

THE CONFERENCE

of the No Hate Speech
Movement Campaign



Mobilising, Planning and
Networking for Campaigning
Effectively with Young People
Against Hate Speech Online

7-9 November 2013
European Youth Centre,
Strasbourg

DOCUMENTATION



COUNCIL OF EUROPE



CONSEIL DE L'EUROPE



THE CONFERENCE

of the No Hate Speech Movement campaign

Mobilising, Planning and Networking for Campaigning Effectively
with Young People Against Hate Speech Online

7-9 NOVEMBER 2013
EUROPEAN YOUTH CENTRE STRASBOURG

DOCUMENTATION

COMPILED AND EDITED BY

ZARA LAVCHYAN



NO HATE
SPEECH
MOVEMENT

The views expressed in this report are the responsibility of the participants in the activity and of the editor and do not necessarily reflect the opinions of the Council of Europe.

Copyright of this publication is held by the Council of Europe. No parts of this publication may be reproduced or transmitted for commercial purposes in any form or by any means, electronic (CDRom, Internet, etc.) or mechanical including photocopying, recording or any information storage or retrieval system, without the permission in writing from the Publishing Division (publishing@coe.int), Directorate of Communication of the Council of Europe.

Reproduction of material from this publication is authorised for non-commercial educational purposes only and on condition that the source is properly quoted.

Cover photo: Katarzyna Sokolowska/Council of Europe, at No Hate Sounds.

Design: Horváth Dániel - danielhorvath.com

© Council of Europe, 2015

Council of Europe Publishing

F-67075 Strasbourg Cedex



ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Thanks are due to all the participants, facilitators and rapporteurs who volunteered with their time, work and expertise to make sure that the conference would be a useful and an enjoyable experience.

And very special thanks to Zara Lavchyan for her commitment to a thorough, faithful and complete account of the conference. And to Ciara Spencer for her skilful proof-reading and editing suggestions.



**NO HATE
SPEECH
MOVEMENT**



TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgements	3
I. Introduction and Background.	7
II. Setting the scene of the campaign: political climate and challenges in Europe today	10
Address of Gabriella Battaini-Dragoni - Deputy Secretary General of the Council of Europe	10
Address of Ambassador Armen Papikyan, permanent representative of Armenia to the Council of Europe	12
Video address of Niels Muižnieks – Human Rights Commissioner, Council of Europe	15
Address of Laurence Hermand, Vice-chair of the Steering Committee on Youth of the Council of Europe.	16
Address of Jerry Der Haan - Bureau member of the European Youth Forum	18
III. Mobilising, planning, and networking for campaigning effectively with young people against hate speech online	20
Ten reasons to take action against hate speech – by Prof. Gavan Titley	20
IV. The Campaign in a broader context of addressing racism, discrimination, human rights violations.	29
Hate Prevention Initiative: David Alexandre and Philippe Coen	29
Hate Speech Online: the view from Mexico - Valeria Berumen Ornelas	31
Conclusions of the conference “The Hate factor in political speech. Where do responsibilities lie?” - Ambassador Urszula Gacek, Permanent Representative of Poland to the Council of Europe:	32
Hate speech and racism in Europe today: Sarah Isal, Chair of the European Network Against Racism	33
V. Sharing challenges, questions, solutions and celebrating successes	35
Successes and celebrations	35
Challenges and setbacks	36
Opportunities and motivation	38
Questions and fears.	39



Facing the issues raised – Rui Gomes, Head of Education and Training Division
40

VI. Learning from practices with online campaigning	41
VII. Planning the campaign for 2014	47
Summary of the results of the working groups	47
Workshop 1. European Action Days.	47
Workshop 2. Hate Speech in political discourse and European Parliament elections.	51
Workshop 3. Evaluation and Impact of the NHSM.	54
Workshop 4. Communication, coordination and networking within the movement.	57
Workshop 5. Education	58
Workshop 6. National campaign strategies, plans and programmes.	61
Workshop 7. Impact and advocacy for policy changes.	64
Workshop 8. Building Online Communities and Ensuring Youth Participation.	67
Workshop 9. Preparing the NHSM Youth Meeting	72
Workshop 10. Fundraising for the campaign and projects	76
Workshop 11. Working with Internet businesses and social networks	80
VIII. Conclusions	84
Conclusions by Zara Lavchyan - Rapporteur of the conference.	84
Sergio Belfor, Bureau of Advisory Council on Youth.	87
A moral obligation to campaign - Snežana Samardžic-Markovic, Director General of Democracy, Council of Europe	89
IX. Appendices	92
Strategic objectives and expected results.	92
Conference coverage: European Youth Press Orange Magazine.	93
X. PROGRAMME OF THE CONFERENCE	95
XI. LIST OF PARTICIPANTS	99

I. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

The youth campaign for human rights online is a project run by the Council of Europe's youth sector to combat racism and discrimination in the online expression of hate speech by equipping young people and youth organisations with the competences necessary to recognise and act against such human rights violations. The campaign is expected to run until March 2015.

The campaign has been coordinated by the Youth Department at the European level and is implemented at the national level by non-governmental and governmental partners in national campaigns, implemented by national campaign committees. Partnerships with other European and international institutions have secured synergies with other initiatives which amplify the outreach of the campaign in denouncing, educating about and mobilising young people and society against hate speech and other human rights abuse online. In addition to the statutory partners of the Council of Europe's youth sector – national youth policy institutions, international youth organisations and national youth councils – and a close partnership with the EEA Norway Grants strengthens the potential outreach and impact of the campaign in the particular 15 countries the programme of the grants is concerned with. Nearly six months after the launching of the campaign by the Secretary General of the Council of Europe, the No Hate Speech Movement was reaching the end of its preparatory phase. National campaign coordinators and campaign committees had been set up in the majority of the member states, partnerships with international organisations and projects were being built and the tools for the campaign were being delivered.

The online platform – www.nohatespeechmovement.org – had been tested and improved. A group of volunteers/activists/moderators had already prepared and facilitated four European Action Days; others were under preparation.

The No Hate Speech Movement is a unique campaign in many respects. It is a European campaign constituted by national campaigns. It is an online campaign grounded on offline activities. It is a campaign addressing very important dimensions of the lives of young people today and of universal human rights, including freedom of speech and the responsibility to not discriminate and spread hate. It is a campaign that is easy to join and support but whose objectives need to fit the specificities of each country. There was no doubt, however, that hate speech and human rights online represent truly important issues for all young people and societies in Europe and elsewhere. It was important to address the challenges listed above with all the relevant stakeholders, actors and partners in the campaign. The European Campaign Conference was organised to confront and address these issues and to further develop the campaign together in all its dimensions: activities, communication, coordination, resources, monitoring and evaluation of the campaign and its objectives etc. This was a conference for online campaign activists, national campaign committee members, representatives of Council of Europe bodies, and campaign partners and stakeholders involved in the campaign and motivated to make the campaign a success.



AIM AND OBJECTIVES

The conference brought together some 220 main players and actors from the campaign at European and national levels to review and discuss the objectives and strategies for the campaign and to plan together the programme of major activities for the No Hate Speech Movement, including the necessary inter-connections and synergies between the European and the national campaigns.

Specific objectives:

- To review together the broad objectives and expectations towards the No Hate Speech Movement youth campaign at the European and national level
- To develop an understanding of the common issues of the No Hate Speech Movement campaign
- To share challenges and experiences in the campaign so far and to seek common responses and solutions
- To discuss and clarify the respective roles of the Council of Europe coordination, online activists and volunteers, national campaign committees and coordinators and of European and national partners
- To identify, plan and share resources needed to make the campaign participative, effective and creative
- To coordinate the programme of major activities and European Action Days and articulate the European and the national levels
- To discuss the expected impact of the campaign on policy and social attitudes, and explore how to make it feasible and sustainable
- To plan the process of reporting, evaluation and follow-up of the campaign at a national and European level.

EXPECTED RESULTS

The conference, including its preparatory process, was expected lead to the following results:

- A shared understanding of the strategic objectives and processes of the campaign by all stakeholders
- Inspiration and motivation of participants to address no hate speech and promote human rights online
- Common vision and criteria for evaluating the campaign results and impact at the levels of policies and practices of youth work and human rights
- A consolidated and coordinated programme of main campaign activities for 2014
- Effective partnerships with relevant institutions and stakeholders
- A closer connection with related projects and policies of the other Council of Europe bodies and sectors
- The launching of a group of patrons to support and stand for the campaign
- Responses to the central challenges faced by the campaign activists
- A stronger network of national campaign committees and partners in the campaign.

PARTICIPANTS

The conference brought together 220 people from all stakeholders– or their representatives - in the No Hate Speech Movement, notably:

- Local, national and European NGO's that implement projects within the campaign framework, including those funded by the European Youth Foundation
- Online campaign activists, moderators and volunteers trained through the courses for bloggers and online human rights activists organised by the Youth sector of the Council of Europe
- The co-management bodies of the Youth Department of the Council of Europe, the European Steering Committee on Youth and the Advisory Council on Youth
- The national campaign committees and coordinators (NCCs)
- European partners active for the campaign and national partners in countries where there is not yet a national campaign committee
- Representatives of other sectors in the Council of Europe concerned by or involved in the campaign, including the Parliamentary Assembly, the Congress of Local and Regional Authorities and the INGO conference
- Representatives of International organisations and partners, including the EEA Norway Grants and their national NGO grants operators (www.eeagrants.org)
- Similar campaigns, initiatives and related stakeholders, including service and content providers and representatives of social networks.

PROGRAMME AND METHODOLOGY

The programme of the conference was prepared for the development of ownership and partnerships of different stakeholders and partners present in the meeting.

The first day of the conference focused on getting to know the different people and their organisations involved in the campaign and an update on the state of the Campaign. This introduction is followed by an afternoon for sharing common experiences, with the aim to identify a common understanding of the issues in the campaign and how they are being overcome in different parts of Europe.

Most of the second day was reserved for workshop to tackle various aspects of the campaign and prepare solutions and proposals. Each working group discussed the issues at hand, building on the already existing experiences and results within the Campaign. The workshops resulted in a plan of action for the rest of the campaign.

The final day of the conference summarised the outcomes of the different working groups, building a common agenda of the key actions in the campaign for 2014. The day also included time for individual and small group meetings between participants to address other issues and aspects they have identified. An important part of this day was devoted to a Real Common Action.



II. SETTING THE SCENE OF THE CAMPAIGN: POLITICAL CLIMATE AND CHALLENGES IN EUROPE TODAY

ADDRESS OF **GABRIELLA BATTAINI-DRAGONI** - DEPUTY
SECRETARY GENERAL OF THE COUNCIL OF EUROPE

It is a pleasure and a privilege to open this “No Hate Speech” conference today, and there are three reasons for why it is important.

The first reason is that hate speech online is not any different from hate speech offline. Both are a violation of human rights. They are menacing human dignity, dialogue and co-operation in democratic societies. The protection of human rights, on the other hand, is central to the political culture and the values that unite all of us. Human rights are at heart of the work that we are doing here in the Council of Europe, together with our 47 member States.

Hate speech is carried out under the cover of freedom of expression, which is indeed a crucial right in any democracy. Freedom of expression, as guaranteed by the European Convention on Human Rights, is a pillar of democracy. It is a necessary condition for the enjoyment of our democratic ideals, providing space for public discussion and debate. And there is no reason to suppress ideas that “offend, shock or disturb the state or any sector of the population”, as the European Court of Human Rights has pointed out in its landmark judgment – because these are the demands of pluralism.

But

Hate speech is not free speech. Its consequences are anything but free. Hate speech undermines democracy and leads to hate crimes.

I am especially worried by the dimensions of online hate speech and cyberbullying against women and transgender people. The two together form an explosive cocktail that has already claimed too many lives of children and young people. It is time to say “stop!”

Your presence therefore carries a very special meaning to us. Your support, your engagement for human rights and against discrimination in Europe is vital. Legal standards and recommendations are one thing; a clear position of civil society organisations in favour of human rights and democracy is at least equally important. We will never succeed in eradicating hate speech just by sanctioning the perpetrators; we must also mobilise the preventive forces of a vibrant civil society.

This leads me to the second reason. Hate speech is not a new phenomenon. Almost 50 years ago, the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe raised its voice against those “increasingly numerous elements” who “are attempting to incite the public, in particular young people, to racial, national or religious hatred...” And ever since, the various organs of the Council of Europe have called for action and proposed

measures against hate speech.

However, intolerance – and its intolerable consequences: discrimination and violence – seem to be regaining ground in Europe.

You are the practitioners; you probably know better than the rest of us that hate speech has taken on truly dramatic proportions, particularly on the Internet. Hand in hand with hate speech on the Internet we are also witnessing how hate speech is encroaching upon mainstream political discourse in a number of member States. This is very worrying and makes urgent action necessary.

The “No Hate Speech” movement is one of the strongest responses of the Council of Europe to hate speech. We will also seek to reinforce the measures to combat hate speech through existing legal mechanisms, for instance in the context of the “Budapest Convention” on combating cybercrime, or through new recommendations or guidelines.

Yet, I must pay tribute to the youth organisations who decided some months ago within the co-management system of the Council of Europe to develop the campaign as one of the high-profile flagship projects.

The campaign is already operational in 36 member States. Like the enormously successful “all different – all equal” youth campaigns against racism and intolerance ten and twenty years ago, the “No Hate Speech” campaign is based on national campaigns and national committees. The Council of Europe can never replace the role of member States in defending and promoting human rights. The success of this campaign will, therefore, be the success of the national campaigns.

And supporting the campaign on the ground is exactly the main role of the conference we are about to open. Each national campaign may use different methods and translate the “No Hate” logo in many languages. Each of you needs to work in a different political environment and with strongly different funding mechanisms. I understand that some of you do not yet have a budget, some are still building their website, and some are still looking for a campaign committee. In fact some of you may even be hoping to find someone here to tell them where to knock to find information about their campaign. And some of you will probably find out that they will in turn become the door at which other people will knock!

But it seems important that you use these three days to agree on the essentials of campaigning, on ways to cooperate and to support each other.

A propos supporting each other – this is the third reason why I feel privileged to open this conference today.

I strongly appreciate the presence at this conference of representatives from Facebook, Google and Twitter. This is not a campaign against the Internet or against social networks. I am convinced that high-level declarations in the member States who sometimes portray social media for instance, as “the worst menace to society” were said in the heat of the moment; this is not the view of the Council of Europe, and never has been. But we also expect from the social media responsible behaviour, particularly transparency of rules and policies.

We need to make sure that social media platforms do not regard themselves, or are regarded by the general public, as human rights-free zones where human dignity ranks lower than market considerations.



It is also in the long-term interest of the industry to make the Internet a safer space for human rights.

I express our sincere thanks to our main partners in this campaign, notably the youth organisations sitting on the Advisory Council and the youth ministries and agencies in the member States, who developed and endorsed the campaign. We are also pleased to have on board the European Youth Forum, a faithful partner in all the campaigns and projects of the Council of Europe with young people.

A special thanks also goes to the governments of Finland and the French community of Belgium, Armenia and Hungary for their voluntary contributions.

This conference and the preparatory activities last year in Budapest would not have been possible without the strong support of the EEA/Norway Grants. This mechanism also provides financial support to campaign activities in 15 countries, and that is a really vital contribution.

Finally, allow me to thank the Armenian government, which currently holds the Chairmanship of the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe, for giving priority to the combat against racism, discrimination and intolerance. I hope that the incoming Chairs, Austria to be followed by Azerbaijan, will also commit similar support to the campaign and its causes.

And now I wish you a hardworking, fruitful conference.

ADDRESS OF **AMBASSADOR ARMEN PAPIKYAN**, PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE OF ARMENIA TO THE COUNCIL OF EUROPE

I am very grateful for having the chance to speak here today on behalf of the Chairman of the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe.

I would like to thank the organisers of this very important event who brought together national campaigns, online campaign activists and partners who are engaged in the realisation of the ideas of the pan European project the “No hate speech movement”. This is also a good opportunity to share the preliminary results, success stories of different activities, discuss challenges encountered, progress made and the possible strategies to ensure the results are sustainable.

The Council of Europe was created to achieve greater unity in its Member States and to promote democracy, human rights and the rule of law. The European Convention on Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, the main pillar for human rights in our organisation, recognises freedom of expression and freedom of the media as essential dimensions of democracy. This understanding has been upheld by the European Court of Human Rights in various judgments. In one judgment the Court has affirmed that “freedom of expression constitutes one of the essential foundations of such a society, one of the basic conditions for its progress and for the development of every person”. The court has also ruled that Article 10 is applicable not only to “information” or “ideas” that are favourably received or regarded as inoffensive or as a matter of indifference, but also to those that offend, shock or disturb the State or any sector of the population. These are the necessary demands of pluralism, tolerance and broadmindedness and without it there is no “democratic society”.

This being said, and on the basis of Article 10 of the Convention, stipulating that the exercise of this right carries with it duties and responsibilities, the Court has also established that any interference with the right to freedom of expression must be *prescribed by law*, must pursue a *legitimate aim*, must be *necessary in a democratic society* and, finally, must be *proportionate* to the legitimate aims pursued.

The Committee of Ministers took an early interest in matters of hate speech with Recommendation (97)20 adopted in 1997. The Recommendation provides a definition of hate speech that is the main existing definition today:

all forms of expression which spread, incite, promote or justify racial hatred, xenophobia, antisemitism or other forms of hatred based on intolerance, including: intolerance expressed by aggressive nationalism and ethnocentrism, discrimination and hostility against minorities, migrants and people of immigrant origin.

It also calls on national governments to take appropriate steps to implement the principles annexed to the Recommendation; “ensure that such steps form part of a comprehensive approach to the phenomenon, which also targets its social, economic, political, cultural and other root causes”; where States have not already done so, “sign, ratify and effectively implement” International Convention on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination in their domestic legal orders; and “review their domestic legislation and practice in order to ensure that they comply with the principles” appended to the Recommendation.

What is less talked about, is the Recommendation 97 (21) on the Media and the Promotion of a Culture of Tolerance. The recommendation confirms the need to impose legally binding standards concerning the propagation of racism and intolerance without violating freedom of expression and the principle of editorial independence. However, as concerns the promotion of a positive contribution by the media, great care needs to be taken so as not to interfere with these principles. This area calls for measures of encouragement rather than legal measures.

The Committee of Ministers has not stopped in 1997 and it has regularly issued texts and recommendations concerning both hate speech and media society. Another recommendation from 2004 on Freedom of political debate in the media, adopted on 12 February 2004, emphasises that freedom of political debate does not include freedom to express racist opinions or opinions which are an incitement to hatred, xenophobia, antisemitism and all forms of intolerance.

I must also make reference, of course to the Additional Protocol to the Convention on cybercrime, related to the prosecution of acts of racist and xenophobic nature through computer systems, which entered into force in 2006. This document is of particular importance where it concerns the dissemination of messages of hatred through the Internet, and describes certain acts as criminal offences.

I quote these two recommendations not because I want to indulge into legal instruments, but because they represent in fact

*The two main orientations taken by the Committee of Ministers regarding hate speech are: legal measures to **sanction** hate speech in the respect of freedom of expression and other measures to **prevent** hate speech and promote human rights.*



I would particularly like to stress Prevention, which comes with a culture of human rights, comes with education for democratic citizenship. And here as well the Council of Europe is very active.

The Charter on Education for Democratic Citizenship and Human Rights Education, adopted in 2010 with a significant input from youth organisations, follows on these footsteps by calling to make human rights education accessible to children and young people. The charter also sees as an essential element of all education for democratic citizenship “the promotion of social cohesion and intercultural dialogue and the valuing of diversity and equality, including gender equality”. Human rights education and education for democratic citizenship are thus very important to raise awareness about and to address hate speech, online and offline.

As the No Hate Speech Movement campaign illustrates, the Internet and new media have amplified the scope and dangers of hate speech in its online dimension. The Committee of Ministers is attentive to the need to update the understanding of these texts, including the definition of hate speech, to include for example misogyny and gender-based discrimination and the specific risks it poses to children and young people, especially when combined with bullying.

But I would like to assure all of you, who are also carriers of the Council of Europe’s values, that the organisation has been consistently on the forefront of addressing and combating hate speech because it is a violation of human dignity; a violation and abuse of human rights.

As I already mentioned youth has a significant role in many of the Council of Europe initiatives. And organisers of this conference are on the right track to emphasise the role of the young people who are the main driving force of the campaign. I know from my own country how brave sometimes the initiatives of the youth organisations could be which we wouldn’t allow ourselves as government representatives. It is for me a particular pleasure to welcome the representatives of youth organisations and thank them on behalf of the Committee of Ministers and particularly on behalf of the Armenian Chairmanship. We are always admiring your pragmatic views, innovative ideas and initiatives towards better realisation and visibility of the campaign.

Let me also say few words on behalf of the Armenian Chairmanship of the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe.

Combating racism, xenophobia and intolerance has been among the top priorities of the Armenian Chairmanship. Manifestations of racism, xenophobia, intolerance and extremism are not new challenges. However, nowadays, when the perception of distance and time has changed, when the countries have become increasingly interconnected and information becomes momentarily available to millions of people through the Internet, the fight against these occurrences is becoming ever more important and demanding.

The intolerance and xenophobia violates human dignity, creates an image of an enemy within the society, fuels mistrust, thus endangering the harmony of our societies. To this end the Armenian Chairmanship organised the High-Level Conference on Combating Racism, Xenophobia and Intolerance in Europe on 21-22 October in Yerevan which brought together more than 130 representatives from Council of Europe member and observer states, international organisations, including the Council of Europe, UN, OSCE, League of Arab States and EU, independent and governmental experts, and civil society. The participants of the conference had an opportunity to reflect upon several issues such as expression of racism and hate speech

in political discourse, the role of political leaders and civil society in combating such processes, the intensive use of preventive measures, overcoming racial stereotypes, manifestations of xenophobia and intolerance, etc. In order to raise the visibility of the No Hate Speech Movement, the Chairmanship devoted a special attention to it during the Conference and called on member states to promote the implementation of the campaign across all the Council of Europe territory.

The Armenian Chairmanship welcomed the No Hate Speech Movement campaign launched by the Secretary General and will always support the activities in this framework. The voluntary contribution of Armenia aims at the implementation of this project.

VIDEO ADDRESS OF NIELS MUIŽNIEKS – HUMAN RIGHTS COMMISSIONER, COUNCIL OF EUROPE

Dear friends, Thank you so much for this very important work.

I really admire the no hate speech movement campaign. I think it is essential to involve young people against hate and do so in the environment in which they live – the internet. By giving tools to young people and empowering them to take action you are making a critical contribution to combating one of Europe's most serious challenges.

Hate speech is far more dangerous than most people realize – it is not merely words, it is a type of violence which can gravely affects individuals, entire communities.

It leads to marginalization, harassment, discrimination and even criminal violence. It creates an atmosphere where offensive behavior becomes a common place. The most common victims are among most vulnerable – Roma, migrants, minorities, people of different religions, LGBTI persons. Children and young people are also dangerously exposed to hate speech, in particular in the cyber space, where they can be confronted with intimidation or have their minds poisoned into thinking hate speech is acceptable or justifiable.

In this context it is urgent to prevent hate speech and to react when it occurs. Education, punishing the perpetrators and standing by the victims of hate speech are all critical parts of an effective response. I support all your efforts and the impressive work within the No Hate Speech Movement. Fighting hate speech through freedom of expression will make the online world a better place for all. I call to all the Council of Europe members to join the campaign and take into account the conclusions of this conference in order to shape cyber space as a space of and for human rights.

I wish you the best of success in your conference and further work.



ADDRESS OF **LAURENCE HERMAND**, VICE-CHAIR OF THE STEERING
COMMITTEE ON YOUTH OF THE COUNCIL OF EUROPE

Ladies and gentlemen.

Allow me if you will to quote from a song written by a young Belgian rap artist, Billy Joe, to mark the launch of the campaign in Brussels last June:

*"I'm of the generation that has time to waste
moochin' around in cyberspace.
If boredom be the root of all evil
the internet reaps the spoils.
Hatred is free, it soon goes viral,
season with resentment, then you're in a spiral.
You think you're empowered but that ain't so.
You're standin' on the edge with no place to go."*

*« J'suis d'cette génération qui s'trimbale sur le net
Qui manifestement a pas mal de temps à perdre
Et si l'ennui est le père de tous les vices
Internet en tire les bénéfices
La haine est gratuite se propage comme un parasite
Et votre rancœur, j'vous la sers avec ou sans frites ?
Tu t'émancipes ? Ca paraît dur à croire
Ta conscience est sur le fil du rasoir ! »*

It's a great pleasure for me to address you at the opening session of this conference, not least because, as a member of the bureaux of our co-managed bodies and as Vice-Chair of the CDEJ, I was privileged to be involved in the birth of the "No Hate Speech Movement" campaign in February 2011, when the Secretary General of the Council of Europe looked to the youth sector in order to bring an innovative and creative edge to the Organisation's reform process.

As the Deputy Secretary General has pointed out, the campaign got under way six months ago, although not, it has to be said, without difficulty because finding the necessary funding is not easy in the present climate and I would like to take this opportunity to once again express my sincere thanks to all those countries which have helped thus far to introduce the campaign, at both European and national level.

The "No Hate Speech Movement" campaign is unique in many ways. It is a European campaign made up of national ones. It is an online campaign based on offline activities. It is a campaign that concerns important aspects of young people's lives and core values, namely human rights and democracy.

The campaign has enlisted the support of large numbers of actors, whether organisations, networks, institutions or even private individuals, who are committed to defending human rights and combating discrimination. The aim, however, is not to preach to the converted but rather to show everyone, not just young people, that it is possible to live together in a way that is respectful and tolerant, in a world where modern communication technologies have created wonderful opportunities but also challenges and risks because of the implications in terms of freedom of expression and defying geographical and mental boundaries.

This campaign fits neatly with the objectives of the Council of Europe and its youth sector. Since its inception, the Council's youth sector has sought to give young people the opportunity to participate in the process of building a Europe founded on human rights and democracy. The aim of this sector, and this is what makes it unique, is not only to improve young people's access to fundamental human and social rights, but above all to empower them to become active champions of those rights.

The “No Hate Speech Movement” campaign is totally in sync with this approach: it is

A campaign by young people, in partnership with the authorities, in the spirit of co-management that is a central feature of the Council of Europe’s youth sector.

It thus offers an opportunity to all the countries involved to implement this system of co-management between civil society actors and government officials. I wish to commend the national campaign committees on their motivation and the calibre of their members, who come from various backgrounds including education, youth, sport and the media.

Lastly, this campaign provides young people and indeed everyone involved with a clearly visible platform for creativity and innovation in the activities and projects already under way at national and local level.

I should also point out that the campaign is firmly grounded in the new realities facing young people and that it has therefore been designed and planned in close consultation with them, with, for example, a preparatory seminar at which young people made recommendations and gathered ideas.

In this regard, the campaign is highly ambitious: not only does it seek to raise awareness about online hate speech and the threats it poses for democracy and individuals but it is also intended to advocate for the development of European policy instruments combating hate speech.

At the same time, the campaign is about supporting and showing solidarity with those targeted by hate speech.

It thus represents a major contribution to the goals and work of the Council of Europe and I hope that, like the famous youth campaign “All different - All equal”, which led to the setting up of the European Commission against Racism and Intolerance, the “No Hate Speech Movement” campaign will give the Council of Europe the impetus it needs for sustainable action in preventing and combating online hate speech and human rights violations.

Before I finish, I would also like to pay tribute to the dedication of, and the invaluable contribution made by, all the volunteers involved in the campaign. Their response has been extensive and enthusiastic and without them, this campaign could never have come about. It is vital, however, that these volunteers have the resources they need in order to take action. As I said earlier, several countries have already made financial contributions and I would ask the rest to follow suit, especially in order to support activities being conducted at national and local level. In 2013, it was difficult for governments to find resources within their existing budgets but I hope that in 2014, they will have managed to earmark some funds for the campaign.

As I also pointed out, however, the campaign has a European dimension, one key task being to co-ordinate the national campaigns and ensure that the objectives are pursued as planned. This naturally requires a degree of material, financial and staffing support from the Council of Europe and I very much hope that these resources will be commensurate with the campaign’s ambitions. One of the top priorities is to recruit a European campaign manager and I wish to say a big thank you to the youth sector team and in particular Rui Gomes for everything they have managed to accomplish to date using the limited resources available.

Ladies and gentlemen, dear friends, since its inception, the Council of Europe’s youth sector has been constantly evolving and has managed to adapt to the new realities and challenges facing young people.



Unfortunately, since the “All different –All equal” campaign, racism, xenophobia, intolerance and discrimination have not gone away, quite the reverse in fact. New forms of intolerance discrimination have emerged, including via new information and communication technologies. A stark reminder that

We can never lower our guard when it comes to preventing and combating these scourges, and that human rights and democracy are a constant work in progress.

This campaign is a building block in that process. It is a starting point, not an end in itself, and I hope therefore that it will be a real success in terms of rallying young people from all over Europe, spreading awareness as widely as possible and furthering the Council of Europe’s ideals.

And as I began with a quotation from a Belgian musician, let me end with another one, this time from Stromae, a new-generation poet with whom you are all no doubt familiar and whose lyrics ring with the self-mockery that his fellow Belgians hold so dear:

*Love is like Twitter,
48 hours and the honeymoon is over.
First you sign up, then you follow,
it drives you nuts and you end up solo.
You'd best beware!
As for all those “likes”, behind the plastic smile
there often lurks
just hashtag bile.
You'd best beware!*

*L'amour est comme l'oiseau de Twitter
On est bleu de lui, seulement pour 48 heures
D'abord on s'affilie, ensuite on se follow
On en devient fêlé, et on finit solo
Prends garde à toi !
Et à tous ceux qui vous like
Les sourires en plastique sont souvent
Des coups d'ashtag
Prends garde à toi !*

It is my hope that this conference will provide an exciting opportunity for encounter, exchange and creative thinking. Thank you.

ADDRESS OF **JERRY DER HAAN** - BUREAU MEMBER
OF THE EUROPEAN YOUTH FORUM

No Hate Speech Movement Campaign generally aims at combating racism and discrimination and its online expression: hate speech.

Subsequent objectives include; awareness raising on hate speech online and the risks it poses for democracy and young people, supporting young people in standing up for human rights, , reducing the levels of acceptance of online hate speech and finally, developing youth participation and citizenship online, are all crucial values for human rights and democracy that the Council of Europe and the European Youth Forum stand for. Young people, like all other human beings, are entitled to the full respect, protection and promotion of their human rights and fundamental freedoms. The Forum adopts a rights-based approach to youth policy that integrates the norms,

standards and principles of the international human rights system into the development, implementation and evaluation of youth policy.

To achieve such a rights-based approach to youth policy, it is crucial to us that youth is not being negatively discriminated against, on any grounds (including age).

Young people frequently face injustices on the grounds of their age mainly in the areas of information, inclusion, employment and mobility.

For example inequalities are particularly visible when young people are acceding to the labour market, when unemployment rates of people under 25 is currently 2.6 times that of the rest of the population.

Young people also remain exposed to “multiple discrimination” because of their ethnic origins, convictions, religious beliefs, sex or gender, sexual preferences, physical and mental condition.

Effective approaches to tackling discrimination must take into account the prevalence of multiple identities, rather than merely based upon categories such as age, ethnicity, or disability alone. When considering discrimination against young people with disabilities, for instance, it is important to assess whether men, women and members of minority groups experience different or additional discrimination.

Discrimination affecting young people is likely to also lead to marginalisation, social exclusion, lack of access to basic rights, an increased likelihood of poverty and lack of power.

However, within human rights law and international treaties, young people are not always recognised as a separate group that experiences discrimination. A special focus on their rights is therefore required.

There is a need to recognise young people as a demographic group, between childhood and adulthood, with deserving needs.

Youth policy should strive to actively promote the autonomy of young people as well as their full participation in society. Protection against discrimination should be strengthened and specific measures to include young people with fewer opportunities in society need to be put in place.

It is crucial that young people are able to fully enjoy their fundamental rights and freedoms. This is not so much about creating something “new” vis-a-vis existing human rights, but ensuring that rights and freedoms responding to age-specific needs of young people are met, to connect and complement existing legislation on human rights, including social and civil rights.

It is about ensuring young people are aware of their rights, know how to claim them (for example if experiencing online discrimination), and have access to them. It is about youth rights being respected.

Therefore in raising young people’s awareness of their rights is crucial, and youth organisations represent an essential actor to this end, coupled with advocacy work to formulate and seek the best instruments to defend and recognise such rights.

This is why we support this campaign, but also why we work with other NGOs on Anti-Discrimination in general and why we stand for the rights of young people.

To put an end to the discrimination young people face, combatting racism and discrimination online and offline is crucial, but not sufficient. It should go in line with stronger recognition, promotion and protection of youth rights.



III. MOBILISING, PLANNING, AND NETWORKING FOR CAMPAIGNING EFFECTIVELY WITH YOUNG PEOPLE AGAINST HATE SPEECH ONLINE

TEN REASONS TO TAKE ACTION AGAINST HATE SPEECH – BY PROF. GAVAN TITLEY

As we all know – the Internet is made up of lists.

“Ten reasons why cats should do yoga

Ten things you need to know about tomatoes

Ten internet lists you need to read now

Ten reasons why lists are ruining the internet”

So there is a good reason to think about our action in a list of 10 things – but the title is not mine: the title came from Rui Gomes, to think about 10 reasons why we should take action against hate speech.

If Rui says so, there must be ten reasons. By last night I had only found 8. Found another 3 reasons this morning, so I actually have 11 in the end, but will stick to 10.

I may not need that many from the activity I have seen in this campaign so far - we know why we are here. And we know that just as plenty of other people are beginning to realize that there is a problem with hate speech. Certain ideas in particular periods come to the fore in public debate and consciousness.

The last two years have followed a growing focus on ‘hate speech’ as a social, political and communication phenomenon across Europe: In the aftermath of fascist terrorism in Norway vast attention and circulation of Anders Breivik’s Compendium Declaration of Independence 2083 was seen. One witnesses dense transatlantic networks of far right activity and this was far beyond conventional hate sites and recognizable supremacist and neo-nazi groups, this was clearly an international ideology, largely shaped also with the use of internet forms and possibilities. This time last year in France there was a sustained public controversy over series of hashtags which were openly anti-Semitic, anti-Black, anti-gay, which invited people for intervention by government ministers, and a high profile court case that confronts Twitter’s appeal to the US First Amendment with French laws on incitement to racial hatred. In multiple European countries such as Germany, UK, Sweden, Finland (am sure many more) one could see sustained public debate about the rape threats, abuse, harassment directed at women, at LGBT people, for being women, for being LGBT, in politics, journalism, the public eye. They were targeted on Twitter, humiliated on Facebook, Reddit, Tumblr, harassed via email and private messages. And here we could make endless lists from across Europe – as any one following the Facebook group of the campaign, and the incidents it posts and discusses, would know. The idea of hate speech is not new, and emerges from twentieth century legal and political debates on

the limits of free expression in relation to ideas of public order, the right to freedom from persecution, to counter incitement, and so forth. Taken on a renewed importance in the social media era conditions are that more and more people have the capacity to communicate and interact in multiple spaces and networks, and to produce and circulate their own media content.

Online platforms, social media - have expanded the space and altered the nature of the public - providing new fora for debate, real-time connections and engagement, opened up access to media production, and established endless paths of networked sharing and reach. In doing so, of course, they also broaden the public field where racist politics, sexism, homophobia and transphobia can flourish. And, equally, extend the capacity to target, harrass, threaten and injure specific individuals, on the basis of the group identity assigned to them.

This campaign recognises something fundamental about this context - "online space is public space, human rights apply there as much as in the rest of society".

The question for the campaign in the context of endless comments, interactions, communication flows –is how to campaign effectively – on principle, politically aware ways that are adequate to how different media and communication platforms work. Working here together over these days will certainly answer this question, as to how.

My list this morning is more focused on why – why act?

The extent of public focus on social media brings me to the first reason. Historically, the introductions of new forms of media were sources of huge optimism and huge pessimism, but they need to be understood in their social and political context. Hate speech happens online, but online is folded into the offline, into the material, political, social world. Nasty behaviour online is as old as the internet, Hate speech is certainly encouraged and increased by the properties of social media and interactive environments. It is often anonymous, it is action at distance from those with whom you interact. Social networks push interaction, they depend on every-increasing connection. In a media environment which is expanding, but where stable streams of finance are difficult to source, there are of course plenty of platforms and media actors who will increase sensationalism, stimulate conflict and encourage scapegoating to generate hits and clicks. However to understand hate, we need to analyze its forms, discourse and strategies online, but we cannot begin or end our analysis online. It is the importance of recognizing this that shapes the first point, which has a funny title, but I will, I hope, explain it.

REASON 1: BECAUSE IT IS AN ACT OF LOVE, IN AN ECONOMY OF HATE.

Two weeks ago, in the space of 24 hours, two Roma children were taken into state care by the police in Ireland. As media reporting constantly emphasised, these blonde blue eye'd little girls just didn't look like their Roma parents, they just didn't look Roma (blonde, blue eyes). Children – taken (and returned) from their families – week after the story of 'Maria', a blonde girl taken into custody in Greece, because she didn't look Roma enough (subsequently found to be Roma from Bulgaria).

Police in Ireland acted because of a very particular chain of events FB site – page of a sensationalist investigative show – already done a programme about 'organised Roma begging gangs in Dublin' – light on information.



Journalist called not the Police, but the Police press office. Children were taken, DNA was tested and they were returned to their families. Meanwhile the fact of this suspicion was enough to provide an excuse for every stereotype, slander, racial myth about Roma to be circulated.

Two things we can notice here, that lead to my point:

Number one: Stream of hate speech about what Roma are, what they do, what we should do about it – flows from a sense of legitimacy. “Now this has happened, we can finally tell the truth”, afterwards claiming this was not racism, just putting children first... We need to understand this about hate – when people express this kind of hate, it is always made legitimate, always based, on an act of love. I love my country / I am defending my values and my way of life/ We’re just doing what everyone knows is right, but are too scared to say/ We need to be honest about the problems they bring. This is critical to understanding the structure of hate, and arguing and acting against it. It presents itself as the defense of love, of what is loved and what is threatened by THEM.

Number two: In many ways this was racism at its crudest – Roma are a homogenous group, and a child that displays the classic characteristics of Nordic racial purity cannot be one of them. And this is all that state power needs to act. Where does this prejudice begin and end? Who is to blame? The FB poster? Journalists? Individual police? Reporters? Commentators? Pinning it to particular individuals is really not the point. “Hate” Sara Ahmed argues, “does not reside in things, in people, but it is shaped in an economy, a symbolic economy, where meanings, feelings, associations circulate”. Insults, myths, threats circulate, and stick to certain people, certain groups, under certain circumstances. One can see that economy at work here in this example – involving social media, but social media in a wider economy of prejudice, circulating between national contexts, through media and institutions.

So a campaign intervenes, it interferes in this economy of hate – it says these ideas, these images, these myths, these insults cannot circulate unchallenged. And it does that by offering a counter-act of love. A specific kind of love – a love for democracy and democratic participation.

REASON 2: BECAUSE IT IS AN ACT OF LOVE FOR DEMOCRACY (WHERE HATE SPEECH IS, IN PART, A RESPONSE TO A CRISIS OF DEMOCRACY)

This would hardly seem to be a remarkable act of love, or a very demanding one. Just like nobody is a racist, everybody these days is a democrat. But, and this may not be a popular thing to say in an institution that is, historically, a conscience of European democracy, democracy is not in good health in Europe. In part, this is an old story about a long illness. Sociologists and political scientists have long discussed a crisis, or a transition in democracy.

First element is that modern institutions of the state, and of democratic governance, have less and less capacity to control the impacts of globalized, networked capitalism on the societies of nation-states. At the same time – contemporary politics would appear to be incapable of generating the unifying ideas that would mobilize us to work collectively to transform these conditions. These are very general points, and they look very different according to where you are positioned, and the recent historical developments of that state, and region. This crisis/transition, and people’s divergent experiences of it, have been intensified



by the Eurozone crisis, consequences across the continent.

For example, I live between Finland and Ireland. This is as a consequence of the need for the public to compensate private financial actors for their investments, social services, public investment and employment have been devastated in Ireland. Not to the extent in Greece or Spain, or Portugal. And of course, beyond the Eurozone in many countries in Europe, unequal access to inadequate public provision is much worse. But I speak about my experience, for a moment, to illustrate a larger point. I have a friend who received his chemotherapy sitting in a plastic chair in a hospital corridor. I have friends who have had all educational supports for their child with learning disabilities simply taken away. In Finland, I hear politicians from far-right to centre-left, state that this is the price that must be paid for economic stability. Of course, they are just doing their job, they don't personally wish this violence on people I know, they don't see it. The problem is that very different realities are opening up between countries, and within countries. Everyone is responsible for what they say. But this is why, in part, the nasty reaction to the Roma case was filled with such a sense of justification, or righteousness. Because just a week before this story, social welfare provisions had been cut, again, in the sixth 'austerity' budget since 2008. And public debate after these cuts was filled with news of government initiatives encouraging the unemployed to motivate themselves to get back to work in a country with one vacancy for every 32 people unemployed. And Roma, of course, steal children so they can take more social welfare than they should ever be allowed receive.

In many contexts across Europe, the economic depression, coupled with the relative lack of control of national governments to represent the common social good under these conditions, has meant a return to open, enthusiastic and coordinated targeting of minorities. Hate speech happens online, but it flows through an economy of hate. These flows are often motivated, and legitimated, by significant political currents, and tendencies. These tendencies run deep in the societies we live in, and we need to grasp why to understand that combating hate is not just about identifying the haters. In Appadurai's analysis, hate and fear of small numbers (minorities) intensifies in periods of anxiety, crisis, uncertainty. The state cannot guarantee a good life, and a secure future, for its citizens. This is an insult to ethnic genius, this is not how it is meant to be. But the power lost over the economy, over social reproduction, this can be reclaimed through culture, by making it pure, by insisting that there, everything should be in order.

Of course, I am offering a very general, and in ways simplified, analysis here. But it nevertheless has a central truth. If we look across Europe, at far-right, right-wing, 'populist' parties – anti-immigrant, minority, Roma, Muslim, anti-semitic, homophobic, sexist (even where they hate Muslims in a feminist way) their act of love is structured like this. Populist right-wing parties are doing well in large part because they say clearly that representative politics is not working for the ordinary people.

They are not revolutionary, but reluctant – they hate 'politics as usual' as that is for the elites, and the elites don't care about the people. The people live in the heartland, they just want to live their lives there. But these ordinary people are let down by the elites, who have favoured globalization, and with it immigration, and favouring minorities over the silent majority. But the silent majority now has someone willing to speak for them, and point out the problems that the people were too scared to name, but that the all know exist. How Roma are criminal and a burden on the state, how immigrants threaten the future of our children (and we love our children), how Muslims want to take over and drive a minaret through the heart



of the heartland. And while you were silent, the gays and the women want to impose their values on us too. The populist right in Europe identify something very real in the failure of national democracies, in a globalized capitalist world, to offer people a viable sense of the present and the future. But the solution is to point to those outside the heartland, the not-ordinary, the different and suspicious, the parasites, as the cause for this. But it is very comfortable for mainstream politics in Europe to point at the populists and say, look at what they are doing, now you really have to vote for us, even if we are not perfect! But it wasn't the Front national that expelled Roma from France. In other words, promoting fear and suspicion of minorities is a widespread tactic in contemporary politics. It is fear and suspicion of others who are already historically placed as a 'problem population', or not normal.

Thus Roma in Ireland – hysteria was a combination of very old myths (child snatching) and very new processes (identifying those that threaten the welfare state, a welfare state that is under severe pressure). So, hate speech is happening in a context of political crisis. This is not the sole reason of course, but it is the context that legitimates it, the economy through which it circulates. So our campaign intervenes in this context. It says this is not democracy, this is democracy's pathology, it's shadow. So intervening in it is an act of democratic love. We could go further, and the next reason does.

REASON 3: IT HELPS DEMOCRATIZE DEMOCRACY

Hate speech is directed at shutting certain categories of people up, and shutting them out. What gives it its power is that it is so frequently directed at people who are already at a disadvantage in our unequal societies, unequal societies with histories of marginalization and oppression. Hate speech is about silencing people who have always had to struggle for a voice. The philosopher Jeremy Waldron puts this very clearly. Hate speech makes expressions of supremacy, scapegoating and inferiorization part of the permanent visible fabric of society. In this way, he argues, 'hate speech' is really not a very useful term (and that's before we come to questions of translation). The idea of 'hate' is misleading, suggesting that interfering people like us want to ban, or police, emotions.

And speech is misleading, as mainly what is in question is written texts, images, videos that form a record in public. Yet, we can't get hung up on that – it is a term that will never be settled, and will always be contested, because it is a political term, that makes political claims. Our understandings are shaped by taking action - no definition will guide a trans-national campaign. Instead we are taking about communication as action, action designed to undermine or destroy the democratic participation of others in public culture. The making public of these insults, slurs, incitements, can be circulated and have – where individuals are targeted – real consequences for their integrity, dignity, sense of self, psychological well-being. Where groups are consistently scapegoated, it hurts the person by ensuring that they must constantly negotiate it as part of their reality.

The problem with hate speech is its consequences as an act, not its relation to thought. Confronting it is not to limit thought, but to defend the space for the participation of those who are always made into the problem.

Hate speech, Waldron argues, undermines the dignity of the individual, a dignity which is part of their expectation to be treated as equals in society. It is designed to undermine their dignity in two ways, in their own eyes – making them feel inferior – and in the eyes of others in society – making treatment as an inferior acceptable. Some of us here are those targeted; others are those who witness those attacks. To not take action says to those targeted, I have accepted the legitimacy of your dignity being undermined. And in so doing, I have made a choice.

At this point, the usual objection is, but how can we know what is harmful? What if it is just offensive? And the answer is: ask those people who are the subjects of hate. The next objection – yes I'm sure they feel bad, but surely they can't just define something as being hateful, as involving hurt, and then we just accept it? The answer is yes. Choose. Democracy requires solidarity, it requires a determination to stand against the abuse of power, to refuse the silencing of others. It involves conflict. The question is how that conflict is handled.

REASON 4: IT DEPENDS ON REFUSING CONFLICTS THAT DO NOT EXIST, WHICH IS THE NEXT POINT. IT DEFENDS FREEDOM OF EXPRESSION

If you debate about hate speech, mention hate speech, mention the problem –before you say what action you want to take, there is a really good chance that someone will mention freedom of expression, and there is a good chance they will quote Voltaire at you. 'Might not agree with what you say, but will defend to the death your right to say it'. Well, Voltaire never said that, he had other things to worry about. Point being – this opposition being opposing hate speech/freedom of expression is something of a fantasy, at least as far as this campaign is concerned. Fantasy – because it starts from a vision of freedom, an entirely unchecked freedom, now under threat, that we never had.

Don't get me wrong there are a plenty of threats to freedom of speech. But this campaign isn't one. Public action, democratic mobilization, isn't one. Most countries – have laws preventing incitement to hatred on grounds of ethnicity, religion and race, or to criminalise threats and public humiliation.

These not viewed as violations of individual freedom, but, under the rubric of the ECHR (which we heard about in the opening speeches) and the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, as guarantees of liberty.

The Campaign is not asking for new laws. In the realm of communication – broadcasting has regulatory frameworks, work places codes of conduct. Service providers have terms & conditions, journalists have professional codes of ethics, and so forth. And of course, in these discussions, we rarely get to questions of private property, inequality of access to resources to communicate, the privatization of knowledge through intellectual property and copyright, that structure communication and public culture. Image of a state of free expression threatened by idea of freedom of speech is a fantasy. Campaign is a demand for reality – it rescues freedom of expression, by struggling for the meaningful freedom to participate. Unchallenged hate speech reduces spaces and homogenises communication – those targeted will simply not participate where they are not safe. Plenty of evidence of this in studies of comment threads, for example. Activists already understand this. So it is a fantasy an ideological one. It only exists in It over-invests in freedom in one realm of social life - speech as condition of a free and democratic society (which it is) while ignoring



the real, material inequalities, violent coercions that disfigure democratic societies. One of these inequalities is access to communicate, and probability to be listened to.

**REASON 5: BECAUSE IT ENACTS A MEDIA ETHICS, IT DEFENDS
MEDIA ETHICS IN A VOLATILE MEDIA ENVIRONMENT**

The Campaign recognizes that democratic potential of new media – as a capacity to communicate is still very uneven – must be protected by struggling for conditions that allow people to really participate. I won't dwell on this, as we will have plenty of discussions as to the specificities of media action.

Instead, I will present another reason to do with 'freedom of expression'.

**REASON 6 - BECAUSE CLAIMING THAT "FREEDOM OF
EXPRESSION" IS THREATENED IS A TACTIC FOR
DIRECTING ATTENTION TO RACIST PROVOCATION.**

In 1977, the National Socialist Party of America decided to hold a march in Skokie, a town in Illinois far from their HG in Chicago. The town had always had a tradition of German settlement, and after WW2 many Holocaust survivors gathered there, in fact 1/6 residents was a survivor. Hence the decision of the Nazis to march there brought maximum controversy, and so publicity. The town council refused permission for the march. The Nazis appealed to the American Civil Liberties Union, who defended their right to free expression under the First Amendment to the Constitution.

This is not about rights or wrongs of that decision, but about the tactic. Nazis were well aware – attract attention by engineering a situation where (a) they are the victims and (b) where good people will feel conflicted about important principles, and often support the principle, if not the actors involved.

Nowadays this is an established tactic, and it has become even more popular in such a crowded communications environment to attract attention, 'break taboos', 'say what should never be said', and seek legitimacy by being defended in principle. An example to have a thought about is Geert Wilders and his film Fitna.

We oppose hate speech because we care about meaningful freedom of expression. So we need to be able to evaluate when this tactic is being used, and effectively counter it. And this is part of a wider need to think about tactics in relation to hate speech, and I will concentrate here for a moment on racist strategies.

**REASON 7: BECAUSE RACISTS TAKE LANGUAGE, LANGUAGE GAMES AND
LANGUAGE POLITICS VERY SERIOUSLY, AND SO SHOULD WE.**

How can this be? On a white supremacist site, globally influential in a white power movement? Studies of Stormfront – and wider study of racist movements - noted significant shifts in discourse and public presentation over the last decades. Of course, this is a very complicated area – provide here just one point of substance. Since at least the 1970s, various kinds of racist movements, or movements/parties that benefit from stigmatizing migrants and 'migrant-looking people', have searched for ways to make racism acceptable. Of course there are always fringe movements that openly celebrate the ideas and iconography of Nazi Germany, the pre civil rights Southern US states, apartheid South Africa, and so forth. But parties and

actors who really want power realized that overt, supremacist racism, expressed in the terms of a horrific past, has no future. So they invested significant effort in language, in discourse, in shifting the terms on which different. Others can be held up for targeting.

On sites like Stormfront, a dominant discourse is that of rehabilitating racial science, in defense of reason. In the broader racist terrain, actors began talking not about racial science, but cultural difference. In fact, the openly accepted the terms that much multicultural and intercultural education favours.

Opposing immigration, and migrants, is simply then about a 'right to difference' (of the heartland). Any action taken by migrants and minorities to oppose their treatment is 'reverse racism'; 'anti-white racism'. Any gain for minorities must automatically be a loss for the silent majority – therefore racism is a struggle for equality, against discrimination.

So what developed are tactics that, as we know, propose their act of love - but that explicitly look to use progressive language, democratic concepts, human rights principles, to justify unequal treatment and the constant identification of certain people as the problem. So if you disagree, who's the fascist now? Who's the racist now? How can you be against the good things that I tell you I am for? These tactics have worked very well, because the main organizing principle of public debate, particularly in media, is balance. There must always be two sides, even if this form of balance distorts the kind of debate we often need (e.g. climate change).

There is much more I could say on this, but for now, just the point is racism takes language very seriously. They take language games and language strategies very seriously. We need to stop thinking of racism as simply anger, blind hate, irrational, and of people who give voice to racism as simply ignorant racists. Racism is constantly shifting, searching for legitimacy, for issues to stick to, for tactics to further certain understandings.

A campaign provides a serious opportunity to learn about these tactics, and figure out counter-strategies. And strategies of when to intervene, how to intervene, how much energy to invest, what audiences to appeal to are crucial, because simply stating our values is of no consequence. Remember they have values too, values that inform the act of love.

REASON 8: BECAUSE WE CAN NEVER LET THESE IDEAS SHAPE THE SPECTRUM OF ACCEPTABLE IDEAS

Of course, we are talking about engaging in spaces and interactions that extend far beyond organized movements. However, the point of the tactics I have just discussed is to shape the basis on which discussions take place, to shape what is commonsense, what is acceptable. A common reaction to the Roma case? 'Yes, what the police did was a mistake, but we have to be able to talk openly about the problems with Roma. It's for their own good as well'. In other words, even where they are in the right, they remain the focus, as the problem. It is these structures of prejudice that we need to target as much as instances, particular utterances, of hateful communication.

The campaign is also about saying that you do not get to define reality, do not get to say who the problem, and what the problem is.



REASON 9: BECAUSE OTHERS DO, EVERY DAY.

Thing is –people are saying that, contesting these strategies, intervening the flow of hate, all the time. Online is a space of contest, of political conflict, of struggle over how communication resources are used. Not just that people contest – but they do so in ways that are adequate to the medium, to the context, to what is possible, at any given moment, in an endless flow of communication.

One example – Wilders film *Fitna* – when posted on YouTube, generated a huge degree of response videos, satire, counter-speech, and so forth. This led to activists coordinating the tagging of these videos, using the same tags as Wilders' film, thus making it impossible to not see the responses.

REASON 10 – YOU TELL ME ...

Questions, reactions, comments, discussions on the “10 Reasons...” from the plenary.

- Regarding the periodicals, there is for example no code of conduct to moderate the comments sections of online parts of the newspapers in Italy. So it is not the article itself, but the comment threads that can carry a lot of hate speech. Question is should there be a code to moderate the threads as well?
- There is a big dilemma for the media articles in Ireland – sensational, racist ones are a big hit and bring more attention, more clicks on the websites, and thus are attractive to editors, to put more of those kinds of materials in their newspapers.
- Talking about 10 reasons we particularly underline the issue of collective hate speech but I think we also need to talk about the torture that speech brings to individuals on individual level. J-P Sartre said, when you give someone a name you are locking that person in that name. Hate speech locks up the individual, making him fragile. So hate speech is a kind of torture, destroying the individual socially and psychologically. We have to fight physical torture but also psychological one.
- I was happy to hear about the love factor in the hate speech. We should remain in the domain of the love issues, as being in the campaign and working with activists online we realized how important the love element is. Hate speech is indeed often wrapped up in love
- Recent European Court of Human Rights in its case against Estonia, ruled that anonymous offensive comments can be censored.
- Recently in Turkey there is a bash against young unmarried couple wanting to live together. Basically many landlords refuse to rent apartments to unmarried couples, and you hear a lot of hate speech around the issue. There is a certain cultural hegemony situation in Turkey feeding this. There are even talks that this will be legally reinforced.
- You mention discrimination in your speech and discrimination that exists in our society, I would like to tell about a case in Italy. Recently first time in history a minister of African origin was in the government. The society was shocked, parliament was shocked and full of discriminatory messages towards this person. This is appalling, as there is a code of ethics in particular for parliament and parliamentarians. The question is; if in such an important institution one cannot be stopped, how can this be stopped in society at large, because the parliament should be a symbol. if in one European country it does not stop it will not be stopped anywhere else.



IV. THE CAMPAIGN IN A BROADER CONTEXT OF ADDRESSING RACISM, DISCRIMINATION, HUMAN RIGHTS VIOLATIONS

HATE PREVENTION INITIATIVE: DAVID ALEXANDRE AND PHILIPPE COEN

Before introducing the initiative the speakers gave a testimony about their own personal cases. Sometime ago they received an invitation to a conference which was dedicated to the fact that in the year 2016 Adolf Hitler's "Mein Kampf" would no longer have the copyright issues and it would be released to the public domain. According to international copyright legislation, Bern convention, the copyright is waived after 70 years following the death of the author and then the piece falls into the public domain. This means that in 2016 the book can be published by any publishing house and can be disseminated by anyone.. The main purpose of the conference was to find ways to respond to these circumstances . What was interesting was that the approach of the conference was mainly pedagogical even having a vast book of legal instruments and legislation fighting against discrimination and racism, harassment and hate speech.. The approach discussed was not to sanction the dissemination of the book, but to prepare the young people to receive it, through education about the book, understanding it was a book full of hate content, and to be aware of all the consequences of the book.

This experience promoted the initiative. Teachers, educators, lawyers, professionals, psychiatrist gathered around the Hate prevention initiative as the clock was ticking for the time when the book carrying most hate content ruining Europe in the WWII will be out in the public domain. There is no country in Europe today that was not affected by the drama caused by the content of this book. The book is still a bestseller in many of the countries. In 2005 75,000 copies of the book were sold in 2 months in Turkey, in Middle East and India there are specified shops for selling the book in different versions and formats. There's probably not one day that passes without some article written in media in our countries.

The initiative used the soft law approach two years ago when in France there were the presidential elections. They sent a message to all the presidential candidates to ask about their vision that opinion about discrimination in general and hate speech. Many of them replied and had a rather criminal law oriented approaches.

The initiative group took an educational approach and came up with a few initiatives to address the issue of Mein Kampf entrance into public domain in 2016.

One of them, following the approach which France had in 1979 , whereby the French Court of Appeal had made a resolution and decided that the book could only be published together with a 10-page critical analytical text which was developed by the French Court. The Court made an exceptional ruling, and stated



that the book was such an important book for understanding what happened and why, and how not to let it happen again, that one should not ban the publishing, but rather use the disclaimer text to accompany it. It is clear, that today, anyone who wishes, can find the book online. What the Initiative wants; is not to prevent people from finding the content, but in fact to find it on the sites with explanations of the general context, which can help explain and educate people, through historical explanations.

Another project of the initiative is to link internet actors, businesses, providers, and promoters to use or subscribe to codes of conduct and ethics to deal with these kinds of hate content. This means responsibility of the businesses when creating and publishing the content.

Summarizing ideas for action and initiatives:

- Labeling: an approach of labeling the hate related content and trying to understand how to make Internet actors responsible by being compliant with social corporate responsibility for their content. The No hate speech movement should be linked to social corporate responsibility ideas. This Initiative proposes to introduce a "Respect zone" label. This will mean that the site will sign up to a charter/requirements of hate free, responsible internet space, and is thus complying with no hate speech approaches. This will also boost the corporate image and credibility of the companies, who can be trusted for their free hate speech content.
- Warning sites and disclaimers on sites with hate content need to be promoted, made accessible and available
- Establishment of a European observatory of hate prevention – initiative which will follow, define, work on codes for internet cyber space

David Alexander and Philippe Coen invited the conference participants to work together and join their initiatives as their work goes hand in hand with the movement and the campaign.

Question and Answers:

- Q. How likely is it that the book will be published in 2016 as the European parliament has been wavering its free publication for a number of years now.
- It is clear that the 70 years have passed so it is going to be released to the public domain.
- How can one ensure that the disclaimers will be read before downloading the book?
- This cannot be ensured but they should be made available, prominent and promoted so people know they exist and have a chance to consult it. These disclaimers can be linked to websites which would explain how the content has a role in today's Europe. These websites can even be sponsored by the Council of Europe.
- Is there any chance to limit the amount of profit that publishing actors can make from publishing and disseminating this book? The approach to waving profits can only be made through soft law and the responsibility of publishing houses. Approaches need to be that the houses themselves will not publish this for making profits but rather make the book available for educational reasons - for education against hate.

HATE SPEECH ONLINE: THE VIEW FROM MEXICO

- VALERIA BERUMEN ORNELAS

I appreciate the invitation to participate in this high-level conference. It is of great importance for the Mexican government to have the opportunity to exchange experiences in these areas, in order to continue with the efforts to prevent and eliminate discrimination, and to fight xenophobia, racism and hate speech.

The Constitution of the United Mexican States has a non-discrimination clause, which forbids any discrimination that undermines human dignity or nullifies rights and freedoms of individuals and includes, within the prohibited grounds of discrimination, ethnic or national origin, religion or any other cause.

The Federal Law to Prevent and Eliminate Discrimination was enacted in 2003. This Act created the National Council to Prevent Discrimination (Conapred), and within it, the following practices are forbidden as discriminatory: to offend, ridicule or promote violence against individuals or groups through messages and images in the media, limiting free expression of ideas, prevent freedom of thought, conscience, religion or customs, provided they do not conflict with public order, incite hatred, violence, rejection, ridicule, defamation, slander, persecution or exclusion.

In recent weeks a very advanced reform of this law has taken place. It will contain tools to repair damages done by discrimination, even of economic nature, provoked by public servants and individual people.

After this brief description of the context and the Mexican legal framework, I'd like to share with you a video - Experiment with the dolls.

As shown in the video, the cultural and social background of racism in Mexico seems to be embedded since childhood and this is how it reproduces and continues to affect millions of people. However, this exercise also revealed in its content, especially in comments raised in social networks, our cultural denial, that in Mexico issues such as racism, xenophobia, discrimination and hate speech exist.

A quote from one of the girls, when she responds to what doll she seems more alike, answers that she is similar to both because there are parts of her body that are white, showing the need to justify her colour, and says phrases which reveal that her dad or mum endowed her to "defend" that fact.

When we released this video, which generated much controversy almost immediately, it gathered more than three million views, comments and denials to discredit. There were people who spoke of manipulation and even that it was not about racism but colour psychology, which linked dark with bad and white with good, insisting that this expression was not racism.

In Mexico we declare ourselves very proud of our indigenous roots, we boast of our great prehispanic civilizations with their pyramids and knowledge; nevertheless, to call someone "indio - indian" is an insult related not only to skin color, but to ignorance and socioeconomic status. Everyday there are numerous discriminatory hashtags that speak of bad smells, a lack of good taste, manners or economic resources when speaking of those who are indigenous. Of course, indignant voices arise, demanding this to stop, but this fails to. Even when this situation is detected in social networks, by public figures or in media content, it is perceived as harmless, just an expression of Mexican "black humor" without any real consequences



to indigenous people or other discriminated groups. But all indicators deny this is true; for example, to be born in a remote area like the Zongolica mountain range means on average there is eleven times less life expectancy than if you are born in a municipality of Nuevo Leon.

The National Survey on Discrimination in Mexico 2010, conducted by the National Council to Prevent Discrimination in Mexico, also reveals data that exposes this hypocrisy in Mexico, because 81% of people believe they are insulted as a result of their skin tone, even though more than 70% of people call themselves “mestizos”. Another exercise that the Council of Europe accompanied, was a citizen initiative named Tweetbullets. To continue I will present another video.

A recent analysis of a Mexican magazine recounted the skin tone of people who appear in “social” publications, namely those which report public life of people with economic or social power. The result of the analysis was that, of six hundred people photographed, only ten had brown skin and only three were mentioned by name: one of them was a woman of indigenous origin, a lawmaker who achieved this status only after a long process, as many men sought to deny her right to be voted by sex, excused in so-called usages and customs. Thus, in everyday life and social culture, discrimination is present not only in everyday expressions and social networks, but in decisions on public policy and legislation.

The big challenge in Mexico is to accept that this problem exists. To give enough information and education so that people understand that there are serious consequences to the lives of people who are discriminated against and are the object of hate speech which is often disguised as humor, standardized, and even justified under the pretext of freedom of expression.

I would like to end by saying that, because of these examples of hate speech in Mexico, an effort to join the No Hate Speech Movement Campaign is not only a possibility but a necessity.

CONCLUSIONS OF THE CONFERENCE “THE HATE FACTOR IN POLITICAL SPEECH. WHERE DO RESPONSIBILITIES LIE?” - AMBASSADOR URSZULA GACEK, PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE OF POLAND TO THE COUNCIL OF EUROPE:

Michal Boni summing up of debates on the Warsaw Conference “The hate factor in political speech, Where do responsibilities lie?

If we want to change the climate of public debate, we need to create an atmosphere of fraternity and solidarity.

This will allow us to change the world” – said Michal Boni summing up the International Conference of the Polish Ministry of Administration and Digitalization and the Council of Europe “The hate factor in political speech, Where do responsibilities lie?”. “Our conference has set before us more questions than answers, moreover, extremely inspiring for the Polish government. However, it seems that six issues are the most important”, said the Minister:

- We must continue to discuss the responsibilities and obligations of states and international organisations in the case of hate speech. It is very important to share the responsibility and to create common reference points for numerous different countries. In this way it will be much easier to deal with the problem.
- We should consider the creation of a common definition of hate speech. It is not an easy task but a definition is needed. We should address this issue at the Belgrade Ministerial Conference.
- We need to discuss further about ways to solve the dilemma between freedom of expression and hate speech. There is tension, because freedom of expression is the fundamental human right. On the other hand, we must find a way to stop hate speech and its consequences. To achieve this goal we must work together with a shared responsibility. It is not only the task of states, NGOs, media portals, international organisations- but it is a job for everyone. Hate speech threatens everyone.
- We should have a good understanding of what problems are borne out of hate speech in the online world, where everything within the digital community everything can be instantly multiplied and shared. The Internet is a space of freedom but it can be misused as a means to facilitate wrongful and harmful acts.
- It is important to facilitate a public space for debate, a public sphere. To change mentality, we should organise an open space for dialogue and debate in the media, on the Internet and – as rightly pointed out by Professor Radoslaw Markowski- for deliberative democracy, which requires debate, and constant participation and dialogue from citizens- rather than just the act of electing.

HATE SPEECH AND RACISM IN EUROPE TODAY: SARAH ISAL, CHAIR OF THE EUROPEAN NETWORK AGAINST RACISM

European Network Against Racism (ENAR) is a network of organizations fighting against racism and discrimination in their local and national realities. Hate speech is something ENAR members face on a daily basis. ENAR's aim is to influence policies and legislation to better tackle racism and discrimination. The focus of this network, which sees its remit as a lobby organization is not only to fight against hate speech but also hate-prompted actions.

Racism is on the rise today, and is getting worse with its presence in politics, the media, and everyday life.

What should be done to tackle and work with hate and racism? It seems an obvious answer that one should work with perpetrators to prevent violence and hate speech. This has become a tricky undertaking, as we have stereotypical understandings of who the perpetrators are – radical groups, neo-nazis, skin heads, etc. However, these perpetrators do not always fit these stereotypical labels, and can be more subtle in their use of hate speech. It is not always from the extreme quarters, but is becoming more frequently heard from mainstream media, mainstream political parties, respected public figures, and their hateful opinions are often accepted as reasonable. This is even more dangerous, as it comes from someone that is trustworthy or regarded as credible.



The effect of this, is the normalization and tolerance of hateful speech. This normalization has grave consequences on social life. Racism and violence are being expressed in more subtle ways. For example in two consecutive weeks there was a headline in French newspapers with an image of a Roma or a migrant, with a text explaining how they did not wish to integrate and have a normal, French life. These instances in the media, which are numerous, are feeding racist behavior and racial exclusion. This is the type of hate speech ENAR is aiming to combat.

Upcoming parliamentary elections are going to make the situation worse, as a lot of parties, who would be considered in the political “centre”, not seen as far right or extreme in their views, are more often using hate rhetoric to gain more votes. ENAR will be holding a few campaigns around European elections to address and challenge racism and hate speech in political discourse. The members of the networks with their campaign are going to ask and demand that the candidates express and conduct themselves in an ethical way and members of ENAR will also be monitoring the election campaigns of different candidates.

This work requires the cooperation and help of all people in order to tackle this issue. We need people to send in examples and also disseminate the positive narrative ENAR is trying to create and promote. One way is through the telling of stories which challenge pre-held, stereotypical assumptions, such as of how a group of young Muslim men raised money in the UK for a charity benefitting war veterans. These narratives can be part of a counter-narrative strategy against hate speech. Positive arguments and narratives need to be heard to challenge racist stereotypes in the mainstream media which may not recognize stories of this kind.

One project ENAR has on the issue is the publication called “Hidden talents – Wasted talents”, which highlights hidden contributions migrants and other minority groups bring to our societies, and this counters some of the negative myths we hear on a daily basis.

A final thought to share – there is a need of a strong cooperation between the EU and the USA, as many web servers promote hate speech are based in the US and we need to work together to see how to tackle the issue with them.

Another thought to share is that one needs to think how to go beyond the converted circles, how to reach the ones who really need convincing, how to make it everyone’s business. There is a need to build alliances with all networks dealing with the various issues of racism, sexism, homophobia and so on, in order to work together and make contributions to each others work and in a spirit of solidarity.



V. SHARING CHALLENGES, QUESTIONS, SOLUTIONS AND CELEBRATING SUCCESSES

In working groups, participants shared their different experiences in the campaign and evaluated the challenges, the open questions and the achievements in the campaign.

The working groups addressed the following questions:

- What are the achievements of the No Hate Speech Movement they have realised/contributed to?
- What motivates them to take part in the No Hate Speech Movement?
- What are the challenges and set-backs they encountered?
- What fears and unresolved questions they have related to the NHSM?
- What opportunities do they see in the No Hate Speech movement campaign for 2014?

SUCCESSES AND CELEBRATIONS

- Geography of the campaign
- The campaign has truly gained support in a number of member states of the Council of Europe, where NCCs have been established, supported, funded. In areas and countries where the NCC does not yet exist, interest and active groups take the lead and ownership of the campaign.
- Online and offline nature of the campaign
- The campaign appeals to youngsters, as the online and cyber space is where they are spending their time to socialize, learn and interact. However, online action is never enough, and therefore offline initiatives are also being organized to support and feed the online work and vice versa.
- Campaign is open to all
- Easy to join, easy to become active, very participatory, everyone can participate if they wish to join, report and take action on either a local, national or European level.
- "No Hate"- a recognizable brand in Europe
- The NHSM, its slogan, logo, messages are recognizable throughout Europe. It has been a successfully marketed brand, with simple, but politically strong, emotionally charged messages which are both verbal, visual, non-verbal. The Campaign has opened up topics to the public domain and raised topics back to the European youth policy agendas. The visibility of the campaign has been successfully reached: many young people know about the campaign. As the tools of the campaign are easy to use in various settings (festivals, market places, concerts, large scale meetings, etc) the general visibility has been increased.
- Campaign tools
- The campaign has managed to create a number of user-friendly and adaptable, tools to help one



become active. Moreover educational materials have been developed and are a good asset for people involved in the campaign whether as activists, or educators and multipliers, etc. A question nevertheless remains whether each country should develop their own educational materials and tools, which will be most relevant and correspondent to their own contexts and realities.

- Strong educational component
- Both on the national and European levels a close attention has been given to educating people and parties involved, especially in the offline space through non-formal education, in giving increasing opportunities for people involved to be trained. In general the campaign is a constant learning opportunity for actors involved.
- Diversity of actors and sectors involved
- It seems the campaign on a European level, and also in many countries on the national level manage to bring people working in the field closer, such as governments, NGOs, some businesses, social media industry, activists, educators, international bodies and organisations, and even gamer communities.
- Trained and competent people involved
- More than 30 activists are being continuously trained at the Council of Europe to recognize hate speech and hate crime, to report it, and to motivate people to take action to stop it.
- Innovation and creativity
- New ideas, new forms of work, space and mobilization of a lot of artistic expressions in, through, for the campaign cause have been present and used in the work so far. Moreover the main core of the campaign – the online nature – is one that corresponds mostly to the communication media young people are used to today, where they would spend most of their social time.

CHALLENGES AND SETBACKS

- Political commitment
- A lack of political will, priority, and passionate political role models is a set-back in many member states which jeopardizes the future success of the campaign.
- There are still a number of taboo topics and a selective approach to what is considered appropriate to tackle. In some member states hate speech is not recognized as a “real” or “serious” crime in the political circle .
- Campaign on the national level
- The level of involvement in the campaign is fragmented and diverse. There are NCCs established or activist interest groups working at a national level. NCCs may be fully functioning or may be inactive , they may be run by the government or by NGOs. There is a divide between the national and European level of the campaign. Often at the European level, activities are not taken by the NCCs, such as the EADs, and therefore there is a lack of ownership being built. In general coordination, connection of the two levels is lacking. Additionally links with research, policy and practice: There is a lack of comprehensive research on national levels which can explain the roots causes of the problem and a lack of suggestions for strategies.



- Can a pan-European campaign be based on the work of volunteers? Probably not, so the need of a campaign manager is essential at this stage. A stronger central coordination will give a chance for:
- Clear structure and direction and the possibility of adjustments when needed
- Management of information sharing, flow, shared knowledge management, where each country can have a space to share and learn
- Clearly planned actions for European and national level
- Consolidation of activities and results
- Prompt response to viralhate speech which is rapid(hate speech reports often have a long wait to be approved before going online),
- Possibility to bring Facebook and Twitter followers on to the campaign platform
- European Action Days (EADs) – are the big opportunities to have the joint work feeling and be together. So there is a strong need for their coordination, timely planned, rich with content/background information EADs, with strong messages, guidelines for action.
- The web site and the platform is not reflecting the work done on various level, does not provide enough tools, educational materials, guidelines and directions to be able to work autonomously in the campaign. It should indeed work as a support for networking, tool to use to customize the joint campaign on national level (download templates, etc)
- Future and sustainability of the campaign
- No clear vision of what will happen with the campaign beyond 2014, where it will go, who will take the ownership and who will finance it
- Mobilization, outreach and motivation
- There is no clear outreach strategy in place for involving new groups (the hate speech targets themselves, younger children, children in schools) and motivating them. A new challenge is to outreach bring in the “non-converted” ones into the campaign and work with perpetrators, “haters” and have ways to work with them.
- Multilingualism and language barriers are also central issues are in relation to outreach and involvement of new groups – The campaign is mainly in English, and not many countries have been developed materials, work, tools, website in local languages.
- In addition, the concepts and definitions of what hate speech and hate crime is , etc are difficult concepts to grasp for young people and children, and mean different things in different contexts. The language needs to become more youth-friendly and understandable.
- Finances and additional human resources
- Little financial support is available at national levels, with no specific or targeted grant programmes for the youth NGOs.
- There is not a clear evaluation and monitoring strategy at the European level, and no possibility to measure impact, effectiveness, efficiency, but also no developed mechanisms/guidelines/plans for national campaign to evaluate their work. There is also a need of clear strategy of evaluating, documenting, measuring both quantitative and qualitative data
- Working with media
- There is not enough media support and involvement to create a media and PR strategy. On the



other side little is done to raise media literacy of the people involved in the campaign. Resources of traditional media are not exhaustively used either.

- Campaign in a broader context
- Cooperation with formal education, is challenging as it is hard to enter schools in many member states. Links and works with internet businesses, corporations, providers and developers are still weak.
- Freedom of speech vs Safe and inclusive internet/cyber space
- Can we say what we do? Defining hate speech and positioning it in discourse is essential and a very sensitive issue, as this tension between freedom of speech and hate speech is used to stop action. There is a strong need to explain the approach and show that the two do not contradict each other, but also raise awareness of how censorship can be misused in some places under the good name of combating. The campaign message should be CLEAR!
- It is a top down campaign
- The Campaign methodology is very top down, where it should be the other way around, creating spaces for grassroot groups and young people to intervene and participate.
- Loss of motivation of activists
- Often people active in the European campaign feel lonely, forgotten, not supported which results in them dropping out...

OPPORTUNITIES AND MOTIVATION

- Sharing, networking, information flow, cooperation and trust building can give positive and valuable results, as it gives opportunities to learn, develop and amplify the work we do by sharing experiences together which will motivate others.
- This work can be done in and between:
- Countries, regions, local grassroot organizations
- Different sectors (businesses, traditional media, social media industry, developers, corporations, public authorities, different sectors, academics, research and practice, legal institutions on national and European levels to work with hate speech reports, formal educational field and sports, Human rights bodies)
- Other similar campaigns and initiatives (to amplify the effect and impact and being a part of something greater)
- New people in the campaign
- New groups, new ideas, new motivations should become a strategic approach and direction for the campaign.
- Advocacy for legal change is possible if continuous effort is made to make existing legal mechanisms and tools applicable for combating and stopping hate, and also to advocate for stronger legal grounds for addressing hate speech and for these hate crimes to be recognized within national legal frameworks.
- Hate speech watch is a useful tool that should be made useful, should be moderated and promoted

so more people start using it. It can be well promoted on other relevant sites and can also promote other similar hate speech watches from around Europe.

- European action days and National action days
- European action days can be strengthened by National action days, where the countries will take the lead and involve local actors.
- European parliament elections are a big chance to voice, monitor, bring into attention the topic and spread the word, as these elections are expected to be more radical and populist than before. They will be an important arena to extend the topic and campaign at a European level.
- Possibilities of Zero cost projects
- The campaign promotes the use of projects with zero or little costs, using alternative support schemes. These practices should be shared and used.
- Ideas of actions!
- Involve youth in internet governance
- Hate speech related database on the European website, crowd maps on the site to contain other initiatives as well
- Have an online living library
- Have a blended learning approach to educational initiatives
- Educational materials
- More and diverse materials for education can be developed, to give alternative possibilities for learning, such as e-learning, blended learning, learning through interactive sites and games. In general, working with the formal educational system, to include learning about hate crimes and speech in the curricula for EDC and HRE, or as an extracurricular activity.

QUESTIONS AND FEARS

A general fear or open question is connected to what is going to happen with the campaign after 2015 and what is going to be the direction. Who will “own” and finance the campaign? How to follow up? Will it become accepted and taken up by young people? National campaign might not take ownership.

impact of the campaign should be about sustainable change –how can we reach the future generations of young people so that they benefit and get involved against hate speech online?

There is a fear that the campaign will not reach the perpetrators nor the wider youth communities but only the online activists and youth leaders.

Many topics will be banned in member states, how can this be approached?

Take care!: offer a SAFE SPACE FOR ACTIVIST: how to maintain privacy? How to protect people that are taking a stand in hostile countries? Raise awareness about privacy in social networks.

Conflicts might become more severe between the groups, how should the Council of Europe approach this?

How to motivate and engage activists to take action on their own once the campaign is finished? How to motivate them after NHSM campaign is over?



- In the crisis, populist parties are more supported and visible, how should we act and what should we do to succeed.

FACING THE ISSUES RAISED – RUI GOMES, HEAD OF EDUCATION AND TRAINING DIVISION

- Political commitment – There is a real political will in member states and in the Council of Europe. Many means have been invested by the stakeholders and partners of the campaign, we count on them, but we also will need to work continuously to mobilise work for tomorrow. The level of commitment depends on the national context. Although the Council of Europe works to follow up and coordinate the work, it cannot replace what member states do at home, on a national and regional level. It is up to young people to take work further and push for political commitment. The Council of Europe has set up guidelines to set up national campaign committees to follow the work on national level.
- Ownership after 2014 – we all own the campaign, and even if there is no NCC in a country, one can become active and work individually on the European level.
- Resources – Council of Europe can in some case mobilise resources and can support activities to be implemented on a local level, but cannot provide NCCs and national campaigns with resources.
- Working on sensitive issues – How far one can deal with sensitive issues in a given country? It is possible and imperative to prioritise human rights in a given context, but this does not mean to exclude others. The question is not whether we should work on sensitive and controversial issues, but on the method we should take to work and address them.
- Objectives and results – Campaign aims and objectives are very clear. The need is that on national levels, national campaigns have national objectives, specific for their local context, which will also be connected to the overall campaign objectives in general.
- Evaluation criteria, indicators – Not everything that is measurable is valuable, and Not everything that is valuable can be measured: It is important to record what has been done and to see where we go, but not all the things can be measured.
- The platform – It is available to download, customise, translate into different languages and use in national campaigns.
- Hate speech watch – the reports in own national languages can go to the national platforms but not the European ones, as they will not be translated.
- Website – all the materials can be downloaded and used by the national campaigns and also can support networking.



VI. LEARNING FROM PRACTICES WITH ONLINE CAMPAIGNING

ROUND-TABLE WITH:

Jemma Tyson , Ministry of Justice, UK
Carlinda Lopez, European School Net
Eavon Carol, Google/Youtube
Rui Gomes, Council of Europe

MODERATOR

Dariusz Grzemny

BRIEF SUMMARY OF SPEAKERS' INPUTS

Presenting the UK approach to Internet Hate

The tools used to Combat Internet hate speech in the UK can be connected and used by the NHSM campaign as they are using similar approaches to dealing with the issue.

The work on combating hate on the internet has a number of challenges in UK. The first challenge has a more global nature and has to do with legislation which leads to the second challenge which is to do with jurisdiction issues. Often, many websites which have harmful content are coming from outside of the UK and thus are outside of its jurisdiction which also means that there is little that the UK can do to challenge this content, even if they have harmful consequences for the UK. For example, many blogger sites are based in the US and due to unrestrained access, UK nationals are exposed to the content. Another challenge is the lack of resources - there are not enough law enforcing actors such as officers and prosecutors who can deal with the increasing amount of hate speech on the Internet. Other challenges include fragmented industry, pace of change, lack of international collaboration between member states and between the EU and USA.

Within the system of the MoJ, a department of Cross government, there is a hate crime program which exists, supporting work combating hate crimes. There is also a dedicated website - True vision (www.report-it.org.uk) – that helps deal with the issue in an integrated and collaborative way between a few different governmental and local structures. Main features of this site/tool are consistency, shared resources, provides secure and fast online reporting, library of resources and information (information packs, reporting tools, third-party reporting support), and providing a community space united against hate. The site has 10,000 visitors per month and 3400 reports per year are made about Internet activity. The site also provides space where one can find information about hate crime, hate speech, definitions,



educational resources, posters and books to help raise awareness about hate crime, with its work supporting community and community organizations. It is a shared resource that can be used by anyone. This is also a site where you can go to, to report hate speech and hate crime online. The reports of abusive sites, videos, Facebook pages are directly and automatically linked to the Metropolitan police. The site also has a lot of links to support victims of hate crime, for example there is also a mobile app to support its work and to respect as much as possible privacy of people who might have been victims of hate crime. There is a protocol about the use of the tool, stating in which cases the report should be made to the site and in which other cases the report should go directly to the police. The website also had a campaign promoting it to British sign language users and reached around 14,000 people out of 16,400. Their Facebook page was used to reach large amounts of people by minimal financial resources. The site is run by the Ministry of Justice but it is also coordinated by the association of police chiefs and this is a good example of cooperation from government to local level.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

- Q. How do you reach targeted groups on Facebook and what effect has this had?
- A. We have tried to target people through pages they visited or liked/ One could see the fact that there was raising awareness about the issues
- Q, How much the efficient work is based on the fact that UK has quite strong legislation on hate crime
- A. Legislation helps a lot as it gives a base for work, but when it comes to awareness raising there is no need for legislation to do so.
- Q. How effective can the link between NHSM and UK Ministry of Justice be, taking into account the fact of long lasting systemic institutional racism in UK police?
- A. There has been a lot of work done to improve the police response after the police was labeled to be institutionally racist for the way they dealt with Steven Lawrence's murder case in UK in 1993
- There is a need, wish and readiness to improve.
- Q. What do you think about NHSM and what can be a recommendation for it
- A. My role is to report back to the ministry, police, youth groups about the campaign, to those who can get involved in this. There are a lot of areas where the no hate speech movement can be implemented with the True Vision site as we have the tool but not the campaign in place. The tools from both structures can be mutually used.
- Rui Gomes (Head of Education and Training Division, Youth Department, Council of Europe) - The movement has tried to help national campaign committees to link their campaign and their reporting mechanisms of the campaigns at a national level to reporting mechanisms in the countries, and has encouraged people to use national reporting systems. When it comes to Facebook, as it was mentioned in the speeches with having the code of conduct and policy on dealing with abusive content, they were invited to join the panel, but could not do so this morning and would like to extend to you their apologies.
- European school net and the Safer Internet day campaign

INSAFE, A NETWORK SET UP WITHIN THE SAFER INTERNET PROGRAMME

In 1999, the European Commission (EC) created the Safer Internet Programme, with the aim of promoting safe, responsible use of the internet by children and young people, and protecting them from illegal and harmful content and conduct online. The programme is managed by the Directorate General for Information, Society and Media and highlights the shared responsibility of NGOs, educational establishments, law enforcement bodies, industry and families in online safety initiatives across the European Union member states. In 2004, the Insafe network was set up to spearhead awareness activities within the Safer Internet Programme.

SAFER INTERNET CENTRES AND COMMITTEES

Insafe is a European network constituted by 30 national Safer Internet Centres in EU member states and in Iceland, Norway and Russia. Every national Centre implements awareness and educational campaigns, runs a helpline, and works closely with youth to ensure an evidence-based, multi-stakeholder approach to creating a better internet. However, Safer Internet Day is also celebrated outside Europe. In 2009, the concept of Safer Internet Day Committees was introduced, to strengthen the bonds with countries outside the network and invest in a harmonised promotion of the campaign across the world. Around 70 committees started working closely with the Insafe coordination team, which is based at the heart of the European Union in Brussels.

Safer Internet Day (SID) is organized by Insafe in February of each year to promote safer and more responsible use of online technology and mobile devices, especially among children and young people across the world. Celebrated on the second day of the second week of the second month, each year on Safer Internet Day hundreds of events are organised to raise awareness of online safety issues, right across the globe. Starting as an initiative of the EU Safe Borders project in 2004 and taken up by the Insafe network (www.saferinternet.org) as one of its earliest actions in 2005, Safer Internet Day has grown beyond its traditional geographic zone and is now celebrated in more than 100 countries worldwide, and across all continents. From cyber bullying to social networking, each year Insafe aims to be at the forefront of emerging online issues and chooses a topic reflecting current concerns.

Any school can celebrate the day. There are a number of resources that can be used to organize this day such as school lesson plans, games, online tools, which can be downloaded and used. Schools only need to go online and register and get all the necessary resources.

The campaign has created different resources targeting different stakeholders and audiences - web resource for the children and youth (The Web We Want - www.webwewant.eu), site for parents (Digital Universe of our Children - www.saferinternet.org) and the decision-makers (European Parliament Magazine Supplement on SID). The resources exist in many languages and are user-friendly, created often by youths themselves.

- The campaign in 2013 has been using all the possible social media tools. The campaign has connected and promoted messages through Microsoft Europe, Google, EU parliament, Council of Europe, ask-



ing people, politicians, structures, companies to re-tweet the messages from the campaign. The campaign also had media outreach work with articles, web site promotions, etc. The campaign has an achievement competition for young people.

Successes of the SID 2013 in figures: 97,000 mentions on Facebook, 10 million users reached, more than 16,000 schools registered for SID, SID video spot seen 42,000 times in 2013, 15,900 tweets #SID2013.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

- Q. A lot of your focus has been on schools. Is that also a possibility for youth organizations to become part of your network and campaigns?
- A. It is absolutely possible for youth organizations to register and be part of the network/ Our members from Iceland in Czech Republic mentioned that they had been a part of the NHSM campaign and they have linked with local school
- Q. Your focus is more education and training, it would be interesting to know if there is also work done for policy change. I know in Cyprus organizations refrain from linking to policy making.
- A. It is true that our focus is mainly on education, but recently we wrote an open letter to the Parliament showcasing the work of the organization in schools and talked to politicians about safe Internet being a part of the national curriculum

YOUTUBE/GOOGLE AND THEIR COMMUNITY GUIDELINES

- The Policy team of YouTube/Google working on ensuring community guidelines are respected when it comes to the online content. These guidelines are the “rules of the road” which define what kind of content can or cannot be online on Google or YouTube. To give a small sum up of the content of our work, one should know that every minute more than 100 hours of Videos are being uploaded on YouTube, there are 4 billion unique views every single month, 70% of our content is coming from outside of US.
- First and utmost Youtube is a platform for free expression. It does not create content, but is creating space for it. The team also realizes that there is a fine balance between being a free platform for free expression and being delicate and protecting the more vulnerable youth audience. This is something that is dealt with on a daily basis. The team is a humane team and there is no auto-response to anything reported to the Policy team, and therefore they analyse and discuss content in accordance to community guidelines, as relevant to the context.
- The guidelines do not allow hate speech, harassment, cyber-bullying, pornography, spam and are particularly sensitive towards any content that has to do with minors. In addition, the team has a “mantra” which says “Context is the King” as this is what determines the team’s approach to content. What this means is that if there is a video which has footage about protest actions or footage related to human rights, we would obviously do our best to leave that video with the footage online. Sometimes the same video with two different footages will require two different approaches. If one is inciting hate and harming anyone it will be taken down, but if it is a video calling for action and support, it will stay. The team looks at who the up loader is and what links they have with different groups and ideologies, etc.

- The policy team is informed about guidelines violations through flaggings of users. When the content is flagged it comes to the team for review and is assessed according to the community guidelines. The team works 24 hours, 7 days a week, 365 days a year. So one can be sure that the most is done to ensure violent-free content.
- There is a new programme called "Trusted flaggers". Currently this is an invitation based programme for our trusted expert flaggers. In the team there cannot be experts for all different topics, so this is where they need the help of expert groups, NGOs, etc to inform the policies.
- YouTube has become one of the most powerful campaigning tools for the non-profit sector. Videos such as Connie 2012 and Get up Australia on marriage equality are good examples of this.
- Youtube/Google has programmes and tools for nonprofit sector campaigning support. These are Youtube for non-profits (help in life streams of campaigns and NGO work, resources and tutorials how to use Youtube tools for better campaigning, etc) and Google grants (free advert programme). Another powerful resource is the "Playbook for good" – it is a resource that gives you basic tips on how to make your campaigning efforts more efficient, for example teaching how to tag and reach the intended audience, how to use life-streams, position your channel according to your branding and work, etc. Yoututbe analytics is a good tool to give figures and numbers to assess the visibility and popularity of your campaign.
- A few words about campaigning in social media.
- the fact that a video or message has gone viral does not mean that it has reached the right audience or the hearts and minds of people you wanted to reach
- second you need to use a blended approach by working with social media platforms and also use off-line activities to support your online work.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Q. How many people do you have on your team and what are the language and theoretical backgrounds and expertise of the employees.

Team consists of extremely strong professionals from various backgrounds (lawyers, developers, internet policy professionals, business professionals, human rights experts, translators, policy makers, etc), covering basically all languages. Nothing is auto-reviewed. It always needs a human eye to determine the context and intent of the uploader.

Q. Have you also looked at the impact of videos - someone can hold a good intention but the impact can be quite negative

This is a question we always struggle with as this is a philosophical issue.

Q. I have spent some time on flagging Internet content and wanted to know how this works. Is there a need to have a critical mass of flagings of abusive content for it to be removed? I have flagged quite horrifying videos inviting hate crimes towards different groups in Turkey and this was never dealt with.

Most probably the issue was the context, so the team after discussion found out that the context did not permit it to be taken down. It could be that the context was calling for action, or putting



it in the spotlight to call for change. We always try to look at the intention of the uploader. There is no need for a critical mass. Even one flag can make a video go out of the cyber-space.

Discussion with the panel:

Q. Around the table we have representatives from the business, government and NGO sector. How do you see the role of your institution/structure in the campaign both on national and European levels?

Evon Carol – two things stood out to me in the workshop yesterday: it is the huge responsibility of all social media to ensure people are aware of the reporting mechanisms, given the fact that a lot of people, structures and public body governments are not aware about different reporting mechanism existing in social media. It is important to raise awareness about these reporting tools and link them with other reporting. Secondly, is the need for the creation of positive counter-narratives by NGOs and other experts within the field.

Jemma Tyson – True Vision is very UK based tool but we can see how links can be made with the European component of the campaign.

Carlinda Lopes - SafeNet centers work directly with the campaign, and it is important that there are resources available for people and teachers to download and use in their work in school or elsewhere.

Question from audience to Google/Youtube:

Q. Don't you think it is contradictory and ingenious of Google to speak about helping the non-profits when it is hugely working for profit and is facing tax avoidance allegations.

I am no expert in the taxation but can direct you to resources to read more about it. In terms of being contradictory, I do not think this is the case: we have a mantra of not being evil. We have philanthropic site www.google.org, we have an organization called "Goggle ideas", encompassing technological ideas and fixes for developmental work worldwide. This is reiterating that we are trying to do all we can to help people.

Rui Gomes (Council of Europe) – informed the audience about a discussion they had with Patricia Cartes from Twitter, on working around the "Tweets for good", to get the campaign activists status of Authorized reporters on hate speech in tweets, and we can further discuss with Google and see how some of these people can also be in the Trusted flaggers programme. In general it is very important for all the educational tools created on the topic, to give precise, concise information about how the reporting works and where it can be used. It is important that on the national level, the campaign informs people what can be done, whether it is reporting or denouncing an abusive content.. Rui invited NCCs and national campaigns to make links with their national tools for reporting and inform their constituencies about the possibilities. Finally, he addressed once again the issue of whether hate speech is within freedom of expression. But it is interesting to see that there are things that are just not acceptable in Google, Twitter, and in the Council of Europe and will not be acceptable to anyone. Even if there are no laws on this, it does not mean everything is allowed. At the end of the day Human rights framework is fairly understandable to all.

VII. PLANNING THE CAMPAIGN FOR 2014

SUMMARY OF THE RESULTS OF THE WORKING GROUPS

The workshops on 8 November focused on planning different aspects of the campaign for the rest of 2013 and for 2014. While they tackle specific themes, they 'should all be concerned with these general outcomes:

- Propose specific objectives for the campaign on the theme
- Propose guidelines for the European campaign and the national campaigns
- Propose activities for the programme of the campaign
- Suggest resources and good practices for the campaign to follow-up on, including various partners that should be invited.
- Participants in the workshop should be invited to take responsibility as well to support the realization of such endeavours.
- The results of the groups had to be concrete, realistic and creative recommendations/ideas/proposals for the youth online campaign against hate speech in the domain discussed in each group.
- Following issues were to be addressed and discussed about the different campaign elements for the year 2014:
 - What should it look like? (the element you will be discussing, e.g. monitoring and evaluation, European activities)
 - What tools should be used to make it happen?
 - What should the Council of Europe do to make it happen?
 - What should be done at national and European levels?
 - What should other stakeholders do? (Think about making a list of stakeholders who should be involved together with the ideas on how to involve them and what they can/should do in the campaign?)
 - How to guarantee that it will actually happen?

WORKSHOP 1. EUROPEAN ACTION DAYS

Facilitator	Anca-Ruxandra Pandea
Resource person(s)	Geert Ates, UNITED
Reporter	Gubaz Koberidze



BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF THE WORKSHOP PROGRAM, MAIN OBJECTIVES TO REACH

The European Action Days (EAD) bring together the entire campaign on issues/topics that are relevant within the European context. While most of the EADs relate with the international human rights calendar, some of the dates stem from different stakeholders in the campaign. By the date of the conference, six EADs have been organised involving partner NGOs, online activists, youth NGOs, and national campaign committees. While Action days provide focus of the campaign and give strength, a reflection needs to be done on: format of the action days, ways to better involve in all stages the different stakeholders, effectiveness and follow-up on the results and/initiatives started in different actions. This workshop aims to develop a plan of action for the EADs in 2014, including dates, partners to involve and results to plan. European Action Days realised so far by the No Hate Speech Movement by the conference: 17 May – International Day against Homophobia and Transphobia, 20 June – World Day of Refugees, 22 July – European Day of Victims of Hate Crime, 12 August – International Youth Day, 21 September – International Peace Day, 14-18 October - European Week of Local Democracy

Along the way there has been many successful moments in the EADs, but also a number of challenges, which curtailed the potential impact of the action days. Among the challenges identified by the participants were:

- Last minute preparation of the European Action Days does not allow for national campaign to mobilize and prepare activities at national level;
- A lot of action days that do not allow for a full process of preparation to be;
- Lack of time to involve and create synergies with other partners in order to create partnerships and not competition;
- Lack of flow between one action day to the other and lack of follow-up on the results achieved;
- Lack of visibility of actions taken in the campaign on the European campaign site;
- Guidelines to actually participate in different activities.
- The format of one week is harder to support and accommodate different partners to rally and act together.
- Lack of a focused message and action if we have a number of days covered by the movement.

BRIEF SUMMARY OF INPUT FROM GEERT ATEs

The resource person of the work shop on European Action days was Geert Ates, director of the “UNITEDfor Intercultural Action”, (<http://www.unitedagainstracism.org/>) the biggest European anti-racist network, that has strong experience in organizing actions in general and especially on the European Action Days. He shared his expertise from the field, giving participants tips to bear in mind for organizing successful action days. Main attention should be paid to the period that is needed to organize successful action and also about the educational side of the action. As mentioned, minimum 6 month is needed to organize action to be sure that it will have good result and impact in the society. Moreover, it is not important to have leaflets or banners, the most important is what is written in this leaflet and on the banner. As Geert said: “You are campaigning for the certain period and you need one day to be more visible!”. Another important

point raised was connected to the security of the activists - it is important to think about activists and because of this he advised hiding location and faces of the participants when they are working to combat discrimination, racism and etc...

FINAL OUTCOMES AND PROPOSALS FOR 2014

Objectives for the EADs

- To promote the campaign (to make it more visible);
- To raise awareness on the specific topic;
- To support and show solidarity to those targeted by hate speech online;
- To support the policy and advocacy work of the campaign;
- To create partnerships (NGOs, Governmental structures and etc.);
- To involve more people;
- To develop strategies on how to combat hate speech;
- To share experiences;

Guidelines for EAD organization

- Create 2 types of action days:
- European Action Day/Weeks - moments when the entire movement (international organisations, national campaign, young people) are taking action together on a specific topic;
- National/ local action days – days to be decided at national level to be marked.
- Other days in the international day calendar can be marked but this should be offered as an opportunity for different partners to coordinate, and it should not be expected that the whole campaign would follow.

Proposal for European Action Days/Weeks

The group proposed two action weeks and 3 action days to be taken on board at the level of the European campaign.

The two agreed action days/weeks:

- 22 July European Day for Victims of Hate Crime: To have the day recognised as a day to commemorate, show solidarity and educate about hate crime, its causes and consequences, and the link between hate speech and hate crime. The main aim is to have the day recognised by member states and actions to be organised in every state.
- 10 December Action week for human rights: It is a good opportunity to rally the whole movement to also show the contribution it makes to human rights culture. It also links with the message of the campaign that it is not only against, but for human rights online and offline.

The three other proposals for action days

- Action Week against Racism and Discrimination – around 21 March: The theme encourages the participation different partners working with those targeted by hate speech online. The week should be used to give particular visibility to the voice of Roma, refugees and migrants in Europe, but should not be limited to it.



- International day against Homophobia and Transphobia - 17 May: These groups are particularly vulnerable to exclusion and discrimination and we found that the issue of homophobia and transphobia are relevant for the whole of Europe and should be highlighted by the campaign. The day should be done in cooperation with the IDAHO campaign.
- 9 November – International day against Fascism, Antisemitism and Islamophobia: It provides a good link with the past and the idea of remembrance and learning from history and can show the mechanism of hatred behind anti-Semitism and Islamophobia is similar.
- Optional Action days for the NCCs will be decided by each one according to their national priorities and challenges.

GUIDELINES FOR PREPARATIONS AND ORGANISATION OF THE EUROPEAN ACTION DAYS

- Task forces for the preparation before the action day

To create task forces that would work to prepare and coordinate the European Action Days. These task forces should include:

- International organisations that work on the topic or with particular target groups that we want to involve to ensure expertise and cooperation with existing initiatives.
- Representatives of national campaign committees to give a sense of what is possible and what not at a national and local level.
- Online activists to support the process of online preparations.

The task force should propose:

- Specific objectives and results for the day to be achieved at a European level;
- How to cooperate and ensure support between different movements that take action in the same period, in order to present a strong and united message together.
- Should support the development of background information – why the day is relevant and how to make it relevant at local level.
- Guidelines on what kind of actions can be taken in that day and how-to organise them

Once a proposal is ready, it should be sent for feed-back for NCCs and other actors that are expected to take action in the campaign.

The task force should finalise the proposal 2 months in advance so that the movement can mobilize implementation.

- Format of the actions

There should be for each action:

- Each Action Day/Week should have 1 specific/measurable objective that can be achieved (i.e. to have the 22 July recognised by different institutions).
- Action Days should contribute to the advocacy and policy objectives of the whole campaign;
- 1 action online and offline that is the same for the whole movement (i.e. flashmob)
- A call for youth organisations, activists, campaign committees, partners to organise events/actions online in the framework of the week/day.

- Pay specific attention to the features of the online platform: hate speech watch, forum and blog to be used within the framework of the week/day.
- The national campaign committees should:
 - Include the European Action Days/ Weeks in their calendar
 - Ensure that they discuss a strategy, calendar and plan in their campaign plan
 - Report and ensure visibility for their action days.
- National action days
 - to be established at national level – recommendation to only have extra 2 national action days
 - to also communicate them to the campaign coordinator/manager at European level to see if there are some synergies emerging
 - to have a survey among national campaign committees on what priorities and specific objectives they would have for the days.
- Visibility
 - Visual identity developed for each day that builds on the existing visual identity of the campaign
 - Press release for the entire movement - easy to translate
 - NCC to coordinate presence in the media at national level
 - Products for the day: posters, info - and to consider online format
- Website European campaign:
 - calendar and map of activities (crowd map);
 - search by country and link to national websites
 - NCC should be able to upload quickly the reports on the day ;

WORKSHOP 2. HATE SPEECH IN POLITICAL DISCOURSE AND EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT ELECTIONS

Facilitator	Balint Molnar
Resource person(s)	Ralph du Long, United for Intercultural Action
Reporter	Julian Perdrigeat

GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF THE WORKSHOPS

The political discourse has become increasingly harsher, and a rise in hate speech occurrence in political speech at all levels can be noted. While the number of racist remarks especially addressing vulnerable groups in Europe has increased, the level of tolerance to such speech in the public sphere has also increased. Elections are usually an opportunity to bring on the public agenda important topics and an easier platform for hate speech.



How can hate speech in the political discourse be monitored, reported and challenged? How can this issue be addressed at national and local elections? Could the European Parliament elections of 2014 provide an opportunity to address the issue across Europe?

The workshop should propose ways to use the European election campaigns to monitor, to raise awareness amongst the general public on political hate speech and challenge it and its underlying causes. The group can explore and propose ways for cooperation with political parties and European Parliament, to prevent the use of hate speech within the election campaign.

Beyond these elections, the group should reflect about the opportunity for a code of conduct to be proposed to candidates in any elections.

This workshop dealt with hate speech in the context of next European election. Rather on the national or European level. Date : May 2014. In general the Parliamentary elections have a low turn-out. Over the last decades, it has been a declining trend of participation. The lower the participation, the higher the chance to succeed for far-right parties. So the NHSM campaign could look at how mobilizing young people and educating them about hate speech in relation to this particular issue of the campaign (combating hate speech).

BRIEF SUMMARY OF INPUT FROM RESOURCE PERSONS

UNITED is working to focus on upcoming elections, and are designing a campaign. There has been a rise of populist and racist parties in Europe. The issue is should one who campaigns focus on them and try to block candidates that use racist and hate speeches or focus on trying to mobilize people that haven't voted yet for example, the youth or migrants. Should there perhaps be two different campaigns (against far right parties or mobilization for participation)? One cannot just suggest people to love each other or to love the EU but be more specific.

UNITED is organising a conference for twice a year, (next year it will be located in Greece, where there is a strong far-right political influence in parliament), and a campaign in 5 countries (France, Italy, Greece, Netherlands, Hungary...) focusing on door to door campaigning in certain regions of these countries: ground work, building community. UNITED hopes to extend this "5C" campaign. The network is also looking for a mainstream campaign for 21 March (day against racism). In October, when there is the new parliament elected, that is the chance : there will be a shift, more radical, more far right, we can make a difference if we focus on the new commission. UNITED is working with ENAR (Hope Not Hate) who is also monitoring hate speech.

MAIN ISSUES/QUESTIONS/CHALLENGES RAISED AND DISCUSSED

Campaign should not only target the EU parliamentarians but also the young parliamentarian in the parliamentary assembly of the Council of Europe. Code of conduct already exists. How to have an impact on the young politician ? How to engage people, What would be the best approach to engage people ? Who do you focus on? People that already vote or those who don't vote? Whether it's a risk if the campaign collect hate speeches and give them another boost? Who is the primary target? In how far will it bring

something interesting if endorsed by MEP? What is the goal in the context of 2014 European parliamentary election? Young voters to get them vote?

If we look at the mechanism it doesn't differ from a country to another. A code of conduct adopted in 2001 (for non racist society) exists and there is some monitoring by the people in the assembly themselves or Vote Watch Europe (www.votewatch.eu).

CAMPAIGNING DURING THE ELECTION CAMPAIGNING

There will be hate speech during these election campaigns. Our goal is to educate young people online about hate speech. Our goal is not to bring people to vote or make sure that politicians do not say hate speech. It is to primarily educate young people online about hate speech, creating awareness about what will happen during these elections.. There is also a need to structure and coordinate the national committees in line with raising awareness and bringing young people to vote. The campaign will need a simple message like "Vote but not for haters".

FINAL OUTCOMES AND PROPOSALS FOR 2014

"The Hate Speech Quote of the Day" – Pilot project

The 2014 Elections are an opportunity to highlight hate speech in the political discourse and boost the reach of the NHSM Campaign. Goal: Educate young voters and the general public about hate speech and its prevalence in the political discourse

CAMPAIGN COMPONENTS:

Engaging NCC's/national partners in the 28 EU member states to collect the worst instances of hate speech by MEP candidates and politicians

The quotes are entered into the HateSpeechWatch database (hashtags + comments)

Artists/cartoonists are asked to produce critical and comical visual artwork based on these quotes

Council of Europe/EU/academic experts are asked to rebut/refute the myths, lies, distortions underpinning these utterances in short, easily digestible comments

The quotes, along with the graphical/visual works and the expert rebuttals are published on the NHSM website (blog) and are spread on social media channels

TOOLS AND TIMELINES:

NHSM website (new section "EP – 2014") / HateSpeechWatch

Social media channels: Facebook, Twitter, Instagram

PROJECT ACTIVITIES AND TIMELINE

November 20: Call for NCC's to collect instances of hate speech by EP Election candidates



January 15: Deadline to send quotes to NHSM EP – 2014 Task Force

December – March: NHSM EP-2014 Task Force engages cartoonists/artists and Council of Europe/EU experts and academics.

March 21 – May 22/25: Rollout of campaign material

If pilot project successful : to be continued with all countries of NHSM after May

October : installation of the EU Commission and Council of Europe?

On a side note, some more possible action elements:

Partnership with www.youngvoters.eu to raise awareness about hate speech on their webpage ; Guest forum on the NHSM webpage and a specific part dedicated to EU election on the website; EP election tag + make it visible with some of the tags proposed on the side page.

WORKSHOP 3. EVALUATION AND IMPACT OF THE NHSM

Facilitator	Laurence Hermand
Resource person(s)	Darek Grzemny
Reporter	Ian McGahon

DESCRIPTION:

In order to know if the campaign was successful, one needs to plan the process of evaluation in order to see if the campaign objectives have been reached and what impact it made to young people’s lives. This is a European Campaign based primarily on the actions implemented on national levels by the National Campaign Committees. The evaluation of the No Hate Speech Movement Campaign should take into account all levels in order to guarantee synergies and consistencies so that the results of the evaluations are comparable and easy to analyse.

The workshop aimed to produce a draft proposal of the evaluation plan of the campaign that should include the aims of evaluation, the means and tools to be used, the different actors to be involved and the evaluation methodology. The workshop also brainstormed guidelines for the National Campaign Committees on how to evaluate the campaign at the national level.

MAIN ISSUES DISCUSSED, QUESTIONS RAISED

THE CHALLENGES OF EVALUATION



- The campaign has different levels of European and National thus requiring different evaluations
- The campaign is both offline and online
- There are a large number of stakeholders in the campaign
- Broad objectives of the campaign
- Lack of human resources for the campaign
- The process of setting up the evaluation
- Motivation of Countries to report

WHAT ARE THE EVALUATION OBJECTIVES/WHY DO WE WANT TO EVALUATE

To document and collect good practices

To learn how to combat hate speech online

Evidence that money is well spent

- To know if the campaign reflects the values of the Council of Europe?
- Has the campaign met its objectives? Was it successful?
- Has it empowered young people
- Are there further added values that the campaign can bring?
- What impact does the campaign have?
- To know how we got here and where are we going?
- To give visibility to the campaign
- Are we reaching the target audiences? how? who are target audience?
- Was it a flagship project? what made it so?

AIM OF THE EVALUATION

To assess the strengths and capacity of NHSM in combating hate speech online and measure its impact on society including political and civil society levels and to assess its sustainability

WHAT AND HOW SHOULD BE EVALUATED

Looking at numbers - how many National Campaign Committees are there? How many NGOs? How many actions? How many partners at conference? How many stakeholders? What is the website traffic? Is there Facebook and twitter interaction? How many hate speech watch reports? How many online activists? How many people participate in Council of Europe activities? How much interactivity is there on Youtube? What are the statistics of the No Hate Speech Campaign online platform? How many different tools and activities have been developed e.g education activities games? How many people were involved? How much time was spent? How much funding was used and required?

- The evaluation should be community based and participatory
- NCCs should be encouraged to collect data
- Qualitative analysis of data and research should assist statistical research in order to gain insight into the wider picture,
- Research and collection of best practices



- See objectives of evaluation for more info on qualitative data

INDICATORS OF SUCCESS

The indicators should be set by the external evaluator. When the objectives of the evaluation are set then the indicators can be set. Also there will need to be wide consultation when setting the indicators

RECOMMENDATION ON EVALUATION

- Each NCC should have 1 person overseeing evaluation
- Create an ownership of the evaluation process among all stakeholders
- Evaluation should be ongoing and not left till the end of the campaign
- Nominate external evaluators for the campaign immediately
- Organise a mid-term evaluation seminar in March or April
- Have a final evaluation conference in 2015 - involve different stakeholders
- Evaluation should be community based and have a participatory approach e.g. online activists and young people should be very involved in designing and implementing the evaluation process
- The evaluation should be much more than just questionnaires
- Stress importance of evaluation and implementing evaluation to countries and NCCs
- To allow freedom of evaluation for each NCC
- Have simple ongoing evaluation processes set up by NCCs
- Include inputs that are summative and formative within the evaluation tools
- To create a common basis for evaluation for NCCs that has indicators for evaluation - send it to NCCs - this should be developed by external evaluator
- Use online community for evaluation process as a resource
- Develop and use a tool for evaluation (data collection) and send to all stakeholders - have it ready for the beginning of 2014 - this can be a simple google spreadsheet that records info - eg. an NCC could have a list of actions and for each action

FINAL OUTCOMES AND PROPOSALS FOR 2014

Main aim of the evaluation will be to assess the strengths and capacity of NHSM in combating hate speech online and measure its impact on society including political and civil society levels and to assess its sustainability.

The evaluation has to take into consideration different challenges e.g. Different levels of campaign and large number of stakeholders

Each NCC should have 1 person overseeing evaluation

We have develop a simple tool for evaluation (data collection) and this should be sent to all stakeholders

The evaluation should be community based and have a participatory approach e.g. online activists and young people should be very involved in designing and implementing the evaluation process

RECOMMENDED ACTIONS TO CONFERENCE

- Development of data collection tools for NCC - needs to be completed in December 2013 (we have already done this!)
- Appoint external evaluators for campaign ASAP
- Hold a mid-term evaluation seminar include all NCCs Mar/Apr 2014
- Hold a final evaluation conference including all stakeholders - mid-term 2015

WORKSHOP 4. COMMUNICATION, COORDINATION AND NETWORKING WITHIN THE MOVEMENT

Facilitator	Shannon Stephens
Resource person(s)	Laszlo Foldi
Reporter	Lilla Nedeczky

GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF THE WORKSHOPS

By the end of 2013, it is hoped that most member states will have established their National Campaign Committee, appointed a coordinator and have a plan of action. Many of these National Committees consist of NGOs, governmental agencies and other institutions. European youth organisations are also getting involved in the campaign together with their members at national level. Youth organisations at local, national and European level are developing various initiatives with funding from the EYF or EEA grants among others. How can the synergies between all these different partners working on all these different levels be secured? Efforts at European level should strengthen local and national initiatives and vice versa. Effective communication and strong coordination within the campaign is essential to secure the realisation of a movement for Human Rights online.

This workshop aims to define communication strategies that will facilitate more efficient coordination, cooperation and networking by all different stakeholders in the movement at local, national and European levels. Key activities, approaches and tools should be proposed to make sure that this is a common movement for a shared campaign.

MAIN ISSUES/QUESTIONS/CHALLENGES RAISED AND DISCUSSED

- no dedicated campaign manager to maintain overall coordination
- diversity in the way NCCs are structured means there is not a common framework for acting
- lack of two-way communications throughout the whole system (ie – Council of Europe sends newsletters to the national campaign coordinators but not vice versa)



- some local and national NGOs are excluded or denied access to the national campaign committee in their country
- continued budgetary challenges at all levels!

FINAL OUTCOMES AND PROPOSALS FOR 2014

Recommendations

- NCCs should upload/update information about national campaign activities on the campaign platform.
- NCCs should inform the online community manager about the national community volunteers at national level.
- There should be an email list for national coordinators which includes the online community manager.
- Any national or local NGOs who have no involvement in NCCs could communicate directly with the campaign manager.
- Support letters from the Council of Europe to the NCC to involve/invite NGOs in the campaign at a national level.
- Regular meetings of activists, stakeholders
- Addressing and involving journalists and media
- NHSM awards to encourage involvement and motivate actors

Activities for the campaign programme in 2014

- Regular meeting of NCCs (2x in 2014) hosted by a member state
- Regular meeting for activists.
- Meeting of liaison officers of European NGOs.

Suggestions of resources for further exploration from partners, participants and experts, good practice and success story examples from national campaigns

- In order to involve new partners and individuals, materials should be translated into all local languages.
- Sometimes open call is not an effective way of invitation.

On a general note:

- Working group finds absolutely crucial that a dedicated European campaign coordinator should be announced.
- NHSM awards to encourage involvement and to motivate actors
- Branding media and journalists.

WORKSHOP 5. EDUCATION

Facilitator	Mara Georgescu
Resource person	Olivier Grinnaert - Lupiote, Claudia Lenz - The European Wergeland Centre
Reporter	Diana Botescu

GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF THE WORKSHOPS

The campaign focuses strongly on education and awareness-raising as central means of achieving the aim of increasing the capacity of young people and youth organisations to deal with hate speech online. While a lot of resources already exist on anti-racist education and human rights education, little of these are dedicated to the specific topic of hate speech and little deal with the online aspect and environment. What are the online learning and education strategies to be applied within the framework of this campaign and how can these respect the standards of the Youth Department?

The workshop should put together all these experiences and materials and analyse what should be further promoted as good practice and what models should be kept. As more training and education was realised on the topic, more learning needs have emerged, so the workshop should also propose recommendations for further educational activities and materials to be developed, highlight good practices from the field and potentially suggest a list of criteria/indicators and activities to be taken on board at national level.

Of particular relevance are measures for campaigning in school environments, common training projects, exchange of practices and evaluation of results.

- Brief summary of input from resource persons
- Olivier Grinnaert from Lupiote that is a campaign tackling the challenges of technology, young people dealing with hate speech in school environments (film 30. min). Loupiote decided to work closely with the NHSM campaign and use the film as an educational tool for awareness raising through discussion with young people. In collaboration with the campaign launched by Brussels a series of videos tackling hate speech was released. Looking for partners such as schools.

Claudia Lenz - The European Wergeland Centre. Challenges arise from how to better link the campaign with schools, for example with awareness raising amongst students, building a human rights proactive culture in schools, changing attitudes, and consultation with educators. The need for a wide range of stakeholders including the police is required. Linking off line and on line actions is also needed and educational tools are requested, for example in the translation of Council of Europe tools which are relevant to the various social contexts and histories of member states.

Filia Salgot - Language Policy Unit of the Council of Europe: They have a program on language policy, formal education, adult schooling, linguistic integration program of adults migrants.

Josef Hubert, Council of Europe Department of Education/ Pestalozzi Programme: responsible for the training activities on matters related to media literacy, training course for trainers on the use on social media for participation. Next week starts a new course on Respect_responsible behavior and attitudes in the virtual social space with the EYF, for young people, with the aim of preventing hate speech and a view to developing responsibility in the online environment. Information: www.coe.int/pestalozzi, Twitter: @pestprogramme

Mara Georgescu: The Council of Europe has School packs, challenges, groups, working groups on:

- educational strategies for working in school;
- non formal education activities with young people in youth centers;
- training activists/ Multipliers (youth workers);
- exchange of practices. The campaign should make connections between the different experiences



- the school pack is called Bookmarks. Texts are being proofread. Within next weeks will be sent to those interested as a word document. It has 200 pages in A5 Format, designed for schools students 13 to 18. It looks at young people from 3 different perspectives:- bystanders, victims, haters. The main themes tackled upon are: freedom of expression, human rights, hate speech, Cyberbullying, Democracy/participation, “campaigning strategies”, internet literacy, racism/ discrimination, safety, privacy. The themes are accompanied by 22 activities. The debriefing part makes references to the NHSM campaign.
- Objectives: creating spaces for sharing good practices between young people, teachers, youth workers;
- Other activities: online activists have been trained. The curriculum can be used by multipliers, study session reports are available;
- Tools for educational purposes;
- Starting points on combating hate speech online on the campaign website;
- evaluation of the needs is required
- Challenges: how to approach hate speech in a proper manner for children;
- Adapting it to the contexts of 47 member states;

FINAL OUTCOMES AND PROPOSALS FOR 2014

Bookmarks Schools need a diagnosis in order to understand where they are. Identification of problems, reflexive methodology, addressing/communicating/solving the problems. Working with prevention. Stakeholders: teachers awareness development, school administration. Every actor should be involved. Methods: should they be published on the website? Evaluation questionnaires for before and after the activity in order to evaluate the results. Should the education on dealing with hate speech be included in a Curriculum? Awareness raising, part of the reflexive introduction.

Common platform to share tools. Mechanisms to convince teachers to accept intervention. Possible strategy: assessment, mainstreaming the campaign. Peer education, kit could be an object and giving it for free to schools. Guidelines: examples of hate and instruments to fight it. Context is important, contacts in schools are important. Ministry of Education is represented in the NC. Power to disseminate the kit to schools.

Link to human rights education - National ministries will link it to the objectives EDC/HRE Charter; human rights education is a transversal concern of education;

- Social spots to broadcast project, for example the Project “Stolpersteine”, through ambassadors of the campaign, famous people, role models, , or within films, pictures, and newspaper articles distributed within social media and mainstream media,. Although it should be noted that role models are vulnerable as all their actions can be followed. Mechanisms to encourage grassroots organizations to cover the topic of hate speech, and the combination between non-formal and formal education should be encouraged, for instance in extracurricular activities at schools in a formal area with non-formal tools, and through the open call for ideas within the EAD – as a way to involve young people to get active in the campaign.

- work of Multipliers
- Should have different roles according to the needs.
- Training activities and opportunities should be added in one section of the website of the campaign as a toolbox which can be used by every multiplier.
- Encourage national trainings by using participatory approach, using materials from everyone that can submit them.
- Study sessions, courses for bloggers, Compass, section can be organized by Latte as developer and volunteers can moderate. Indicators: uploaded material, downloads, feedback. This is an exchange of practices.
- Develop as Guide for evaluation of the activity.
- Connection, building on what has already been done, sharing examples of good practices.

OBJECTIVES FOR 2014

- Creating tools for educational purposes
- Linking the topic to the human rights education
- Creating spaces for sharing good practices between young people, teachers, youth workers

PROPOSED ACTIONS FOR 2014

- disseminating and using the school pack (Bookmarks)
- evaluating the needs and adapting tools for different contexts
- mainstreaming the campaign

Toolbox for multipliers on the campaign website with organised training material according to themes, actions, action days, including quality criteria and assessment/evaluation tools- encourage NCCs to organise national training courses and use these materials

WORKSHOP 6. NATIONAL CAMPAIGN STRATEGIES, PLANS AND PROGRAMMES

Facilitator	Satu Valtere
Resource person(s)	Jan Dabkowski, Aleksandra Knezevic
Reporter	Lusine Ghazaryan

GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF THE WORKSHOPS

The NHSM is a European Campaign that is built by national campaigns. The National Campaign Committees (NCCs) and, in some cases, the Campaign Support Groups, play an essential role in the movement. The



NCCs bring together the main partners, set a programme that reflects current issues and priorities within their country, can monitor hate speech in the languages used and can mobilise legal and government resources to react against hate speech and also to prevent it. It is also the NCCs that can ensure links and cross-cutting issues to be worked on across Europe, while ensuring enough space for ensuring national applicability and that particular needs are fulfilled.

The workshop will make proposals and guidelines for developing effective national programmes and campaigns, propose actions and tools for regional and European cooperation and cooperation between national campaigns. A model “national campaign plan” will be produced which should also make place for the role of European partner (youth) organisations.

BRIEF SUMMARY OF INPUT FROM RESOURCE PERSONS

Aleksandra Knezevic sharing a succeeded practice of formation and functioning of NCC in Serbia. The resource person emphasized in her presentation the main issues that need to be taken into consideration and clarified when starting the formation of the NCC and later when developing the proper functioning of it. “You must be there where youth is”, that is why education in the field of Sports affairs should be conducted as a main goal for 2014, to educate sportsmen as public figures to reach youth. Seasonal activities have been planned and are being currently conducted, i.e. Summer activities through festivals, youth activities, leisure sometimes, Autumn activities in schools, Universities, etc.

Below you can find the outline of main points emphasized by her:

First Phase - Preparation Phase

- Preparing even before the official launching of the Campaign
- Priorities set were:
 - Clarification on the similar understanding of the Campaign (concrete aims it pursues)
 - Clarification on similar understanding of the topic (what is hate speech?)
 - Brainstorming about the possible interested parties to be involved in the Campaign.

Second Phase- Formation of the National Campaign Committee

- Included representatives of the following groups in the NCC:
- Representatives of public Institutions in charge of topic
- Representatives of youth (youth organizations, activists)
- Representatives of professional community (researchers, professors)

Third Phase- Functioning of the National Campaign Committee

- Basic strategic documents prepared
- The need for three kinds of activities identified: Online, Offline and Legislative
- Field research and analysis of the situation in Serbia was conducted
- Activities planned and ongoing (mostly offline, as believed to be the most efficient)

Principles of the National Campaign Set

- Transparency
- Openness and participation



- Responsibility
- Sustainability (plan to continue after European campaign is over).

Important tips to take into consideration

- Visibility
- Regional initiatives are important, whereby countries may share similar problems in the region (Balkan countries)
- Funding opportunities- sit together with all governmental institutions and agree on which can contribute to the Campaign and how. Even small contributions from each institutions (both financial and human resources) are vital.
- Keep the balance, that is to say the Campaign on national level must include both high-level representation and youth, not to lose attention of the Government and the society at the same time (e.g. activities including a Prime Minister and a football player)
- Online consulting of psychologists in the national website of the Movement. The existence and help of psychologists helped to gain public attention, especially when reaching the groups that are vulnerable to hate speech.

FINAL OUTCOMES AND PROPOSALS FOR 2014

After sharing the good practices with the example of Serbia, the group was asked to brainstorm on developing the “Puzzle of National Campaign Committee”, i.e. assessing the necessary components for a proper National Plan to be set. The group came up with various components which needed to be addressed, which are stakeholders (interested parties), governmental institutions, non-governmental organizations, volunteers, academics, lawyers, media personnel, online service providers, Council of Europe, sponsors, various regional and international committees (e.g. Regional Network against Racism), international NGOs, international non-governmental organizations, targeted groups, financial opportunities, visibility of the Campaign, national context of the Campaign, the role of media, goals and objectives of the Campaign, possible political support within the scope of the campaign, evaluation methods for the campaign, coordination and timeline of the Campaign.

Based on the brainstorming noted above four main components were identified as key points for setting up National Campaign Plan, which are

- To Identify National Context of the Campaign
- To Build and Manage National Campaign Committees
- To Engage Stakeholders
- To Prepare Activities.



WORKSHOP 7. IMPACT AND ADVOCACY FOR POLICY CHANGES

Facilitator	Sergio Belfor
Resource person(s)	Rui Gomes
Reporter	Daniela Prisacariu

GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF THE WORKSHOPS

Education and awareness-raising about hate speech is only one aspect of the Council of Europe's work for human rights online. The work on Internet governance, safe Internet use, the rights of Internet users and the protection of private data online, for example, all touch upon human rights in the online sphere.

How can the activities in the NHSM youth campaign and its outcomes contribute to this process? What should the national campaigns advocate for as changes in legislation, policies and programmes? How can they support changes at the European level and what can the European level do for changes at national level? For example, how to follow up on the petition to make 22 July the European Day for Victims of Hate Crime? How should the campaign lead to more youth participation in Internet governance, or how should future youth policies include online aspects?

This workshop will identify political aims for common action. Participants will make proposals for objectives and plans for policy outcomes to be pursued and how the actors in the youth campaign, specially the youth, should be involved in such processes.

BRIEF SUMMARY OF INPUT FROM RESOURCE PERSONS

Rui Gomes introduced the topic of advocacy within the No Hate Speech Movement bringing up some of the current questions and challenges:

lower level of acceptance of hate speech: education and awareness raising:

- media policy
- internet governance

Budapest convention on cyber crime- not ratified by all member countries

Are young people part of decision making, internet governance?

NHSM- makes people crystallise what they want to ask to policy makers

Conventions ratified by countries related to the topic- we should all use the existing ones.

- Main issues/questions/challenges raised and discussed
- Fields of expertise in the room: LGBT, games, Council of Europe, Youth Department: education, advocacy, children, national campaign coordinator, school systems, youth, civic education, human rights advocacy, people living with HIV, hate crimes, human rights education, hate prevention initiative



- Key points for advocating- brainstorming from the group
- Legislation around hate speech
- Cyberbullying
- Educational policies
- Gaming industry
- Existing conventions
- How to use instruments of courts
- How to change the hate climate
- Education in formal system
- Media
- National political context
- Hate crimes- implementing existing laws

COMPREHENSIVE & INCLUSIVE DEFINITION

- Education (cyberbullying)
 - curriculum (start civic education at an early age, media literacy-responsible behaviour)
 - anti bullying policy (involve the Ministry of education, teachers unions, parents, youth clubs, Students unions- their role; Obessu): Charter on education for democratic citizenship- should students learn about citizenship online Council of Europe can review it and add media literacy etc:
 - support services for students
- Gaming Industry
- Gamers face prejudice
- Videogames are most successful industry, almost half of them are women, a forth of people play once a week
- How to deal with hate speech (existing conventions, recommendation, national complain bureau social networks)

UPDATE THE DEFINITION OF THE COUNCIL OF EUROPE

- What do we advocate for?
- Facebook definition of HS
- Media/ Internet governance
- Youth use other kinds of media: less tv; radio; printed newspaper
- Media should be an information tool
- We face a social bubble circle when reading articles (people find them on facebook even if they don't read printed papers)
- Media freedom
- Media education
- How do we work with it for the NHSM?
- How do we create an impact: media doesn't like to be told what to do; not easy to implement
- Proposing self-regulatory mechanisms (adherence to common values- ex: respect zone)



- How do we tackle internet governance issues in the campaign?
- Creating spaces of democracy and participation
- There are some meetings related to internet governance happening where the NHSM could participate: but what is our agenda?
- Politicians: what they say- how does it influence young people?

FINAL OUTCOMES AND PROPOSALS FOR 2014

- The Campaign should be viewed and presented from a human rights point of view.

For advocacy we have the following main objectives:

EDUCATION AND AGENDA CONCERNING HATE SPEECH: REDUCING THE INCIDENTS OF ONLINE HATE SPEECH

- Raising awareness among relevant stakeholders
- Building capacities of educational institutions
- Having a common understanding of hate speech
- Strengthen the commitment of Council of Europe member states

MEDIA AND GAME INDUSTRY

- Reduce the amount of hate speech in the media
- Mobilisation of the media for an active involvement in the media
- NHSM in contact with local and national sources of news
- Review the human rights guidelines for game developers through bottom up participation
- Involvement of gamers in local activities
- Review those grey areas that are characterised by hate speech in video games
- National internet governance forums to be joined by everyone, especially youth
- Activities for the campaign programme in 2014
- Curriculum development: how can hate speech (cyberbullying) be addressed within the curriculum
- Training of teachers, parents etc
- Networking of stakeholders
- Provision of support services
- Reviewing the definition of Council of Europe on hate speech
- Producing guidelines for social media (hate free zones)
- Holding member states accountable to conventions and charters they signed
- Encouraging more member states to sign up to the already existing conventions
- Setting up monitoring and reporting mechanisms at national level
- Guidelines for comments and content
- Support the European Journalist Association
- Training of journalists on hate speech
- Review the Guide on Human Rights for Internet Users and incorporate in it the NHSM Campaign

RESOURCES NEEDED:

- Online tools , Teachers unions, students unions etc, Toolkit for tackling hs in schools, Charters, conventions, Council of Europe expertise

PARTNERS:

- National partners (Ombudsman, Equality bodies...), Council of Europe institutions, Youth organizations, Internet service providers
- What the Council of Europe could do:
- Provide toolkits, templates, space for sharing of good practices; Training of trainers; Advocate for political commitment from member states

TOOLS:

- www.saferinternet.org, Scouts have a non-formal education kit, human rights guidelines to game developers, the guide on Internet user's rights

WORKSHOP 8. BUILDING ONLINE COMMUNITIES AND ENSURING YOUTH PARTICIPATION

Facilitator	Ron Salaj
Resource person(s)	Kristina Liing, European Youth Card Association
Reporter	Ela Suleymangil

GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF THE WORKSHOP

The NHSM campaign is based on a community and movement that actively debates on the issue of hate speech, that exchanges on strategies to combat it and that also takes action together. The initial steps to this community were taken by recruiting and training online activists and by having an online community manager to coordinate their activity. The European Action Days have been one of the main ways in which this group reached out to the public in the online space.

The development of National Campaign Committees enlarged the community of actors and activists, online and offline. This enlargement poses obvious challenges of information, communication, training and mobilisation.

The NHSM also relies on the active participation of young people, online and offline. Yet, the European and national campaigns require organisational resources and project management processes that can take precedence over the participation of young people. The campaign relies on the agency of young people



and should thus be an opportunity for empowerment and extension of the forms of youth participation, online and offline.

The workshop will address the questions: What defines the campaign community? What can be expected from the European movement? How to engage with existing online communities that attract young people? How to address the issue of language barriers and connect the communities of volunteers and activists for the national campaigns? Which activities should be seen to support the motivation and work of volunteers and activists?

The workshop will build on already existing experiences and result in an action plan to secure online and offline participation of young people in the campaign and in supporting young people in standing up for human rights, as well as consultation on decision-making processes to make sure that the campaign is driven by young people themselves.

The NHSM relies on the active participation of young people, online and offline. Yet, the European and national campaigns require organisational resources and project management processes that can take precedence over the participation of young people. The campaign relies on the agency of young people and should thus be an opportunity for empowerment and extension of the forms of youth participation, online and offline.

The aim of the workshop is to discuss and propose approaches that support young people in standing up for human rights online and offline and ensure their participation in the campaign and beyond. The workshop will build on already existing experiences and result in an action plan to secure online and offline participation of young people in the campaign and in supporting young people in standing up for human rights, as well as consultation and decision-making process to make sure that the campaign is driven by young people themselves.

The workshop was divided into two groups; one discussing building online communities and the second one ensuring youth participation. The groups spent the first part of the workshop brainstorming on objectives to be reached. These objectives were then presented to the whole group and discussed further and merged together into 5 final objectives. The groups then returned to their working groups to discuss the recommendations for achieving these objectives. As the group on youth participation was larger they later broke up into two smaller working groups to work on recommendations for the identified objectives that we would like to achieve.

BRIEF SUMMARY OF INPUT FROM RESOURCE PERSONS

Kristina from the EYCA talked about methods for encouraging and ensuring youth participation. EYCA is a partner to council of Europe since 1991, and has member organizations in 38 countries. Main tool to connect to youth is the youth card itself. There is an example of launching the No Hate Speech European youth card. (eg of Slovenia). Scotland: Together with Scottish Government, local surveys were made on how to improve the access of all young people in the immediate neighbourhood, report(Access all Areas) available.

INPUT FROM RON:

Some good campaigns and websites to consider:

<http://www.edl.me/> – English Disco Lovers (a creative campaign to know the English Defense League off the top spot)

<http://www.charitywater.org/about/>

<http://www.onedaywithoutshoes.com/>An offline idea that we could use as a way to increase the online community

<http://www.pencilsofpromise.org/>: An example for creating your own campaign as an individual or as an organisation

MAIN ISSUES/QUESTIONS/CHALLENGES RAISED AND DISCUSSED

- The platform needs to be more interactive.
- All national coordinators should have to contact 3 youth organizations in their country, a requirement for committees. (Different situation in different countries)
- We need to reach out to as many young people as possible: A good example, an email that was sent to all youth offices in Serbia to implement some NHS activities on that day, which they carried out and showed their participation, which made the movement more visible
- Problem of spreading the information (eg. Russia, movement may reach the city it is based in but does not reach all youth in the country, ie. In smaller towns, size of the country an issue)
- Young people have no opportunity to participate offline, there are a lot of challenges
- Need to consider the methods to reach youths offline: eg Flanders, creating a product to provide teachers with so that they can use these tools to educate
- Schools are one of the most effective ways to reach young people
- Finland: working on a toolkit to give to high schools and vocational colleges
- By meeting with the Ministry of Education we can get them to recommend the campaign, which can help the national campaign spread the message
- By creation of the national committee all relevant bodies are included
- We have not reached local youth at all... We haven't provided the tools they need. Our website is not having the response we would like. There is not as much youth participation as is needed for a campaign like this.

OBJECTIVES FOR YOUTH PARTICIPATION IN NHSM:

- To ensure that youth participation is happening in both dimensions: online and offline; as well as at European and national levels
- To ensure that marginalized youth who have no/limited access to internet and/or media are also reached out to and have equal opportunity to participate to the campaign
- To reach out and ensure the participation of specific online youth communities (eg. Gaming)

DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS FOR YOUTH PARTICIPATION:

- Regularly improve the glossary of the campaign containing explanations of important terms



- Learn about online communities and how to approach them physically to visit their conventions, meet leaders and motivate them. Meet the developers, companies who produce games that incite hate speech.
- Included on the existing web platform: creative content on what human rights are, in a way which engages young people
- How do detect hate speech – what is the difference between joke and discrimination. We are here to give more responsibility to youth about what they are saying and how they are expressing themselves. Hate speech cannot be deleted but we can create, guide how to act, responsibly behavior (NCCs, organisers).
- Anti-discrimination pack – training tool template can be made available to everyone.
- Give positive examples about how to stand up or take responsibility
- Involvement in student organisations in the education of young people in schools. OBESSU
- Involvement with specific online groups.
- Reach out to gamers, bloggers.
- Insuring youth participation in all stages of the campaign (planning, implementation and evaluation)
- Develop resources which young people can use and be a response to hate. Site does not give enough opportunities to work with educational tools.
- Database about responses to hate. Responses that local organisations can use and share. Written in a form that is useful for social media (tweetable sentences, that can be copy and pasted)
- Providing more information about local events at the campaign platform, exchange on the main website to see which events are held
- Recognize young activists at the European level Ambassador group. Recognition and rewards to activists e.g. activist of the month. Inviting them to participate in meetings in Strasbourg. NCC, Council of Europe
- Motivate local activists to develop national media projects. Create (youth) journalist groups.

OBJECTIVES FOR BUILDING ONLINE COMMUNITIES:

- To increase the number of informed, motivated and active members in the online community
- Ensuring a sustainable online community

DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS FOR BUILDING ONLINE COMMUNITIES

- Celebrity ambassadors that can be the face of the movement
- Council of Europe to negotiate with Google, Twitter, Youtube for free promotion and ads
- Create a DIY social media toolkit that includes a strategy, tips and tools on social media best practices (how to create a good meme, websites that can be used, best times for posting, etc)
- “Steal-it” a package with visibility materials – posters for schools, all national campaigns can upload their materials and everyone can steal the materials. Dimensions which are ready and usable.
- “Walk with your heart against hate” – the heartbeat of the movement –1 day high visibility event. All countries involved.
- Recognition of online community: level of badge system with rewards, contests (medals, diplomas)

- A members area for online activists with an ushahidi/google map where activists are pin-pointed. You can click on a country and the activists will be listed along with their contact details, making communication among activists easier.
- Events calendar of the coming year on the platform for the whole year: The events that are going on are picked up a bit late by other members, therefore would be good to have them listed or mapped according to where they are taking place, ideally a list for the coming year.
- Face-to-face meetings for online community. Bringing online community members together. Regional, national, international, local, in official or casual meetings.

FINAL OUTCOMES AND PROPOSALS FOR 2014

- Ensuring youth participation is present in both dimensions - offline and online - as well as at a European and national level
- Ensuring marginalized youth, and youth who have limited access to internet, are also reached and have equal opportunities to participate in the campaign
- Reaching out and ensuring participation of specific online youth communities (e.g. gamers, bloggers, artists etc)
- Increasing the number of informed, motivated and active members of the online community (better, not just bigger)
- Ensuring a sustainable online community.

RECOMMENDATIONS AND ACTIONS:

YOUTH PARTICIPATION

- Updating the platform
- Glossary
- Responses to hate speech
- Accessible info, arguments, etc.
- HR-charter increase visibility and put in context?
- Reaching out to specific communities
- Participating in events
- Creating events for participants
- Reaching out to particular target groups E.g. bloggers, gamers, student orgs.
- Involve young people in all stages of campaign - in planning, implementation and evaluation.
- Motivate local activists to develop national media projects (e.g. target journalist groups)

BUILDING ONLINE COMMUNITIES

- Recognition of effort in online community
 - a level badge system with rewards, contests
 - a members area for online activists (Google/uShahidi map)
- Events calendar for the coming year (Crowd mapping)
- Face-to-face online community (Local, national, European)



- Involve celebrity ambassadors in the campaign
- Bring on board internet companies (FB/TW/Google/YouTube) to provide vouchers for promotion and ads.
- Create a DIY social media -toolkit (Strategies, techniques, tips, tools etc)
- “Steal-it-package” containing visibility materials
- Offline high-visibility-events
- “Walk with your heart against hate” - Celebrating the anniversary of campaign

WORKSHOP 9. PREPARING THE NHSM YOUTH MEETING

Facilitator	Stefan Manevski
Resource person(s)	Ilaria Esposito
Reporter	Nelli Gishyan

GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF THE WORKSHOPS

The ‘NHSM Youth Meeting’ is planned to be held at the EYCS in the early fall of 2014. The participants will include the young people actively involved in the campaigns, together with other stakeholders involved in running the campaign. The meeting will identify the aspirations of young people in relation to the issues of the campaign and the measures for follow-up at national and European level.

The workshop will review the function, aims and objectives of the Youth Meeting in the NHSM campaign, the role and profile of participants, the programme and how to involve young people in the preparation and running of the meeting. It will result in specific proposals for the European and national campaigns to secure the feasibility of the meeting and to secure it a central role in the campaign programme.

OBJECTIVES OF THE WORKSHOP

- The workshop has reviewed the function, aims and objectives of the Youth Meeting in the NHSM campaign,
- It also aimed to define the profile of participants and the categories of young people that need to be involved
- The workshop aims to develop the programme and how to involve young people in the preparation and running of the meeting.
- It will also aim to produce a specific set of recommendations for the NCCs and the European level campaign in order to prepare a successful meeting

BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF THE WORKSHOP PROGRAMME

The workshop was held working in a group of 5 people with 3 supporters (facilitator, resource person and reporter). The workshop programme followed these steps:

- Step 1: Introduction of the participants (all the participants introduced themselves by sharing their name, where they are from and their motivation for the Youth Meeting – or why they chose this workshop in particular)
- Step 2: Input by Ilaria about the Enter! Youth Meeting
- Step 3: Discussing what the youth meeting should be about. The participants were asked to devise a timeline to show foreseeable upcoming steps that they think the campaign will make until next summer. Based on these plans we ask participants to share in small groups and write up to 4 issues that will answer the question: For which purpose is the NHSM Youth Meeting next summer?
- Step 4: The participants were asked to define the profile of the young people who are attending the Youth Meeting. This was done using a method of brainstorming and linking the participants' profiles into relevant categories.
- Step 5: In 2 smaller groups (one for online activists, and the other for offline activists) based on the identified objectives and the target groups the participants have developed action plans for the Youth Meeting. The action plans answered the following questions: Type of activity // for whom is it for and who prepares it// Preparation activities // what will happen during the Youth Meeting. Afterwards the groups presented the work and gave feedback to each other.
- Step 6: Closing of the workshop. Defining who will make the presentation and what it will be about.
 - Main issues discussed and questions/issues/challenges raised
 - Participants from the workshop were mainly suggesting
 - To mobilize recourses at national levels, by involving not only governmental bodies, but also for example: Microsoft, Facebook, Twitter and other social network representatives into the campaign.
 - During the NHSM Youth Meeting journalists can have informal educational material such as a tool-kit that would be useful to use online, to declare about the importance to have a declaration of ethics during the European meeting.
 - Have a step more by practicing methods, rather than sharing moments of celebration. In this direction the meeting should offer space to develop competencies and to use them in national level, learning by doing.
 - To organize a meeting to mobilize governmental bodies to recognize the movement and its importance, use this occasion as a milestone.
 - Produce outcomes and recommendation to youth sector itself and to ensure strong impact of online while the meeting is offline.

FINAL OUTCOMES AND PROPOSALS FOR 2014

The group discussed the objectives of the Youth Meeting and agreed on the following ones:

- To serve as a space for sharing good practices and to offer in this way a clear recognition for the ef-



forts made by the young people within the campaign

- To offer experiences for the participants on how the different methods work and to add opportunities for practical capacity building for the young participants
- To encourage the participation of young people affected by hate speech online as well as young people who are facing obstacles to take part actively
- To represent a model-event for online presence and impact, during the time of the actual Youth Meeting.
- To produce recommendations or conclusions from the young people related to the future steps of the campaign on local and national levels, ensuring it has sustainable effects in the communities.
- To transform the focus of the campaign from the European dimension, into specific national and local follow-ups.

The group identified the profiles of young people to be of particular importance to be present on the Youth Meeting. They are categorized into 3 groups (youth active online, youth in civil society, people working with youth).

Youth active online include:

- Online youth activists such as bloggers, twitter-users (influential users), moderators of the NHSM web-sites and moderators of forums, Facebook page administrators (of any youth related popular pages), Youtube users
- Targets of hate-speech online and victims of cyber-bullying
- Online gamers and people involved in online social and gaming activities
- Young journalists working for e-magazines and online information portals
- Potentially invite people who became aware that they were “online haters” and have changed their behavior and people who are making “trolls” online.

Youth in civil society includes but it is not limited to:

- Young social entrepreneurs and young computer programmers
- Young movie-makers
- National Youth Councils and other forms of youth representation bodies such as student unions
- Young parents associations (young parents in general interested to learn more about hate speech online)

Finally the last list is of people who do not qualify as Young participants but could be of benefit if invited to the meeting as supporters:

- Youth Workers
- Teachers
- Young parliamentarians
- People involved in the campaign
- Funders / potential sponsors
- Researchers
- Celebrities that would like to support the campaign

Important suggestion: The meeting itself can be organized in the week of 22 July (as the proposed European day of the victims of hate crimes).

PROPOSED ACTIVITIES FOR THE YOUTH MEETING:

Online activities during the meeting:

Logo-support by major web sites	Make the logo of the NHSM for one day visible in the opening page of Google and for Facebook to have a red color with heart on the day of the meeting, 22th of July 2014 (tbc). With the help and cooperation of all National committees existing send request, also involve into the process organizers of the campaign
Facebook flash-mob	To change profile and Timeline pictures of the FB and other social networks, jointly (all activists)
Twitt-up	To establish a new # for the meeting and twitt-up competition The group of bloggers that manages to twitt-up their national level # on the highest position gets a specific acknowledgment during the Meeting
Online world-café	Organize world café using online chatrooms in order to have more audience that could not be involved into the meeting offline. The online chatrooms can use a specific video-calling via Skype conference for example.
Live-broadcast	Publishing and broadcasting the day of the meeting, via Youtube channels.
Blogger actions	Online reports from the bloggers , right from the place of venue which are constantly promoted by the activists
No-hate-speech video-links with the NCCs (Eurovision style)	To involve all national committees, young activists and those people who are standing for human rights online/offline to speak in the welcome ceremony via live stream from different countries, (introducing some dances, songs in campaign t-shirt etc.) in order to support the meeting and people present.
Online story-telling	To involve online “targets” who will speak up and share their opinions about the problems they face and to raise awareness that they are not alone.



Offline activities:

Simulation game (online and of-line gaming)	Invite young programmers to develop a game to be played online during the meeting (open call for the proposal and voting on the platform for the gathered ideas). Idea is to play this game not only with Young participants but also with young people who are at their homes during the NHSM Youth Meeting
Living library	NCC can identify targets of hate speech online to be prepared and asked to be “books” during a living library which can take place during the Meeting.
Forum theatre as a tool to build capacity to respond to hate-speech	Ideas / examples of scripts for forum theatre to be proposed online and selected using the NHSM platform.
Capacity building and advocacy	The capacity building workshops can be offered by peers (national youth council members or the YFJ) through simulations and experience for the participants Exhibition of success stories in advocating for human rights online to be placed as an example
No hate in movies	Working together with the 60second story (Amsterdam) to prepare shortcuts from movies aiming to promote human rights online
Possibility for synergy with Digital Champion initiative of the EU	http://ec.europa.eu/digital-agenda/en/digital-champions

WORKSHOP 10. FUNDRAISING FOR THE CAMPAIGN AND PROJECTS

Facilitator	Menno Ettema
Resource person(s)	Jean-Claude Lazaro and Vlad Dumitrescu
Reporter	Sara Serrano

GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF THE WORKSHOPS

The European and most national campaigns are notoriously under-funded. The economic and financial crisis affecting many European countries does limit the potential of the campaigns to be built on a solid basis and, especially, to support of projects of young people within the campaign. This has not prevented any campaign from being prepared, but can seriously limit their potential in reaching out to young people

and effectively addressing hate speech online. Foundations and funders, both national and European – such as the EEA Norway Grants and the European Youth Foundation – have chosen nonetheless to support the campaign because they recognise the need for action and for change.

The workshop will put together experiences from funders and from fundraisers and propose guidelines, activities and resources to be mobilised for supporting the national and European campaigns as well as projects initiated and carried out by young people at national and local level.

BRIEF SUMMARY OF INPUT FROM RESOURCE PERSONS

VLAD DUMITRESCU, CIVIL SOCIETY DEVELOPMENT FOUNDATION

This foundation is not just a donor. At the first level, it is a financial body based on EEA Norway Grants and other private funding (transition period since 2004). At the second level, it is a normal organisation providing projects, applying for funding (as Youth in Action). They also organise trainings for different target groups, from the general public to specific sectors. They have a department of lobby and advocacy, alike to a watchdog.

This Foundation has 2 rounds of funding. The first one is already closed and there was over 2000 applicant projects. The foundation donates to civil society in Romania to raise capacity and link it with the needs of the community (building bridges between organisations and the society).

For this foundation the Hate Speech topic is a priority. They are working at 2 levels:

- Priority projects which address the issue directly
- Operating grants: they give money for activities.

It is also about development of projects. For instance in Romania, if you don't have a serious background it is quite hard to get funds. Public bodies can not give money so this foundation has an important role.

They also fund and do small activities such as promoting NHSM web, photos or even conferences... And the Laboratory of education, where they use new methods that can be applied to combat hate speech online and offline. They are also working in one study related session with hate speech, made for the first time in Romania. The idea is to gather all the info regarding hate speech: bodies, legislation... and address the issue. They want to put together a resource network of experts as lawyers, journalist...

EUROPEAN YOUTH FOUNDATION

EYF has public money coming from the 47 public states of the Council of Europe (is an obligatory system). The campaign is one of the priorities of the EYF since 2012 where they have special care to seek for projects that creates national campaigns, committees and so on. In 2013 they are more focused on the local level of the campaign.. In an informal way, Jean Claude was explaining that the important thing to get the fund is about how is the projects organized (working with different sectors as media) and what the participants of the project will win, so they do not care any more about key words (old system). EYF is always promoting non formal education. But this year the budget is not high The new way of applying for funding is related



directly with the proposals that the organisations do, thinking always from a broader perspective. They want simple proposals but with creative, new approaches and methodologies. They like to get direct information for example by calling an organisation and asking what the project is about, through a direct and honest conversation with the people about their aims for implementation. The main characteristic of the EYF is proactive attitude.

MAIN ISSUES/QUESTIONS/CHALLENGES RAISED AND DISCUSSED

Gathering together inputs and experiences from funders and fundraisers (as Jean-Claude Lazaro of the EYF and Vlad Dumitrescu of Civil Society Development Foundation – related also with EEA Norway Grants), the participants of this working group analysed the main objectives of the campaign and the needs and challenges to reach them.

It was agreed upon between participants that there are occasions when the national campaigns are under-funded due to the economic and financial crisis affecting many European countries (as for instance in Spain). During the introduction of participants, there were representatives from the Serbian and Finnish Committee, two countries that have already developed the campaign and could start measuring impact and results. They remembered that the NHSM campaign is often created under voluntary basis.

After describing the actors of the movement, participants discussed the NEEDS AND CHALLENGES of the campaign. They were:

- Some countries have lack of funding for the campaign (due to the current economical context) so they are looking for other options to succeed with the campaign. One of them is to build partnerships with similar and close actors. Thanks to networking it is easier to combat the lack of funding. To link different partners when they are applying for funding facilitates the process. In the same way, it should exist a networking between donors and resources to increase knowledge and possibilities of organisations to join the campaign.
- Lack of sensitivity of the donors as they do not state the topics they prioritise in the campaign campaign (youth, online space and hate speech). However the two funders represented were not the case as the EYF and EEA Grants has as a priority these topics.
- It is important to evaluate the needs that the NHSM campaign has. The questions raised were: how can the campaign have a bigger impact? How can we attract the attention of donors? How to mobilize and engage more volunteers and support them afterwards? How to make the campaign interesting for politicians and state partners? And how to cooperate with them at the national level? Shall we involve more actors such as the media, researchers or other professionals in the movement? Some ideas were to collect small grants, ask for simple things such as printed materials or expertise (could be feasible this has been organised before. The case of the French Union of Jewish Students was raised as an example (twitter is obligated to give IP addresses to justice). Disseminating this experience can help others do the same so it was proposed to create a toolkit for EU countries. Lastly, the possibility of building strong links of cooperation at a transnational level to lobby multinational corporations such as Google, was mentioned.

HOW TO GENERATE RESOURCES AND SUPPORT FOR THE NHSM

- Establish partnerships with funders at the national level and at the European level. We should start to clearly define what NHSM is and sell it as a product. However, many questions were raised: what do we need to do for that? How do we involve funders on the campaign? Do we have to look for political support or even the support of business companies? It is important to create a list of donors.

ACTIONS

- Identify potential donors and contributors at a national level (national committees/bodies) and an international level (working group on the Council of Europe level)
- Prepare clear, appealing package on the campaign to be presented, with needs and demands (national/European) depending on the target group
- Present campaign to potential donors through events (info days, dinners)
- Prepare declaration on cooperation for national and international levels as a basis for partnership activities

Establish an efficient communication between all the actors of the campaign: NGOs, donors, state agents, youth volunteers... We must use what already exists and generate clear figures and reports on hate speech (which is why it is important to create a working group on the question)

ACTION

- creating a list of different actors participating in the campaign: NGOs, volunteers, governments, media and donors.
- maintain constant communication between the different actors.

Establish an ambassadors group for the NHSM that meet with donors and members of the media, to get political and social support.

ACTION

- We need a campaign manager
- We need ambassadors to gain visibility,
- We need an action day for the movement and the ambassadors,

Capacity building on how to fundraise and implement the projects. This was a suggestion to finish with the problem of bad projects. So in this way it would be easy to explain the needs of organisations, of the project and, address the issue on how to tackle hate speech.

FINAL OUTCOMES AND PROPOSALS FOR 2014

- Create a communication package to "sell" the NHSM campaign
- To map all funders and ambassadors



- To create a communication plan that contains: a campaign manager and structure that takes up funders and delegations at the national level
- Join funders for NHSM by donors and join action to raise funds sharing experiences and information

IF you are visible you can convince others(Jean Claude)

Fundraising for the campaign and projects - WHY?

To get partners

To get funds and support

To get people involved

Fundraising for the campaign and projects - HOW?

WORKSHOP 11. WORKING WITH INTERNET BUSINESSES AND SOCIAL NETWORKS

Facilitator	Viktor Szabados
Resource persons	Eavan Carrol, Google/YouTube; Patricia Cartes, Twitter
Reporter	Martin Mlynar, Roman Maca

GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF THE WORKSHOP

Hate speech online is spread through Internet infrastructures and media that are, to a large extent, private businesses, whether they are social networks, online media outlets or games. Most of these businesses are only the medium through which hate speech is propagated and disseminated. But undoubtedly they have a responsibility by either enabling or preventing certain types of content, as well as by promoting, or not, projects aimed at making the Internet a better space for human rights. Contacts with Google, Twitter and Facebook, for example, have indicated their interest in discussing their role in relation to the campaign issues and also their potential role in supporting the online campaign.

The workshop will identify existing practices and projects that associate Internet businesses and providers with the promotion of human rights online and offline, make proposals and recommendations for working with them in the national and European campaigns and how to make use of their potential to support the outreach of the campaign.

BRIEF SUMMARY OF THE INPUT FROM RESOURCE PERSONS

Internet Governance and set of the context

- Video with Vint Cerf one of the founding fathers of Internet (IGF 2012 Google big tent), with a discus-



sion on how the Internet was designed and which role private companies held in building an internet based on the protocols provided (TCP IP). It grew organically. Other aspects were if the Internet needs to be governed? The importance is to recognise that the responsibility is for everyone and all stakeholders, it is a bottom up approach. The challenges of different jurisdictions without borders on the global Internet is also an important aspect to consider since hateful speech can harm others in different jurisdictions. A tool used was the ratio of Internet users per capita since the 1990s which was discussed with the help of Gapminder; a useful tool found here: www.bit.ly/1cJPs19.

Discussion with Youtube representative Eavan Carrol about – community guidelines, restrictions, various content, efficient team, extreme content – need to be shown, flag system – reporting, free expression – best reports system needed, trusted flaggers programme – NGOs, copyright management tools, youtube help center – copyright center, 18 or older users, safety mode, flagging comments. Every minute, 100 hours of content is uploaded onto YouTube. Approximately 70% of traffic comes from outside the US. Youtube is a platform for free expression and tries to do as much as possible to ensure content stays online, even if it is expressing unpopular opinions. YouTube has a set of Community Guidelines which outlines the kind of content which is and is not allowed on the site (youtube.com/communityguidelines). Youtube does not allow hate speech or harassment. Youtube is informed about potential Community Guideline violations after a member of the online community flags the video for review. The team reviews content 24/7/365, once the video has been flagged.. If it violates Community Guidelines it will be removed and a penalty will be applied to the account holder. For content that does not violate Community Guidelines but might not be suitable for younger members of our audience, we can add an age restriction. Context is key when it comes to reviewing flagged content. We look at all the information the user has provided us when determining if something violates Community Guidelines. The Trusted Flaggers Programme allows expert users (NGOs etc.) to flag content at scale. Policy & Safety Hub has a range of articles on reporting information as well as tips on how to stay safe online. The YouTube Digital Citizenship Curriculum contains tips for parents, students and educators to stay safe on YouTube and across the internet.

Discussion with Twitter representative Patricia Cartes. Twitter is compared to Google and Facebook as a smaller company, 250M of active users and 400M unique users monthly and there is 1B of new Tweets every 2 days, 2000 employees in offices worldwide, supported Languages: 35+ languages. Twitter is not collecting information about users as other social media tools do to a large extent, and it does not require age information and current position. They do not mediate content but they have features/structures helping to face hate speech and manage it (Trust and Safety, User Safety team – keeping an eye on safety, Legal Issues unit tries to solve really tricky issues with allowed and prohibited/illegal content {in different countries some posts may be illegal, in that case they are hidden from wall in that country}, Reporting Team – handles bullying and harassing posts on twitter {similar to NHS Watch}.

Multiple accounts are prohibited, in case that person has more than 1 account, accounts are suspended. When they know that there is some trend in abusing, posts with similarity it will be considered as more urgent and controlled. Twitter is working on improving its policy regarding hate speech, here is a good opportunity to cooperate with the knowledge, experience of the Movement. hate speech is not specifically mentioned in the policies but it falls under harassment.



FINAL OUTCOMES AND PROPOSALS FOR 2014

Challenges

- NHS Watch should be connected with Social Media Platform, what means that Reports should be automatically send as report to Facebook/YouTube/Twitter platform
- Creation of position counter-narrations + making it searchable
- NHSM Platform should be creative
- Connecting the online and offline elements {for instance via education}
- Education of staying safe online
- Peer mentoring – Teaching Student to Student
- Internet safety on National Curriculum – Up skill Information Communication Technologies teachers (www.saferinternet.org)
- It's very hard to create relationship with ministries
- Content that can go viral
- Lack of press reporting
- Lack of engagement. Eg. Twitter followers
- Reaching the right audience 10-80-10%
- Medium: how and where to engage in counter speech
- Definition and Language around Hate speech
- Actions on hate speech on the internet (escalation of content)

Proposals:

- Hashtag alert to trigger online counter-narrative campaigns, action group can be created via hashtag which will represent actual situation
- Online database of people who are ready to mobilize and start acting
- Awareness of reporting options across platforms {Facebook, Twitter, Youtube, Google etc.}
- Online webinar should be created {industry + NGOs} on reporting aimed at minors
- Cyber Angels {teaching up – peer to peer}
- Ambassadors – Celebrities representing campaign
- Support from the sites
- Re-tweeting and Re-Sharing content
- Promotion of the content
- Case studies, analysis of examples, research – targeted groups, reasons, triggers
- Building a working relation between the movement and the sites – reporting and sharing intelligence
- Working together on counter speech: sharing cases, developing guide
- Regular exchanges with moderation teams {moderate, take action}
- Use doodle starting page of Google search (link, image) as an advertising mean only by contacting Google in each country
- Google Grant – applicants can get up to 10 000 Euro

Working with Internet businesses and social media: prerequisites and actions



- Conditions of cooperation
- Capacity to manage ongoing contacts
- Engage in win-win situation
- Mobilisation, Awareness Raising
- Pro-Bono ads (Twitter), grant programmes (Google)
- Striking content, that can go viral
- Sharing, retweeting (Twitter) of content (doodle for Google)
- Share intelligence, cooperate in reporting across platforms
- Mobilisation, Awareness Raising
- Online webinar on reporting to providers, authorities - HSW
- Develop online database of ready to mobilise groups
- Counterspeech
- Sharing cases, developing guide to engage and argue
- Regular exchange with moderation teams of providers
- Sharing of positive counter-narratives, make it searchable
- Hashtag alert to trigger counter-narrative campaigns
- Keywords, tags triggering informational context
- Engage in peer mentoring
- Guide how to identify, argue and act against hate speech
- Contribute to development of Help Centers of providers
- Engage Internet safety on National Curriculum
- Connect online and offline elements



VIII. CONCLUSIONS

CONCLUSIONS BY ZARA LAVCHYAN - RAPPORTEUR OF THE CONFERENCE

We have come now to closing of one of the important chapters of the campaign - The first European conference – and I have the task to recap what we saw, discussed, agreed and disagreed on, and what we did these past 3 days.

As you might recall, we started our meeting asking everyone who ever saw, read, witnessed hate speech online to stand up! And the whole plenary was on their feet.

We started the conference by trying to see what the situation is today and how the phenomenon of hate speech is manifesting itself. And of course touch on the question of Why there is a need to work continuously on the topic. Do we need 10 reasons to action against hate speech online?

As we are often told hate speech is not a new phenomenon, and it seems decades of experience with this should have taught us how to address the issue and eliminate it. But, in fact, it is the contrary: in a new information society and social media era more and more people have the capacity and means to create, share, spread communication and information, and this is a new reality that needs new responses and work. But of course to be able to respond adequately, timely and efficiently, we need to understand why hate speech is created, where it comes from, and why does it find a fertile ground of acceptance, or even worse, indifference and often impunity in our societies, which identify themselves as democratic, tolerant, protective. Why do we find ourselves in a reality where hate, populism and extremism is becoming widespread, entertaining, interesting, how do we become a society where “hate and populism pay”.. As Gavan Titley mentioned, democracy is in a bad health today, entangled with political crisis, social distrust, and an economy of hate, which prepares fertile ground for hate to exist, express, and even be justified as act of love (love for my country, my values, my ideals, my family...), in fact it is pathology of democracy, it's dark shadow!

We are seeing today a normalization of hate speech in the public domain – offline or online, where it is often not coming from radical, extremist groups, but from seemingly neutral ones, voices we trust. What can/should be the responses to these – hate can never erase hate, so a new, positive narrative needs to be introduced in the discourse and social climate. This is the orientation our colleagues have taken and shared with us from the European network Against racism.

Today strong actions against hate speech are often regarded as a threat and contradiction to freedom of speech and expression and pluralist democracy in general, but as the Deputy Secretary General has stressed, “hate speech is not free speech. Its consequences are anything but free. Hate speech undermines democracy and leads to hate crimes.” It is important to understand that

Action against hate speech is not an action against internet or social media

but in fact “We need to make sure that social media do not regard themselves, or are regarded by the general public, as human rights-free zones where human dignity ranks lower than market considerations.” Today more than ever there is a need of not only hard laws and sanctions, but as well as Philippe Coen called it “soft laws - responsabilization” of all actors involved, especially actors from the social media industry, to ensure that the cyber space is a hate free space.

Where is the campaign now? Where are we now? What have we learned on our way?

Young People Combating Hate Speech Online is a project that aims to combat racism and discrimination in the online expression of hate speech by equipping young people and youth organisations with the competences necessary to recognise and act against human rights violations. So after several months in the campaign where are we?

Well, we have things to celebrate as successes such as geography of the campaign, open and participatory nature, motivation, strong educational tools and components, mobilization and networking opportunities, successful EADs, strong partnerships with international and national institutions, bodies such as EEA Norway grants, member states, good allies inside the bodies and structures of the Council of Europe such as the Congress, Human Rights protection bodies, support from high political leadership of the organization – Secretary General, Committee of Minister Chairman, human rights commissioner.

There are also challenges and setbacks and many questions in the pipeline:

There are member states in which NCCs are not established, there are states where young people and youth activists struggle to build national networks and alliances and be on board with NCCs with the governments and other stakeholders to manage the campaign on national level. There is a strong need of coordination and management of information in the campaign to make it a really joint initiative. Recognizing and appreciating the great work the activists and volunteers of the campaign are doing to help the campaign run, it is clear that a campaign manager is needed.

Then there are a number of questions. ... What will happen to the campaign, who will own it, how we can create and maintain political commitment, how do we support, develop and work in national campaigns, how do we reach the unconverted ones, where do we find financial and other resources to sustain the campaign, how can we address sensitive and taboo issues, how do we know that we make a progress...?

In order to be able to address these challenges,

We cannot work alone. What we need is a more solidarity and fraternity.

We also identified the great opportunities that can be used to strengthen the campaign, such as strong networking and sharing, alliance building, mobilization of new people and new stakeholders, many new innovative ideas. The campaign is strong because it gives an opportunity for each of us to take ownership and act!

What is the place and role of the campaign? What is the broader context of human rights and anti-racism movements in which it develops?

This conference became a platform, where you could really feel that we are not alone, that other initiatives, projects, campaigns, interests exist on local, national, European and global levels. Not only different



countries, but also international institutions and networks, social media itself are taking action to make the cyber space a safer space. Moreover, projects such as the Tweetbullet in the museum in Mexico show that the issues are relevant and addressed far beyond Europe. We are really not alone. The challenge is to find ways of working together continuously and using each other's resources to strengthen the initiatives.

WHAT COMES NEXT: LIFE AFTER THE CONFERENCE

The conference brought together the main players and actors for the campaign at European and national levels to review and discuss the objectives and strategies of the campaign and to plan together the programme of major activities of the No Hate Speech Movement, including the necessary inter-connections and synergies between the European and the national campaigns.

So what are we taking home with us:

- Better understanding and a common vision of the campaign
- Motivation and inspiration
- Good contacts and new friendships
- Questions and answers
- Ideas for concrete projects online and offline
- Guidelines and principles for working with social media industries
- A stronger network of allies
- Evaluation plans and criteria
- Plans to engage and act during the EP elections,

Now, we know what each of us is taking home, but we hope also the institutions, the Council of Europe, National campaign committees and other partners involved also have something they will take home from this meeting:

- Campaign needs competence and opportunity for learning
- Campaign needs human resources and staff to support
- Campaign needs financial means
- Campaign needs strong community and network
- Campaign needs continuous educational interventions and support
- Campaign needs continuous political commitment!
- Campaign needs each of us

To conclude: Are we really lost in definitions? Do we need to wait for a law/regulation to tell us what's good and bad, to tell us what hate speech is in order to act? Is it not enough seeing people next to us being targeted, discriminated, harassed and suffer from day to day?

Is there a real contradiction with combating hate speech and protecting the right to freedom of speech? No, hate speech endangers freedom of speech, there are common-sense boundaries, which today in Europe we share a similar respect to culture of human rights, tell us what is and what is not acceptable.

I would like to end my presentation with reminding you of Gavan Titley's words "To not take action says to those targeted, I have accepted the legitimacy of your dignity being undermined. And in so doing, you

have made a choice". In fact this is the choice which is truly in our hands. It is a choice with your heart! Many of us came here with aspirations, hopes, questions, fears, ideas and motivations to share with others. We are going home with new aspirations, hopes, questions, ideas, motivations and hopefully much more than 10 reasons to take action against racism, hate speech online and stand up for protection and promotion of human rights and dignity in Europe.

SERGIO BELFOR, BUREAU OF ADVISORY COUNCIL ON YOUTH

My friends,

Slowly we are getting to the end of the three beautiful conference days, three hard-working days where we were trying to figure out what to do in 2014. I am happy, not because the conference is ending but because you all worked so hard and so many lovely people attended this meeting.

The conference had set important objectives: we wanted to network, we wanted to share successes, share experiences, but also wanted to plan our actions and be a part of it. I think we managed to reach most of these objectives. The Advisory Council on Youth, all my colleagues who were here at the conference are taking this campaign very seriously not only because the AC initiated it, but because we believe that action should be taken to combat hate speech. So you can count on the members of the Advisory Council who will make sure that this stays a priority for the Council, will help and develop all that is necessary to combat hate speech.

The success of the conference had 3 ingredients for me:

- First of all was your creativity and talents which you have shared in these past three days. We have seen that in many countries there are songs, movies, videos dedicated to the campaign and we have seen games being developed to work with this theme
- The second one is your participation in the campaign and in the conference, being able to mobilise people around your campaign, having or not having a national campaign committee, organizing events online and off-line, participating in campaign events with high level of involvement. This has been one of the most important factors for the success of the conference and the campaign
- Last but not least is your determination. I know that the campaign started slowly, it was a complex issue, a sensitive issue, but you kept your motivation and involvement in the process which was needed and necessary. Thank you for that

The Advisory Council members who were present here heard your concerns and questions. There are a lot of them, many have been discussed.

Some of these challenges are especially relevant when it comes to political commitment. I can assure you that the commitment is there from different bodies, departments, staff of the Council, The Secretary General is on board, our director, more staff. The Advisory Council will do its best to mobilize and lobby for the campaign on different levels within the Council. It is important to also involve other departments of the Council and the permanent representations of countries in the Council of Europe. I was happy to see some of the permanent representatives here in this conference.



What is of utmost importance is that the political commitment is also present in your own countries. There is a lot of support format the European level we can give to you, your countries and your campaigns and we are ready to do so.

The next challenge is funding. The Advisory Council does not have huge amounts of money to give, but again we will be looking at all the possibilities out there to fundraise and finance the campaign, try to find innovative ways to finance and do things without money or with smaller resources.

Some of you asked for technical support for example with the platform and we will take this seriously as well to support your national campaigns.

Another important thing that we heard from you is to have a campaign manager and this is something we also have been talking about since the beginning of the campaign. We will continue to remind the Secretariat that the success of the campaign depends on having someone coordinating its work on European level.

I would ask you to keep involving young people in the campaign as at the end of the day this campaign is for and by young people. So at the national level keep involving young people, go back and talk to your governments so they do something. Look also for other partners from international institutions and inter-governmental structures. The success of the campaign is based on what happens at the national level in the 47 member states.

Tackling hate speech is a multi-dimensional task and it needs specific national responses, so specific national action plans are needed to reach action and to decide what response the country will give to hate speech.

I would encourage you to also work on regional level cooperating within your regions sharing resources, budgets, doing things together, developing materials in a shared language that can be used in more than one country. These can be CIS, Balkans, BeNeLux, etc.

You are now leaving Strasbourg and I hope you leave motivated and inspired, because there is more than 10 reasons to be motivated and be inspired.

I would like to remind you that we did a survey before starting the campaign and more than 70% of young people stated that they have been confronted with hate speech and the top five target groups mentioned by young people were LGBTQI, Muslims, immigrants, ethnic minorities and women.

I would urge you to go back and be agents of change even if some realities are not happening in your countries they are elsewhere in Europe. The question is do we want these realities even to exist. If the haters are able to hijack the Internet then let's call the "lovers" to reclaim the Internet back to be a safe space for all, if haters can create fear, you and us - lovers are able to create hope,

If haters are able to violate human rights, lovers can be the human rights defenders

and stop the violations if we work together and if there is solidarity, because this affects our human rights and we all should be caring about each other.

I would like to conclude my speech with a recent example. We were in the Czech Republic for a conference on discrimination and at one point one of our participants said that she had to leave, because the next day would be the day when it would already be the 3rd or 4th time in Ostrava that Neo Nazis were marching



against Roma community and they have to be there to help protect the Roma communities and their homes from being attacked. The conference participants all asked what they could do to help. It was said that they could spread the word, raise awareness that this happens. As it was too far away to travel to Ostrava, the conference participant decided to demonstrate in Prague to show their support and solidarity. That was time in Ostrava when for the first time together with around 200 people supporting the Roma community also Roma community members came out to the streets to show that they are here to protect and confront the neo-nazis and basically that time saw that the whole community was standing there to stop them and the neo-nazi demonstrators ran away. This happened because there were people showing their solidarity to Roma community. Solidarity is important because it helps confront and challenge own fears. So all of the people behind the Internet who have their fears do not need to worry: I have one good message for them - because of you they don't have to fear anymore, but they can feel that there is a joint action and joint solidarity.

A MORAL OBLIGATION TO CAMPAIGN - SNEŽANA
SAMARDŽIĆ-MARKOVIĆ, DIRECTOR GENERAL
OF DEMOCRACY, COUNCIL OF EUROPE

This conference confirms yet again that this campaign is needed because hate speech is a violation of human rights and a crime that cannot be fought by laws alone. It requires awareness, it requires education, it requires action to draw deeper the line of what is and what is not accepted in democracy.

Hate speech is not normal or acceptable in democracy. Racism is not acceptable. Anti-Semitism is not acceptable. Discrimination is not acceptable.

The number of campaign committees, activists and partners represented here is a sign of optimism for all of us. Optimism because we are many and we come from everywhere within Europe and even from outside Europe. Your optimism stands up against a background that is often full of pessimism. I mean the human rights crisis that cuts across many of our societies. A human rights crisis is a crisis where the very first article of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights – freedom and equality in dignity and rights of all human beings – is challenged, openly or covertly, by the perpetuation of prejudice against minorities, by the denial of the equality in dignity of LGBT fellow citizens. We see evidence of this crisis all around us, every day. Look at the resurgence of antigypsyism in levels and forms that we thought belonged only to the past. A human rights crisis is also present when we see young people taking their lives because they see no way out of bullying and racist harassment. A human rights crisis is when the desperate hope of refugees seeking asylum in Europe is met with cynicism and death in the Mediterranean. A human rights crisis is a crisis where we, again, have good reason to be afraid of mounting fascism and antisemitism. A human rights crisis is when immigrants are killed out of racial hatred. Hate crimes, let us not forget, are always accompanied by hate speech.

The culture of human rights everywhere that the No Hate Speech Movement fights for is universal. But, it needs to be taught, learnt and transmitted. And it needs to be re-created by the children and young people so that they will make it their own culture.

I appreciate, in this respect, the attention placed by the campaign on education and training. We may cam-



paign online or offline or both. We can educate using formal or non-formal education approaches. But we cannot learn and unlearn tolerance and human rights without involving the school communities and youth organisations at large. This is where most young people are.

Our moral obligation to campaign is also a statement of belief in education that incorporates the right to human rights education: the right to learn, to live and to learn according to human rights.

COMMITMENT OF THE ORGANISATION

This conference has been about making commitments for action to campaign effectively. Through your hard work in these three days you clearly demonstrated your commitment. Let me assure you that you are not alone.

The Council of Europe is taking this campaign very seriously and the fight against hate speech is high on the organisation's agenda. In this respect, I would like to share with you some of the conclusions reached at a recent high-level meeting organised by the Armenian chairmanship of the Council of Europe:

- It is important to address the root causes of hate speech and hate speech online. The visible expressions of hate speech, online and offline, are the reflection of non-democratic ideologies that constitute real threats to the fabric of democratic, open and tolerant societies.
- It is important for the Council of Europe and member states to adopt consistent legal measures to combat hate speech, online and offline. While legal measures alone are not sufficient, they provide an important and necessary signal of what is and is not acceptable. Our campaign must also be effective in this respect.
- Difficulties over prosecution and jurisdiction should not be confused with impunity. Hate crimes must be investigated effectively and the perpetrators of such crimes must be sanctioned.
- More member states should be encouraged to sign and ratify the Additional Protocol to the Budapest Convention.
- We should update our working definitions of hate speech in order to reflect the issues brought up in this campaign, including its online dimension and the inclusion of social groups often targeted by hate speech such as LGBT, women and people with disabilities.
- Cooperation with other European and international bodies, such as the Fundamental Rights Agency and the OSCE, is important in view of pursuing effective remedies and exploring common approaches.
- Combating hate speech online must be articulated with the broader debates and initiatives about Internet governance, namely in relation to human rights, democracy and participation online. Awareness of the ways in which the Internet is and is not governed is important so that citizens understand it also as a public space where dignity and human rights apply.
- More member states must support the implementation of the youth campaign "No Hate Speech Movement" which, like the "all different – all equal campaigns", must be present and visible across all the Council of Europe territory.
- The educational resources and tools developed within the Council of Europe – such as Compass, Mosaic, and the manuals for Education for Democratic Citizenship – should be further disseminated



in the member states and made available to actors in formal and non-formal education.

Combating hate speech is not the task of the youth sector of the Council of Europe alone. Many sectors, institutions and bodies of the organisation also do their own part such as the Human Rights Court, the PACE, the Human Rights Commissioner, monitoring bodies such as ECRI and FCNM, and so on. The campaign is an excellent opportunity for bringing our standards and values closer to the people who are the ultimate stakeholders of the Council of Europe.

Before closing this conference, I would like to express our sincere gratitude to:

- The governments of Armenia, Belgium and Finland for their voluntary contributions to the campaign. We hope your example will be followed by other member states.
- The chairmanships of Andorra, Armenia and, I hope the forthcoming chairmanships of Austria, Azerbaijan and Belgium for keeping the campaign and intercultural dialogue present in their priority agendas
- The EEA Norway Grants for supporting the campaign in 15 member states and for working together with the Council of Europe.
- I would also like to mention my thanks towards:
 - The national campaign coordinators
 - The members of national committees
 - The partner organisations
 - The voluntary online activists and bloggers
 - The youth organisations and the governmental youth partners
 - The staff of the Youth Department
 - Those recognised and unrecognised for their work
 - The digital natives and the digital migrants
 - The experts and the newcomers
 - The friends from outside Europe and particularly from Japan and Mexico

All the facilitators, rapporteurs, resource persons and speakers. This a campaign against hate speech but is also very obviously a campaign for free speech. Thank you for encouraging speech to flow freely and usefully in this conference. We always end up doing more than we think! [There is no campaign without pain!]

Very special thanks to the members of the Follow-up Group of this campaign. You have been working for this campaign for more than one year now and, had you given in to the many doubts and obstacles that you came across – we might not be here together today. Thank you Laurence, Sergio, Aleksandra, Shannon, Darek, Kristiina, Dicle, Ghofran. Thanks to the colleagues from the Advisory Council and the European Steering Committee on Youth for their tireless efforts and courage to believe that we can and we must do more for human rights online.

And finally dear participants I would like to extend my thanks and my admiration to all of you for giving so much of yourselves, your time, your knowledge, your love against no hate.

We still have a long way to go and we should make it also an exciting and rewarding experience to go through together.



IX. APPENDICES

STRATEGIC OBJECTIVES AND EXPECTED RESULTS

Draft document by the secretariat of the Youth Department

The campaign aims to combat racism and discrimination in their online expression of hate speech by equipping young people and youth organisations with the competences necessary to recognise and act against such human rights violations.

Within this framework, the campaign cuts across the programmes and priorities of the Council of Europe youth policy as adopted by the Joint Council, including: Human Rights Education and Youth Participation, Roma Youth Action Plan, Intercultural Dialogue; Fighting discrimination and inclusion of vulnerable groups, Youth policy development, Recognition of youth work and non-formal education.

It also addresses various other policy areas of the Council of Europe in the Human Rights, Democracy and Rule of Law pillars.

Its objectives and expected results should therefore concern the whole organization as well.

The various sectors of the Council of Europe active in and responsible for work in these areas are involved in the campaign preparations.

The campaign is currently being prepared in 36 countries and is expected to run (at European level) through to December 2014 (at the earliest). Evaluation and follow-up measures will be implemented in 2015.¹

The campaign conference (7-9 November) will be the opportunity to review and agree on common strategic objectives of relevance to the European and national levels. Each national campaign may adopt a specific thematic focus and corresponding objectives.

The preparatory work done so far points towards the following objectives and expected results:

- Human rights; combating racism, discrimination and intolerance
- Ratification by member states of the Additional Protocol to the Convention on Cybercrime (concerning the criminalisation of acts of a racist and xenophobic nature committed through computer systems).
- Preparation of an ECRI General Recommendation on combating hate speech online (and cyber hate)
- Recommendation of the Committee of Ministers to member states on addressing hate speech online, focusing on national monitoring mechanisms and educational strategies
- Charter or "code of conduct" to be agreed or endorsed by social media networks and service providers
- Council of Europe "Hate Speech Watch", as an online database to report, discuss and monitor hate speech, particularly in political and public discourse (online and offline)

¹ States parties to the European Cultural Convention *not* yet known to be taking part: Albania, Andorra, Denmark, Estonia, Germany, Holy See, Ireland, Kazakhstan, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Monaco, San Marino, United Kingdom.

- Citizenship and human rights education
- Inclusion of media education and Internet literacy in programmes and strategies for EDC/HRE in formal and non-formal education (possible update of the Charter on Education for Democratic Citizenship and Human Rights Education)
- Support to online and off-line educational resources against hate speech online, including cyber-bullying
- Development of online youth work and non-formal education, including a virtual (European) youth centre
- Information and education about how human rights and democracy apply to the ways that Internet is governed and organized
- Inclusion of training modules on digital competence related to democracy online for teachers and youth leaders
- Adoption of 22 July as European Day of Remembrance for Victims of Hate Crimes (and related activities)
- Youth participation and Internet Governance
- Consultation and inclusion of youth representatives in Internet governance projects
- Internet governance issues to be placed in the youth policy agenda(s)
- Freedom of expression, safetyonline
- Guidelines for warnings of hate speech and offensive content in computer games
- Development of online games and human rights-friendly gaming communities
- Development of children and youth-friendly policies on content, privacy and reporting of harmful content by major social networks
- Dissemination and updating of the Human rights guidelines for online games providers, together with stakeholders of the gaming industry.
- Development of "Trusted site" standards with national stakeholders and Internet businesses.

These objectives were discussed and supported by the Campaign Conference (7-9 November 2013).

Internally, they would deserve being discussed with the various sectors of the organization concerned by and involved in the campaign before the conference.

Coordination in view of their implementation should be secured for 2014 and 2015.

CONFERENCE COVERAGE: EUROPEAN YOUTH PRESS ORANGE MAGAZINE

1. Blogging on the face book: <https://www.facebook.com/pages/Orange-Magazine/110241995724711?fref=ts>
2. Website posts: <http://www.orangemagazine.eu/editions/no-hate-speech-movement-conference-2013/>
3. Storify materials (daily summaries):
DAY 1 <http://storify.com/orangemagazine/no-hate-speech-conference>



DAY 2 http://storify.com/orangemagazine/no-hate-speech-conference-day-2?utm_medium=sfy.co-twitter&awesm=sfy.co_gVUJ&utm_campaign=&utm_content=storify-pingback&utm_source=facebook.com

DAY 3 <http://storify.com/orangemagazine/no-hate-speech-conference-day-3>

4. Videos:

- 8 interviews on the website (everything is under a link from the point number 2)
- two productions EYP helped with (Anti Racist and Flash Mob)
- Overview of the conference <http://www.orangemagazine.eu/no-hate-speech-conference-2013-video/>
- two behind a stage videos (also second link)

5. Radio <http://www.orangemagazine.eu/our-european-radio-broadcast/>

6. Infogram: <http://www.orangemagazine.eu/infogram-on-no-hate-speech/>

7. Editorial: <http://www.orangemagazine.eu/the-grassroots-campaign-no-hate-speech-movement/>

8. Photos: <http://www.orangemagazine.eu/gallery-2/>

9. Regular twitting

Contact person: KatarzynaMortoń | board member

European youth press | network of young media makers

Square de Meeus 25

B-1000 Brussels, Belgium

phone: 0032 486 363 848

e-mail: k.morton@youthpress.org

<http://www.youthpress.org> | <http://www.orangemagazine.eu>

FB: European Youth Press

TW: @youthpre



X. PROGRAMME OF THE CONFERENCE

WEDNESDAY, 6 NOVEMBER 2013

- 16:00 Welcome and registration
- 19:00 Dinner
- 21:00 Welcome evening

THURSDAY, 7 NOVEMBER 2013

- 09:00 Opening of the Conference
Gabriella Battaini-Dragoni, Deputy Secretary General of Council of Europe
Ambassador Armen Papikyan, Permanent Representative of Armenia to the Council of Europe
Laurence Hermand, Vice-chairperson of the Steering Committee on Youth
Jerry den Haan, Board member of the European Youth Forum
- 10:00 Introduction of the participants and of the conference
- 10:45 Break
- 11:15 Ten Reasons to Take Action Against Hate Speech, Gavan Titley, National University of Ireland
- 12:00 Statement by Niels Muznieks, Human Rights Commissioner
- 12:20 Presentation of the Hate Prevention Initiative, David Alexandre et Philippe Coen
- 12:35 State of Play of the No Hate Speech Movement campaign at European and at national level, Rui Gomes, Youth Department of the Council of Europe
- 13:00 Lunch
- 14:45 Sharing Challenges, Questions, Solutions and Successes with the campaign so far
- 16:15 Break
- 16:45 "Sharing" space continues
- 17:45 Plenary sharing of conclusions, experiences and challenges
- 18:10 Introduction to the European Action Day Against Fascism and Antisemitism, by Anca-Ruxandra Pandea, and to the campaign Wipe Out Hate by Geert Ates, United for Intercultural Action
- 19:00 Dinner
- 21:00 Exhibition market of NHSM activities and tools by the participants



FRIDAY, 8 NOVEMBER 2013

- 09:30 Tackling Challenges: feedback on the conclusions identified in the previous day
- 09:50 Hate Speech Online: the view from Mexico, by Valeria Berumen Ornelas, CONAPRED (National Council for the Prevention of Discrimination)
- 10:05 Conclusions of the conference "Hate Speech in Political Discourse" (Warsaw, 18-19 September) by Ambassador Urszula Gacek, Permanent Representative of Poland to the Council of Europe
- 10:20 Hate Speech and Racism in Europe Today, Sarah Isal Chair of the European Network Against Racism
- 11:00 Break
- 11:30 Workshops on Campaign Planning

Workshops' themes

1. European Action Days - facilitated by Anca-Ruxandra-Pandea; resource person: Geert Ates
2. Hate Speech in Political Discourse and The European Parliament Elections – facilitated by Bálint Molnar, Youth Department of the Council of Europe; resource person: Ralph Du Long, United for Intercultural Action
3. Evaluation and Impact of the No Hate Speech Movement Campaign – facilitated by Laurence Hermand, Follow-up Group of the European Campaign; resource person: Dariusz Grzemny, Follow-up Group of the European Campaign
4. Communication, Coordination and Networking – facilitated by Shannon Stephens, Follow-up Group of the European Campaign; resource person: László Földi, online community moderator
5. Educational Strategies Against Hate Speech – facilitated by Mara Georgescu, Youth Department of the Council of Europe; resource persons: Claudia Lenz, European Wergeland Centre, Olivier Grinnert, Loupiote
6. National campaign strategies, plans and programmes – facilitated by Satu Valtere and Jan Dabkowski, campaign coordinators in Finland and Poland; resource person: Aleksandra Knezevic, Follow-up Group of the European Campaign
7. Impact and advocacy for policy changes - facilitated by Sergio Belfor, Follow-up Group of the European Campaign; resource person: Rui Gomes
8. Building Online Communities and Securing Youth Participation – facilitated by Ron Salaj, online activist; resource person: Kristina Liing, Follow-up Group of the European Campaign
9. Preparing the No Hate Speech Movement Youth Meeting – facilitated by Stefan Manevski, national campaign committee of "The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia"; resource person: Ilaria Esposito, Advisory Council on Youth
10. Fundraising for the campaign and projects – facilitated by Menno Ettema, Youth Department



of the Council of Europe; resource persons: Jean-Claude Lazaro, European Youth Foundation, Vlad Dumitrescu, Civil Society Development Foundation

11. Working with Internet Businesses and Social Networks - facilitated by Viktor Szabados, moderator of the online community; resource persons: Eavan Carrol, Google/YouTube; PatriciaCartes, Twitter

- 13:00 Lunch break
- 14:45 Workshops continue
- 16:15 Break
- 16:45 Workshops continue
- 18:30 Finalisation of the workshops
- 19:00 Dinner
- 21:00 Free evening

SATURDAY, 9 NOVEMBER 2013

- 09:30 Plenary opening
- 09:45 Learning from practices with online campaigning – round-table with Jemma Tyson, Ministry of Justice, United Kingdom, Carlinda Lopes, European Schoolnet, Eavan Carrol, Google/Youtube
- 10:30 Open space for participants to work out joint initiatives for 2014, coordinate their actions, share experiences and ideas regarding the Campaign.
- 11:00 Break
- 12:00 Building the action plan for 2014: presentation of the outcomes of the workshops and identify the main actions for 2014.
- 13:00 Lunch break
- 14:45 European Action Day against Fascism and Antisemitism
- 16:15 Break
- 16:45 Closing of the Conference
Zara Lavchyan, rapporteur of the conference
Sergio Belfor, Vice-Chairperson of the bureau of the Advisory Council on Youth
Snežana Samardžić-Marković, Director General of Democracy, Council of Europe
- 18:15 Reception
- 19:00 Buffet – Dinner
- 20:30 Move for No Hate Party



NO HATE
SPEECH
MOVEMENT

SUNDAY, 10 NOVEMBER 2013

Departure of participants

XI. LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

Country	Name	Organisation
Andorra	Thais Zapata	National Campaign Committee
Armenia	Nelli Gishyan	National Campaign Committee
Armenia	Lusine Ghazaryan	Online campaign activist NGO (PINK Armenia)
Austria	Martin Fischer	Online campaign activist
Azerbaijan	Isfendiyar Amrahov	National Campaign Committee, National Assembly of Youth Organizations of the Republic of Azerbaijan
Azerbaijan	Ravana Hashimova	National Campaign Coordinator (National Assembly of Youth Organizations of the Republic of Azerbaijan).
Azerbaijan	Tarana Hasanova	NCC-National Assembly of Youth Organizations of the Republic of Azerbaijan
Belarus	Darya Tryhubava	National Campaign Committee, Smart Networks
Belarus	Kiryl Masharski	National Campaign Committee (Smart Networks)
Belgium	Amal Hamich	Similar campaign, initiative or related stakeholders
Belgium	Celine Brandeleer	Similar campaign, initiative or related stakeholders, European Think Tank Pour la Solidarité
Belgium	Ela Suleymangil	NGO, Service Civil International (SCI)
Belgium	Gerda Van Roelen	National Campaign Coordinator
Belgium	Emmanuelle Mainil	National Campaign Committee
Belgium	Mariam Barhandi	Forum of European Muslim Youth and Student Organisations (FEMYSO)
Belgium	Michel Duponcelle	National Campaign Coordinator/ InforJeunesasbl
Belgium	Alessandro Cadau	Jong & Van Zin (National Campaign Committee Flanders)
Belgium	Nele Bulens	Jong & Van Zin (National Campaign Committee Flanders)



Country	Name	Organisation
Belgium	Katarzyna Morton	European Youth Press
Belgium	Rita Stadtfeld	Young European Federalists
Belgium	Maria Borissova	Bij Belgium (Trainee)
Belgium	Olivier Grinnaert	Loupiote internet tools
Belgium	Carlinda Lopes	European Schoolnet
Bosnia and Herzegovina	Aleksandra Matic	NGO Association of youth "MotusAdulescenti"
Bosnia and Herzegovina	Andelija Kovačević	Online campaign activist
Bosnia and Herzegovina	Branka Malesevic	National Campaign Coordinator
Bosnia and Herzegovina	Milos Blagojevic	National Campaign Committee (NYC President) Youth Council of Republic of Srpska
Bulgaria	Teodora Hristoforova	National Campaign Coordinator
Croatia	Ankica Milic	National Campaign Committee (Croatian Youth Network)
Croatia	Ivana Zivkovic	National Campaign Committee
Croatia	Sanja Vukovic-Covic	ERYICA(European Youth Information and Counselling Agency)
Cyprus	Marinos Pavlou	National Campaign Coordinator
Cyprus	Rafaela Camassa	Online campaign activist, "Hope For Children" UNCRC Policy Centre
Cyprus	Steven Lockhart	Online campaign activist
Czech Republic	Roman Maca	National Campaign Coordinator
Denmark	Dobriyana Tropankeva	European Youth Press
Finland	Christian Thibault	National Campaign Committee
Finland	Marinets Stanislav	Finnish Association of Russian-speaking Organizations (FARO)
Finland	Piritta Siekkinen	National campaign committee (Ministry of Education and Culture, Plan Finland and Trade Union of Education in Finland/The Finnish Association of Class Teachers)
Finland	Satu Valtere	National Campaign Coordinator
Finland	Susanna Salmijärvi	National Campaign Committee



Country	Name	Organisation
France	David Alexandre	Initiative de Prévention de la Haine
France	Camille Dupont	European Youth Press
France	Julian Perdrigeat	The Movement Against Racism and for Friendship among Peoples (MRAP)
France	Iulia Gheorghe	Club de Presse de Strasbourg
France	Dovile Sakaliene	Human Rights Monitoring Institute
France	Philip Coen	Initiative de Prévention de la Haine
France	Camille Destandau	Club de Presse De Strasbourg
France	Aleksandr Bolotnov	Tyumen United Nations Youth Association (Russia)
France	Franck Porterat	Droits de l'Homme, Integration et lutte contre les discriminations, Ville de Nancy
France	Maria Borissova	
France	Oti Ayenbi	National Youth Service Corps, ABUJA-Nigeria
France	Uliana Ivanova	Executive director of the International Affairs Department, Cojep International
Georgia	Gubaz Koberidze	Georgian School Students Unions Alliance
Georgia	Nora Gigineishvili	National Campaign Coordinator
Georgia	Tamara Gamkrelidze	Europe Our House
Germany	Diana Botescu	AmaroDrome.V./AmaroForoe.V.
Greece	Christoforos Pavlakis	Youth Council of Kos Island
Hungary	Bálint Jóna	National Campaign Committee
Hungary	Ivett Karvalits	National Campaign Coordinator
Hungary	Lilla Nedeczky	National Campaign Committee-Hope for Children Hungary
Iceland	Solveig Karlsdottir	National Campaign Committee
Iceland	Gudberg K. Jonsson	National Campaign Coordinator
Iceland	Steinunn Pieper	Icelandic Human Rights Centre
Ireland	Anne Walsh	National Youth Council of Ireland
Ireland	Ian McGahon	Online campaign activist
Italy	Benedetta Rubin	National Youth Council Italy



Country	Name	Organisation
Italy	Emilia Astore	Human Rights Education Youth Network (HREYN)
Italy	Eugenio Orsi	LATTE Creative
Italy	Luisa Zappala	ELSA International
Italy	Marialuisa Silvestrini	National Campaign Deputy Coordinator
Italy	Roberta Lulli	Similar campaign, initiative or related stakeholders
Italy	Sandro Salvatore Accogli	South Europe Youth Forum
Italy	Maria ValendnaTora	
Italy	Valentina Carta	LATTE Creative
Kosovo*	Ron Salaj	Trainer
Latvia	Gundeva Rupenheite	National Campaign Coordinator
Latvia	Sabīne Tropa	LGBT and their friends alliance MOZAIKA
Lithuania	Jurate Guzeviciute	Human Rights Monitoring Institute
Luxemburg	Kia Faraji	ASTI-Making Luxemburg
Malta	Gabriella Calleja	National campaign committee (National Youth Agency)
Malta	Irene Attard	National Campaign Coordinator
Mexico	Valeria Berumen Ornelas	Consejo Nacional para Prevenir la Discriminación (CONAPRED)
Mexico	Maria Cristina Ceballos Lopez	Institute of Youth Mexico (IMJUVE)
Montenegro	Krsto Vukadinovic	National Campaign Coordinator
Montenegro	Slobodan Volaric	National campaign committee
The Netherlands	Jerry Den Haan	European Youth Forum
The Netherlands	Neringa Tumenaite	OCEANS Network
The Netherlands	David Alexandre	Initiative de Prévention de la Haine (HatePrevention Initiative)
The Netherlands	Geert Ates	UNITED- European Network United for Intercultural Action

* All reference to Kosovo, whether to the territory, institutions or population, in this text shall be understood in full compliance with United Nations Security Council Resolution 1244 and without prejudice to the status of Kosovo.



Country	Name	Organisation
The Netherlands	Ralph Du Long	UNITED- European Network United for Intercultural Action
Norway	Claudia Lenz	European Wergeland Centre
Norway	Eirik Rise	National Campaign Coordinator
Norway	Joakim L. Lossius	National campaign committee
Lithuania	Vanessa Ivanov	EEA NORWAY GRANTS
Norway	Kasper Holm	EuropeiskUngdom/JEF Norway
Poland	Anna Gotowska	National Campaign Committee (Young Journalists Association "Polis)
Poland	Jan Dabkowski	National Campaign Coordinator
Poland	Justyna Frydrych	The Batory Foundation (linked with EEA)
Poland	Karolina Garlińska	Jewish Volunteer Centre
Poland	KasiaDumanska	The Batory Foundation (linked with EEA)
Poland	Małgorzata AnielkaPieniążek	Humanity in Action Senior Fellows Network in Poland
Poland	PrzemysławIwanek	Humanity in Action Polska
Poland	Michał Piasecki	Association Education by the Internet (StowarzyszenieEdukacjaPrzez Internet)
Portugal	Adriana Delgado	Nationalcampaigncommittee (Rede Portuguesa de Jovens para a Igualdade de Oportunidades entre Mulheres e Homens- REDE)
Portugal	Andrea Vertessem	Associação Par - Respostas Sociais which makes part of the Portuguese National Committee
Portugal	David Pinto	National Campaign Committee
Portugal	Margarida Saco	National Campaign Coordinator
Romania	Daniela Prisacariu	ACCEPT Association
Romania	Valerie Marian Panait	National Campaign Coordinator
Romania	Vlad Dumitrescu	Civil Society Development Foundation/EEA ORANIS OPERATOR ROMANIA
Russian Federation	Alina Zhilidova	National Campaign Committee (National Youth Council of Russia)
Russian Federation	Aleksandr Bolotnov	Tyumen United Nations Youth Association (Russia)



Country	Name	Organisation
Russian Federation	Vladislav Vnuchkov	National Campaign Committee (National Youth Council of Russia)
Serbia	Ena Nikolic	National campaign committee (Support Team of Ministry of Youth and Sport of Republic of Serbia, Secretary of National Committee for Combating Hate Speech Online)
Serbia	Gazela Pudar Drasko	National Campaign Committee
Serbia	Ivan Zivkovic	National Campaign Coordinator (Timok youth center)
Serbia	Marija Minic	National campaign committee (Serbian Assotiation for youth - UMS)
Serbia	Nenad Borovcanin	National campaign committee (State Secretary, Ministry of Youth and Sport)
Serbia	Salin Salijevic	Club for Youth Empowerment 018
Slovakia	Andrej Bencel	National Campaign Coordinator
Slovakia	Martin Mlynar	National Campaign Committee
Slovakia	Peter Kupec	National Campaign Committee
Slovenia	Misa Hrib	National Campaign Committee
Slovenia	Sabina Planinc	Youth Center Brezice
Slovenia	Zorko Skvor	National Campaign Coordinator
Spain	Natalia Diaz Santin	National Campaign Coordinator (Head of Area INJUVE)
Spain	Imanol Sancosmed Camara	ADYNE (The African Diaspora Youth Living in Europe)AFRIC FORUM
Spain	Koudjo Mawuli Klevo	ADYNE (The African Diaspora Youth Living in Europe)AFRIC FORUM
Spain	Sara Serrano Latorre	Online campaign activist
Sweden	Ariana Jankovic	ERYICA(European Youth Information and Counselling Agency)- SolnaUnginfo
Switzerland	Golo Yawo Atitsogbe	National Campaign Coordinator
Switzerland	Vladimir Schwager	Conseil Suisse des Activités de Jeunesse
Switzerland	Youssef Himmat	Forum of European Muslim Youth and Student Organisations (FEMYSO)



Country	Name	Organisation
"The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia"	Matej Manevski	National Campaign Committee
"The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia"	Stefan Manevski	National Campaign Committee
"The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia"	Zorica Stamenkovska	Agency of Youth and Sport
Turkey	Mehmet Cetinkaya	Youth Information Center Association
Turkey	Serhan Karatas	Similar campaign, initiative or related stakeholders
Ukraine	Nadiia Pavlyk	National Campaign Coordinator
Ukraine	Olha Vyhovska	Organisation -Coordinator "Association" KVN
Ukraine	Volodymyr Vygovsky	Organisation -Coordinator "Association" KVN
United Kingdom	Emese Kovacs	Pen Club International
United Kingdom	Jemma Tyson	Ministry of Justice

FOLLOW UP GROUP OF THE JOINT COUNCIL ON YOUTH FOR THE NO HATE SPEECH MOVEMENT CAMPAIGN

Belgium	Kristiina Ling	European Youth Card Association
Belgium	Ruben Loodts	Advisory Council on Youth
Belgium	Laurence Hermand	European Steering Committee for Youth
Germany	Shannon Stephens	Advisory Council on Youth; Council of Europe, European Youth for Action
The Netherlands	Sergio Belfor	Vice-Chairperson of the Bureau of the Advisory Council on Youth
Poland	Dariusz Grzemny	Consultant - Trainer
Serbia	Aleksandra Mitrovic Knezevic	The European Steering Committee for Youth
Montenegro	Bojana Bulatović	The European Steering Committee for Youth; Council of Europe, Directorate for Youth and Sports
Turkey	Dicle Akinci	The European Steering Committee for Youth; Council of Europe, Ministry of Youth and Sports
United Kingdom	Ilaria Esposito	Advisory Council on Youth; Council of Europe



GUESTS AND SPEAKERS

Eavan Carrol	Google/Youtube
Gavan Titley	National University of Ireland
Jerry den Haan	Board member of the European Youth Forum
Niels Muznieks (by video message)	Human Rights Commissioner
Patricia Cartes	Twitter
Sarah Isal	The European Network Against Racism

CONSULTANTS

Armenia	Zara Lavchyan	Rapporteur of the Conference
Hungary	László Földi	Moderator of the online community
Hungary	Viktor Szabados	Moderator of the online community

PERMANENT REPRESENTATIONS AT THE COUNCIL OF EUROPE

Armenia	Armen Papikyan
	Varduhi Melikyan
Azerbaijan	Agil Gunashov
Belgium	An Ghys
Finland	Tanja Leikas-Botta
Finland	Matias Kallio
Finland	Sanna Väisänen
Georgia	Giorgi Edilashvili
	Aleksandre Papiashvili
Poland	Urszula Gacek
Portugal	Paulo Pocinho
Switzerland	Urs Beer
	Andreas Scharnowski
Turkey	Alaaddin Kilinc
Ukraine	Oleksandra Popesku



MEDIA

Japan	Kosuke Watanabe	NHK, Japan Public Broadcaster
Japan	Boris Carrete	NHK, Japon Public Broadcaster
Japan	Magdalena Fournier	NHK, Japon Public Broadcaster

COUNCIL OF EUROPE SECRETARIAT

Gabriella Battaini-Dragoni	Deputy Secretary General
Snežana Samardžić-Marković	Director General of Democracy
María Ochoa-Llidó	Head of Migration and Roma Department
Gordana Berjan	Children Rights Division
Liri Kopaci-Di Michele	Convention on Preventing and Combating Violence against Women and Domestic Violence
Sonia Sirtori-Milner	Head of the Secretariat Committee on Equality and Non-Discrimination; Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe
Philia Thalgott	Educational Policy
Christopher Reynolds	Educational Policy
Yulia Pererva	Educational Policy
Josef Huber	Unit for Capacity Building, Exchanges and Mobility in Education - The Pestalozzi Programme
Dmitri Marchenkov	Secretariat of the Congress of Local and Regional Authorities of the Council of Europe
Michael Guet	Support Team to the special Representative of the Secretary General for Roma Issues

YOUTH DEPARTMENT

Aileen Donegan	Campaign Officer
Anca-Ruxandra Pandea	Educational Advisor
André-Jacques Dodin	Head of Division Intergovernmental
Angela Donath	Finance unit
Bálint Molnar	Deputy to the Executive Director of the European Youth Centre Budapest
Chaim Waibel	Trainee
Claire Uszynski	Campaign Officer
Claudia Montevecchi	Administrative Assistant



Jean-Claude Lazaro	Head of Division, European Youth Foundation
Jeanne Chiarizia-Gendron	EYC Receptionist
Joanna Killy	Secretarial Assistant
Joanna Wyartt-Jesser	EYC Receptionist
Katalin Ormos	Administrative Assistant
Mara Georgescu	Educational Advisor
Marina Filaretova	Programme officer
Meltem Kutlu	Programme officer
Menno Ettema	Educational Advisor
Nina Kapoor	Programme Support Assistant
Pascal Walter	Finance Unit
Patrick Norlain	EYC Receptionist
Sara Walter	Financial Officer and Deputy to the Executive Director of the European Youth Centre Strasbourg
Rui Gomes	Head of the Education and Training Division
Tina Mulcahy	Acting Head of the Youth Department
Verena Jirgal	Trainee

The youth campaign for human rights online is a project run by the Council of Europe's youth sector to combat racism and discrimination in the online expression of hate speech by equipping young people and youth organisations with the competences necessary to recognise and act against such human rights violations. Nearly six months after the launching of the campaign by the Secretary General of the Council of Europe, the No Hate Speech Movement was reaching the end of its preparatory phase. National campaign coordinators and campaign committees had been set up in the majority of the member states, partnerships with international organisations and projects were being built and the tools for the campaign were being delivered.

The European Campaign Conference was organised to plan and to further develop the campaign together in all its dimensions: activities, communication, coordination, resources, monitoring and evaluation of the campaign and its objectives etc. This was a conference for online campaign activists, national campaign committee members, representatives of Council of Europe bodies, and campaign partners and stakeholders involved in the campaign and motivated to make the campaign a success.

This documentation of the conference has been used in the implementation of the campaign and should remain useful to recall and to remember the issues, the proposals and the resolve of participants and partners.



ENG

www.coe.int

The Council of Europe is the continent's leading human rights organisation. It comprises 47 member states, 28 of which are members of the European Union. All Council of Europe member states have signed up to the European Convention on Human Rights, a treaty designed to protect human rights, democracy and the rule of law. The European Court of Human Rights oversees the implementation of the Convention in the member states.

www.coe.int/youthcampaign