STEP IN! BE ACTIVE AGAINST RACIST PROPAGANDA AND HATE SPEECH ONLINE

Report of the study session held by
UNITED for Intercultural Action
in co-operation with the
European Youth Centre of the Council of Europe

European Youth Centre Strasbourg
9 – 15 December 2012

STEP IN! BE ACTIVE AGAINST RACIST PROPAGANDA AND HATE SPEECH ONLINE

Report of the study session held by
UNITED for Intercultural Action
in co-operation with the
European Youth Centre of the Council of Europe

European Youth Centre Strasbourg
9 – 15 December 2012

Table of Contents

SUMMARY

The study session brought together 37 participants from 21 countries, using a variety of non-formal education methods in three stages, namely:
- *Knowledge*: understanding racism as a serious problem across Europe and the mechanisms of prejudice through conceptualizing and sharing experiences.
- *Recognition* of situations leading to hate speech online.
- *Reaction:* exploring different possible forms of intervention, and developing action plans, strategies and synergies.

The programme integrated many topics, as hate speech online cannot be isolated from offline manifestations, but used as a prism to explore the mechanisms of racism and hate. Participants learned that the online world is not distinctive from the "real" world; it is merely a reflection of that same society. When the prejudices that exist offline seep onto the Internet however, it is subject to new codes and behaviours, identified through discussions as;
- Certain racist attitudes and thoughts can be more easily expressed online than in public, where others may consider in unacceptable or inappropriate.
- We all hold prejudices, which we may not recognise as discrimination. When these are expressed online, they become more amplified through; reposting and sharing on social media; anonymity online affords lack of accountability and consequence; sharing and liking on social media builds group relations, collective identities and individual self-confidence.
- Hate speech online is difficult to monitor and take action on; it is user generated, connected across multiple platforms and is hidden behind privacy settings.
- The widespread illusion of hate speech online as "jokes" and "banter" makes combating it difficult among young people; the lack of direct contact means they do not see the harmful effect it has on victims.

The group teased out the central conflict between hate speech and freedom of speech. When hate speech can prevent targeted communities from realising multiple human rights, both directly and indirectly, limits to free speech can be identified. Hate speech was found to impact on; right to equality; freedom from discrimination, right to life, liberty and personal security, right to marriage and family, freedom of belief and religion, right of peaceful assembly and association, right to education and right to participate in the cultural life of community among others, whilst the freedom of expression must be protected, as must others.

Governments in particular are faced with difficulties in governing and regulating this online terrain at both national and international level. Some difficulties are related to the following aspects:
- there is no internationally agreed definition of hate speech
- governments have much less technological authority than they used to; online technology empowers individuals, and state structures have been slow to adapt
- The solutions for combating right-wing extremism cannot lie in blocking access to platforms and cutting off their communication; individuals and informal networks are much more fluid and effective at responding to change than the state. It is therefore important to understand the nature of interaction and communication of groups spreading hate speech online.
- Legislation against hate speech could be complemented by placing the onus on internet service providers (ISPs), who could govern the internet by a contract and terms of service. However, privatising governance entails a lack of transparency.

Now that the complexities of combating hate speech had been mapped out, the group arrived at a solution; a combination of legislation, harmonised terms of service and active citizens.

There are five main options for **reporting** hate speech;
- Criminal complaint
- Request for removal of content to the author
- Notification of illegal/hateful content to the administrator of site

- Notification of illegal/hateful content to internet service provider
- Notification of complaints bureau - INACH[1], INHOPE[2]

The most appropriate option is dependant on whether the content is hosted in your own country (and is therefore subject to national legislation) or internationally. It is vital to include a copy of the legislation as evidence of its illegality. Participants were walked through each option and found and reported cases of hate speech online.

Engaging with those who spread hate speech online is tricky. It does not work to be confrontational and angry. Some good practice emerged from research on the psychology of such groups, as follows:
- People seek out others who share their opinion online, creating an echo chamber where that opinion intensifies and radicalises. Simply being there and calmly disagreeing triggers some group members to question their views.
- If your presence is interpreted as trying to convert them, they reject you.
- The more you shut people up, block them or remove their posts, the more radical they become as they feel persecuted further.
- Answer hostile posts in a neutral way. This immediately disallows extremists to dominate the public space. By answering the question or statement you also send a message that the opponent is worthy of your time.
- Once you have engaged them, highlight the irrational parts of their arguments. Your contribution should make them question their process of thinking, rather than the ideology as this creates an "us versus them" relation.
- It is important to engage safely and protect your personal data. The group developed tips for ensuring privacy online.

To **campaign** for human rights, respect and equality online, participants devised an online flash mob to mark the date 12.12.12, by making a short video #logoutofhate. Brainstorming on the content highlighted good practice in international campaigning;
- visual content attracts more attention
- focusing on the visual communication minimises language challenges
- the audience should not be overloaded with messages and information; one clear message will be most effective
- positive messages encourage involvement of others

The group also made recommendations for the Council of Europe campaign
- The campaign video presents a very narrow view of hate speech (told through the speakers) and needs a broader pan-European perspective that can appeal across different countries and their situations.
- The logo (Hate me 2) will escalate hate. As activists, our job of trying to encourage people to take part in the campaign will be harder as a result of this. Teachers and youth-workers will be put off by the logo.
- Activists in the no hate speech movement should develop ideas for how the campaign could be simultaneously launched in 47 countries.
- If the logo remains, a clear strategy for connecting the audience to further information clarifying the message needs to be developed.

---

[1] http://www.inach.net/
[2] http://www.inhope.org/gns/home.aspx

INTRODUCTION TO THE FRAMEWORK OF THE STUDY SESSION

Aims and objectives

The overall aim was to sensitise, motivate and enable young people to recognise and step in when they witness a situation where racism, discrimination and hate speech are spread online. The concrete objectives were:

-        participants are becoming aware that intolerant thinking, racist assaults and hate speech are widespread and that they can be confronted with it in their everyday life

-        participants get to know how to recognise situations in which racism, discrimination and hate speech are spread online

-        participants get to know and can apply possible options to react in a situation in which racism, discrimination and hate speech occur online

Participant profile

Both the 5 preparatory team members and 32 participants were selected to reflect geographic and cultural diversity in Europe, with a gender and age balance; their average was 26 years. Participants were activists from antiracist, antifascist, refugee, human rights, minority rights organisations or active in grassroots work. This included:
-        Leaders and representatives of youth organisations or groups working against racism, discrimination, hate speech and in online environments
-        Representatives of national and international organisations active in human rights
-        Youth workers and educators working against hate speech, racism, for human rights and with online technologies
-        Bloggers and online human rights activists.

Participants were also prioritised who offered the potential to;
-        Be multipliers, channelling new skills, knowledge and contacts back to their own organisations and communities
-        Represent a broad spectrum of sectors and working fields to maximise diversity of skills, perspectives and experience

Special effort was made to include youth from minority, marginalised and disadvantaged backgrounds, such as Roma, Muslim, LGBT and migrant communities. The selection of participants from 21 countries created a strong intercultural working environment.

Overall topic and main content

The topic of the study session was racism and hate speech, their manifestations online, especially among youth, and how to spot it and stop it.

There are multiple manifestations of racism and hate online, ranging from the hate sites of extreme-right and neo-nazi groups to racist "jokes" on social media pages.

Issues discussed

-        Racism in Europe; experiences and perceptions from participants' own countries, available statistics and data
-        Bullying and racism among young people

- Relationship between online and offline racism
- Perpetrators of hate speech; who they are, understanding online radicalism, how governments (struggle to) deal with them
- E-governance and legal tools for combating hate speech online
- Hate speech within a human rights framework; its impact on victims
- Hate speech vs. freedom of expression; the limits of free speech
- Mechanisms and tools for reporting and removing hate speech online
- Intervening in hate speech online and engaging with perpetrators; how to construct counterarguments
- Privacy and security online
- Online campaigning; planning a campaign, free online tools, video-editing, planning online flash mobs
- "Young people combating hate speech online" Council of Europe campaign
- Developing projects and action plans for combating hate speech online

Background

The rise of the Internet and especially the creation of new media platforms and social networks have made a drastic change in how the world and our societies function. They provide powerful tools to activists for information sharing, campaigning and networking, but there are also risks and threats to online space; hate speech is becoming increasingly common, users are discriminated against and victimised in online communities, and there are multiple security and data protection issues when using such tools.

UNITED is a network of over 550 organisations across Europe, active against racism, fascism, nationalism and in support of refugees and migrants. All of these offer experience, expertise and strategies to combat racial discrimination and hate. This study session sought to bring these different organisations together on a common platform to develop a body of knowledge on the specificities of hate in the online world, share good practices and develop new strategies for counteracting this relatively new phenomenon.

The study session was conceived against the background of needing to equip young people with the knowledge, skills and competences to combat the rise of hate online, both by taking action against such manifestations, and being active in expressing an alternative vision of the Internet environment; one of inclusion and respect. Rather than merely lobbying for states to regulate Internet use, it seeks to involve and empower youth in making the online space a safe space for all.

PROGRAMME INPUTS AND OUTCOMES

The three objectives formed the flow of the programme; awareness of racism, recognition of how racism and hate speech are spread, and ability to react and intervene

Stage 1: understanding racism as a serious problem across Europe and the mechanisms of prejudice through conceptualizing and sharing experiences
Stage 2: situations leading to hate speech online
Stage 3: exploring different possible forms of intervention, and developing action plans, strategies and synergies

The flow firmly anchored hate speech online within the broader phenomenon of racism, bringing in racism and hate speech in offline spaces with the aim of contextualising hate speech online.

State of Play: Racism in Europe

The phenomena of racism and discrimination across Europe vary; their manifestations and targets depend on local or national situations. Sharing experiences and perspectives allows us to highlight common trends;

- The targets of racism are often Roma communities, labour migrants (mainly from Eastern Europe), Muslims and Jews, LGBT communities and linguistic minorities.

- Mass media and politicians' speeches are based on stereotypes, which fuel fear towards these groups

- There is a close connection between the socio-economic stability and level of racism and xenophobia within a country, where prejudice and hate grows during increasing competition over jobs and welfare.

- Victims and discriminated groups remain less visible and vocal, they are not in a strong position to stand up for themselves.

- Effective institutional responses to racism are lacking in each country.

- Many people hide their racist attitudes and thoughts in public, in order to be "polite". They may also harbour racist ideas that they are unaware of, such as prejudices. When these un/conscious attitudes start to be expressed online, they are given the perfect breeding ground to get stronger and louder.

DEREX Index[3] compares tendencies and manifestations of racism across Europe by looking at social attitudes. Some key findings from the data are;

- In comparing Western and Eastern Europe; whilst the frequency of holding strong right-wing values is almost twice as much in Eastern than Western Europe, there is hardly any difference between the regularity of prejudice held.
- In Western and Central Europe, DEREX showed that from 2000-2008, France, Greece, Hungary and Slovakia have gained more supporters of the extreme-right, whilst numbers decreased in Belgium and Switzerland.

---

[3] see http://www.riskandforecast.com/post/in-depth-analysis/attitude-radicals-in-hungary-in-international-context_734.html

When presenting respondents with statements gives further insight into prejudices held across Europe, like

"There are too many migrants in my country"
About half of respondents agreed with this. Numbers were particularly high in Britain (62%) and Hungary (59%) even though White British people make up 83% of their population, and native Hungarians make up 96% of theirs

"There is a natural hierarchy of Black and White"
Around a third of respondents believed this statement was true, the highest being 61% in France

"Jews have too much influence in my country"
Almost half of Poles and 69% of Hungarians thought this was true, compared with 6% in the Netherlands.

"Muslims make too many demands in my country"
Over 50% of all respondents agreed, apart from 34% in Portugal. That figure reached 65% in Italy

"Women should take their role as wives and mothers more seriously"
There was an exceedingly varied response; over 80% agreed in Poland, whilst in the Netherlands it was less than half.

Hate crime and hate speech are manifestations of racism. Hate crime is understood as needing two elements; the act committed is a criminal offence, and perpetrator intended to target someone with a protected characteristic (ethnicity, religion, sexual preference etc). Some findings from the different records collected include:

- According to the Fundamental Rights Agency (FRA) racist crime in all EU countries except Czech Republic increased in 2000-2008. Denmark had the highest rise of 88%.

- Roma and Sub-Saharan African groups were the most consistently attacked (FRA)

Looking deeper at the data collected, it becomes clear they cannot be taken at face value. Some reasons for inconsistency and inaccuracy include;

- data is not collected
- data is not made public
- different definitions (e.g. of hate crime) exist between countries
- many agencies contribute to data collection
- crimes are not reported by victims, because they believe nothing will change, it is the norm for them, they did not know how to go about reporting, or they feared the consequences.

It is even more difficult to accurately collect data on hate speech as it is defined even more differently across countries. Furthermore, hate speech online is hard to monitor as online content is largely user-generated, aggregated, appears in different forms and takes place in the form of private messages or behind security settings. A study of people's experiences however showed that 78% of respondents had encountered hate speech online (Simon Wiesenthal 2011[4])

---

[4] see
http://www.wiesenthal.com/site/apps/nlnet/content2.aspx?c=lsKWLbPJLnF&b=4441467&ct=9141065#.UZkibetXtsM

Outcomes and learning points

Racism and hate speech are prevalent at all levels of society and across all European countries. The online space, whilst offering different forms of communication for society and stimulating changes to the way we engage with each other, clearly reflects attitudes and values that exist offline.

There is a lack of accountability on online space as it is anonymous, people can say things online they would never say offline.

Social media has become a strong tool for people, especially youth, to build their identity and feel belonging to different social groups. Affirmation (such as "liking', reposting and sharing) builds confidence and acceptance.

Social media has a multiplying effect, reposting and sharing increases the audience of racism and hate

Viral content, such as photos and videos, portray prejudices and stereotypes as humour. Objection to jokes on the grounds of discrimination are unpopular.

Monitoring and reporting systems for hate crime and hate speech need to significantly improve. Authorities should collect more comprehensive data, victims and witnesses need to be informed on how to report incidents, and encouragement to do so.

Impact and effect: Why does hate speech matter?

Young people and bullying

Young people constitute a vulnerable group and need to be nurtured through growing up; schools should offer a safe environment yet the risk of bullying and hate is omnipresent because there are so many different people from a diverse cross-section of society. Between children and young people, there are three main levels of ridicule, resulting in varying levels of harm.

-Teasing: practical jokes, not (intended to be) offensive, can be affectionate. Teasing rarely refers to race, religion, sexuality.
-Bullying: more offensive, mean-spirited, is an everyday reality for school children, intends to harm, mock or ridicule a person, relies and reinforces a power relation.
-Hate speech: recognized by law, a form of communication that discriminates another, usually for a protected characteristic such as race, ethnicity, religion, sexuality etc.

There are thin lines between these levels; the difference between teasing and bullying is commonly believed to be the intention of the perpetrator. However, if the person being teased feels victimised and bullied by it, the intention is not so important.

We can identify four main forms of bullying:
1. Verbal
2. Physical
3. Internet-based
4. Ignoring, thievery (a more passive form)

As a generalization, certain forms of bullying are common of certain groups;
-Girls: use words and name-calling, gossiping, and exclusion through whispering and secrets
-Boys: violence, threatening

-Adults: ridiculing people in social situations. The hierarchy of a workplace enables bullying through gossiping, aggression, blame and intimidation. Managers can be bullies.

Therefore, hate speech is just one manifestation of bullying. Bullying is not just a concern for the victim and perpetrator, but bystanders play an important role. Their inaction allows bullying to persist and get stronger. As NGO activists, youth workers and educators, participants were taught the telltale signs of bullying among young people, and shown possibilities for intervention.
It is important to remember that a lot of kids do not admit to bullying or being bullied.

Warning signs of an issue:
not going to school; making excuses to stay at home e.g. illness
not talking about school, no contact with classmates outside of school time
poor academic performance, concentration problems and possibly experiencing nightmares

If left unaddressed, it can lead to lifeless behaviour, withdrawal, physical pain and sickness, bruising, damaged belongings, and self-harm and suicide.

Cyberbullying
This relates to harassment that relies on new information and communication technologies and ranges from SMS or email insults or threats, circulating embarrassing photos, spreading rumours online, hacking someone's accounts or intentionally transmitting a virus.

Steps for intervention

It is necessary to act quickly. The longer you wait, the higher the risk of depression, substance abuse, and an escalating cycle of hate speech are results.

-Fix the problem by offering counselling to the victim and contacting authority figures in the school; a principle, teacher or in-school counsellor
-For the perpetrator, it is necessary to identify the root of aggression/hate and its effects. Make them aware of the criminality of hate speech if it applies.
- However difficult it must be, take an open approach to engage with the perpetrator so that you can work together to fix the problem; it makes no sense to ban them from using the Internet, as this equals isolating them– detrimental at that age.

A preventative approach to hate speech is also necessary to tackle the root of the problem, so build your awareness of hate speech sites to know what those groups are saying, and what arguments, myths and stereotypes they use. There are a number of hate videos online, anti-Israel and anti-Islam for example – know your enemy. Whilst some audiences can clearly identify them as propaganda, children and young people are susceptible to them; many young people have never met someone from other cultures or religions, so hate speech manipulates their opinions.

Hate speech and human rights

When looked at through their eyes of victims and targeted communities, hate speech can be found to violate multiple human rights;

Art. 1. Right to equality
Art.2. Freedom from discrimination
Art. 3. Right to life, liberty and personal security
Art.12. Freedom from Interference with Privacy, Family, Home and Correspondence
Art 16. Right to Marriage and Family
Art 18. Freedom of Belief and Religion
Art.19. Freedom of Opinion and Information
Art. 20. Right of Peaceful Assembly and Association
Art. 23. Right to Desirable Work and to Join Trade Unions

Art. 26 Right to Education
Art. 27 Right to Participate in the Cultural Life of Community
Art. 30 Freedom from state or personal interference in the above rights

Human rights clash in most examples of hate speech;

e.g. Nazis demonstrating outside a Synagogue
Freedom of religion vs freedom of assembly

e.g. Beenie Man and other dancehall stars rapping homophobic lyrics
Freedom of expression vs freedom from discrimination.

Defining exactly what hate speech is has proven to be a huge challenge for all those working on the topic; and whether the distinction is in the intention or the effect. An exercise finding possible examples of offensive speech raised the following questions:
- Are sexist jokes hate speech?
- Finding the element of hate is subjective, so can hate be identified with certainty amidst so much ambiguity?
- At what point do jokes and banter become hate speech?

Answering these questions leads us to the core conflict between hate speech, freedom of expression and art. In fact, there is no accepted definition of hate speech as different countries have different legislation on the topic; for example in the United Kingdom hate speech must include incitement to violence.

Human rights based approaches help us to understand the impact that hate speech can have on victims, as individuals and communities. If left untreated, hate speech can fuel a cycle of hate where anger, resentment and fear escalate. This has a destructive impact on society as a whole.

Anger – towards the perpetrator, or the perceived perpetrator
Resentment – towards a society, including the police and state, that does not effectively respond to, investigate and prosecute perpetrators
Fear – which they, their families and friends are unsafe and will be attacked again.

Legal   instruments
International instruments for combating hate speech exist, but need to be used responsibly and may therefore be subject to certain restrictions.
One legal tool is *UN International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (1966)*; the freedom of speech remains at the top of the "rights-hierarchy pyramid" since it affects widely other rights. Propaganda should be prohibited, as should advocating national, racial or religious hatred that constitutes   incitement   to   discrimination,   hostility   or   violence.
Article 19 of the ICCPR, paragraph 3 announces few exceptions permitted only to protect the rights of the others, public security, health, order and morals. Still, these exceptions apply very rarely. Article 19 was only applied twice last year, once in WG Party vs. Canada[5], because WG was spreading hate speech via telephone. The other case was Vassalari and others vs. Greece relating to a hate pamphlet against Roma people, but this case was dismissed. Article 20, which relates to prohibiting   propaganda,   has   never   applied.
Another legal tool is UN's Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Racial Discrimination (1966). Article 4 condemns propaganda and theories about racial superiority of one race. It also prohibits organisations from spreading this, and public authorities or public institutions are not allowed to promote discrimination. The state must investigate complaints of this nature, identify and prosecute the perpetrators and guarantee an effective remedy to the victims and their family members. In many cases unfortunately the state does not investigate hate crimes properly, partly because the police don't have the protocol in place.

---

[5] see http://www.article19.org/resources.php/resource/3237/en/hrc:-j.r.t.-and-the-w.g.-party-v.-canada

Outcomes and learning points

Whilst many of the characteristics of bullying apply to cyberhate, it is distinctive because;

-the perpetrator can easily remain anonymous
-the bullying can be persistent as it does not require a face-to-face encounter. Cyberbullying does not stop at the front door.
-the message (or act of bullying) can remain indefinitely online, accessible to huge audiences
-the perpetrator cannot see how hurtful his/her actions are, It is easier to underestimate or even ignore the damage that can be caused.

Whilst adults, parents and educators may be unsure how to handle newer forms of bullying, threat and intimidation, blocking access is only a short-term solution. The internet is now fundamental part of human interaction and social relationships.
Stopping young people's social interaction is not an option; they need to learn *how* to use it.

Hate propaganda can be characterised by;
- generalisations of homogenous cultures
- depicting "the other" as *naturally* barbaric and violent
- illusion of scientific evidence
- heroism by protecting liberal "Western" values of freedom, democracy and equality

Case studies of hate speech and its impact on targeted communities clearly shows that it can both directly and indirectly violate multiple social, economic, civic and cultural rights, as on the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Studying hate speech will always involve assessment of which human rights clash, and weighing up which should take priority.

Looking up: governments and policy

Governments talk about the internet and the "real world" as if they are two different places, when in fact they are not far from each other. Reports an

A recent Pan European survey[6] of thousands of people linked to far right wing parties online showed us that 1 in 5 carried out offline actions, proving that there is a linkage between online and offline behaviour. Over 25% believed that the act of violence was justifiable, and surprisingly, participants believed that political participation is necessary, contrary to popular belief that racists are disengaged from politics. This survey clearly proved that the online reality matters.

The online world is different, yet equally important. The challenges faced in regulating and understanding this space can be exhibited in a number of ways;

-A recent study showed that just under half of children bring obvious propaganda into the classroom that was so extreme teachers found difficult to address – many say this occurs monthly.

-The amount of technological power, as in the amount of autonomous capacity we can get from technology, has increased so much that the distance between state and citizen is marginal. As a comparison, in the 1950s the government had space programs to launch rockets to space at the same time as their citizens were getting their first refrigerators, but now private individuals can fly into space; the power balance has shifted away from the state and in favour of the ordinary person. Governments, as large bureaucratic structures, take a lot longer to employ, adapt and respond to

---

6 "The New Face of Digital Populism", Demos (2011)
http://www.demos.co.uk/files/Demos_OSIPOP_Book-web_03.pdf?1320601634

this technological transformation. For this reason, laws to govern the online space are not in place; the tools to fight online problems are yet to be created, rendering states as merely reactive.

-In the summer of 2011, riots in England were organised via social media and senior ministers could only respond by shutting down the platforms that messages were being spread through. This tactic is more Syrian in nature; there is a danger that governments will shut down groups at the push of a button but there needs to be due process for their suppression.

Who is behind hate speech online?

The vast majority of people in radical groups on the internet are young males, but studies show that people involved in this extreme-right hate speech are no more likely to be less educated and unemployed. This is important as there is a common misperception that hate speech is underpinned by economic reasons; these narratives are in general false assumptions - this is about identity, cohesion, and a strong ideology of the state.

Communication and understanding is imperative, here are some key points from research conducted in this field, which are focused in two streams: *how people act online* and *how the internet affects us.*

Case study;
A US governmental study on 9/11 conspiracy theorists found;
-People twisted the information they sought to fit their ideas.
-Numerology is used as logic.
-It was common to attribute a conspiracy theory to a left wing agenda.
-Almost all radical groups play into a conspiracy theory, and shape information to create truths
During the study, researchers did not change one theorist's mind; they had no idea how to communicate with them.

Internet governance: the work of the Council of Europe

The complexities governments face in trying to govern the internet was confirmed when learning about the work of the Council of Europe in e-governance. How can human rights be implemented on the internet? This relates to the central dilemma between free speech and hate speech. Deciding what can and cannot be posted in the Internet, and justifying a violation to the freedom of expression, is the constant challenge. Censorship is rarely effective, and in this case, meets numerous further complexities.

The Internet is so global, which is unique for governance; if you break a window in Strasbourg, you're doing it in France and therefore French constitution applies – unlike acts online. As there is not even an internationally agreed definition for hate speech (it varies from country to country), it also will vary whether it is illegal or not. Hate speech is also problematic due to the subjectivity of its interpretation by the receiver or audience; drawing a line between jokes, offensive or verbal abuse, and hate speech is difficult.

Redefining "Media"

Our understanding of media is changing and includes a broader spectrum of activities, for example blogging. Blogs are now a popular way to share information, but in their distinct difference to traditional news forms, but they bring into question accuracy, reliability and bias. This in fact asks us to question our understanding of what constitutes reliable and accurate news. Do professional journalism, data checking, validation and clearance by senior editors make mainstream news more reliable? News sources can never be neutral. Unofficial media, such as social media in the case of the Arab spring, takes a different yet important role, providing faster, almost immediate news from

the ground before it could go through the stages required by professional journalism. In the media too, the gap between the official and the citizen has closed in. In this context, how can a law distinguish between the voice of the media and that of the individual? We had to once again discover, that the internet is a blurry dimension, somehow very public and very private at the same time.

Media pluralism should be embraced, professional journalism is still required as the credibility and rigour of source- and fact-checking is essential for news, whereas social media democratises news through sharing personal experiences, opinions, ideas, beliefs. Whilst it enhances news, neutrality of those experiencing a certain situation is far away from neutral.

Finding a way through the maze: possible solutions

In spite of the Internet being outside the geographical state boundaries, that is not an excuse to refrain from trying to make some common regulations. The online space is not dissimilar to air; pollution created in one place travels across borders and there is no central authority to deal with this.

Reframing the problem within a human rights context, our rights apply on the internet, as in any other space, for example incitement to hostility or violence is prohibited by law, as is the dissemination of ideas on racial superiority or hatred and racial discrimination. The conflict between rights is omnipresent; dignity and equality versus freedom to express/exchange ideas.

There have been discussions of additional protocol to the convention on cybercrime[7] that would concern criminalisation of acts of a racist and xenophobic nature. This proposal faces a number of complexities for the jurisdiction; there is risk of misuse or abuse of this criminalisation. Finding out the identity of the person behind the computer will be difficult, even when his/her IP is known, how can you prove that person conducted that crime?

One possible suggestion to navigating this disunity is to consider Internet use as a service; there has to be a server, a provider and the internet could then be governed by the contract, terms of service, service agreement and acceptable use policy.
This suggestion has pros and cons; it is a speedier process, vast volume of content could be monitored, and if terms of service are harmonized, this offers a viable deterrent. However, the use of vague language in the policy and contract, and the privatisation of decision-making processes; lack of review mechanism, decisions on the nature of content and its removal are reached in a non-transparent process, is obviously a concern.

Outcomes and learning points

- The anti-terrorism sectors of governments do not know how to handle the internet yet; legislation is being made on gut instinct and on precedent.

-The online space is so unmapped that we need to create new ways to fight hate speech from a completely fresh perspective.

- The solutions for combating right-wing extremism cannot lie in blocking access to platforms and cutting off their communication; individuals and informal networks are much more fluid and effective at responding to change than the state.

- It is important to understand the nature of interaction and communication of these groups;

---

[7] http://conventions.coe.int/Treaty/en/Treaties/Html/189.htm

-When we socially interact, we group ourselves by seeking out people who agree with us.
-We seek out this corroboration significantly more online than offline, because here we have absolute freedom to ignore those other views, ideas and diversity more generally without consequence.
-Within a closed environment, agreement between individuals creates an echo chamber; where the repeated view or sentiment results in the original becoming more extreme.
-Pockets of online radicalism are in general extremely isolated. They do not have contact with information they do not trust and are therefore incredibly restricted from what information they take in.
-30% of people in radical groups do not trust any governmental institution, and they are mistrustful of people who leave their group; credibility is key to engaging.
-The image of heroic truth tellers is a core narrative and needs to be recognised.
-Each group has their specific conspiracy theories, we need to know the theory and the information it is based on if we want to make contact.

In assessing the many possibilities for combating hate speech, we arrive at a solution; a combination of legislation, harmonised terms of service and active citizens.

Looking in the Mirror: Reacting to hate speech online

Reporting

One response to hate speech is to report it. The concrete steps include finding the registrar, contacting service providers and those circulating hate speech. It is a useful strategy to provide legislation documents to them; many times the person or organisation is not aware of the illegality – providing legal evidence and technical terms often scares them into taking action.

The first step is always to evaluate the content and then select one of the main five strategies accordingly;

- Criminal complaint
- Request for removal of content to the author
- Notification of illegal/hateful content to Administrator of site
- Notification of illegal/hateful content to internet service provider
- Notification of complaints bureau - INACH, INHOPE

Fundamental criteria to guide your decision is whether the content in question is on the internet as a web page, blog, audiovisual recording or a post on the social network (Myspace, Facebook, and other social networks) and if it is on a domain hosted in your national state or abroad.

If the content is hosted on your national server (you can tell as the domain ends with a country code) the procedure is easier as both identifying the author and communications with all stakeholders is less complicated. Moreover, in this case there is no problem with proving the illegality of the proceedings as for any content placed on the domain extension, national legislation applies. However, authors of hateful content are aware of this fact and therefore content that violates applicable legislation is often placed in a large majority of cases on servers located abroad.

In all cases, regardless of where the content is located, it must be documented and saved it for future reference.

How to Backup

It is very important to create a local copy of each case of the cyberhate that we want to address,

because it is possible that the person who posted the original comment, video etc., removes as soon as they become aware of any proceedings, and thus destroy the evidence of its existence.

There are a number of programmes and ways to backup the entire website, such as *Get Left* http://sourceforge.net/projects/getleftdown/files/latest/download)

Usually it is not necessary to backup the entire website, but only certain content.

Backup videos from portals like YouTube with a download helper program https://addons.mozilla.org/en-US/firefox/addon/video-downloadhelper/ or similar, *addon* can create a local copy of the video.

Backup a particular statement or comment in the debate, the easiest way to do this is the print screen - click on this title located in the upper right corner of the keyboard. Save a copy of your current view and run any graphics program, e.g. MS Paint (drawing). Ctrl + opens the file in the observed state of the screen and it is possible to edit, crop etc.

1) Criminal complaint
Criminal complaint is the appropriate course of action when dealing with cases that; store extensive materials (website), is a repeated action of individuals (blogs), or the activity of an organised group.

2) Request for removal of content to the author
The second option against cyberhate is to contact the author and ask him/her to remove his/her comments, posts and statements. It is worth stating what criminal law was violated in their statements and warn them of the potential legal consequences of their actions.

This approach can be effective in the case of persons, whose ideology is not clear-cut and the threat of prosecution is intimidating. The anonymous nature of the Internet, however, reduces the real impact of such action.

3) Notification of objectionable content to administrator
In the event that the notice does not bring the desired effect, for if various reasons that was not possible, communication starts with the website administrator. If the domain where such content is hosted is national, the procedure is simple - after finding the contact address, just write an email giving them all relevant information. It is essential to restate the quote, provide a link to the place where it is and refer to the part of their legislation or terms of service that was breached.

To find the contact:
1. open http://whois.domaintools.com/
2. In the search field on the page, write the name of the website
3. The results should show who the domain registrar is, who are the operators, their contacts, and other data.

In the case of foreign domains follow the procedure described in the next section.

4) Reporting content to ISPs
If the website administrator does not respond, you can contact the provider - the company which provides space on their servers for websites hosting such objectionable content. In most cases however, administrators fulfil requests for content removal if it is illegal.

Foreign domains
1. open a page with service whois: http://whois.domaintools.com/
2. find who is the registrar and where a particular page is hosted
3. If the registrar of domain is a real person, this information is very important for possible criminal prosecution as well as the next steps.

4. Given that registrars often prefer to protect their anonymity, they use companies that register domains instead of them. Therefore sometimes it is impossible to ascertain the individual registrar that way.
5. Regardless of whether you managed to find a domain registrar or not, you need to check whether the provider's rules contain references to the nature of content, such as if inciting hatred is illegal. These rules are often called Terms of Service (ToS), or Acceptable use policy. It is necessary to locate the word "hate" within these Terms or policies. Usually, the provider reserves the right to assess a particular page against these rules.
6. Next step is to write an email to the provider, stating breach of ToS by the author of that content.

If the content is on a second level domain, it is necessary to examine the ToS or AUP service at which the content is hosted, e.g. Wordpress
1. find out the address of the parent service
2. Identify ToS or AUP and see whether it contains anything on hateful or illegal content.
3. If the content falls within one of these definitions, write an email to the administrator, or report objectionable content.

Social Networks
Social Networks allow for quick and easy sharing of content that is not subject to control or administration at the time of posting. Their importance in the last few years has grown exponentially.

Facebook contains many groups, events, photos, meeting the definition of cyberhate. In order to handle such huge amounts of information and requests for removal, Facebook has generated the Reporting System. Below is the example of the notification procedure:

1. Do the print screen of a particular post/group/picture
2. Click on the options
3. Select one of the options - Harassing a friend or hate speech or symbol.
4. Ask your friends on Facebook to do the same

Facebook evaluates how many requests for removal a particular post, picture, video receives, and depending on the number of requests, administrators decide whether to delete it or not.

YouTube
1. Backup your video with download helper
2. to record video to an electronic database
3. to check whether the same user has uploaded similar videos
4. Report video(s) as offensive.

5. Report to complaints bureau
INACH/ INHOPE has a network of national offices tasked with collecting and dealing with complaints related to hate-inciting or illegal content on the internet.

Useful links:
whois.net
http://www.networksolutions.com/
whois.domaintools.com
inach.net
inhope.org

Engaging with hate speech

A more positive approach to combating hate speech could also be engaging with groups and individuals, entering into dialogue to change their behaviour.

Approaching, for example radical groups, can be tricky as often they process information so that it supports their previous views (just like the conspiracy theorists case study showed us).

The online world enables users to encounter more radical content and groups more easily than they could offline; joining a Facebook group is an effortless and everyday occurrence for many young people, but imagine the similar situation in "real life": hardly any of them would go to a neo-nazi's door asking to enter. In order to combat these people we need to learn how they think and act.

Security online

There is significantly more data available on the internet than we realize; search engines such as Google only show us approximately 5% of it – the rest is stored on the "deep web".
Even if you delete information, it is very rarely untraceable. Pages such as www.pipl.com pull data from different sources to create profile on us, and your personal data is used for advertising and marketing. In fact, many services on the internet are able to be offered for "free" as your personal data is the currency and it's used to advertise – such as on Facebook.
Frequent changes to the terms of use of such services mean that users do not check and reset their privacy settings each time that happens. Referring to personal information, it is a commonly held belief that one can only know 5 people really well, and around 20 people quite well; when a person has 500 Facebook friends, their level of privacy clearly decreases, and the risk is multiplied through their network of friends.

Outcomes and learning points

NGOs can play an active role in monitoring and reporting hate content. Using the steps above, it is possible to build evidence and prosecute. These steps can also help to collect more reliable and comprehensive data.

When notifying authors, administrators and service providers, it is important that legal terms are used, and legislation is provided.

Engaging with extreme-right groups online needs to be strategic and measured;
- simply being in the public space and saying you do not agree with the radical group abates them. In that way, the echo chamber is broken and triggers some group members to question their views.
- The more you try to persuade somebody onto your "side", the more they harden, even in the face of clear evidence. If your presence is interpreted as trying to convert them, they reject you.
- Talking to just one person within the group helps; when in a closed group, they are not used to encountering someone who disagrees and strikes a conversation with them.
- The more you shut people up, block them or remove their posts, the more radical they become as they feel their narratives and opinions are somehow oppressed, and they feel persecuted further. As they construct their perceptions using cognitive bias, reasoned arguments do not work; they only search for and absorb information that fits with their previous thoughts.
- A good approach would be to answer to hostile posts in a neutral way. This immediately disallows extremists to dominate the public space. By answering the question or statement you also send a message that the opponent is worthy of your time. Furthermore, you challenge them to have conversation with you. It is hard to be angry with someone who is not angry with you, hence the neutrality; you "disarm" them by being nice.

- Once you have engaged them in conversation, highlight the irrational parts of their arguments. Your contribution should make them question their process of thinking, rather than the ideology as this creates an "us versus them" relation.

Research shows that rushing/flooding a chat room or forum with opposition does not work, however if the forum that you are entering could be threatening or somehow unsafe, it is better not to venture alone. This raised the essential question of ensuring safety and security on the Internet.

There is a huge amount of data available on all of us, more than we can see via googling ourselves (this only searches the "surface web"). The following steps will help to protect your personal data;
-combine; use different browsers to "spread out" your behaviour and data, e.g. one for work and another for your personal life.
-similarly, use a combination of different email accounts
-make a clear distinction between your personal life (e.g. your friends and family) and your online activism.
-create an alias if you are reacting to hate speech
-set a strong and different password for each service you use (at lest 12 characters long); change between cases, use numbers and special characters
-use password management software such as *1password*
-encrypt communication using *GPG-mail* or *systemli.org*

Young People Combating Hate Speech Online

To raise awareness of the severity of hate speech online, the participants marked 12.12.12 with an online flash mob. Discussions over the form and content highlighted some good practice in campaigning

- visual content attracts more attention
- focusing on the visual communication minimises language problems and can work internationally
- the audience should not be overloaded with messages and information; one clear message will be most effective
- positive messages encourage involvement of others

The final result was a short video, uploaded onto YouTube and posted across all social media and emails at the time 12.12.12
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=s9WTk6vBmtQ

Online Campaigning

To create videos and other online content, participants collected and shared a list of free tools for each other (full list appendixes)

- N-1 (https://n-1.cc/)
Is a free software platform created in 2011 by activists involved in the 15M movement in Spain. It allows you to create groups for discussion and share webs, videos, pictures… and every kind of document. It is in continuous improvement by their users. Useful and not controlled by any company ;)

- http://recursostic.educacion.es/bancoimagenes/web/
Bank of pictures that you can use for free

- Meograph (http://www.meograph.com/)

Meograph helps easily create, watch, and share interactive stories. The product combines maps, timeline, links, and multimedia to tell stories in context of where and when.

- QR CODES (http://storify.com/cdperiodismo/crea-codigos-qr-desde-tu-navegador)
In this link there are different applications to create a QR Code

- Merlink (http://merlink.me)
Merlink is a web application that lets you customize and manage any public Internet content (RSS, social networks or your own content) like if it would be an online magazine.

- Twitterfall (http://twitterfall.com/)
Twitterfall is a way of viewing the latest 'tweets' of upcoming trends and custom searches on Twitter. Updates fall from the top of the page in near-real-time.

- Freeplaymusic (http://freeplaymusic.com/)
Library of more than 6000 files of different styles.

- GoToMeeting and GoToWebinar (www.gotomeeting.com/ and http://www.gotomeeting.com/fec/webinar)
GoToMeeting is the extremely simple, extraordinarily powerful way to hold unlimited online meetings with up to 25 attendees. Start a meeting and share your screen with just a click.

- Youth Work Online (http://network.youthworkonline.org.uk/)
Community for youth workers & other youth professionals where they can explore digital dimensions of their work. Sponsored by Practical Participation.

- Polldaddy (http://polldaddy.com/)
Create stunning surveys, polls, and quizzes in minutes. Collect responses via your website, e-mail, iPad, Facebook, and Twitter. Generate and share easy-to-read reports.

- Campaign Monitor (http://www.campaignmonitor.com/)
Campaign Monitor makes it easy to attract new subscribers, send them beautiful email Newsletter

- Storify (http://storify.com)
Storify users tell stories by collecting updates from social networks, amplifying the voices that matter to create a new story format that is interactive, dynamic and social. Discover meaningful social media from the best storytellers online, including journalists, bloggers, editors and people like you, too.

Council of Europe Campaign against Hate Speech Online

The introduction and discussion of the Council of Europe campaign gave a deeper understanding of the pretext, context and goals of the campaign;

-The project was supported by young people who are in the Advisory Council, so there was a need from young people to apply human rights to the online space.
-Finding hate speech is easier than recognising human rights violations, but this is about doing both.
-The campaign is not about being nice to each other online, but promoting fighting online action that abuses human rights.
-This is a campaign to promote free speech. We are not going to close websites, but hope that countries criminalise offensive sites.
-Bloggers and online activists are important, but they are not the only participants, there should be offline activities too
-The campaign will be named along the lines of "NoHateSpeech" and aims to;

-Reduce tolerance of hate speech online
        -Map online hate speech
        -Mobilise young people to be active
        -Develop youth participation
        -Promote solidarity between victims and supporters.
- The Campaign is based on action, education, and research and will target civil society, activists and victims.
-It should be decentralised throughout Europe because it needs to be contextualised according to the local situation and language. Therefore national campaign committees are being created who can develop own campaigns, slogans etc.

Outcomes and recommendations

Feedback from young people and other target groups should be sought from the video. It presents a very narrow view of hate speech (told through the speakers) and needs a broader pan-European perspective that can appeal across different countries and their situations.

Videos and tools need to be available in local languages, or not rely so much on English language.

- The logo (Hate me 2) will escalate hate, it will confuse people because they will not have the time to research the concept behind it. Furthermore, as activists, our job of trying to encourage people to take part in the campaign will be harder as a result of this. Teachers and youth-workers will be put off by the logo – we cannot promote this to many people in the target group.
- Activists in the no hate speech movement should develop ideas for how the campaign could be simultaneously launched in 47 countries.
- If the logo remains, a clear strategy for connecting the audience to further information, or an alternative way for them to discover the message of the campaign needs to be developed. It is too risky for the logo to be isolated and taken at face value.

Where to next? Group project Ideas

Having gained a deeper understanding of racism, hate and hate speech online, as well as developed new skills throughout the study session, participants were inspired to initiate their own projects back in their communities and organisations. Working either individually or in groups based on fields of work or regions, the following projects were created, developed, planned and presented. Participants were also encouraged to cooperate on multiple projects to share resources and maximise impact.

1. Establishing hate-speech online monitoring at national level.
This can start from top by working with national ministries, or can start at grassroots level. First, partners from other NGOS, government, and even IGOs should be identified to build a broad network. NGOs and minority NGOs should be supported to research, collect and share data.
The government should be educated of the problem of online hate speech and draft a work plan on possible solutions. Then, engage them in facilitating communication between NGOs and governments.
The Congress of Local and Regional Authorities of the Council of Europe and Steering Committee on Media, Society, and Internet could be useful resources.

2. RRA Creation of an online platform of blogging and other tools to raise awareness of online hate speech.
It will aim to eliminate racism and hate speech in Council of Europe countries through advocacy, lobbying and disseminating information, and mobilizing civil society participation through collaboration and networking
The platform will engage in online monitoring, research and advocacy

3. Regional network of NGOs in Eastern Europe and CIS countries

A one-year action plan to combat hate speech online within the unique context of this region. It comprises one training course for the region, followed by training at national levels for youth leaders with a focus on youth from minority communities. This will be supported by online platform for countries to share experiences with each other.

4. Training course and educational activities to raise awareness of hate speech online

An online seminar targeting youth and children to spread the knowledge gained from the study session. Will feature online games to increase interactivity, and offer tools to help report hate speech in different countries. Therefore there will be country-specific websites, but with opportunities for dialogue, such as through transferring the human library concept to online space. This will link up participants and victims of online hate speech.

The seminar would ideally be six months to match with the student calendar of a semester, and such a platform could be a tool to survey youth on online hate speech.

5. National campaign in Spain

"Voices combating hate speech online"

The main goal is for participants to share learning and multiplying their knowledge.

Will include; training course for different governments, NGOs, and association members to combat hate speech; a forum for intercultural dialogue and finally a campaign against hate speech online.

This will be on the national level through six Movimento Contra La Intolerancia[8] offices across the country, launching on 21 March (Day Against Racism) and finishing on 16 November.

This will create a platform to engage with other members of society (teachers, journalists, and perpetrators), and will offer guidelines for prosecutors and others working in the legal field. The training course will be adapted depending on the target group.

6. International campaign on inter-religious dialogue

This will target organisations working with minority youth, and has proven to be effective in Bosnia and Herzegovina. It aims to introduce intercultural dialogue and communication.

It can be a training course or study session, depending on our partners, and could take place in a European Youth Centre

Would like to work with children outside of school environment, and train them to organize activities in their NGOs and in schools.

7. School work

Use existing contacts in the Georgian education system to deliver formal education workshops in the Caucasus region against hate speech. Will focus on peer education, and may possibly collaborate with the above group, to make use of existing contacts.

8. Online resource centre in social media

A blog, Facebook page or any other platform providing tools and software, alongside training to fight hate speech. It is a platform to promote little-known, simple and innovative tools, which will be listed alongside a description and a link to download (legally).

Hope to be ready by March 2013 in order to be a resource for all Council of Europe countries.

---

[8] http://www.movimientocontralaintolerancia.com/

FINAL CONCLUSIONS

The need for this study session was addressed; participants developed and contributed to a body of knowledge in understanding hate speech online and identified a range of practical ways to counteract it. Through the programme, they became aware, motivated and equipped with skills to recognise and step in when they witness a situation where racism, discrimination and hate speech are spread online.

Revisiting aims and objectives

Participants became increasingly aware that intolerant thinking, racist assaults and hate speech are widespread and that they can be confronted with it in their everyday life.

They gained an overview about racism in Europe; prejudices, victimised and vulnerable communities, trends across different countries, and the way racist thinking manifests; in attitudes and acts of speech and violence.

They were able to understand how the online space relates to society; it reflects the values and beliefs held, but offers an alternative space to express them where the consequences and the interactions are not the same.

They realised data on hate speech online is exceptionally difficult to collect and monitor; it is defined differently across countries, and content is largely user-generated, appears in different forms and is sent privately. However, many online users have been confronted with it, especially young people.

They recognised that hate speech and hate crime isolates and further excludes minorities from society.

They became aware of existing relevant institutions, actors and regulations.

Participants became able to recognise situations in which racism, discrimination and hate speech are spread online

The topic of bullying gave some insight into how hate speech affects young people; the rise of cyberbullying and the impact of hate speech on victims

Using the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, participants learned that hate speech can directly and indirectly violate human rights of the target (or targeted group). They were able to understand the wider consequences of hate speech, and the ensuing limits of free speech.

They realised that legislation, policy and e-governance has been slow to respond to hate speech online, and the reasons why state capacity is limited technologically in comparison to the empowered individual.

The characteristics and behaviours of extreme-right groups online ere discussed, equipping participants with an understanding of how they operate.

Participants learned and could apply possible options to react in a situation in which racism, discrimination and hate speech occur online

They were trained on how to react to hate content through reporting to authors, administrators, service providers and complaints bureaus.

They developed argumentation for engaging with those voicing hate speech; that a non-confrontational, respectful but questioning approach will be best received.

They learnt how to use the Internet safely; protecting their personal data and not compromising their identities or various online accounts.

They shared tips for online activism, and tools for creative campaigning. They put this into practice through creating an online flash mob.

They developed action plans within the frame of the Young People Combating Hate Speech Online campaign, which will take place at both national and international levels.

Recommendations

It is essential that all discussions of hate speech are positioned within a human rights framework, so that an appreciation of the complexities, conflicts and dilemmas in which it needs to be combated is gained. Furthermore, it enables a broader understanding of the consequences and impact of hate speech on individuals, societies and communities.

Practical application of learning using online platforms and technologies is essential for developing their online activism competences. Wider and innovative options to incorporate these into non-formal education methodologies should be developed.

The main learning points from the study session indicate that the capacity of young people to combat racism and hate speech online relies in large part on developing practical responses and learning how to apply them. Our collective skills and competences in online space are still developing. In making steps forward, these outcomes point to the need to compile and share good practice examples, and create innovative methods to equip youth activists with a series of alternative approaches to tackling hate and discrimination online.

APPENDIX 1: LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

ORGANISATION	COUNTRY
Anne Frank Foundation - Anne Frank Stichting	the Netherlands
Centre for Intercultural Dialogue	"former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia"
Culture - Tolerance - Friendship	Latvia
Diverse Association - Asociatia Divers	Romania
European Foundation of Human Rights	Lithuania
Faith Matters	United Kingdom
Freelance Journalist	Austria
Georgian School Students Unions Alliance	Georgia
Group of the European Youth for Change	Romania
Human Rights Institute - University of Valencia	Spain
Integrum	Armenia
International Cultural Youth Exchange	Germany
Karlstad Young Muslims - Karlstad Unga Muslimer	Sweden
King's College London - Department of War Studies	United Kingdom
Knowledge Committee of Serbia - Komitet Znanja Srbije	Serbia
Kurt Lewin Foundation	Hungary
Medecins Sans Frontieres - Greece	Greece
Ministry of Interior - crime prevention department	Slovakia
Minority Rights Group Europe	Hungary
Movement for Freedom	Belarus
Movimiento Contra la Intolerancia - Málaga	Spain
Movimiento Contra la Intolerancia - Valencia	Spain
Muslimische Jugend in Deutschland	Germany
No Border Project - Social Action Centre	Ukraine
OSCE - Mission to Skopje	"former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia"
PINK Embassy/LGBT Pro Albania - Ambasada PINK	Albania
Portuguese LGBT Youth Association - Rede Ex Aequo	Portugal
Spravedlivaya Ingushetiya - Just Ingushetiya	Russia
Strengthening Participatory Organization	Pakistan
The Law association at Stockholm's University	Sweden
Ukrainian Helsinki Human Rights Union	Ukraine
UNITED for Intercultural Action	the Netherlands
UNITED for Intercultural Action	the Netherlands
UNITED for Intercultural Action	the Netherlands
UNITED for Intercultural Action	the Netherlands
Youth Assistance Fund - Youth Initiative	Russia
Youth Center Jajce - Omladinski Centar Jajce	Bosnia Herzegovina

APPENDIX 2: PROGRAMME

	Sunday	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday
	9 December	**10 December**	**11 December**	**12 December**	**13 December**	**14 December**
9.30 - 11.00	Arrival of participants and registration	**Welcome session** • About the UNITED Network • About Youth Department of the Council of Europe **Programme, Objectives and Technicalities**	**HATE AMONG YOUNG PEOPLE** **Bullying and Racism in Schools** Cor van de Griendt - UNITED for Intercultural Action	**IMPACT OF HATE SPEECH ON VICTIMS** Case studies in groups	**MECHANISMS & SYSTEMS TO COMBAT ONLINE HATE SPEECH** Daniel Milo - Ministry of Interior, Crime Prevention Department (SK)	**STEPPING IN!** Introduction of No Hate Speech Online campaign of the Council of Europe
11.30 - 13.00		**GETTING TO KNOW EACH OTHER** Human bingo **RACISM IN EUROPE** Sharing experiences	**NEW CHALLENGES ONLINE** **Hate, radicalisation and the online space** Andrew Somerville, Kings College London (GB)	**FREEDOM OF SPEECH VERSUS OTHER HUMAN RIGHTS** Free2Choose Ivana Gabalova - Anne Frank House (NL) **THE LIMITS OF FREE SPEECH** A Theoretical Overview, Daniel Milo **ONLINE FLASHMOB**	**DIVERSITY IN CYBERSPACE: COMBATING HATE SPEECH WITH COUNTERARGUMENTS** Daniel Milo and Andrew Somerville	**GET ACTIVE!** Developing Action Plans
15.00 - 16.30		**RACISM IN EUROPE** Sharing experiences and feedback from groups	**E-GOVERNANCE AND LEGAL STANDARDS** Lee Hibbard, Council of Europe		**SHARING TOOLS & GOOD PRACTICES** Rotating workshops on: Privacy online, Free online tools for activism, How to plan an online campaign, Legal standards	**GET ACTIVE!** Developing Action Plans
17.00 - 18.30		**OVERVIEW OF RACISM IN EUROPE** Gabor Hera - Kurt Lewin Foundation (H)	**GET YOUR ACT TOGETHER!** Planning the online flashmob	**FREE AFTERNOON** **and dinner in Strasbourg**		**Exhibition of Action Plans and discussion, with the European Youth Foundation** **EVALUATION and CLOSING**
21.00	**WELCOME EVENING**	**INFO-MARKET**	**"Cross the Line": Intercultural game**		**Informal evening**	**Farewell Party**