists and editors to challenge Islamophobic reporting in their news media and give space to more balanced views. Generally, the issue of religious literacy is a huge problem that does not only concern media but also the police, prosecutors and civil servants. We see that people simply lack basic knowledge on Islam and Muslims’ practices. We see a need for the introduction of more comparative religion courses, or religious teaching, in a formal and informal educational setting.

We see that Muslim women are among the most vulnerable direct victims of Islamophobia. ENAR has conducted a report on the impact of Islamophobia on Muslim women and presented 37 recommendations, which we can only underscore given the findings of our report.6 Women who are visibly Muslim are socially ostracised in many places. The combination of internal community prob-

lems, discrimination (education and employment) and hate crimes against Muslim women (data shows that it is 70% more likely for a Muslim woman to be attacked in the street) are leaving their horrible mark on Muslim women. Hence, the protection and the empowerment of Muslim women have to be on the central agenda of states and NGOs. The ruling of the European Court of Justice regarding Esma Bougnaoui’s dismissal by a French company for wearing a hijab when dealing with clients as unlawful discrimination is an important step towards equality and an anti-discriminatory society. At the same time, the case of Belgian Samira Achbita vs. Belgium, where it was argued that a dismissal due to the headscarf would be permissible against the backdrop of a general prohibition of all outward signs of political, philosophical and religious beliefs exhibited by employees in the workplace, is worrying and challenges the reality of a diverse Europe.
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Executive Summary

There are almost 3,000 Muslims living in Lithuania according to the 2011 population census.¹ The Institute for Ethnic Studies, Lithuanian Social Research Centre reports that Muslims are one of the most negatively viewed religious groups in Lithuania in 2016. Compared to the previous annual public opinion polls, in 2016, negative attitude towards Muslims (64.2%) and refugees (63.8%) significantly increased. According to the Lithuanian Social Research Centre, refugees (especially war refugees from Syria) and their migration to European countries is a topic that receives significant attention in public discourse (including media). Lithuanian society's opinions towards refugees were largely affected by the intensive questioning and hardening of the European Union’s politics towards refugees, the views of European politicians, and the radical or negative opinions towards refugees shared by Lithuanian politicians during the parliamentary election campaign in 2016.²

The Equal Opportunities Ombudsperson did not receive any complaints regarding discrimination on the ground of religion (Islam) in 2016. There is no data available on hate crimes towards Muslims. Nevertheless, the media widely reported on an attack against two refugee women in Rukla, the town where the Refugee Reception Centre is located.

There were no significant developments in the field of justice. Hate crimes and incitement of hatred cases remain underreported. And even very clear cases of hate crime are not necessarily registered as hate crimes, but rather as other criminal or administrative offences.

During 2016 there were no registered employment-related incidents regarding Muslims. Public opinion polls, however, show there might be potential underreporting. Interviewees mentioned headscarves and beards as elements that might scare potential employers and prevent them from hiring an individual.

The Equal Opportunities Ombudsperson has reported that there are no cases recorded in 2016 related to education and Muslimness. Nonetheless, the OEOO investigated one case that was related to Islam and possible discrimination on the ground of ethnicity – the complainant was possibly of Arab origin.

Lithuanian parliament elections took place on 9 October, 2016. Anti-migrant, anti-refugee and to a certain degree Islamophobic discourse was used, in particular, by some populist parties.

Media coverage of different Islamophobic statements has been related to the same (continuing) public discussion on global refugee flows, on the one hand, and local refugee integration challenges, on the other. However, one significant difference

1. This amounts to 0.09 % of the total population. The latest population census is from 2011; for more data, see http://statistics.bookdesign.lt/table_049.htm?lang=lt / https://osp.stat.gov.lt/2011-m.-surasymas
2. Lietuvos socialinių tyrimų centro Etninių tyrimų instituto užsakymu 2016 m. atliktos visuomenės nuostatų apklausos rezultatai, 2016.
has been identified: the amount of information on the aforementioned issues in 2016 was significantly less than in 2015. Eventually, anti-immigrant and anti-refugee attitudes in media discourse became less visible, while xenophobic manifestations by politicians and public commentators became less frequent.

Lithuania could be characterised by the diversity of its xenophobic manifestations. There are different xenophobic manifestations related to global refugee flows, to Muslim integration in the EU member states and to other related processes in social media. Unfortunately, almost all Facebook profiles with xenophobic content, which were observed in 2015, are still active in 2016.

Santrauka
Remiantis paskutiniais Lietuvos gyventojų surašymo duomenimis, Lietuvos gyvena 2727 musulmonai. Lietuvos socialinių tyrimų instituto ataskaitoje teigiama, kad pabėgėliai (ypatingai karo pabėgėliai iš Sirijos) ir jų migracija į Europos šalis – tai tema pastaraisiais metais sulaukianti ypač daug dėmesio ir diskusijų viešajame (taip pat žiniasklaidos) diskurse. Intensyvus Europos Sąjungos šalių migracijos politikos pabėgelių atžvilgiu kvestionavimas ir jos griežtinimas, kai kurių Europos politikų, taip pat ir Lietuvos politikų rinkimų į Seimą 2016 m. agitacinės kampanijos metu, radikalūs arba neigiami pasisakymai pabėgelių atžvilgiu, turėjo įtakos ir Lietuvos visuomenės požiūriui į šią grupę žmonių.

Lygių galimybių kontrolieriaus tarnyboje nebuvo gauta skundų dėl diskriminacijos prieš musulmonus, tačiau respondentai išskiria diskriminacijos problemą, siekiant musulmonams išsinuomoti būstą, ypatindai ji būtų nori išsinuomoti galvos apdangalą dėvinti moteris. Atskiros informacijos apie neapykantos nusikaltimus musulmonų atžvilgiu nėra, tačiau žiniasklaida plačiai pranešė apie dviejų pabėgelių moterų užpuolimą Rukloje, miestelyje, kuriamo įkurta Pabėgelių priėmimo centras.

Didelių pokyčių teisingumo srityje per 2016 metus neįvyko. Pranešimų skaičius apie neapykantos nusikaltimus ir neapykantos kalbą vis dar yra labai mažas. Ir netgi tais atvejais, kai pradedamas ikišteisinis tyrimas dėl aiškiai identifikuojamo neapykantos nusikaltimo, teisėsaugos institucijų tyrimas pradedamas dėl kito nusikaltimo ar nusižengimo arba administracinio pažeidimo.


Lygių galimybių kontrolieriaus tarnyba (LGKT) praneša, kad 2016 metais nebuvo atvejų užfiksuotų švietimo srityje dėl diskriminacijos religijos pagrindu (kon-
krečiai, islamo). Kita vertus, LGKT tyrė du atvejus dėl galimos diskriminacijos tautybės pagrindu (dėl pareiškėjos galimos arabų kilmės) ir pažiūrų.

2016 m. spalio 9 d. vyko Lietuvos Respublikos Seimo rinkimai. Prieš Seimo rinkimus kai kurios politinės partijos, ypatingai populistinės, savo kampanijų metu skleidė neigiamą informaciją apie migrantus, pabėgėlius ir musulmonus.

Žiniasklaidoje pasirodžiusios islamofobiškos publikacijos 2016 m. buvo vis dar susijusios su tuo pačiu (tęstiniu) viešų diskursu apie pasaulinius prieiglobsčio ir migracijos srautus iš vienos pusės, ir pabėgelių integracijos iššūkius iš kitos pusės. Vis dėlto, pastebėtinas skirtumas: informacijos apie minėtus klausimus kiekis 2016 m. buvo pastebimai mažesnis, lyginant su 2015 m. Tuo pačiu, prieš imigrantus ir pabėgélius nukreiptos informacijos žiniasklaidoje 2016 m. taip pat buvo mažiau, o politikų ir viešųjų komentatorių ksenofobiniai pasisakymai pasisakymai 2016 m. buvo labiau fragmentiški, negu 2015 m.

Internetinė erdvė Lietuvoje pasižymi ksenofobinių ir islamofobinių apraiškų įvairove. Kaip ir 2015 m., 2016 m. šios apraiškos buvo susijusios su taip vadinama „pabėgelių krize“, musulmonų integracijos procesais kitose ES valstybėse narėse. Deja, beveik visi „Facebook“ profiliai su ksenofobiniu turiniu, kurie buvo pastebėti 2015, vis dar yra aktyvus ir 2016 m.
Introduction

Lithuanian society remains quite homogenous in 2016. However, intense international migration and the so-called “refugee crisis” brought various political and societal challenges to Europe and the whole world. Lithuania is no exception, but is influenced more by views and public opinions than by the direct challenges of an increasing migrant population. The latest population census was carried out in 2011. According to it, 2,727 residents in Lithuania considered themselves to be Sunni Muslims or 0.09% of the total population.4

According to the latest data by the Migration Department there are 42,057 foreigners in total living in Lithuania,5 which is only 1.47% of the total population. There were 113 requests for refugee status submitted as of 1 July, 2016; 22 persons received refugee status; 6 received subsidiary protection; and 49 did not receive refugee status. There were 185 refugees (out of 1,105 that have to be relocated by the end of 2017) relocated from Greece and Turkey to Lithuania as of November 2016.6 There is no breakdown of data according to religion.

Even though the number of Muslims in Lithuania is very small, it is one of the religious groups evaluated most negatively by Lithuanian society. According to the latest data by the Ethnic Research Institute, more the 60% of respondents answered that their opinion of Muslims and refugees, among other groups, has worsened in the last five years.7 Around 47.9% of people would not want to live next to Muslims in their neighborhood, 44.8% would not want to live next to refugees. The Social Research Centre pointed out that the opinion towards refugees has insignificantly improved compared to 2015 based on measuring social distance, but also by measuring change in the last 5 years.8 According to the centre, Lithuanian society’s opinion towards refugees was largely affected by the intensive questioning and hardening of the European Union politics towards refugees, the views of European politicians, and the radical or negative opinions towards refugees shared by Lithuanian politicians during the parliamentary election campaign in 2016.

8. Ibid.
Significant Incidents and Developments

There were no major legal changes affecting the rights of Muslims in 2016. The most significant developments are related to the acceptance of refugees and the EU, and the national agreements regarding relocation and resettlement of refugees within the EU.

The Lithuanian government has agreed to share the responsibility with other EU countries and adopted the decision to relocate 1,105 refugees over a period of two years (by 31 December, 2017). Discussions in the EU regarding the duty to accept larger numbers of refugees have continued in 2016. “The Lithuanian ruling coalition parties signed a political agreement voicing their disapproval of additional mandatory refugee resettlement quotas” on 10 June, 2016. The Labour Party that tried to revoke the agreement to accept the refugee quota back in 2015 initiated the agreement. The same party has used openly anti-refugee rhetoric during the parliamentary election campaign (see Politics).

The Information Technology Department under the Ministry of the Interior, which collects information on crimes, does not break down the information in terms of the numbers of hate crimes committed against Muslims. In general, a very low number of hate crimes are officially recorded; in total 45 hate crimes were registered in 2016.

The number of other attacks is unknown. Refugees, in in-depth interviews, stated that they feel disrespected, vulnerable and rejected because of the local population’s views towards other nationalities.

An attack in Rukla, the town where the Refugee Reception Centre is located, received significant media attention. Two locals attacked a Syrian and an Iraqi woman that were going from a local shop to the Refugee Reception Centre. One of the women’s glasses were broken, the women were pushed and they were grabbed by their clothes. According to the information received from the Ministry of Interior, the investigation was initiated as a mere violation of public order (Article 284 of the Criminal Code). It has not been registered as a hate crime so far, but the representatives of the police department stated that the investigation is still ongoing.
Two skinheads were fined for an administrative offence – an incident of minor hooliganism – 15 for violently grabbing a poster from one of the demonstrators during the public demonstration “Safe passage for refugees”. The demonstration took place on 27 February, 2016.16 This ‘attack’ was not investigated as a hate crime, which is a criminal offence according to the Penal Code of the Republic of Lithuania.

A person was found guilty by a court for incitement of hatred towards Muslim refugees. On 18-19 July, 2016, the person wrote online comments inciting hatred in the comment section of an article about a Muslim refugee and his family, saying they should be burned and sent away from Lithuania.17

According to the information received from the Office of Equal Opportunities Ombudsperson, in 2016, there were no complaints received regarding discrimination of Muslim persons in particular (information received by 20 December, 2016). There were three cases related to the ethnic origin and/or beliefs of persons. An investigation was carried out because of alleged discrimination in the field of employment; in this case, no grounds for the misconduct were established (see Employment).18 A case was recorded in the field of education when a university lecturer mocked a student due to her possible Arabic origin; the case ended in a friendly settlement (see Education).

The representatives of the association Islam Culture and Education Centre19 stressed that there were many cases of discrimination against Muslims when, especially those who do not speak Lithuanian, tried to rent flats. Both organisations stressed that, if women who wore headscarves and were easily recognisable as Muslims tried to rent flats they would surely not be able to do so. No official complaints were filed.

The discriminatory attitudes of real estate owners towards refugees were also raised by the representatives of the Lithuanian Social Research Centre and the Refugee Reception Centre during the discussion entitled “Political Strategic Document on Integration of Foreigners who Received Refugee Status”20 at the Ministry of Social Security and Labour.

19. Interview with the Director of the Islam Culture and Education Centre Mr. Aleksandras Beganskas and the Imam Mr. Romualdas Kaminskis, January 4, 2017.
20. Dr. Vilana Pilinkaitė-Sotirović, research fellow at the Ethnic Research Institute, Lithuanian Social Research Centre; Neringa Gaučienė, head of the Social Integration Department of the Refugees Reception Centre, Discussion in the Ministry of Social Security and Labour of the Republic of Lithuania, September 30, 2016.
Discussion of Islamophobic Incidents and Discursive Events

Employment

The Office of Equal Opportunities Ombudsperson reports that during the period of January to December 2016, there were no employment-related incidents that discriminated against Muslims in particular. However, the Ombudsperson initiated an investigation when she received information about an article in the leading news portal DELFI.lt. The article was covering the opening of a beauty salon for men, “Men’s spot”, and it cited the director of the salon Mr. Povilas Malinauskas. The director, among other discriminatory statements, informed the media “We had an offer to employ Syrians, Turks, however we decided that only Lithuanians will work to make the money remain in Lithuania”. Further, in the article the director claimed “They have selected the staff of the salon very responsibly”, which led to the perception that the director willingly avoided hiring Syrians and Turks. After the Ombudsperson started the investigation and contacted the director, he informed her that, in fact, he had not received any offers to employ Syrians and Turks or persons of other ethnicity and he expressed his regret that the article published false information. He assured the office that competence was the only criterion, not the candidates’ gender, race, origin, religion, etc. The OEOO failed to contact the journalist, and the communication with local and national migrant organisations and NGOs working in the field showed no evidence that Syrians and Turks were in fact candidates for the job. Hence, the OEOO terminated the investigation due to the lack of objective data on the committed violation.

Even though officially there are very few Islamophobic cases, public opinion surveys and interviews with representatives of the community show that there is potential underreporting. Work migrants and inhabitants of smaller towns are less likely to complain for various reasons including fear of putting their job in jeopardy and not being able to identify discrimination.

While analysing possible discrimination cases, few aspects have to be mentioned. It should be noted that there are less than 3,000 Muslim residents in Lithuania and Islam has not been evaluated to any great extent. Society primarily learns about Islam via mass media, which usually reports negative aspects (see

22. Unofficial translation, Ibid.
23. Unofficial translation, Ibid.
Media). Hence, the lack of knowledge about the religion brings challenges to Muslim employees. While looking for a job, clothing and physical attributes, such as headscarves for women and beards for men, become a barrier due to negative stereotypes about the Muslim community. During an interview, the community representative noted that Muslim women usually do not work, as they are studying and afterwards return to Turkey, or they are afraid of society’s and employers’ reactions to their headscarves. For example, a female volunteer in a kindergarten could not continue her practice as the representative of the kindergarten said she could not explain to the parents why the volunteer was wearing a headscarf; this lack of knowledge was a trigger to discontinue volunteering. Another Turkish student, who was studying in Lithuania, enrolled in an European voluntary service programme and was a volunteer in the same kindergarten. He had no issues with his ethnicity or appearance. However, after the summer break, he came back with a beard, which was unacceptable to the kindergarten. The student was Turkish, but not Muslim. However, he was perceived as such.

There is no official statistical data collected nationwide on employment rates, disaggregated by ethnicity, nationality or religion. The Lithuanian Labour Exchange is responsible for granting work permits to foreigners who live in Lithuania with temporary work permits.26 According to the Labour Exchange data,27 for the period up to 31 December, 2016, 12,600 work permits were issued to foreigners, 7,064 could work on additional grounds, while 1,035 foreigners were unemployed.28 Most of them were citizens of the Russian Federation, Belarus and Ukraine. Most work migrants are men.29

The framework of Lithuanian society’s perceptions can help identify potential areas of discrimination. As observed by the Institute for Ethnic Studies,30 the social distance between co-workers of different ethnicity or religion is relatively smaller and less pronounced than the negative social attitudes regarding living in a neighbourhood with persons of different ethnicity or religion. Compared to 2015, in 2016, a public survey showed slightly better results. However, in general, results are worse than before the so-called “refugee crisis” started. A bigger number of respondents of the public opinion survey would agree to work with

26. People who live in the country with permanent residence permits do not require a work permit.
27. Lithuanian Labour Exchange official note of 3 January 2017, No. Sd-13 „Concerning the request for information”.
28. Information as of 1 November 2016, ibid.
Muslims, refugees, Chechens, Syrians, Iraqis and Turks – the groups of people who practice Islam in Lithuania in 2016 than in 2015. Tatars were the only ethnic community of Muslim background who were perceived slightly worse than in the previous year. However, it has to be noted that the Muslim community overall is the least favoured group in the workplace compared to other religions and confessions.\footnote{Ibid. Please indicate a group with which you would rather not work: Muslims – 24.9% (2012); 26% (2013); 22.4% (2014); 38% (2015); 37.6% (2016). Refugees – 16.3% (2012); 21% (2013); 15.1% (2014); 31% (2015); 27.8% (2016). Chechens – 22.5% (2012); 23% (2013); 17.4% (2014); 26% (2015); 21.7% (2016). Syrians – 28% (2015); 17.8% (2016). Iraqis – 22% (2015); 17.8% (2016). Turks – 8.8% (2012); 10% (2013); 7.8% (2014); 12% (2015); 10.7% (2016). Tatars – 7% (2012); 8% (2013); 4.9% (2014); 5% (2015); 7.3% (2016).} Muslim people are among the most negatively perceived and 37.6% of respondents would not work with a Muslim, only a little less than in 2015 – 38%. Therefore, it is important to understand that negative perception about Muslims did not really change. As last year, respondents tend to assess ethnicity more favourably than religion.

In the long term, it can be observed that the reporting of multiple terrorist attacks in the media, especially starting in 2015, had the most negative impact on the Muslim community in Lithuania. This tendency continued in 2016 when negativity towards the Muslim community appears to be slightly declining, but the group remains among the most socially distanced.

**Education**

The Office of Equal Opportunities Ombudsperson has not reported any cases of possible discrimination on the ground of religion in education. Nonetheless, the OEOO investigated a case in relation to Islam. The office received a claim from a student at Vilnius College, which is a higher professional education institution, who complained about a lecturer’s remark during a lecture. The lecturer asked “Are you an Arab? Like some kind of refugee?” This remark insulted the complainant. During the investigation, it appeared that the student had talked to the lecturer and as they came to terms, the investigation was dropped.

Discrimination in educational institutions is rarely observed due to the small number of Muslims. However, incidents when certain university lecturers inappropriately commented on Islam-related matters were recorded. Students report that their lecturers oppose Islam and compare terrorism and religion. Therefore, there is a need to educate society about Islam and the teachings of the Quran. On the other hand, good practices have also been observed. A student at Mykolo Romerio University mentioned that her professor gave her a separate key to a room at the Institute of Psychology so she could pray in peace and silence. In addition, a separate room for prayers was established at this university in 2015.
The Law on Religious Communities and Associations of the Republic of Lithuania has been praised by the Muslim community: children can learn about Islam at state schools if there are six or more pupils who express such a desire.

Politics
As in most other fields, negative attitudes towards Muslims were related to the public discussions about refugee flow, integration, resettlement and relocation procedures. The views of various politicians working on the national and municipal level could be analysed, however as there is no research on the attitudes of politicians, examples will be provided mostly relating to the attitudes of various political parties during the parliamentary election of 2016.

The Lithuanian government agreed to share the responsibility with other EU countries and adopted the decision to relocate 1,105 refugees in a period of two years (by 31 December, 2017).

The discussions on the greater responsibility and involvement of EU member states continued throughout 2016.

“The Lithuanian ruling coalition parties (Lithuanian Social Democrats, Party ‘Order and Justice’ and Labour Party) signed a political agreement voicing their disapproval of additional mandatory refugee resettlement quotas” on 10 June, 2016. Eight parties were encouraged to sign this agreement, stating that, even if requested Lithuania, would not accept more than 1,105 refugees. The agreement among the three ruling coalition parties stressed that consistent and clear refugee selection and revision procedures did not exist, and this posed a danger to national and internal security in Lithuania. It stated that there were no possibilities to check a person’s past, their relationships to criminal groups or propensity to commit crimes. It claimed that most asylum seekers were not refugees running from war, but economic migrants. The Labour Party, which had tried to revoke the agreement to accept the refugee quota back in 2015, initiated the agreement. A political scientist called it their electoral campaigning strategy.

33. Interview with Director of the Islam Culture and Education Centre Mr. Aleksandras Beganskas and the Imam Mr. Romualdas Kaminskas, January 4, 2017.
34. Lietuvos Respublikos Vyriausybės 2015 m. birželio 22 d. nutarimas Nr. 628 „Dėl užsieniečių perkėlimo į Lietuvos Respublikos teritoriją“.
35. Lithuania's ruling parties sign political agreement on refugees, BNS, June 10, 2016, available at: http://www.baltictimes.com/lithuania_s_ruling_parties_sign_political_agreement_on_refugees/
A member of the Lithuanian Liberal Movement expressed the same ideas.\textsuperscript{38}

The Lithuanian parliament elections took place on 9 October, 2016. Discussions on refugees, asylum seekers and Muslims occurred throughout the entire year. The discourse on Muslims is usually connected to negative opinions by politicians, who relate to the so-called “refugee crisis”. According to the Lithuanian Social Research Centre, Lithuanian society’s opinions towards refugees were largely affected by the intensive questioning and hardening of the European Union politics towards refugees, the views of European politicians, and radical or negative opinions towards refugees shared by Lithuanian politicians during the parliamentary election campaign in 2016.\textsuperscript{39}

Islamophobic attitudes were clearly expressed by the Labour Party in their election campaign. One of their election slogans was “We will stop the influx of refugees” and their campaign videos claimed they would not allow the refugees “to drain our social welfare system”. People in videos talked about refugees as a danger to national security, women, girls, and children, called them extremists, and associated refugees with the terror attacks in France, Belgium and Denmark.\textsuperscript{40}

It has to be noted that the campaign of the Labour Party received criticism and was ridiculed, as the number of refugees that were resettled to Lithuania is still very small (35 as of 1 July, 2016, and 185 as of November 2016). Famous journalists released a social commercial making fun of the Labour Party’s campaign.\textsuperscript{41} It is also important to note that the party did not pass the required 5% threshold, receiving 4.68% of votes.

Other parties, considered to be far right did not receive more than 1.01% of votes: the Lithuanian People’s Party received 1.01% of votes and the S. Buškevičius and the Coalition of Nationalists “Against Corruption and Poverty” (“Young Lithuanian, Union of Nationalists” party) received 0.54% of votes.\textsuperscript{42}

Far right parties do not (yet) occupy an important place in the political arena. Nevertheless, mainstream parties sometimes use anti-migrant and xenophobic statements.

\textsuperscript{38} MP Eugenijus Gentvilas, one of the leaders of the Lithuanian Liberal Movement said “Causing fear is very effective among a certain part of voters. It shifts from causing fear talking about Russians, ticks, and refugees. Instead of causing fear, we should talk with people. Let’s remember the times, when Lithuanians were running away and were accepted by others. Have we forgotten?” – article by Tracevičiūtė Roberta, ‘Valdantieji sutarė: daugiau pabėgėlių įsileisti nenori’, lzinios.lt, June 11, 2016.

\textsuperscript{39} Lietuvos socialinių tyrimų centro Etninių tyrimų instituto užsakymu 2016 m. atliktos visuomenės nuostatų apklausos rezultatai, 2016.


According to the media reports, the Muslim Community and Vilnius Municipality failed to find a compromise regarding the land plot for building a mosque.\textsuperscript{43}

**Media**

While analysing media content related to Islamophobia in 2016, the same trends as in 2015 were revealed as media coverage of different Islamophobic statements was related to the same (continuing) public discussion on global refugee flows, on the one hand, and local refugee integration challenges, on the other. Eventually, as in 2015, Islamophobia-related challenges and processes in 2016 have to be analysed and discussed in a broader context of xenophobia and immigration issues, particularly the ongoing international debate on flows of asylum seekers, resettlement and relocation schemes, and the general perception of solidarity among different EU member states.

One significant difference was identified: the amount of information on the aforementioned issues in 2016 was significantly less than in 2015. This trend might be explained by different factors: on the one hand, the media response has shifted towards more local challenges and processes (for example, national elections and corruption controversies) and, on the other, due to the very intense information flow in 2015, a natural decrease in the interest of different media channels in 2016 has emerged. Eventually, anti-immigrant and anti-refugee attitudes in media discourse became less visible. At the same time, xenophobic manifestations by politicians and public commentators became fragmented and less frequent.

According to the FRA report (FRA 2016),\textsuperscript{44} courts, national equality bodies, independent press councils and independent regulatory or supervisory bodies for broadcasting organisations found incitement against immigrants and refugees in Lithuanian media content and political discourse. At the same time, courts, independent press councils and independent regulatory or supervisory bodies for broadcasting organisations ruled on cases or complaints relating to incitement to hatred against (members of) Muslim, Jewish and Christian communities in Lithuania (as in a number of other EU member states).

In addition, the Media 4 Change Report (2016)\textsuperscript{45} revealed unethical reporting on migrants and refugees in Europe, including Lithuania. According to the research, refugees and immigrants have sometimes been seen as a treat to Christian values. Some Lithuanian newspapers reported on the topic. Journalists failed to question the official rhetoric of politicians and religious leaders publishing claims that refugees coming from the Middle East and being transferred to Lithuania might not have an


\textsuperscript{44}Incitement in media content and political discourse in EU Member States. Contribution to the second Annual Colloquium on Fundamental Rights - November 2016. European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights, 2016.

\textsuperscript{45}Unethical Reporting on Migrants and Refugees in Europe: Media 4 Change, 2016. Available at http://www.media4change.co/news/unethical-reporting-migrants-refugees-europe
impulse to learn the language and to accept the local culture, and might pose a threat to Christian values.

As far as publications on immigration issues in Lithuania appear after certain events and the media response is usually triggered by different “external” factors (EIR 2015), the year 2016 was not an exception. Recent incidents in Rukla, where the Refugee Reception Centre was established and the initial refugee integration phase is organised, could be considered as an example. Due to a more intense refugee relocation process, Rukla has witnessed a bigger influx of foreigners granted asylum. Eventually, some minor conflicts within the local community emerged. These minor conflicts and the follow-ups with comments by the director of the Refugee Reception Centre, the mayor of Jonava and the elder of Rukla were reported in the media.46

Contrary to the media coverage in 2015, no visible anti-immigrant and anti-refugee statements were identified. At the same time, no particular Islamophobic, anti-immigrant or anti-refugee campaigns in Lithuanian media were observed with the exception of activities in cyberspace such as social media and blogs, and fragmented and marginal websites (see below).

Justice System

There have not been any laws adopted in 2016 that could be labelled as Islamophobic.

The Information Technology Department under the Ministry of the Interior, which collects information on crimes, does not break down the information in terms of hate crimes committed against Muslims. In general, a very low number of hate crimes were officially recorded. Only 38 cases of incitement of hatred were recorded by the end of November 2016 according to the Information Technology Department under the Ministry of Interior;47 there were 138 recorded cases of incitement of hatred in 2015. There is no publicly available data breakdown for the year 2016 regarding the number of hate crimes on the grounds of religion or belief.

The number of other attacks is unknown. In in-depth interviews, refugees stated that they feel disrespected, vulnerable and rejected because of the local population’s views towards other nationalities. One of them mentioned an attack against his


47. Data on recorded crimes in January-November, 2016, Information Technology Department under the Ministry of Interior, available at: http://www.ird.lt/statistines-ataskaitos/wp-content/themes/ird/reports/xt_file.php?fv=data/1_201611.lt/I-1g-201611.data.txt&ff=%3C%21--%7C1G%7C6%7C--%3E&tr=Duomenys%20apie%20muskalstamas%20veikas%20padarytas%20Lietuva%20Respublikoje%20Respublikoje%201G%29
daughter when her veil and trousers were torn at school but explained that because of the fear of being called terrorists they did not want to talk about the incident. 48

An attack in Rukla, the town where the Refugee Reception Centre is based, received significant media attention. Two locals attacked a Syrian and an Iraqi woman who were going from a local shop to the Refugee Reception Centre. One of women’s glasses were broken, the women were pushed and they were grabbed by their clothes. The first reports stated that around 20 men sought to take revenge for the women who reported this attack to them, and that with the involvement of the police there were no fights. According to the information received from the Ministry of Interior, the investigation was initiated as a mere violation of public order (Article 284 of the Criminal Code). 49

So far, the incident has not been registered as a hate crime, but the representatives of the police department stated that the investigation is still ongoing. 50

Lithuania was reviewed by the Universal Periodic Review on 2 November, 2016. According to the draft report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review, Lithuania has received a particularly large number of recommendations in relation to hate crimes and incitement of hatred. Around twenty recommendations pay particular attention to strengthening efforts in combating hate crime - some of them addressing hate speech/incitement of hatred in particular - and stress the importance of fighting xenophobic, racist hate crimes. 51 Others pay particular attention to hate crimes committed because of a person’s religion or anti-Muslim, Islamophobic crimes.

The Chairman of the Parliamentary National Security and Defence Committee continued to express his opinion on the need to prohibit women from Muslim countries from wearing clothes that cover their faces, but no draft laws have been registered. The Minister of Interior Tomas Žilinskas did not see a reason for discussing the matter as in his opinion there were no people who would wear such clothes in Lithuania. 52

Internet

As in 2015, in 2016, cyberspace in Lithuania could be characterised by the same diversity of xenophobic manifestations, especially following global refugee flows and the terror attacks in Paris and Brussels. Regarding Islamophobic manifestations in

50. Representative of the Police Department, Aušra Sadauskienė during the working group in the Ministry of Interior, December 15, 2016.
51. Recommendations No. 100.50, 100.52, 100.53, 100.54, 100.56, 100.61, 100.62, 100.64, 100.65- 100.70, 100.72, 100.73, 100.74, 100.82, 100.85.
Lithuanian cyberspace in 2016, social media stands out as a fertile ground for different xenophobic manifestations including, among others, comments relating to global refugee flows, and Muslim integration on the EU member states. Unfortunately, almost all Facebook profiles with xenophobic content, which were observed in 2015, are still active in 2016. However, contrary to 2015, when some of these initiatives went far beyond the digital world, in 2016, these initiatives remained without any activism outside the Internet. The content, which is published on the profiles of these initiatives, should be considered as an open incitement of hatred against immigrants (refugees) in general and Muslims in particular. Such incitements are not republished in traditional media channels.

New forms of hatred in cyberspace against Islam, in general, and Muslims, in particular, emerged in 2016. For example, the Centre for the Study of Political Islam in Lithuania,\(^53\) provides single-sided information relating to Islam and Muslims in Lithuania and beyond. Moving from social media to the so-called ‘regular’ websites, the same trend is identified as with still existent Facebook pages: almost all websites with xenophobic and Islamophobic content, which have been observed in 2015, are still active in 2016.\(^54\)

Summarising xenophobic and Islamophobic manifestation on the Internet, emphasis should be given to the fact that the biggest proportion of information in cyberspace is not related to immigration to Lithuania or to the integration of Muslim immigrants in Lithuania. Rather, it is related to a very specific collection of propaganda-related information on so-called challenges posed by international migration and the integration of Muslim immigrants in different EU member states and beyond.

However, the biggest concern lies in the fact that governmental institutions and law enforcement agencies do not properly monitor initiatives and xenophobic manifestations on the Internet. As a result, no significant number of pretrial investigations, related to the aforementioned initiatives, were identified in 2016.

### Central Figures in the Islamophobia Network

There are no Islamophobic organisations or activists that are fostering Islamophobic campaigns, stirring up debates and lobbying for laws. However, after the incidents in the Rukla Refugee Reception Centre in 2016, some discussions, related to refugee integration challenges, emerged. At the same time, local politicians expressed their attitudes towards the cultural issues of the integration of refugees from Islamic countries.

After the brutal attack against refugee women from Syria and Iraq, the Minister of Foreign Affairs Linas Linkevicius visited the Rukla Refugee Reception Centre.

---

\(^{53}\) For more see: https://www.facebook.com/pg/cspi.lt/about/?ref=page_internal

During the meeting, refugees in Rukla opened their hearts emphasising that Lithuanian society, especially in Rukla, does not want to welcome refugees. However, after the meeting with refugees, the minister expressed his opinion that refugees in Rukla are not afraid and are not intimidated. At the same time, refugees emphasised that they will defend both refugee and local women from any kind of violence, emerging in Rukla and beyond. Eventually, different opinions were expressed, while some local politicians expressed discriminatory attitudes. For example, the elder of the town of Rukla stated that if refugees “fled as cowards and did not defend their country, they should sit with folded ears”. In addition, he stated that refugees should not show their traditions openly. However, this discussion had no significant follow-up and was fragmented in terms of the time and people involved.

Civil Society and Political Initiatives Undertaken to Counter Islamophobia

As the majority of Lithuanian society has rarely personally met a Muslim person, the majority of information comes from the media. Few initiatives can be mentioned as countering Islamophobia and raising awareness on the topic.

‘Mišri šeima’, ‘Priimsiu pabėgėlį’ (‘Mixed family’, ‘Welcome Refugees’) is an initiative that started two years ago as a volunteer hub for sharing experiences on living in ‘mixed’ families. These initiatives later evolved into a “Welcome Refugees” campaign, which is very active in raising awareness on Islam and refugees’ lives. Members of the initiative constantly write articles for the mainstream media to raise awareness on Muslimness and integration.

The Islam Culture and Education Centre provides information to members of society on interpretations of Islam and Muslims in Lithuania, and engages in dialogues with the media, politicians and state institutions. They organise Open Day events, meetings with students, excursions to mosques and summer camps for children. The Turkish government officially supports this centre.

---

55. For more, see: http://lietuvosdiena.lrytas.lt/aktualijos/pabegeliai-rukloje-atvere-sirdi-l-linkeviciui-jie-nenori-musu-priimt.htm
56. For more, see: http://www.vc.lt/naujienos/lietuva/lietuvos-naujienos/linas-linkevicius-rukloje-pabegeliai-neraulgauginti-1502711/
61. See more: www.priimsiupabegeli.lt, www.misriseima.lt
It is important to note that the Minister of Foreign Affairs has met with the Mufti Romas Jakubauskas of the Lithuanian Muslim Sunni Spiritual Centre and Imam Romualdas Krinickis to discuss cooperation opportunities, the integration of relocated refugees and public initiatives that could educate society about Islamic culture.62

Conclusion and Policy Recommendations

Employment
- Measures must be taken to protect victims of discrimination and to assist them in filing complaints against their employers and other perpetrators, e.g. public consultations, visits to Rulka Refugee Reception Centre, migrant centres, training for employees on diversity, etc.
- In the light of the so-called “refugee crisis” and the influx of refugees, sensitive measures for integration have to be developed such as guidelines for job hunting and work with potential employees to consider language requirements and cultural differences.

Education
- Establish state-funded infrastructure and ensure that measures are taken to integrate children of migrant backgrounds, as well as children who learn in a language other than their mother tongue, into the education system.
- Involve journalists into proactive discussions about the promotion of diversity and the responsibility of the media in the formation of negative attitudes towards the Muslim community.
- Collaborate with universities and other higher education institutions for a better understanding of Islam.
- Ratify the UNESCO Convention against Discrimination in Education (1960).

Politics
- As public opinion towards Muslims is significantly influenced by politicians, it would be meaningful to carry out continuous monitoring of politicians using hate speech, especially during election campaigns, to prevent Islamophobic hate speech from spreading.
- Political parties and politicians should strengthen their initiatives in cooperating with the Muslim community in Lithuania and raise awareness about the integration of refugees resettled in Lithuania.

• Adopt political programmes and strategies fighting hate speech and hate crime and encourage the dissemination of correct information about Islam and Muslims living in Lithuania.

Justice
• Improve the effectiveness of the mechanisms that record hate crimes and educate those responsible for recognising hate crime.
• Establish an alternative hate crime recording mechanism.
• Provide assistance to victims of hate crime, including hate speech.
• Regarding the police department: establish cooperation with the Muslim Community in Lithuania.
• Initiate legal changes ensuring the proactive role of the Office of the Equal Opportunities Ombudsperson, whereby it can bring cases of discrimination to court on behalf of victims of discrimination.

Media and Internet
• Implement a long-term monitoring mechanism to prevent ethnic and Islamophobic hatred in mass media and cyberspace.
• Explore ways of enhancing the knowledge and understanding of the media about global asylum and migration issues and the situation of refugees in Lithuania to ensure accurate and objective reporting, and the avoidance of stereotyping. Different measures have to be taken into consideration: alternative media campaigns, training for journalists, specific external communication strategies for different social groups, etc.
• Outline the roles and responsibilities of the various actors in this area and the initiatives taken to promote a welcoming environment and combat racism, xenophobia and related intolerance; elaborate on a clear way forward beyond the current practices and initiatives. Different governmental institutions and NGOs have to be involved in this process.
Chronology

- **6 February**: The organisations National Interest and Public Committee Against Forced Immigration organised a demonstration as part of the international demonstration organised by Pegida against “European Islamization and forced immigration”.63

- **27 February**: Two skinheads violently grabbed a poster from one of the demonstrators during the public demonstration “Safe passage for refugees”.64 They were fined for an administrative offence (“small hooliganism”).65 Counter-demonstrators were also present, holding posters, such as “The invasion of Communist Muslims to Europe – is the real hybrid war” and “Lithuania is not a multi-cultural jungle”, etc.

- **18-19 July**: A person wrote comments inciting hatred towards Muslim refugees. He was found guilty by the court for incitement of hatred in December 2016.66

- **2 August**: Muslims were not given permission to build a mosque in Vilnius.67

- **5 August**: The social experiment ‘What is means to be a Muslim in Lithuania’ is presented by TV Alfa.68

- **10 June**: Lithuania’s ruling parties sign a political agreement on refugees.69

- **19 October**: A report by lrytas TV tries to explain why violence broke out in Rukla.70

• **20 October:** The Lithunian newsportal Delfi publishes an article with a title “After the conflict in Rukla refugees claim ‘We will not only defend our women, but also Lithuanian women’.”\(^71\)

• **2 December:** The Minister of Foreign Affairs and the Lithuanian Muslims’ mufti discuss the possibilities of cooperation.\(^72\)

---

\(^{71}\) Paulius Garkauskas, ‘Po konflikto Rukloje prabilę pabėgeliai: ginsime ne tik savo moteris, bet ir lietuves

This is the second issue of the annual "European Islamophobia Report (EIR)" which was presented for the first time in 2015. New countries are included in this year's EIR; while 25 countries were covered in 2015, the report for 2016 includes 27 country reports. EIR 2016 is the result of 31 prominent scholars who specialise in different fields such as racism, gender and Islamophobia Studies.

Islamophobia has become a real danger to the foundations of democratic order and the values of the European Union. It has also become the main challenge to the social peace and coexistence of different cultures, religions and ethnicities in Europe. The country reports of EIR 2016, which cover almost all the European continent from Russia to Portugal and from Greece to Latvia, clearly show that the level of Islamophobia in fields such as education, employment, media, politics, the justice system and the Internet is on the rise. Since the publication of the last report there is little improvement. On the contrary, one can see from the country reports that the state of democracy and human rights in Europe is deteriorating. Islamophobia has become more real especially in the everyday lives of Muslims in Europe. It has surpassed the stage of being a rhetorical animosity and has become a physical animosity that Muslims feel in everyday life be it at school, the workplace, the mosque, transportation or simply on the street.
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