



**Expert meeting on violence
in the name of honour**

Stockholm, 4–5 November 2003



REGERINGSKANSLIET

Justitiedepartementet

Contents

Monday 4 November: Introductory plenary session6

Introduction by Minister for Democracy and
Integration Issues Mona Sahlin6

Key-note address by UN Special
Rapporteur on violence against women,
its causes and consequences Yakin Ertürk10

Key-note address by Dr Purna Sen,
London School of Economics
For CIMEL / INTERIGHTS Project on
Crimes of “Honour”22

Working group reports to the plenary29

Working group 129

Working group 230

Working group 330

Working group 431

Tuesday 5 November: plenary session33

Key-note address by Jacqueline Hunt, Equality Now33

Summary of the discussions held on 4 November
by Minister for Democracy and
Integration Issues Mona Sahlin39

Summary of the final discussion
in the plenary on 5 November43

Appendix 1: Programme46

Appendix 2: List of participants49

Monday 4 November: Introductory plenary session

Introduction by Minister for Democracy and Integration Issues Mona Sahlin

Dear participants,

First of all I wish you all a warm welcome to this seminar on violence in the name of honour.

I am particularly pleased to have so many distinguished foreign guests joining us here in Stockholm. It is good to know that you will contribute to our efforts to combat violence in the name of honour.

It is a special honour for me to welcome the UN Special Rapporteur on Violence against Women, Ms Yakin Ertürk.

As you know, Ms Ertürk has recently replaced Ms Radhika Coomaraswamy as the UN Special Rapporteur. We are most happy to have the opportunity of meeting you so soon after your appointment.

I was very impressed by the contributions of Ms Coomaraswamy and her efforts, frankness and courage in combating violence against women. Ms Ertürk, I wish you every success in your work against violence against women in all its forms, among them violence committed in the name of honour. I would like to assure you of Swedish support in these endeavours.

I would also also like to mention that Ms Asma Jahangir, Special Rapporteur to the United Nations on extrajudicial, summary or arbitrary executions has been invited to this meeting but was regrettably unable to attend.

One of the issues closest to my heart is the right of young people to control their own lives. Some families exercise strict control over the lives of their daughters and sisters: sometimes they are forbidden to participate fully in school, they are not allowed to engage in activities that are a normal part of young people's everyday lives. Therefore they lack the opportunities for personal development that the majority of young people in our country enjoy. Many suffer threats and violence when they break the family's rules.

Boys and young men can also come under severe pressure from their families. The choice of whom and when to marry are particularly sensitive issues. The individual's right to his or her own sexuality is another one.

According to the Universal Declaration on Human Rights, all human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights. This is perhaps the most central principle of international human rights law. For it is crucial always to remember that violence committed in the name of honour constitutes a violation of universally accepted and indivisible human rights, such as the right to respect for private and family life, reproductive rights, the right to marry and to found a family and the right to be protected from violence within the family. It is the responsibility of states to ensure that the human rights of all young women and men are respected also within the private sphere. It has been stressed by, among others, the UN General Assembly, the Human Rights Commission and the UN Special Rapporteur on Violence against Women, that Governments should investigate honour killings promptly and thoroughly and bring those responsible to justice. It is also entirely clear from an international legal perspective that custom, tradition or practices in the name of religion cannot be invoked by states to avoid their obligations to eliminate such violence.

“According to the Universal Declaration on Human Rights, all human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights.”

Let us also remember that all forms of violence against women occur within the context of de jure and de facto discrimination against women and the lower status accorded to women in society. This has also been stressed by the UN Human Rights Commission.

A series of events has drawn my attention to a group that has been neglected in Sweden, namely young people – including boys and young men – who risk being subject to honour-related violence. In 1999, a young woman was abducted from Sweden and murdered by her father and uncles for having brought dishonour on the family by having a boyfriend. At the beginning of 2002 another young woman was murdered.

The Swedish Government took a number of initiatives aiming at eliminating oppression and protecting girls and young women from violence committed in the name of honour. It was clear to us that the police, social services, teachers and other staff at schools needed practical advice on how to deal with these difficult issues.

The county administrative boards of the three largest counties in Sweden made surveys to establish the frequency of the problem of girls and young women needing sheltered housing for fear of their families. As it turned out, several hundred girls contact the authorities every year. The lack of sheltered housing is an enormous problem. We have taken measures to solve this, but much remains to be done.

I have met many young people, particularly girls and young women, but also boys and young men, who live with the threat of violence if they fail to meet their family's demands and expectations. It is a fundamental right for all young people, no matter what kind of background they have, to make their own decisions about how they live their lives. Culture, tradition or religion can never be invoked for states' failure to take action against violence.

men and human rights
political commitment
good practice
violence against women and girls in the name of honour
rights
justice
meditation techniques

It is important for us to discuss the situation of these young people in both national and international contexts. We have made some progress in

Sweden, but where honour-related violence is concerned it is plain to me that the solution must be sought at the international level. The UN has played, and must continue to play, a central role in the struggle against this type of violence.

“Culture, tradition or religion can never be invoked for states’ failure to take action against violence.”

In the spring I visited a number of UN bodies and NGOs in New York and Washington DC to gather information about their views on what Sweden could do to highlight the issue in this area.

My goal is to make more countries aware of the problem. Honour-related violence occurs throughout the world. I am convinced that international cooperation is the most important means of fighting this kind of oppression.

Today and tomorrow we will discuss how an international conference on violence in the name of honour could be arranged. We will learn more about measures taken at international and national levels to combat honour-related violence. And we will discuss arrangements and preparations for an international conference in 2004.

I am sure that this meeting will be successful and I am most grateful that you have come here to contribute with your expertise in order to combat violence in the name of honour.

Thank you

Key-note address by UN Special Rapporteur on violence against women, its causes and consequences Yakin Ertürk*

Violence in the Name of Honour within the Context of International Regimes

Introduction

One of the most salient and universal aspects of societies across the globe is the patriarchal nature of gender relations which systematically produces the subordination and inequality of women. This system of domination is sustained and enforced through the use of violence or its threat. At the core of patriarchal gender relations lies the interest of a social group to sustain and control socially acceptable lines of reproduction of their species. Within this context, men have used power to control women's reproductive capacity and their sexuality. The honour and prestige of a man, in many instances, became intrinsically associated with the conduct of the women related to

them and paradoxically, to their ability to violate the sexuality of other women, such as in rape – in war or in peace – among other things. The regulation over women's reproductive capacity and their sexuality has taken diverse forms, marriage being the most common form today.

“One of the most salient and universal aspects of societies across the globe is the patriarchal nature of gender relations which systematically produces the subordination and inequality of women.”

In addition to the sexual assault and abuse of women by men, whether within or outside the home, patriarchal power manifests itself in the form of culturally approved or instigated forms of

* Professor of Sociology at the Middle East Technical University, Ankara, and the Special Rapporteur on Violence against Women of the UN Commission on Human Rights.

transgression against women by the wider collective group, such as the extended kinship networks. Some of the most striking cases of such violence observed across the globe are mutilation of female genitals, bride/dowry killings and crimes committed in the name of honour, the last one being the subject matter of this expert meeting. Violence in the name of honour is one but very specific manifestation of the universal phenomenon of violence against women, which takes place from the domicile to the transnational arena in everyday and every night lives of women every where.

“Violence in the name of honour is one but very specific manifestation of the universal phenomenon of violence against women, which takes place from the domicile to the transnational arena in everyday and every night lives of women every where.”

The issue of honour, understood in diverse ways in different parts of the world, is important from the point of view of the integration of the individual into the group, failure of which would result in shame and loss of status. In some societies, for men this would be a loss of their masculinity. In contrast with the often compared crimes of passion, which is a matter involving violence against women by an intimate partner, crimes of honour embodies collective identity and action with consequences for public reputation of all actors involved. As such, it is intimately embedded in the prevailing values and norms governing the relationships of the collective group concerned. It is this normativity and the collectivist aspect of honour crimes that makes it so complex and resistant to change. Empowerment of women, a primary goal of the international gender agenda, as a strategy to resist violence, in the case of honour, crimes may in fact result in increased violence against women. Such was the case of Fadime Sahindal who was killed by her family in Sweden in 2002 because she dared to deviate from the norms prevailing in her family and kinship environment. Therefore, efforts to employ effective strategies to deal with such violations of women's human rights require a combination of approaches employed at the level of the state, community/family and the individual women.

International Agenda for Gender Equality and Women's Human Rights

In the course of history, particularly with the creation of the rule of law, the public sphere came under the regulation of law and following the Second World War it increasingly became a subject of the human rights discourse, significantly altering the relations of domination to the advantage of disadvantaged groups and classes. Gender contract, on the other hand, until recently, remained marginal to the regulatory processes and the mainstream human rights agenda. Although, the principle of non-discrimination on the basis of sex enshrined in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, integrating women's rights into mainstream international human rights law lagged behind.

The evolving United Nations gender agenda¹⁾, which started with the norm of non-discrimination and evolved into a focus on integration of women into the development process, resulting in the First World Conference on Women in 1975. This was followed by the Decade for the Advancement of Women, during which the Convention on the Elimination of all forms of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW) was adopted by the General Assembly. After the Decade, the gender agenda became shaped within an empowerment discourse as defined in the Beijing Platform for Action (PfA) and finally, after the Fourth World Conference on Women in Beijing the human rights discourse emerged as the all encompassing approach to women's issues. This process corresponds to five periods, each encompassing key developments that successively unfolded into a new phase in the UN gender agenda (see Annex).

¹⁾For a comprehensive discussion, evaluation and documentation of the developments in the UN gender agenda from its inception see; United Nations and the Advancement of Women, 1945–1996, New York: UN Department of Public Information.

Emergence of Violence against Women as a Policy and Human Rights Issue

The issue of violence against women, considered as a private matter, remained largely marginal to the early work of the UN. The First World Conference on Women in 1975, although did not refer to violence as such, laid the ground for focusing on factors that inhibit or obstruct the advancement of women. It is interesting that the issue of violence could not be addressed in the drafting of CEDAW either. It was, however, addressed at the Nairobi conference in 1985 as a major concern. Governments were urged to take urgent action to prevent violence. While, during this period, it was acknowledged that violence against women exists in various forms in everyday life, the main focus was mainly on domestic violence. Thanks to the women's movement, before the ending of the decade, all forms of violence against women became challenged at the cognitive, normative and policy levels, resulting in greater sensitivity and awareness. In 1991, CSW recommended the convening of an expert meeting to determine what international instruments are needed in confronting the problem. In 1992, the CEDAW Committee adopted General Recommendation 19 that strongly linked violence with the general framework of discrimination against women, thus making states responsible for reporting on and taking measures to eradicate violence.

"In 1992, the CEDAW Committee adopted General Recommendation 19 that strongly linked violence with the general framework of discrimination against women, thus making states responsible for reporting on and taking measures to eradicate violence."

The Committee's emphasis on violence as an outcome of women's inequality and subordination was further reinforced by the Vienna Declaration and Programme of Action (A/CONF.157/23) adopted at the World Conference on Human Rights in Vienna in 1993, which described women's rights as human rights. The impact of the Vienna conference within and outside the UN was astounding; within six months of the Conference, the GA adopted the Declaration on the Elimination of Violence against Women (48/104), which was followed by the creation of the post Special Rappor-

teur on violence against women, its causes and consequences by CHR in 1994 (1994/45). These developments led to an exponential growth in the engagement of mainstream human rights activists in violence against women and stimulated action to eliminate violence at national and international levels.

The Declaration provides the normative framework for all international and national action in the field of violence against women. The preamble recognizes the urgent need for the universal application to women of the rights and principles with regard to equality, security, liberty, integrity and dignity of all human beings. It also recognizes that violence against women constitutes a violation of the rights and fundamental freedoms of women and that violence against women is a manifestation of historically unequal power relations between men and women, which have led to domination over and discrimination against women by men. The Declaration represents a significant contribution to the international gender agenda in a number of ways: (i) it provides the first official definition of violence against women (Article 1 & 2); (ii) it affirms that women are entitled to equal enjoyment and protection of human rights (Article 3); and (iii) it calls upon states to condemn violence against women and not permit custom, tradition or religion to justify violent acts and to exercise due diligence to prevent, investigate and punish acts of violence against women (Article 4).

The term 'violence against women' as defined in the Declaration, was integrated into the Beijing Platform for Action as: "...any act of gender-based violence that results in, or is likely to result in, physical, sexual or psychological harm or suffering to women, including threats of such acts, coercion or arbitrary deprivation of liberty, whether occurring in public or in private life." The Platform, by including violence against women, along with women and armed conflict and human rights of women, among its 12 critical areas of concern placed a priority to the need to respond to violence related issues in achieving advancement of women. Within the context of the PfA, various forms of sexual assault on women that were not specifically mentioned in the Declaration became specified. These include; systematic rape and forced preg-

nancy during armed conflict, sexual slavery, forced sterilization and forced abortion, female infanticide and prenatal sex selection. The 2000 special session of the GA on the review of the implementation of the PfA, popularly referred to as Beijing + 5, clearly demonstrated that violence against women had become a priority issue on the agenda of the Member States and significant steps have been taken to address the problem, in some cases, pre-dating the adoption of the Platform.²

The review process also revealed that violence, along with poverty, remains to be the most pervasive problems confronting women across the globe, with adverse consequences for the other critical areas concern. On the other hand, the critical area on Human Rights of Women, since the adoption of the Platform, emerged as an overarching goal embracing all critical areas of concern.

Violence against Women Committed in the Name of Honour

While reaffirming the strategic objectives of the PfA with regard to violence against women, the Outcome Document adopted at the special session has gone a step further in calling for the criminalization of violence against women punishable by law (69c; 103b). Paragraph 69c states; “Treat all forms of violence against women and girls of all ages as a criminal offence punishable by law including violence based on all forms of discrimination”. The OD also identified “so-called honour crimes” as a specific form of harmful traditional practice (paras 69e and 96a) in need of being eliminated by implementing law and other measures. Although, honour crime was listed among harmful traditional practices much earlier³ and

² For an analysis of government reports on the implementation of the PfA, see; From Beijing to Beijing + 5: Review and appraisal of the implementation of the Beijing Platform for Action, 2001. New York: United Nations.

³ The issue of harmful traditional practices was addressed by CSW as early as 1950's, then again in the 1970's but no significant action could be taken until mid-1980's when WHO and other UN entities made a strong case that traditional practices were a form of violence against women. Although, crimes of honour were identified among these practices the focus was on female genital mutilation.

addressed by the CEDAW Committee in its concluding comments on Turkey in 1997 and other countries, it was not until the special session that the subject became a highly debated and at the same time contested issue in the intergovernmental fora, particularly as it gained a presumed linkage with Islam, owing to the showing of the film “Crimes of Honour” prior to the circulation of a resolution on honour crimes in 2000.

“In 2002, however, the GA was able to adopt Resolution 57/179 ‘Working towards the elimination of crimes against women committed in the name of honour’ by consensus.”

Consequently, the resolution tabled by Netherlands was received with much opposition and could only be adopted by vote with 120 in favour and 25 abstaining. In 2002, however, the GA was able to adopt Resolution 57/179 “Working towards the elimination of crimes against women committed in the name of honour” by consensus. The resolution calls upon States, “To investigate and thoroughly, prosecute effectively and document cases of crimes against women committed in the name of honour and punish the perpetrators (para 3c); To intensify efforts to raise awareness of the need to prevent and eliminate crimes against women committed in the name of honour, with the aim of changing the attitudes and behaviour that allow such crimes to be committed by involving, inter alia, community leaders” (para 3e).

The resolution also invited the CSW to address the subject at its forty-seventh session under the priority theme, “Women’s human rights and the elimination of all forms of violence against women and girls”. As it is well known, the Commission, for the first time in its history, failed to reach a consensus on the agreed conclusion with regard to this theme. This alarming outcome can be perceived as a continuity of the difficulties encountered during Beijing + 5 in 2000, which signalled the growing trend towards political and cultural fragmentations, resulting from the disparities and new polarizations unleashed by globalization, and the mounting backlash in response to the progress achieved in the gender agenda. These incidents reveal that, consensus among Member States on critical issues concerning women’s human rights are becoming increasingly difficult.

While, it is important to acknowledge and seriously reflect on these trends that pose a threat to the sustenance of a common agenda for gender equality, there have also been promising developments during the same period, such as: the adoption of Security Council Resolution 1325 in 2000; the same year going into force of the CEDAW Optional Protocol; in 2002, the GA adoption of resolution 57/179 on “Working towards the elimination of crimes against women committed in the name of honour”; and in 2003, the renewal of the mandate of the Special Rapporteur on Violence against Women (200/45) by the Commission on Human Rights. Furthermore, The Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court, by defining rape and other gender-based violence as war crimes, crimes against humanity and components of crime of genocide, has given the issue of violence against women high visibility and official acknowledgement within mainstream international law.

Although still a contested issue in multilateral dialogue, it is also encouraging that “honour crimes” are now on the agenda of several countries as a violation of human rights of women, which compels the State in these countries to engage in international law in reviewing and amending their penal code to ensure that sexual felonies are defined as crimes against the individual punishable by law. Reference also needs to be made to the fact that, honour crimes -once a local and invisible act of transgression on women’s sexuality and bodily integrity – is now a globalized problem, occurring among immigrant communities in receiving countries. In such situations it is important that, while the universality of human rights law must be observed, honour crimes should not be treated in isolation from the phenomenon of violence against women in general. This is important in order to avoid two potential risks: (i) stigmatization of migrant communities which will result in anti-immigrant sentiments and policies; and (ii) normalization

“This is important in order to avoid two potential risks: (i) stigmatization of migrant communities which will result in anti-immigrant sentiments and policies; and (ii) normalization of other forms of violence in the society which will make everyday incidents of violence against women invisible or neglected.”

of other forms of violence in the society which will make everyday incidents of violence against women invisible or neglected.

Conclusion

While at the normative level the international standards are more or less adequate in addressing issues of violence against women, including crimes of honour, the challenge lies in ensuring and monitoring State compliance with existing norms and in observing respect for the human rights of women. When viewed from this perspective there are major gaps as human rights of women fail to be universal today. Despite the international consensus on values related to human rights, existing institutional arrangements, lack of political commitment and determination of States make human rights unrealizable for most women. Women's sexuality in most parts of the world continues to be a matter of public concern, resulting in violation of their bodily integrity. Women's body is the zone for wars and the site of politics and policies, as revealed in the armed conflicts around the world, recent restrictions on reproductive rights, dress codes as well as certain immigration and refugee policies, among others. Even in situations where traditional patriarchy is ruptured, as in many of the western countries, discrimination and violence against women continues to persist in modified, subtle and discrete forms.

In addition, growing disparities, increased conflict and conservative political trends worldwide, make constructive dialogue among nations difficult, seriously endangering the sustenance of the progress achieved thus far. Within this context, the increased politicization of culture, especially its articulation in the form of religious fundamentalism(s), in the competition over global power poses a major challenge to international and national governance as well as to women's human rights.

In short, the struggle to eliminate violence against women in all its forms has a long way to go. In this regard, while an inclusive, just and an enabling global environment needs to be established, at the

more specific level, the strategy to end violence against women in general and crimes of honour in particular, must include interventions at the level of the state, community/family and individual women, using a combination of human rights, culture and empowerment discourses. Needless to say, the state is the main subject of international and is, therefore, accountable and obligated to observe due diligence in protecting and promoting women's human rights and in punishing those who violate those rights. At the level of the community, on the other hand, a cultural perspective is needed to understand the causes of persisting violence and raise awareness of the detrimental impact of violence on those who experience it as well as on the entire society by drawing on positive elements of culture. In the case of immigrant communities, it is also important to analyze the structural and policy constraints that may prevent the equal participation of individual immigrants in the wider society, a situation which may leave them dependent upon the solidarity network of their own immigrant community. Similarly, women who lack economic autonomy in their own country are also vulnerable to the pressures of their family and kinship network since their survival is dependent upon them. Finally, at the level of individual women, legal and other measures are needed to empower them in order that they may be able to resist violence and have access to justice. International women's networks can be instrumental in supporting local women's initiatives to resist violence and demand justice, while at the same time, compile good practices in this regard.

Last but not least, there is need for deconstructing hegemonic masculinity and engaging in a dialogue and alliance with alternative masculinities that are distant to oppressive uses of power. The March 2004 session of CSW, which will address the role of men as one of its priority theme, offers an opportunity for the international community to explore these issues further and adopt effective policy guidelines without, however, deviating from the strategic objective of the Platform to achieve gender equality through the empowerment of women.

ANNEX: Evolving UN Agenda for Gender Equality and Women's Human Rights

1945–1962: The norm of non-discrimination

- 1946 establishment of the Commission on Human Rights (CHR) and the Commission on the Status of Women (CSW)
- 1948 Universal Declaration of Human Rights
- 1952 Civil and Political Rights
- 1957 Nationality of Married Women
- 1962 Consent on Marriage, Minimum Age of Marriage

1963–1975: Integration of Women into Development

- 1966 Economic, Social, Cultural Rights
- 1967 Declaration on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women
- 1975 International Women's Year and the First World Conference on Women in Mexico City – theme: equality, development and peace; adoption of “World Plan of Action on Equality of Women and Their Contributions to Development and Peace”
- 1975 Recommendation to create INSTRAW and UNIFEM
- 1976 – 1985: The Decade for the Advancement of Women
- 1979 CEDAW – Women's Bill of Rights
- 1980 Second World Conference on Women in Copenhagen (mid-term review of the Decade) – adoption of resolution of battered women in the family
- 1985 Third World Conference on Women in Nairobi – adoption of “Nairobi Forward Looking Strategies”

1986–1995: Empowerment of Women

- 1986 UN expert group meeting on violence in the family
- 1992 CEDAW General recommendation 19
- 1993 The World Conference on Human Rights in Vienna – women's rights are human rights
- 1993 Declaration on the Elimination of Violence against Women
- 1994 CHR creates the post Special Rapporteur on violence against women, its causes and consequences
- 1995 Fourth World Conference on Women in Beijing – adoption of Beijing Declaration and the Platform for Action (12 critical areas of concern)

1996 – present: Women’s Human Rights

- 1997 ECOSOC Agreed Conclusion on Gender Mainstreaming
- 1999 Optional Protocol to CEDAW
- 2000 Special Session of the General Assembly on: Women 2000: gender equality, development and peace for the 21st century (Beijing + 5) – adoption of the Political Declaration and the Outcome Document
- 2000 Security Council addresses women, peace and security and adopts resolution 1325
- 2001 CSW adopts new multi-year work programme
- 2002 GA Resolution 57/179 – Working towards the elimination of crimes against women committed in the name of honour
- 2003 CHR renews mandate of Special Rapporteur on violence against women – Resolution 48/104

Key-note address by Dr Purna Sen, London School of Economics for CIMEL/INTERIGHTS Project on Crimes of “Honour”

“Honour” crimes and human rights

Thank you for inviting the CIMEL/INTERIGHTS Project on “Honour” Crimes, in which I am a partner, to address this conference. I shall say a little about this project in a moment but would like to begin with a brief reminder of the types of behaviours we name to be “honour” crimes and consider similarities with other violence against women that is not normally categorised as “honour” crimes. I also want to attend to the dangers inherent in

separating out different “types” of abuse, particularly in the part of the world where we sit for this meeting. My main messages are that it is important to problematise “honour” crimes as an issue of human rights and violence against women, that cultural voices are heterogeneous and that cultures can and do change.

“My main messages are that it is important to problematise ‘honour’ crimes as an issue of human rights and violence against women, that cultural voices are heterogeneous and that cultures can and do change.”

CIMEL /Interights Project

The CIMEL/INTERIGHTS “Honour” Crimes Project starts from the understanding that crimes against women that are associated with notions of “honour” can be found in different areas, cultures and groups and are contested in many ways across different locations. It is not a matter of “insiders” to a culture being party to these practices and “outsiders” being able inherently to criticise and bring change. The Project brings together voices, both individual and organisational, that contest such practices and justifications thereof, sharing ways in which “honour” crimes have

been challenged and demonstrating the variety of internal initiatives against these. Links between partners are premised on the exploration of significant commonalities across locations (geographical, religious, cultural, etc) on the central issue of the control of women and female sexuality and around concepts or practices that enable or excuse men's violence. In many places the motif is "honour"; in others it is (men's) "passion". This understanding brings together partners from Latin America, the Middle East, South Asia and Western Europe. We also recognise that notions of "honour" are not unique to the areas which currently provide the focus of international concern (the Middle East in particular) but have a history in parts of Europe. For example European parallels can be found in recent history in Greece and Italy.

Information about the CIMEL/INTERRIGHTS project can be found on the following website - <http://www.soas.ac.uk/honour-crimes/>.

Human rights and violence against women

The term "honour" crimes is increasingly used in popular discourse to refer to killings of women by family members. But these crimes in fact cover a range of behaviours and practices that include not only killings but also false imprisonment, forced marriage (especially to foreclose individual selection of partners) and barring of women from employment or education. The language of "honour" gives a social or cultural cloak of legitimacy to such actions, thereby excusing, justifying or exonerating them. Each of these forms represents a means through which "honour" is played out on and through the bodies and lives of women and is therefore about a common theme of control of women, especially women's sexuality.

"The language of 'honour' gives a social or cultural cloak of legitimacy to such actions, thereby excusing, justifying or exonerating them. Each of these forms represents a means through which 'honour' is played out on and through the bodies and lives of women and is therefore about a common theme of control of women, especially women's sexuality."

Considering the range of behaviours to which the term therefore refers, it is clear that many human rights are violated through such constraints on and abuses of women – including but not only, the rights to

- life,
- liberty,
- security of the person,
- movement,
- expression,
- work,
- family,
- private life,
- marry and found a family,
- education,
- (highest standard of) health,
- freedom from cruel, inhuman and degrading treatment or punishment, and
- non-discrimination

Women everywhere suffer the same sort of violence that I have earlier named as “honour” crimes – physical abuse, killings, controls on mobility, friendships and so on. In the main it is private actors, men, who are the perpetrators of such abuses of women, whether or not named as “honour” crimes. But the principle of due diligence places upon the state a responsibility to be pro-active in preventing, investigating, punishing and providing redress for such violations of human rights. The appropriateness of a human rights framework in addressing crimes of “honour” should be clearly understood. In this respect, the practice of “honour” crimes can be understood and framed as an issue of violence against women and of human rights.

An alternative approach, that of framing crimes of “honour” as a cultural issue to be found only among specific communities that are minorities in the west, is one that carries dangers. As we sit in northern Europe discussing this issue I would like to contextualise our discussion with examples of the ways in which this approach can be divisive and dangerous.

At an abstract level the temptation to define and limit crimes of “honour” to minority groups or Middle Eastern communities identifies these as “problematic” groups or cultures. In turn, this rests upon and promotes a homogenised interpretation of culture – one which says that a given group has a given (monolithic?) culture which, by implication at least, uniformly condones such practices. It homogenises “members” of a group, builds a divide between them and those “outside” it, assumes in outsiders an ability to criticise and constructs the problematised group/culture as a backward “other”. Such a formulation fails to recognise and therefore hear or support, voices of dissent among “insiders”. It also strengthens the hands of conservative voices active within such cultural debates.

In fact, internal voices of dissent exist in all cultures and links can be forged between them, as in the CIMEL/INTERRIGHTS Project. In Jordan, local activists are involved in contesting legal provisions supporting “honour” as a justification of violence, as well as promoting pro-active measures that provide women avenues for safety from crimes of “honour”, such as increased shelter provision. In Brazilian courts the concept of a conjugal defence strongly associated “crimes of passion” with the defence of “honour”. These have been actively contested by women’s organisations.

At a practical level problematising whole communities or cultural groups can have clear and undesirable practical consequences. In Western Europe the problematisation of minority groups is often played out through state controls on immigrant populations. Constructing minority communities as inherently backward, or problematically different highlights the need for specific and special treatment. Exploring some local examples is illustrative. Northern European countries have adopted policies that have reviewed and increasingly restricted the mechanisms and rules for immigrants to gain residency rights. At the same time, in several northern European countries the language used to refer to minority groups is “immigrants”, thereby formalising and legitimising their construction as “others”, as inherently and consistently different from the native population.

Many European countries impose a period of time during which an incoming spouse must remain with a settled spouse in order to secure rights of independent residence. These rules have been tightened in recent years in Iceland and Denmark. Iceland has moved from having no such period to introducing a three-year residence requirement in 2002. Denmark has gone from three years to an exceptionally long period of seven years, adding a number of other criteria on which any application will be judged. These include a requirement of having an “attachment” to Denmark, such as having other family members in the country, having completed education or having a permanent connection to the labour market and having language proficiency in Danish. Not only must the attachment be proven, but it must be demonstrated to be greater than any attachment to another country.

Increasing attention on the issue of forced marriages in Denmark, again cast as an immigrant problem, led to the introduction of a higher age for family reunification (24) than for marriage (18), anticipating that forced marriages, family reunification and immigration were closely dovetailed. The climate in Denmark concerning immigrants has been described as “growing hostility towards migrants” at the UN [Committee on Elimination of Discrimination against Women 12/06/2002].

Problematizing minority groups, or exoticising forms of violence, entails the danger of casting women as compliant with prevailing norms and of failing to afford adequate protection to women against violence and especially so in a context of growing discomfort at best, and at worst, possible hostility against minority groups.

Changing cultural norms

There are indeed some cultural traditions in which the notion of “honour” has a high value and which have in turn supported this as a defence or excuse for men’s violence against women. However, it would be wrong to move from this recognition to cast cultures

as homogenous. I take an example from Sweden to show that you are yourselves familiar with such dynamics – the case of prostitution. In many cultures, prostitution is viewed as “the oldest profession”, something that is an inescapable part of life that has always been around and will always be there: a “cultural norm”, in some sense. It may be such views that informed the 1972 recommendation from a group of parliamentarians⁴ to legalise brothels in Sweden. The following decades saw Swedish dissent mobilised not only to ensure that this specific proposal was not implemented, but to move in a different direction to criminalise the buying of sexual services. In 27 years, the cultural norm that might have seemed unassailable at the time was completely overturned, with Sweden enacting innovative anti-prostitution legislation in 1999⁵ that is now the focus of attention from many countries.

“It is essential to encompass the possibility of cultural change, an aim for which internal dissent strives.”

Here we see an example of internal heterogeneity, internal cultural dialogue and contestation over the use, sale and commodification of women’s bodies and sexuality, primarily for the use of men. The same sorts of issues and dynamics underlie the “honour” crimes issue – not only is it possible for internal contestation, but it is happening. Casting entire populations, cultures, communities as problematic fails to see this and fails also to forge constructive alliances among actors who might share values. Such alliances are an essential part of positive and powerful initiatives against crimes of “honour” and stand as an important alternative to conservative alliances that construe cultural values as primordial and never changing.

⁴ See Boethius M-P, 1999, The End of Prostitution in Sweden?, available at www.sweden.se/templates/article_2295, Swedish Institute

⁵ Act Prohibiting the Purchase of Sexual Services, 1 January 1999, SFS 1998:408

Conclusion

In conclusion I would like to welcome the proposal of the Swedish Ministry of Justice to hold a public conference in 2004 on crimes against women in the name of "honour". I would like to urge that the framework for such a meeting ensures that such crimes are understood

- to be part of a whole range of abuses of human rights,
- as an aspect of the realm of violence against women,
- as practices which are actively contested from within,
- not as given cultural values that are monolithic or unchanging,
- not simply chosen cultural expressions among specific countries or minority groups, and
- not as justifications for increasing controls or restrictions upon such groups in European countries.

Thank you.

Working group reports to the plenary

Working group 1

- ◉ It is important to carefully consider ways of contextualising the issue of honour crimes and how to approach it in general. There were two main groups of opinion in this regard. Some stated that dealing with crimes of honour as a separate issue entails risks, as it could be perceived as a problem that is mainly of concern to others and would lead to the conference not dealing with the unequal distribution of power between men and women. However, other members of the working group were of the opinion that the specificities of the problem of violence committed in the name of honour need to be addressed if the conference is to be successful.
- ◉ On the other hand, there need not be any contradiction between these two perspectives. The starting point should be the structural imbalance and inequalities between men and women.
- ◉ In general, it was held that organising a conference on violence committed in the name of honour was a good idea. Although the meeting should not be intergovernmental, government officials could be invited along with experts and grassroots organisations.
- ◉ The conference should deal with the issue at both an academic and a more practical level. Topics that should be discussed include support to women's organisations, different means of preventing honour crimes, the teaching of basic values in schools, especially to young boys and ways in which the UN should deal with the problem of violence committed in the name of honour.

Working group 2

- The value of positioning the issue of violence committed in the name of honour both as one aspect of violence against women and as a more specific issue was emphasised. These two perspectives need not be mutually exclusive.
- The issue of violence committed in the name of honour should be approached from a human rights perspective, making connections between human rights standards and criminal law and benefiting from work already done in this area.
- The international conference should result in concrete action and network building, both between different groups working specifically with this issue and others engaged more generally with violence against women, such as law enforcement officials, NGOs, governments, etc. In these networks, progress can be monitored and developed over time.
- Organisation of a national conference before the international conference may be possible. Assistance may be sought from an international consultant who could help choose participants in order to guarantee broad-based grassroots participation.
- There is a need to break down the fear arising when different traditions live in proximity. Communication and integration between communities should be increased in order to break down this fear.

Working group 3

- The conference should focus on crimes committed in the name of honour within a human rights perspective. It should also be noted that 2004 is the tenth anniversary of the Cairo Conference on Population and Development. As it was the Cairo Conference that first put sexual rights on to the international human rights agenda, it could be used as a framework for the Swedish confer-

ence in order to emphasise that the issue of violence committed in the name of honour is closely related to sexual rights.

- A good time for the conference would be between the UN Human Rights Commission and the Third Committee of the General Assembly, which means September 2004.
- The participants should include high-level representatives of governments, UN Special Rapporteurs, researchers and NGOs.
- The conference could aim at different categories of outcomes:
 - political commitments by governments,
 - guidelines for implementation of international human rights law in cases of violence committed in the name of honour, and/or
 - examples of good practices.
- In order to avoid addressing the issue of violence committed in the name of honour as a specifically "other culture" problem, Sweden's own history as regards pregnancies outside marriage, unofficial abortions, etc. could be brought to the fore. It was not so long ago that it was extremely shameful for a woman in Sweden to be pregnant without being married.

Working group 4

- There were differing views with regard to the way in which the theme of the conference should be conceptualised. The issue needs to be placed in a wider context of human rights and violence against women. Stigmatisation and the use of the "us and them" approach should be avoided.
- There is a need for greater knowledge and information, e.g. experiences from other countries.
- It is important to focus on questions of masculinity and of the role of immigrant men.

- ◉ Both academics and practitioners from different countries should be invited to the conference. Participants should also reflect different levels and sectors of society, such as the judiciary, the social sector, the police, the health sector and NGOs.
- ◉ Best practices should be identified.
- ◉ The goals of the conference should be clearly stated so that the results can be evaluated.
- ◉ The title of the conference needs to be carefully considered. One proposal for the title of the conference was “Challenging the boundaries for women’s rights as human rights”.

Tuesday 5 November; plenary session

Key-note address by Jacqueline Hunt, Equality Now

Crimes of Honour and Advocacy Against the Practice

It is a great pleasure to be here among such distinguished company and we would like first to extend our thanks to the Swedish Government not only for having invited Equality Now to participate in this meeting, but also, and even more, for having taken this important step to address the issue of “honour” crimes in an international context.

Even though many think of “honour” crimes as the killing of girls and women for some sexual or societal indiscretion to protect the family honour, as we all know the wish to control women’s sexual and social choices and the perception of women as male property pervades all societies around the world and takes many forms. Acid burnings, dowry killings and female genital mutilation are other culturally specific forms of violence used to subordinate women. Domestic violence and rape are more universal manifestations of the same syndrome. And, as we know, these types of discrimination against women can be found in all countries without exception.

“The wish to control women’s sexual and social choices and the perception of women as male property pervades all societies around the world and takes many forms.”

Equality Now took up a case in the United States in 1994 that I think might be considered comparable to “honour” killing. It was the case of Kenneth Peacock who killed his wife earlier that year, several hours after finding her in bed with another man. In passing the minimum sentence, which he then suspended, Judge Robert

Cahill expressed his sympathy for the defendant and said, "I seriously wonder how many married men...would have the strength to walk away...without inflicting some corporal punishment, whatever that punishment might be. I shudder to think what I would do." Where you or I might contemplate counselling or possibly divorce as a way of addressing the issue of marital breakdown, even a judge in the Baltimore Circuit Court of the United States felt that taking a woman's life for committing adultery was in some way justified. He repeatedly referred to Mr Peacock as a "non-criminal". Is that so different from an "honour" killing in the Yemen, say?

"Even though fundamental human rights that are theoretically gender-neutral should protect the civil, political, social, and economic rights of men and women, violations of women's rights have been historically viewed as 'cultural'."

It is the changing of perception from that of women as property with no rights to that of women as equal partners that is the biggest challenge in our work to stop crimes of "honour". The right to equal protection of the law, as it applies to violence against women, has largely been ignored. Even though fundamental human rights that are theo-

retically gender-neutral should protect the civil, political, social, and economic rights of men and women, violations of women's rights have been historically viewed as "cultural". The fact that South Africa allowed only whites to vote in that country under apartheid generated an international campaign fuelled by outrage, whereas the fact that Kuwait allows only men to vote has gone virtually unnoticed by the international community. The notion that human rights violations against women are acceptable cultural practices is a manifestation in itself of discrimination that allows "culture" to be defined by those largely responsible for violations. Women in Kuwait demonstrated and have been organising to protest the denial of their voting rights. In all cultures, there are women, and men, working to promote respect for the fundamental human rights of women. It may only be the courageous few who articulate the silent concern of others, but these few also represent their culture. The aspiration for equality is a universal phenomenon.

men and human rights protection justice political commitment good practice violence against women and girls in the name of honour rights justice meditation techniques

We must work to break down the public/private distinction traditionally drawn. Historically, the private sphere of action has been excluded from the agenda of those who work to combat human rights violations, even though it is equally protected in human rights instruments. The distinction has left the so-called private sphere, where many human rights violations against women take place, beyond scrutiny, and is used to justify inattention to violence against women. For example, although in recent years there has been increasing focus on rape as a weapon of war, there is still reluctance in many countries to address the issue of rape as a weapon of control in civil society. As a result of frequent police non-responsiveness, rape, like domestic violence, is carried out often with systematic impunity in the “private” spheres of many countries. Denunciation of police non-responsiveness to death squad activities in authoritarian regimes around the world, for example, strongly supported the individual right to political dissent. Yet the underlying human rights targeted by violence against women, such as the right to personal safety, sometimes, even life, has not been equally championed. Whether the police beat you to death or whether they stand by and watch while your husband or your sons beat you to death makes no difference. Either way you have lost your life.

“The distinction has left the so-called private sphere, where many human rights violations against women take place, beyond scrutiny, and is used to justify inattention to violence against women.”

Because violence against women is often viewed in the private sphere and seen as an element of “culture”, that is, something to be preserved and not interfered with from outside, it is essential to reach out to those elements in the community that are working from the inside to change common practices and perceptions. While it is important to condemn violence and discrimination against women outright as a fundamental abuse of human rights, it is also crucial to respect the advice of those working from within who will have found mechanisms to navigate their way through the obstacles that might otherwise prevent change. Equality Now, for example, has been collaborating very closely with those working on

the ground in Jordan to overturn a law that exempted from penalty a man who killed his wife or female relative after finding her in an “unlawful” bed, as it was called. We mobilised our international membership to write letters and targeted other bodies and individuals to intervene with public pressure. A temporary law, which absolves the perpetrator only if he commits the crime immediately on finding the victim committing adultery, has now replaced this provision. However, “honour” crimes have been committed on women and girls for violating sexual norms, or for being victims of rape, incest, sexual abuse or sexual rumour. Unfortunately, other articles of the Jordanian Penal Code, which provide for a reduction in penalty for cases where there has been “provocation”, have been used to reduce sentences in many cases of so-called “honour” crimes even when there has clearly been premeditation.

It is this systematic non-responsiveness of domestic law enforcement authorities to acts of violence against women that raises the issue to an international human rights level. In Brazil, when Jose Lopes stabbed his wife and her lover to death after finding them together in a hotel room, he used the “honour” defence to justify his actions and was acquitted by an all-male jury. While the Supreme Court did overturn the acquittal, holding that murder was not an appropriate response to adultery, Lopes was again acquitted by an all-male jury in the new trial. Although the law in most countries prohibits domestic violence, there are rarely effective measures in place to ensure that the law actually works to protect women from violence and to bring violent offenders to justice. These examples illustrate a pattern with respect to the human rights of women and while over the past few years initiatives like this meeting have done much to raise public awareness about “honour” killings, and much has been done to raise public awareness about violence against women generally, we still have not seen a significant increase in prosecutions which are still more the exception, while impunity remains the rule.

Even though, without accompanying attitudinal change in society, any law that seeks to punish traditional practices in conformity with international legal standards or domestic constitutional provi-

sions might not always be implemented in practice, Equality Now still believes that the law is a crucial tool to protect and promote the rights of women. Firstly, it is the means by which we can hold perpetrators accountable. Secondly, it sets a public standard of conduct, a norm of behaviour that can help change culture, although of course it is only part of the complex process of social change. Recently in Jordan the courts in a very few cases have blocked misuse of the “provocation” defence and given harsher sentences to those guilty of “honour” crimes, thereby upholding the true meaning of the law. More judgements such as these will send an important signal back to society that so-called crimes of “honour” are not acceptable and will not be tolerated, which in turn and in time will help change some public attitudes. In the United Kingdom recently, a Kurdish Muslim man who murdered his daughter for having a Christian boyfriend showed huge remorse for his crime – an indication maybe that there is growing recognition that “honour” killing is wrong.

We should remember also that crimes of “honour” brutalise those who carry them out. Often, younger male members of a family are designated to commit the murder in an attempt to avoid adult punishment. Even with the approval of their families and society at large, how could they remain unscathed by that experience? We have to stop the cycle of violence and the way in which the issue of “honour” killings is portrayed is not helpful to that end. Unfortunately, in Europe there appears to be increasing hostility, particularly in the popular media, against refugee and immigrant communities. This hostility is often exacerbated and exploited by stories of brutal so-called “cultural” practices, like “honour” killing. Women are often the first to suffer in this environment where there is considerable community pressure both to present a united front and to preserve traditional identities and values. While unequivocally condemning these

“We should remember also that crimes of ‘honour’ brutalise those who carry them out. Often, younger male members of a family are designated to commit the murder in an attempt to avoid adult punishment. Even with the approval of their families and society at large, how could they remain unscathed by that experience?”

crimes, by working in partnership with those in the relevant communities who also oppose the practice and by positioning the issue as just one of many forms of violence against women, which it is, we should be clear in condemning all violence against women universally rather than by singling out particular populations or forms of it and dealing with those in isolation. Backlash can thereby be avoided and society as a whole can be brought into the dialogue about respect for women's rights.

“Armed with education and economic and social choices, women will have more freedom to escape violent and potentially violent situations as well as to establish themselves as equal members of society, rather than someone else’s wife, sister or mother.”

What is needed also is the stronger reconceptualisation of the human rights framework as it is envisaged by the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. By focusing not just on civil and political rights, but also on economic, social and cultural rights, we should speed up the process of stopping violations against women. Human rights such as the right to ownership of property, free choice of employment, and to education were included in the Universal Declaration when it was adopted in 1948. Implementation of these

rights requires both political will and economic resources. Armed with education and economic and social choices, women will have more freedom to escape violent and potentially violent situations as well as to establish themselves as equal members of society, rather than someone else’s wife, sister or mother.

In 1988, when officials in Peru were questioned about the common practice of rape by government troops, they explained that rape was “to be expected” when troops were based in rural areas. They said it was “natural” and that prosecutions should not be expected. Such a statement would never be made about torture, even in the absence of prosecutions, because the statement itself would be so clearly shameful. We are now working towards and looking forward to the day when such a statement would never be said about “honour” crimes or other violence against women.

Thank you for your attention

Summary of the discussions held on 4 November by Minister for Democracy and Integration Issues Mona Sahlin

General idea of organising a conference

The general idea of organising a conference was considered to be a good one. There may be difficulties concerning the framework for the issues to be discussed but that does not mean that we should not discuss them.

Phrasing and contextualising the problem to be addressed

There have been many different views on the perspective from which honour crimes should be addressed and the context in which to put the issue.

The point of departure for this conference needs to be clear from the outset. This will save time when preparing for the conference and issuing invitations.

Addressing in a general way the issue of violence committed in the name of honour, by putting it into the context of the patriarchal structures in society, or as merely one aspect of men's violence against women, has been described as one possible perspective.

Another approach to phrasing the issue has been described as addressing the particularities of honour crimes.

But – as many have already said, and I agree – these two perspectives are not mutually exclusive, and both sides of the problem need to be taken into account.

This means, in my view, that that we do need to name the problem

“We do need to name the problem of honour crimes, and to see the particularities of this problem. At the same time we need to put it into the context of men’s dominance and the dominance of the norm of male heterosexuality. This norm is threatened by female sexuality, as well as by gay and lesbian sexuality, which needs to be taken into account during the conference.”

of honour crimes, and to see the particularities of this problem. At the same time we need to put it into the context of men’s dominance and the dominance of the norm of male heterosexuality. This norm is threatened by female sexuality, as well as by gay and lesbian sexuality, which needs to be taken into account during the conference.

Legally speaking, the problem of honour crimes needs to be seen in the context of human rights law, as it has been by the United Nations.

Thus although I think the conference needs to deal with the specific nature of honour crimes, this does not mean that we should turn a blind eye to the larger picture.

Another point that was made in this regard was that honour crimes are not only a question of violence, but – as I have already touched upon – a question of controlling female, gay and lesbian sexuality.

One way of putting honour crimes into a broader perspective at the conference next year is to stress that in 2004, ten years has passed since the Cairo Conference on Population and Development was held. Since reproductive rights, and the right to one’s sexuality were among the conclusions from that conference, the perspective of “Cairo +10” could be used in order to frame the conference in a fruitful way.

Expected outcome of the conference

It must be clearly stated beforehand the result to be expected from the conference. Different ideas have been put forward here at the meeting in this regard, including:

- Political commitments from governments.
- Guidelines for national implementation of human rights law in relation to honour crimes.
- Guidelines to be used within different sectors of society, such as the social services, the judiciary, the police, schools, etc. Such guidelines could, for example, include examples of good practices.

It was suggested that the conference could become a platform for forming a network, which could keep in touch after the conference to continue this work and the sharing of ideas and knowledge.

It was also stressed by many participants that we need greater knowledge. This, in itself, could be one important result of the conference if it manages to assemble many people with experience and know-how about dealing with these issues.

Representation at the conference

This question is closely related to the issue of expected outcomes, that is, if we wish the conference to lead to political commitments, practical guidelines or other measures.

There were different views regarding whether governments should be involved, and if so, in which form, or whether the conference should assemble experts. There was a fear that the timing for an intergovernmental meeting involving intergovernmental negotiations may not be ideal.

However, from the discussions I have understood that most participants thought it important to invite governments, while leaving open the issue of the precise form that this could take.

It is clear that it is important to invite experts from different sectors of society and different countries, NGOs and experts from intergovernmental organisations, such as the UN.

It was also stated that we need both practical knowledge, operative experience and academic knowledge to be presented at the conference.

In other words, we need to invite persons representing many sectors and levels of society in several countries and to try and arrange a meeting where these perspectives and people can meet in a true sense.

Timing of, and preparations for the conference

It is my hope that we will be able to arrange the conference next year, in 2004, preferably in the autumn, so that we will have enough time for preparations.

One idea that was mentioned was that a Swedish conference could be arranged first in order to provide input to the international meeting. This might be a good idea. But I also hope that we can keep in touch with all of you to discuss preparations for the conference at various stages. You have provided so much important input already, that I regard you as given participants in the international conference next year.

I am convinced that having a conference on honour crimes next year would in itself be an important achievement. However it is also important to remember that it should be seen as the starting point for a much longer and broader process, where we will be able to address the issue in many different forms and forums.

Thank you

Summary of the final discussion in the plenary on 5 November

There was strong support for the organisation of a conference in Stockholm in 2004 and for the proposal to invite both experts and government representatives.

Many stressed that the seminar had provided an opportunity to put the discussions on honour killings into a broad context of male power structures and male violence against women – themes that should also be in focus for a conference in 2004.

Others suggested that the conference in 2004 should focus on crimes of honour. There is a risk in treating crimes of honour as just one form of violence against women. If the problem of honour crimes is not specifically addressed, it may be difficult to combat.

It was generally acknowledged that it is extremely important, in European countries as well as in countries in other regions, to break the silence and to bring these problems out into the open. This is true both about crimes of honour and about the overall problems of male dominance and public acceptance of male violence as a means of dominating and subjugating women and girls. It is also crucial to engage in dialogues with boys and men on the subject and where possible, to support networks among men to deepen dialogues.

“It was generally acknowledged that it is extremely important, in European countries as well as in countries in other regions, to break the silence and to bring these problems out into the open. This is true both about crimes of honour and about the overall problems of male dominance and public acceptance of male violence as a means of dominating and subjugating women and girls.”

It was noted that, while a number of expressions of male violence against women tend to be tolerated and in practice accepted in many societies, the difference between these violations and crimes

of honour appear to be that crimes of honour, even if committed by an individual, are initiated by large groups and even encouraged and applauded.

The conference will need to look into both the mechanisms that make gender-based violence tolerated and those that actually encourage gender-based violence, particularly crimes of honour. It will also need to counteract the tendency to equate culture with ethnicity and to emphasise it rather as a set of values, not necessarily connected with certain ethnic groups.

It was pointed out that a decision needs to be taken on whether or not the conference should have a European focus with participants exclusively (or mainly) from European countries. In this case, discussions may come to focus on immigrants and ethnicity. Another option may be to also invite countries “of origin”, i.e. where crimes of honour have been practised for long periods of time.

It was suggested that the conference should focus on preventive measures, both to address underlying root causes and more short-term problems.

Several speakers stressed the need to support groups within countries of origin, not least women’s groups, youth organisations, networks and progressive religious groups that are engaged in activities and/or research regarding honour crimes. It is important to invite such groups, both from European countries and countries of origin.

It was suggested that presentations be made of what had been done at national levels, in Sweden, the United Kingdom and other countries, in order to combat honour killings.

One possibility may be to look at the role of schools, the police, social services and public authorities at large. The role of neighbours and people in the local community could also be addressed.

Suggestions were also put forward to examine refugee legislation and immigration rules in order to strengthen the protection of women victims of male violence – issues which were to be addressed by, inter alia, Amnesty International in their 2004 campaign on violence against women.

In planning for the conference it is essential to keep in mind the fact that discussions on crimes of honour – particularly after 11 September 2001 – could be used by xenophobic groups as an argument for restricting immigration. There is a general tendency, mainly demonstrated by the media, to portray these problems as questions of ethnicity rather than acknowledging the overall problems in all societies which permit a range of different expressions of male violence against women.

Also discussed was the importance of particularly addressing the role of the media, which often simplifies the discussion related to honour killings. Proposals were put forward to arrange a specific seminar for generalists in order to seek to deepen knowledge regarding root causes in terms of overall structures of male control of female sexuality leading to honour killings, forced marriages etc.

“Also discussed was the importance of particularly addressing the role of the media, which often simplifies the discussion related to honour killings.”

APPENDIX 1: Programme

Programme for the Expert Meeting on Violence in the Name of Honour, Stockholm 4–5 November 2003

The overall objective of the expert meeting is to identify ways of preventing honour-related violence nationally and internationally. More specifically, the expert meeting should;

- acquire knowledge about measures at international and national level to combat honour-related violence, in the light of international human rights commitments,
- discuss and present proposals on arrangements and preparations for the international conference planned for 2004, and
- produce background material for the international conference in the form of proposals for stronger action against honour-related violence, nationally and in international cooperation.

Tuesday 4 November

- 10.00 – 10.15** Minister for Democracy, Gender Equality Policy and Integration Issues, Ms Mona Sahlin
- 10.15 – 10.40** “Honour” Crimes in the Context of International Regimes – UN Special Rapporteur Ms Yakin Ertürk
- 10.40 – 11.10** Break
- 11.10 – 11.35** Confronting Crimes of “Honour”: Key Challenges – Ms Gita Sahgal, Amnesty International
- 11.35 – 12.00** Crimes of “Honour” – a Human Rights Perspective – Ms Purna Sen, CIMEL/INTERIGHTS
- 12.00 – 13.15** Lunch
- 13.15 – 15.45** Work in subgroups
- 16.00 – 17.00** Reports from subgroups and discussion
- 19.00** Dinner

Wednesday 5 November

- 09.00 – 09.15** Crimes of “Honour” and Advocacy against the Practice – Ms Jacqui Hunt, Equality Now
- 09.15 – 10.00** Discussion on the plans for an international conference in 2004
- 10.00 – 10.30** Break
- 10.30 – 11.30** Discussion (contd.)
- 11.45 – 12.00** Summary and conclusion – Ms Mona Sahlin
- 12.00** Closing of meeting followed by lunch

Questions to discuss

1. What is the situation in countries where “honour crimes” are or have been common?
2. What action has been taken – and what further action is needed – in migrants’ countries of origin and destination, in terms of preventive measures and attitude-changing efforts, support for victims and their families, and so on?
3. What international commitments exist in the area and what forms of cooperation between countries and international organisations already occur?
4. What can be done to strengthen measures against honour-related violence, whether national or taken in cooperation between countries and other actors?
5. When should an international conference be held, how should it be organised and prepared and what results should be targeted in order to best advance international efforts against honour-related violence?

The five most important conclusions from the working group discussions should be reported to the plenary.

APPENDIX 2:

List of participants

1. **Abbaspour, Samira** Companion to Maria Rashidi
2. **Begikhani, Nazand** KWAHK – Kurdish Women Action against Honour Killings
3. **Bergh, Lise** State Secretary, Ministry of Justice
4. **Bilici, Feyza** Network Terrafem, Stockholm
5. **Bredal, Anja** Institute for Social Research, Oslo
6. **Boda, Anna** Ministry for Foreign Affairs
7. **Buzaglo, Camila** Ministry of Justice
8. **Cullberg, Annika** Left Party
9. **Eldén, Åsa** Feminist Studies in Social Sciences, University of Uppsala
10. **Engström, Stefan** Ministry of Justice
11. **Ertürk, Yakin** UN Special Rapporteur on Violence against Women
12. **Fredriksson, Gabriella** Ministry of Justice
13. **Fritz, Elisabeth** Lawyer, Stockholm
14. **Grutzky, Eduardo** Project Elektra, Fryshuset, Stockholm
15. **Hammarstedt, Tina** Ministry of Industry, Employment and Communications
16. **Hoffman, Ulla** Left Party of Sweden
17. **Hunt, Jacqui** Equality Now
18. **Javaheri, Alireza** Ministry for Foreign Affairs
19. **Johansson, Eva Lotta** Ministry of Justice
20. **Johansson, Kajsa** Ministry of Industry, Employment and Communications
21. **Johansson, Lasse** County Administrative Board of Västra Götaland
22. **Johnsson-Latham, Gerd** Ministry for Foreign Affairs
23. **Jönsson, Mona** Green Party of Sweden
24. **Klum, Anita** Network against Violence against Women in the Name of Honour
25. **Lindahl, Katarina** National Swedish Association for Sexual Information

- | | |
|--------------------------------------|---|
| 26. Lindberg, Maria | County Administrative Board of Skåne |
| 27. Lindberg, Urban | Ministry of Health and Social Affairs |
| 28. Lindblom, Anna-Karin | Ministry of Justice |
| 29. Linde, Vysse | Ceifo – Centre for Research in International Migration and Ethnic Relations – University of Stockholm |
| 30. Lundberg, Helena | Green Party of Sweden |
| 31. Mjörnell, Rigmor | Network against Violence against Women in the Name of Honour |
| 32. Mårtensson, Carina | Ministry for Foreign Affairs |
| 33. Nujen, Debbi (Devrim) | Government's Expert Group for Girls at Risk |
| 34. Odebäck, Anna | Ministry of Justice |
| 35. Pekgöl, Nalin | National Federation of Social Democratic Women in Sweden |
| 36. Rashidi, Maria | Activist |
| 37. Rizvi, Javeria | Network Terrafem, Stockholm |
| 38. Reyes, Maria Pilar | County Administrative Board of Stockholm |
| 39. Sahgal, Gita | Amnesty International |
| 40. Sahlin, Mona | Minister for Democracy, Gender Equality Policy and Integration Issues |
| 41. Sen, Purna | CIMEL/INTERIGHTS |
| 42. Siddiqui, Hannana | Southall Black Sisters, London |
| 43. Svensson, Annelie | Swedish Federation for Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender Rights |
| 44. Söderbergh, Carl | Amnesty International, Swedish Section |
| 45. Sörman-Nath, Ylva | SIDA – Swedish International Development Authority |
| 46. Wikan, Unni | Professor of Social Anthropology, University of Oslo |
| 47. Woodford-Berger, Prudence | Ministry for Foreign Affairs |
| 48. Zackari, Gunilla | Ministry of Education and Science |
| 49. Åhré Älgamo, Kickis | National Criminal Investigation Department |
| 50. Ålund, Aleksandra | Department of Ethnic Studies, Linköping University |
| 51. Ölvebro, Hans | National Criminal Investigation Department |



REGERINGSKANSLIET

Justitiedepartementet