



European
Policy
DIALOGUE
FORUM

**KAICIID Europe Region
RESEARCH PAPER #1**

PUBLISHED IN FEBRUARY 2022

This research paper was developed for and further discussed at the 3rd European Policy Dialogue Forum on Refugees and Migrants in Lisbon, Portugal, on 19-21 October 2021, organised by the International Dialogue Centre (KAICIID), the Network for Dialogue and the European Council of Religious Leaders/ Religions for Peace Europe (ECRL/RfP), and supported by the OSCE Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights (ODIHR).



KAICIID DIALOGUE CENTRE

International Dialogue Centre (KAICIID)

Promoting dialogue to help people to understand and respect different religions and cultures



www.kaiciid.org
europe@kaiciid.org

Using Education to Counter Anti-Refugee and Migrant Hate Speech in Europe

Author: **Olivia Quinn**

Contents

Executive Summary	2
Introduction	3
Section 1: The Role of Education in Confronting Anti-Refugee and Anti-Migrant Hate Speech	4
Literature and Programmes	5
Policy and Institutional Environment	6
Section 2: Case Studies on Education	8
Programme Types and Techniques	8
Case Studies: Europe-Wide Initiatives	9
Case Studies: Southern Europe	11
Case Studies: Central Europe	15
Case Studies: Northern Europe	16
Section 3: Case Study Insights and Takeaways	19
The Role of Education in Countering Hate Speech Within Society	19
Defining Purposes, Approaches and Targets	20
Target audience	21
Focus on Anti-Immigration Groups and Individuals	22
Knowledge-Sharing, Collaboration and Evaluation	22
Historical and geographical context	23
Section 4: Conclusion	24
Appendix 1: Glossary of Terms	25
Appendix 2: Selection Criteria Matrix	25
Appendix 3: Interviews	26
References	27
About the Author	28

Executive Summary

Many European nations are struggling with how to mitigate anti-refugee and anti-migrant hate speech. Education plays a critical role in addressing the drivers, trends and incidences of hate speech, yet there is a lack of research and resources that delineate what programming exists, how it is delivered and what the impact is on segments of society. Education initiatives by faith-based organizations represent a significant portion of programmes countering anti-refugee and anti-migrant hate speech. There is a strong commitment to programming and resources spanning a wide range of faiths and denominations across most of Europe, but there are deficits to be filled, particularly engagement targeting the far right and scalable state-backed education efforts.

There is a lack of clarity on how official institutions, faith-based organizations (FBOs) and civil society should collaborate to counter hate speech through education. Many programmes fall short of defining the purpose of such education and subsequently cannot effectively match programming approaches to appropriate audiences.

There is also a serious deficit in programmes that address and consider hate groups, far-right movements, supremacy groups, religious extremists and political parties – even though many members of these are also part of congregations and faith groups. Historic cycles and contexts of hate speech in Europe are not adequately considered as part of education on migration, specifically Europe's colonial past, participation in the transatlantic slave trade and role in armed conflicts in countries that are currently the largest refugee producers.

Drawing on the drivers, causes and triggers of hate speech within groups as a basis for programming would improve education. In addition to considering the multiple foundations of hate speech, organizations that aim to counter its detrimental effects would benefit from knowledge-sharing, collaboration, engagement of a wider array of actors, clear policy communication and a legal framework. If programmes rely mostly on reactive measures, they are less likely to tackle hate speech effectively.¹

¹ This paper was commissioned to explore the methods, reach and approaches of different educational programmes and to provide both a resource and a usable set of considerations to support policymakers, FBOs, civil society organizations and religious leaders/communities seeking to counter hate speech. This research will be used to inform KAICIID's programming. It was carried out between April and June 2021 and covers work from 2015 to 2021.

Introduction

Hate speech is “any kind of communication in speech, writing or behaviour that attacks or uses pejorative or discriminatory language with reference to a person or a group on the basis of who they are – meaning based on their religion, ethnicity, immigration status, nationality, race, colour, descent, gender or other identity factor.”¹ In the European context, the Council of Europe has played an important role in working on countering hate speech.

To better understand the landscape, FBO-led education programmes must be assessed to identify key themes, challenges and deficits. Significant areas of focus include reviewing the links among setting a programmatic purpose and targeting the relevant demographic groups, analysing the appropriate role for FBOs in the wider European context and exploring how better knowledge-sharing and collaboration can strengthen the role of education. Insights and considerations derived from interview case studies and existing literature aim to improve educational approaches and help overcome existing practitioner and programmatic challenges.

There are a range of education programmes to counter hate speech for schools, universities, religious leaders and communities, policymakers, law enforcement, migration practitioners and volunteers. Formal and informal education initiatives to counter hate speech can be classified into six general categories: 1) encounters with refugees and migrants to foster individual connections; 2) positive messaging; 3) dialogue; 4) advocacy; 5) reporting and counter-narratives; and 6) inclusion.

A growing trend has emerged whereby FBOs are taking the lead on hate speech in their communities through faith-based advocacy that seeks to integrate refugees. The plurality of approaches, spheres of influence, audiences and implementation give way to a diverse but fragmented approach that would be well-served by increased collaboration.

SECTION 1: **The Role of Education in Confronting Anti-Refugee and Anti-Migrant Hate Speech**

The problem – Europe is faced with the challenge of mitigating anti-refugee and anti-migrant hate speech while neutralising radicalisation trends and far-right movements that pose serious risks to safety, cohesion and inclusivity.ⁱⁱ Experts and international organizations consider education a critical tool in addressing the drivers, trends and incidences of hate speech directed towards refugees and migrants. Discourse concerning hate speech trends within the European context often hails education as a key factor in driving change and reaching diverse segments of society.ⁱⁱⁱ Yet, little research is available on what programming exists, how it is delivered and what impact it has had. Additionally, there has been little focus or direction on how governments should guide the educational space to counter hate speech, with programming in some cases defaulting to religious communities or civil society. FBOs are vital in reaching communities but they should represent one element of a larger state-supported effort for maximum impact.

The need – educational programmes have the potential to address several aspects of hate speech. Hate speech is often a symptom of a perceived threat about a group based on their identity. While there is no single underlying cause or rationale, anti-refugee and anti-migrant sentiments in Europe are often linked to a fear of the other. This includes: associating refugees and migrants with criminality rooted in illegal border crossings; the perception that newcomers from other faiths and races will change the look and fabric of society; that newcomers will take jobs from people or be a strain on the state; and that refugees are extremists and will import violence, undesirable values and extremist ideologies. While the assertion is not to identify these as driving forces or exhaustive examples, acknowledging some of the underlying issues is necessary to consider how programming can be developed and delivered to varying groups based on their belief systems and prejudices.

Hate speech is shown to occupy a broad spectrum that cannot be addressed as a monolithic whole.^{iv} While some rhetoric can be linked to less extreme drivers, as in the fear of refugees adversely impacting the economy, it can also range to more extreme cases, such as overt messaging that conveys threats of violence and eradication. These instances must not only be treated distinctly on a legal front, but also in terms of how educational programmes are conceived.

The approach – this research focuses on the work of FBOs, however, in addition, two select civil society entities were included based on the relevance of their programming types. Faith-based programming is the primary focus, however, attempts to improve collaboration between FBOs, state entities and civil society should not be overlooked. The case studies are representative of the organizations that are active in this space and span various faiths and dominations, including Lutheran, Jesuit, Quaker, Catholic, Greek Orthodox, Muslim and Jewish entities,

in addition to civil society organizations. The following breakdown reflects the presence of institutions given Europe's demographics, whereby fewer documented or publicly available non-Christian faith groups offer educational programmes.²

PAN-EUROPEAN:

- Facing Facts (Jewish)
- QCEA (Quaker)
- JRS (Jesuit)
- Caritas (Catholic)

WESTERN EUROPE:

- Germany (Church of Germany, Lutheran)
- Belgium (JRS, Jesuit)
- UK (QCEA, Quaker)

SOUTHERN EUROPE:

- Greece (Apostoli, Greek Orthodox; MAG, Muslim; Schools for All, civil society)
- Portugal (MEERU, civil society)
- Spain (JRS, Jesuit)
- Malta (JRS, Jesuit)
- Italy (JRS, Jesuit)

CENTRAL AND EASTERN EUROPE:

- Bosnia (Nahla, Muslim)
- Hungary (JRS, Jesuit)

NORTHERN EUROPE:

- Sweden (A World of Neighbours, Lutheran; Social Sustainability, Lutheran)
 - Norway (Church of Norway, Lutheran)
 - Finland (Shoulder to Shoulder, Lutheran)
-

The above illustrates the breakdown of interviews, including 1) the country, 2) the organization and 3) its faith orientation (those in italics reflect countries that are covered within a case study entity's work but were not the primary focus of these interviews or the interview did not inform a specific case study). These are not representative of all European countries, and they do not comprehensively cover the scope of policies, laws, amendments or programmes in place.

//// //// //// //// //// Literature and Programmes

Religious leaders take a stand – since the 2015 migration influx, often referred to as a “refugee crisis”, many religious leaders have publicly condemned hate speech and xenophobia towards refugees and migrants. Religious leaders and FBOs continue to make public statements to counter hate speech, specifically towards refugees and migrants. There has also been an increase in educational programmes centred on religious leaders and groups educating their congregations on the division and danger hate speech poses to society.^v While the impact of local religious entities or community leaders that promote anti-immigration beliefs has not been analysed in this context, it is assumed that these voices also carry weight in promoting hate speech, making FBO efforts to counter this type of discourse even more vital. Inflammatory anti-refugee and anti-migrant rhetoric by political leaders is also a factor in normalising hate speech; therefore, the power of negative rhetoric in leadership should be considered more generally.

The Lutheran World Federation and member churches made a series of public statements condemning discrimination on the back of the 2015 refugee crisis,

² The methodology for this research project includes desk research, a literature review of materials such as EU policy documents, World Association of Christian Communication, other FBO and theological publications and UNESCO frameworks, among others. It included 13 semi-structured interviews, two written Q&As with a select group of predominantly FBOs and a few civil society entities (see Appendix 1) as well as independent analysis and consideration. The organizations and programmes were chosen based on 7 criteria: 1) established educational programming; 2) an intent to counter anti-refugee and anti-migrant hate speech; 3) having FBO status or being a relevant civil society entity; 4) pan-European presence; 5) taking place between 2015-2021; 6) access to data; and 7) having an approach to measure impact (refer to Appendix 3 and 4).

drawing on biblical elements that condemn hate speech towards the “stranger.”^{vi} In 2016–2017, a project called *Refugees Reporting* revealed patterns of invisibility and misrepresentation concerning migrants and refugees in seven European countries.^{vii} On World Refugee Day in 2018, Pope Francis addressed the rising tide of hate speech, saying: “It is not just about migrants, it is also about our fears. The signs of meanness we see around us heighten our fear of ‘the other,’ the unknown, the marginalised, the foreigner... We see this today in particular, faced with the arrival of migrants and refugees knocking on our door in search of protection, security and a better future.”^{viii} This laid an important foundation for the work of Catholic FBOs such as Caritas Europa. In 2018, the World Association for Christian Communication (WACC) Europe and 13 other groups called on the EU to provide immediate aid to refugees and take action regarding their portrayal in public discourse.

In addition, Muslim organizations such as Al-Azhar University, and many Jewish groups, have spoken out about increasing Islamophobia and anti-Semitism in Europe. The trend is of particular importance given the rise of newcomers originating from Muslim-majority countries and Islam being perceived as more visible in Europe. In many cases, inflammatory language and negative stereotyping by elected officials have contributed to a normalisation of hate speech. Economic drivers and unemployment have also played a part in anti-refugee and anti-migrant rhetoric, as well as acts of religious extremism in several major European cities, among other factors. While addressing the Democracy, Social Cohesion, and Global Challenges Committee at a Council of Europe conference, one spokesperson from the Bahá’í International Community cautioned that unless Europe considered the historical drivers of migration and its role in them, it would face ongoing challenges.^{ix}

Using education and awareness to counter anti-refugee and anti-migrant hate speech – a growing body of research has addressed the role of education in countering hate speech in Europe. Between 2013–2017 the Council of Europe ran the No Hate Speech Movement to mobilise young people to combat hate speech, however there is still a considerable gap in introducing this education more widely.^x In 2015, the European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights (FRA) developed a plan to detect racism, xenophobia and related intolerance at schools, which was piloted in Spain but was never scaled up.^{xi} In 2017, WACC Europe published research on how migrants and refugees are portrayed in the media and to what extent their voices and perspectives are included in stories. In 2020, UNESCO research pointed to the deep-rooted presence of xenophobia in most education systems and offered ways to eliminate it.^{xii}

Policy and Institutional Environment

In 2012, the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR) adopted the Rabat Plan of Action to gain deeper insight into legislative patterns, judicial practices and policies regarding the incitement of national, racial or religious hatred. The plan also aims to ensure full freedom of expression as outlined in Articles 19 and 20 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights

(ICCPR).^{xiii} At an EU and member state country level, there are a raft of policies that cover discrimination, intolerance and religiously or racially motivated violence and abuse, but hate speech is treated differently within many member states. With the growth of social media, online hate speech remains a key area of focus at both EU and national levels.^{xiv} There are EU-level efforts to stem online hate speech, including discussion in the media around the EU making hate speech a criminal offense as part of the Digital Services Act.^{xv}

At a European level, the roles and responsibilities to counter hate speech, monitor discrimination and provide member states with guidance are divided:

- The European Court of Human Rights has purview over the application of the European Convention on Human Rights, which includes the monitoring of hate speech.
- The European Commission against Racism and Intolerance (ECRI) monitors the climate of racism and intolerance within member states. In 2015, the ECRI published General Policy Recommendation No.15 to combat hate speech.
- The Anti-Discrimination Department of the Council of Europe is responsible for work on policy, monitoring and capacity building to tackle discrimination and hate speech as well as strengthening inclusive societies.
- The Victims' Rights Directive, introduced by the European Parliament, provides minimum standards on the rights, support and protection of all victims of crime, paying particular attention to victims who have suffered a crime committed with a bias or discriminatory motive.
- In 2016, the European Commission, along with Facebook, Microsoft, Twitter, and YouTube, agreed on a Code of Conduct to counter illegal online hate speech. Other companies have since joined the agreement.

While data does exist on each country, a further mapping and assessment of policy coverage would be of great benefit. It also is worth noting that hate speech is heavily under-reported globally, presenting a challenge for national governments and international responses.

Section 2

Case Studies on Education

Programme Types and Techniques

The case studies have been classified into six major areas to examine various approaches. The categories were devised by reviewing and filtering the aim of each entity, the educational methodology, the training delivery mode as well as the target audience.³

1. **Encounters** - facilitate face-to-face interaction, meetings and collaboration between refugees and people in Europe to learn by experience: *JRS CHANGE, MEERU, Schools for All*.
2. **Positive messaging** - positive stories, narratives and campaigns around refugee and migrant inclusion: *MEERU, JRS CHANGE, Social Sustainability, A World of Neighbours, Social Sustainability*.
3. **Dialogue** - foster discussion and interaction: *Church of Norway, A World of Neighbours*.
4. **Advocacy** - faith- or creed-based advocacy with the public sector, civil society or at a community level: *MAG, QCEA, Church of Germany, Social Sustainability, Facing Facts, Nahla*.
5. **Reporting and anti-bias** - ways to monitor, engage with and report hate speech while providing training on bias and perceptions: *Facing Facts, Nahla*.
6. **Inclusion** - foster integration, opportunities and access: *Schools for All, Apostoli, MEERU, MAG*.

The approaches outlined in these case studies were not evaluated to determine which types were more effective. Instead, an overview has been provided to allow an understanding of how they were developed and implemented. The differing techniques were assessed to determine whether they were appropriately matched to target demographics, thus ensuring the type of intervention for a specific manifestation of hate was considered. For example, positive messaging may be ineffective in targeting white supremacy.

³ These categories do not represent the official classifications used by the interviewed entities but have been created as a tool to understand the education landscape. Several programmes overlap; therefore, where programmes have multiple areas of focus, the secondary ones are indicated with italics.



CASE STUDIES: EUROPE-WIDE INITIATIVES

Quaker Council of European Affairs (QCEA) Human Rights Courses

Present in the UK and Belgium with select engagement from across Europe – 2019 onward

In 2019, QCEA revised its strategic plan to include more proactive programming to address migration as part of human rights. Its programming is heavily based on planting seeds of peace through long-term education, interaction with migration and driving systematic change.

Purpose: QCEA's workshops aim to stem the root of hate, viewing hate speech as only one visible part of the racism and intolerance migrants face.

Educational offering: A UK migration course that brings an anti-racist lens by “unlearning” dominant perceptions around migration. The content is rooted in a historical migration continuum, proposing that in order to shift the current climate, perceptions and hate, education must improve in regard to European colonial history and Europe's participation in the transatlantic slave trade. Programming is not rooted in academic or policy-based case studies, but draws on facilitators who bring in their direct experiences.

Duration/delivery method: Select workshops of 3–4 weeks on average. Online and face-to-face programmes.

Reach: 40–45 participants per intake, but smaller groups are considered more favourable in order to delve into changing social attitudes, contracts and migration thinking.

Target audience: Individuals working in migration, including volunteers, practitioners and decision makers. This includes Quaker supporters and the general public (the majority of the European Quaker community resides in the UK).

Takeaways: A key lesson from QCEA's approach is that it draws heavily on its FBO status by using moral or faith-based advocacy as an argument against hate and discrimination, which can be effective if it is properly mapped to the audience. Their focus is on long-term education to encourage change in mindsets but it is unclear whether they are able to reach the audiences that would most benefit from this approach. QCEA's assertion may be true that a “five-year programme cannot change the 400-year legacy of racism in Europe,” however, a critical challenge is that it is equally hard to gauge or measure whether this type of long-term educational programming has any real impact. While FBOs can support a holistic approach, it is paramount that schools and migration institutions build historical accountability and an anti-racist lens into their curriculum and approaches. *Notable tools: faith-based advocacy, acknowledging European historical context, interfaith dialogue.*

Facing Facts, CEJI

Based in Brussels with programming across Europe, including Italy, Germany, Romania, Croatia, Latvia and Belgium – 2011 onward

Facing Facts, under CEJI (a Jewish organization) is a programme tackling hate crime and hate speech in Europe. This community-of-practice approach runs training and advocates for hate crime monitoring systems that expose overlooked hate-motivated acts. It evolved into a European network of civil society organizations and law enforcement agencies that generates holistic approaches to hate crime monitoring, response and prevention.

Purpose: The aim is to address the issues of hate crime and hate speech in Europe through effective training focused on different segments of society, including EU practitioners, lawmakers and law enforcement, activists, social workers and teachers.

Educational offering: The content development methodology is based on bringing together experts, authorities and researchers who look at discrimination trends in order to create responses to hate speech. It includes custom online courses and general material on hate speech, hate crime and bias indicators, including understanding and identifying anti-migrant hate crime and understanding and identifying anti-Muslim hate crime.

Duration/delivery method: Courses range from three 45-minute sessions for journalists to five-week programmes that include two modules per week with additional training sessions, workshops and offline assignments. It is delivered via facilitators, online learning and content libraries. Many courses can be taken on a self-paced basis, but facilitator-led training tends to add more value, discussions and networking opportunities.

Reach: 5,000 participants – the community focuses on the type of participants, including decision makers, policymakers, sector leaders and practitioners. As of 2016, CEJI estimated that they had trained more than 30,000 people overall. A new round of reporting was conducted in 2021.

Evaluation: Measured through platform participation to gauge the impact of training on bias and knowledge of how to detect, report and monitor hate speech.

Target audience: EU practitioners, lawmakers and law enforcement, activists, social workers and teachers. Custom courses are often for CSOs, law enforcement, IGO staff, ombudspersons, public authorities and decision makers.

Takeaways: A clear training methodology with customisation to meet the needs of practitioners and policymakers helped reach a broad sampling of audiences. However, further research into how the programme type was tailored to the differing audiences is required given that the programme aims to be tailored to the specific needs of a particular group experiencing hate (e.g. refugees and migrants). *Notable tools: advocacy, multi-partner consultation, practitioner-focused tools.*

Jesuit Refugee Service Europe – CHANGE

Research primarily focuses on Belgium with examples from Hungary, Italy, Malta and Spain – 2019 onward

CHANGE is a project coordinated by JRS Europe (Jesuit – Roman Catholic) and is implemented in nine European countries: Belgium, Croatia, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Malta, the Netherlands, Portugal and Spain. It is inspired by Jesuit or Ignatian educational principles,⁴ but the content does not contain religious material. The goal of the project is to educate young people on refugees' positive contributions to society, encouraging students to make a change in their schools and local communities. Through this platform, CHANGE provides an opportunity for encounters between refugees, students and teachers.

Purpose: CHANGE aims to encourage students to think critically on the subject of refugees and migration, to distinguish facts from opinions, and to recognise prejudices and stereotypes.

⁴ Ignatian education stresses the active appropriation of knowledge and skills to build ethical and learned human beings.

Educational offering: CHANGE is designed to offer students meaningful knowledge, experiences, encounters and a new perspective. It includes a six-stage programme with detailed lesson plans for classrooms. It can also be used by mentors and/or youth groups. Students are encouraged to keep a journal to note any reflections and personal perspectives to compliment what they are learning. The last stage of CHANGE motivates students to engage in at least two concrete actions, such as small-scale events, campaigns or service projects, to share what they have learned with their school and local communities.

Duration/delivery method: Six 45-minute sessions where teachers can pick, choose or adapt materials as needed. Both in-person classroom training and virtual schooling platforms are available. Anyone can register and use the material free of charge.

Reach: 37,000 students across nine countries. In Belgium alone this includes 19 schools, 39 registered teachers and 1,830 students (the number could be substantially higher if non-registered teachers and mentors are accounted for).

Evaluation: When teachers register, anonymous evaluation forms are generated at the start and finish of the programme. The CHANGE team also solicits feedback from teachers and participants.

Target audience: Teachers from both Jesuit and non-Jesuit schools in all nine participating countries.

Takeaways: CHANGE is one of the few programmes included in the interview process that focuses on schoolteachers. While CHANGE has a strong base of resources, content and guidance for teachers regarding how to change mindsets and educate against hate speech, the content and curriculum does not have to be used in full and is left to the teachers' discretion.

As CHANGE provides flexible resources, without knowing what material is being used and why, it is hard to evaluate whether the content is effective. It also poses a challenge in gauging what is driving teachers' choices when it comes to choosing content. This makes it almost impossible to chart trends or identify specific examples of how the material may or may not be suited to the relevant manifestations and drivers of hate in a school or geography.

Success and adoption rates varied between countries due to factors such as the partner's network, the relevant political climate and will amongst schools. With this in mind, a key lesson is that adoption must be considered on a region-by-region basis and should draw more on the hate speech drivers locally. *Notable tools: multi-platform engagement that includes refugees, teachers and students, as well as teacher-focused educational resources, online tools and discussion forums.*



CASE STUDIES: SOUTHERN EUROPE

Apostoli

Greece – 2014 onward

Apostoli is the social arm of the Church of Athens (Greek Orthodox). The work with refugees evolved from basic needs in 2014 to better the integration of migrants and refugees in urban centres.

Purpose: Support better integration of migrants and refugees into Greek society by advocating for access to services and opportunities.

Educational offering: The countering hate speech and xenophobia element of Apostoli is informal and community-based around helping migrants and refugees integrate into daily life in Athens. Informal awareness work includes countering negative perceptions about refugees and migrants and working with and conducting advocacy with local authorities, neighbourhoods, landlords and organizations to foster better acceptance and inclusion of newcomers. They also advocate to leadership and community figures and demonstrate the Church's support of newcomer integration, mediating and helping newcomers tackle xenophobia on a day-to-day basis using their status as part of the Church. This includes advocating to local officials and business owners for better inclusion of refugees and migrants, working with schools to educate them on refugee inclusion and petitioning landlords to rent to refugees and migrants.

Duration/delivery method: Ongoing.

Reach: N/A

Target audience: Authorities and local communities.

Takeaways: In the Greek context, Apostoli, and the other programmes included, point to challenges in the overall reception and inclusion of refugees and migrants, even sometimes at the most basic levels regarding access to housing and schooling. In addition, the current political and economic climate is viewed as not being supportive of refugee integration and has been cited to spur and condone much of the hate speech and even hate crimes in Greece. What is notable is that countering anti-refugee and anti-migrant hate speech is a daily practice at the community, municipal and even refugee services level. It remains a question as to whether such programmes should be prioritised at the onset if food and shelter are not in place, or if education to counter hate speech would be a net positive across the whole refugee arena in Greece, especially targeting civil servants, law enforcement and policymakers.

For Apostoli, their status as an FBO has allowed them to draw on moral arguments based on faith but has also given them credibility amongst community members and officials in their advocacy for refugee and migrant inclusion; credibility that a non-local FBO would not have had. This programme sought to counter discrimination but did not deal with the subject of hate speech, or address far-right and fascist groups who are members of the Church.

Muslim Association of Greece

Greece – 2014 onward

The Muslim Association of Greece (MAG) works on advocacy to support the rights, infrastructure and integration of Muslims in Greek society; this includes countering Islamophobia at an EU level. The association draws on Islamic values but works predominantly with civil society and social services to conduct principled advocacy. They were instrumental in building the first mosque in Greece since the Ottoman times.

Purpose: Dialogue and advocacy for Muslims in Greece, which includes refugees, migrants and Greek Muslims.

Educational offering: Greece has no official or lasting counter-hate-speech offering or sustained programme. MAG works on countering anti-Islamic rhetoric in the media around perceptions of Muslims. They also work on advocacy for better infrastructure and inclusion, and educating civil society and authorities on the need for Muslims to benefit from basic human dignity in Greek society.

Duration/delivery method: Ongoing.

Reach: N/A

Target audience: Decision makers, authorities and the general public.

Takeaways: It was evident that in Greece, programming needs to be perceived as mutually beneficial to Greek society, while also serving to strengthen the infrastructure itself. Whereas in other contexts there was an automatic acceptance of such programmes adding value. A lesson learnt from this particular programme, which differs from other Greek examples, was that successful educational programmes that go beyond the community level may require a reputable and strong organization with good institutional funding in order to be successful and to last – perhaps an EU or Pan European entity that promotes an interfaith approach. The suggestion is that training should start with opinion makers, civil servants, law enforcement, journalists and teachers with a heavy focus on anti-bias training and awareness. A parallel can be drawn with what Facing Facts offers, but perhaps tailored to the unique challenges of the Greek context. While MAG is not offering official programming, it was one of the few entities that focused on the types of educational intervention that would deliver the most impact for a particular segment. Notable tools: EU-level advocacy material, interfaith dialogue, educational material on Islam.

Schools for All – Integration of Refugee Children in Greek Schools

Greece (North and South) – 2019 to 2022

The European Wergeland Centre (EWC) is a civil society resource centre for education for intercultural understanding, human rights and democratic citizenship. The Schools for All programme created a framework to support secondary schools to cultivate a more democratic and inclusive school environment.

Purpose: The training aims to equip school directors and teachers with the tools, competence and confidence to manage controversy and deal with issues concerning intolerance, discrimination, racism and hate speech in schools and in the local community.

Educational offering: The project is designed within the Framework of Competences for Democratic Culture – Council of Europe. The programme provides training to teachers and parents and offers online webinars on refugee education and integration. It takes a whole-school approach, including the wider school, the parents and the local community which includes workshops, diverse encounters and ongoing activities through the academic year.

Duration/delivery method: Run between 2019–2022 and including academies for teachers/directors and parents of the selected schools, training/workshops for teachers, mentoring visits to all schools and webinars for awareness raising.

Reach: The project is implemented in different regions of Greece (north and south). The call to the schools is sent by the Ministry of Education and Religious Affairs and its dissemination is also supported by the Institute of Educational Policy (IEP) – 4 experts taught 43 trainers who worked across 18 schools to educate a further 226 school directors and teachers.

Evaluation: This is implemented by an external evaluator from Leeds Beckett University (UK); results will be available at a later stage.

Target audience: Secondary schools and subsequently the teachers from participating entities.

Takeaways: The Schools for All programme takeaway is that while civil society programming is vital, there is often a shortfall when it comes to what government entities and authorities are doing to support public schools. Civil society programmes do have impact but often lack the resources, capacity and direction to support all local schools, especially where schools are experiencing new demographic intakes. *Notable tools: Schools for All methodology, educational resources and material, action plan guidelines, mentorship tools.*

MEERU

Portugal (North) – 2020 onward

MEERU is a civil society organization that believes in the power of proximity in order to combat the social isolation and loneliness of refugees and migrants living in rural parts of Portugal. The youth training programme takes place across six cities – Viana do Castelo, Braga, Porto, Vila Nova de Gaia, Gondomar and São João da Madeira. The social media campaign raises awareness about accurate and timely understandings of migration, conflicts and stories.

Purpose: The youth training programme aims to provide students and young people with tools as well as experiences of diversity and understanding others as a means of making migration more understandable and accessible.

Educational offering: Training in schools, universities and youth groups to educate young people on migration, integration, diversity and human rights. The training is heavily based on using personal narratives and experiences to make migration stories accessible. The youth programme incorporates the human connection elements of the Aproxima programme. The training includes intercultural dialogue, ethics of hospitality, diversity and up-to-date information on migration trends and developments. The materials/toolkit include: three different training sessions, six short introduction/warm-up sessions and an online activities toolkit which was produced for the Covid-19 lockdown.

Duration/delivery method: Face-to-face and online training and awareness.

Reach: In 2019, MEERU reached a total of 310 students – primary school, high school and university. In 2020 there were an estimated 120 middle school, high school and university students. Until June 2021, about 400 students were reached – middle school, high school and university. Additionally, 70 people from youth groups have been trained.

Target audience: Training – youth, school children, universities, informal youth groups and religious youth groups (often in more rural areas). Social media aims to target members of the general public who are not aware of, or educated on, current migration issues.

Takeaways: This programming is relatively new, but it is significant to this research in that it aims to use human encounters and dialogue as a means to engage youth in rural communities with countering anti-refugee and anti-migrant hate speech by overcoming the unknown. While further testing and evidence would be required, MEERU's approach is an important learning example of advocating for mutually beneficial and measurable programmes. Although MEERU does have a target audience, it could benefit from casting a wider net in rural areas. *Notable tools: youth engagement resources, dialogue tools.*



CASE STUDIES: CENTRAL EUROPE

Church of Germany and EVHN Lutheran University of Nuremberg

Germany – 2017 onward

The focus of the two different Lutheran programmes is to train both professionals and volunteers to consider religious and cultural discrimination by drawing on moral arguments in the context of migration. This is the first such effort by the Church in Germany.

Purpose: Encouraging youth within parishes to embrace diversity and oppose racism and xenophobia, drawing both on Christianity and ethics overall. It also targets practitioners from all religious communities to support sustainable dialogue processes between communities, schools, social organizations and companies.

Educational offering: Religious education in schools and further interfaith dialogue training for volunteers and parish members was designed to cover knowing and appreciating one's own religion and the religions of others. It covers recognising democratic values as the basis for living together, opposing racism and xenophobia from sources of Christianity and making inclusion of religious and cultural heterogeneity the task of the entire education system. Full-time employees gain a degree through the two-year programme and graduates go on to work in communities or schools.

The training programme for intercultural and interreligious education (EVHN Lutheran University of Nuremberg) includes seven modules on knowledge about racism, hate speech and xenophobia, but also education about religious othering, religious radicalisation, antisemitism and postcolonial reflections. The programme has a decidedly interreligious focus to enable participants to break down stereotypes and offers more on colonial history and the rise of anti-Semitism and Islamophobia in migration.

Duration/delivery method: Participants must complete all of the modules and a final thesis over a two-year period.

Reach: There are two intakes of 20 participants every two years (approx. 150–160 to date).

Target audience: Programme 1 – schools and parishes; and Programme 2 – employees or managers in the social, pedagogical, therapeutic, nursing and pastoral fields of work.

Takeaways: A key takeaway from the German context is around how to use the existing formal religious education in schools to address how Christianity and its teachings, as well as interfaith dialogue, could be used as a basis for countering hate speech. Yet, while the programming covers a wide range of material, there is a risk that the approach is not adequately matched to some of the demographics. At the training programme level, like the Swedish and Norwegian examples given, a key learning is that it is most effective for members of the Church or related institutions to be trained and provided with specific examples and evidence of how religious creed counters hate speech before rolling it out more widely. Further research and exploration are required around how such a programme could target far-right members and if it only acts to encourage diversity and interfaith education or if it is able to address the drivers of hate speech.

Nahla

Bosnia and Herzegovina – 2015 onward

Nahla is a Muslim organization that counters Islamophobia by working against discrimination through Islamic principles and through the reporting and monitoring of hate incidences. The Young Activist Programme provides young professionals with the tools, skills and knowledge to counter hate and discrimination, including hate speech as a precursor to hate crime. Programming works to equip the community and the authorities with knowledge on how to monitor, report and press charges related to hate speech and hate crime. The recent historical and ethnic conflicts in Bosnia and Herzegovina are a consideration in the programme design.

Purpose: The aim is to combat hate at its roots and give young people the tools to react to hate speech, including positive narratives to outweigh hate.

Educational offering: Nahla's activism and cooperation programme runs targeted programmes including a curriculum for the education of young activists, and targeting young professionals in fields such as law, media and social work. It aims to fight hate and discrimination using targeted activities, projects and case studies. A follow-on programme was introduced for the roughly 65 alumni activists to provide training and tools for work against racial and religious intolerance – for example, social media and event monitoring and reporting, countering media response and promoting freedom of religion and belief as a reactive campaign to hate speech and suppression. Nahla is also engaged in a "train the trainer" project that includes developing counter narratives and positive messaging graphics in collaboration with the European Union.

Duration/delivery method: Starting in 2015, it runs 3-month programmes twice yearly which include a weekly 3-hour session for 20–25 participants.

Evaluation: Written and verbal evaluation of the material itself, but impact is measured by the pursuits of the existing 65 activists.

Takeaways: A unique element of the programme is their ability to wed social activism, local context and education to specifically engage young professionals. This programme is also an indication of how legal frameworks may be in place around anti-discrimination and freedom of belief, but knowledge of the law, monitoring of its implementation and trust in whether it will protect victims remains an ongoing challenge for reporting and punishing hate speech and hate crimes. This provides another example of a lack of clarity between the role of FBOs and the state, especially regarding education on legal frameworks and coverage. *Notable tools: training materials, interreligious dialogue, activist networks, collaboration with global and European entities and authorities.*

CASE STUDIES: NORTHERN EUROPE

Social Sustainability – Church of Sweden

Centred in Uppsala, Sweden but in all parishes – 2019 onward

The Social Sustainability Programme is Lutheran and takes place within the dioceses. The Church's stance is that it must defend human rights and democracy and oppose discrimination. The programme

was developed to explore migration, integration and social inclusion/diversity in churches as a means to foster what they term as “social sustainability.”

Purpose: To create a network of parishes that collectively protect human rights and act against hate, linking this responsibility to Lutheran creed.

Educational offering: The training programmes are internally focused to educate everyone working with and for the Church as well as youth and parishes at large. The programmes predominately draw on existing training material from diverse sources as well as commissioned content.

Internal programme – includes a method for translating theology into practice by developing content on the connection between faith and social action based on creed. It also considers history and the root and role of human rights, drawing on different denominations and schools of thought on countering discrimination. It targets the role of parishes locally and the Church nationally, in acting against hate and offers guidelines and tools to be used in dialogue around human rights and hate speech in parishes. External programme – courses are created on a proactive and reactive basis, drawing on institutes, authorities and expert input.

Duration/delivery method: Ongoing face-to-face and online training sessions and workshops.

Reach: 1,400 to 1,500 people are trained in different courses related to human rights, racism, xenophobia and history. Seminars can have up to 300 people as they are open to all parishes.

Evaluation: Course numbers, discussions and meeting exposure are considered but the programme will seek solicit feedback and engage with participants over the long term.

Target audience: Internal: everyone working with or for the Church. External: All parishes, with a focus on youth.

Takeaways: While many religious leaders have taken a stance against anti-refugee and anti-migrant hate speech as covered earlier in this research, this programme demonstrates an educational approach that starts within the Church and works its way out. It demonstrates a defined link between the programming technique and one of its target audiences. *Notable tools: faith-based advocacy, resource libraries, training partnerships and collaboration, interfaith dialogue, targeted audience segmentation.*

A World of Neighbours

Sweden with practitioners across all of Europe – 2015 onward

The Church of Sweden’s archbishop (Lutheran) set up A World of Neighbours as a welcoming movement rooted in the three Abrahamic faiths. It is also open to any other groups working in reception. It was created both for Sweden as a whole, the Church of Sweden and a network of practitioners across Europe.

Purpose: To build a network of practitioners that learn from each other, borrow best practices and share challenges through the creation of a community of practice.

Educational offering: A community of practice programme taking place over a 13-week period that meets twice a week, focusing on interreligious dialogue and knowledge-sharing. It is practitioner-led and there is no formal curriculum. Practitioners train each other and share best practices and learnings – for example, narratives in media, ways to use energy effectively to spread positive narratives versus

just countering hate speech. It engages expert lectures, topical zoom webcasts and collaboration with other programmes including the Social Sustainability Programme, which is also included in this research.

Reach: A network of 60 practitioners.

Target audience: Faith-based practitioners.

Takeaways: A World of Neighbours counters hate by creating a community of practice that brings together practitioners across Europe to share best practice, address shared challenges and learn from each other's successes. It was cited by several interviewees as a useful resource in their work, indicating that such programmes can be scaled and offered widely across Europe. Yet, to date, their content and findings are derived from discussions between practitioners and would need to be developed and formalised to be offered more widely. A unique tool that they employ is inviting researchers to document their work as it evolves and asking them to share useful tools and tips from their other research findings to add depth to what was on offer. Notably, practitioners cited facing burnout and personal threats for countering hate speech. Notable tools: community of practice for sharing best practices, case studies and challenges, researcher engagement.

Church of Norway and Dialogue Pilots

Norway – 2016 onward

The Church of Norway has a strong focus on interfaith dialogue. The Dialogue Pilots Programme is run by two Sunni and one Shia group, the Norwegian Humanist Association and the Church of Norway in Oslo. The training is done in coordination with the Faculty of Theology at the University of Oslo. The interviewee was a member of the Lutheran Church of Norway.

Purpose: Interreligious dialogue and communication among young people through the creation of the Dialogue Pilots.

Education offering: The faith and belief-based programme owners handle the training and praxis that take place in high schools and youth groups of various faiths. The course accounts for 20 of the 60 credits that students are required to take each academic year. Participants must take the course, pass the exam and complete the practice to be qualified as a Dialogue Pilot. The methodology is based on personal faith stories drawn from the Pilot's experiences – this often includes xenophobia, Islamophobia and anti-Semitism hate speech.

Duration/delivery method: Yearly.

Reach: N/A

Target audience: University students.

Takeaways: The existence of a university-accredited pilot programme in itself is an important takeaway on how countering hate can be formally embedded within higher education. The peer-to-peer or university-to-high-school student element has the potential to be even more effective than clergy-led dialogue, but its generalist approach risks not being able to address the target demographics and their stances on migration within a given classroom. This programme is a joint effort between the university and multiple FBOs – a good example of collaboration. *Notable tools: interfaith dialogue curriculum and tools, accredited syllabi.*

Section 3: Case Study Insights and Takeaways

Surveying and mapping existing practices and programmes across Europe yielded a set of themes, including: 1) the absence of a clear breakdown of how official institutions, FBOs and civil society entities collaborate to counter hate speech via education for the wider population; 2) current programming shows gaps in defining the purpose of anti-hate speech education and does not effectively match programming types and approaches to the appropriate audiences and demographics; 3) few programmes target the groups and individuals who are most actively participating in hate speech and who are affiliated with anti-immigration and racist movements; 4) collaboration and knowledge-sharing in the form of working groups, communities of practice and resource databases is lacking; and 5) the historical cycles and contexts of hate speech in Europe are not always adequately considered as part of education.

The Role of Education in Countering Hate Speech Within Society

European, national and even school system-level initiatives for countering hate speech as an established part of education are mostly lacking. At a country level, many practitioners and individuals face challenges in understanding what anti-hate speech policy covers, how it is implemented and their role in preventing, addressing and reporting hate speech – whether it be online, in schools, within government entities or public spaces. A key theme was a recurring expression of interest from practitioners and programmers on how state entities can introduce education to counter hate speech in school curriculums and how this could be formalised for public servants, law enforcement and policy and decision makers. This could greatly alleviate the challenges many organizations face in accessing the resources or material on the drivers and trends in hate speech and how to address it.

In terms of how the education is delivered by the varying players, the balance between official content and FBOs working within the wider community was unclear in most countries. There are undeniably many instances of publicly funded and driven initiatives, however, the majority of the interviewees cited that their own programming was often not linked to policy or official content due to lack of resources or knowledge, with some cases intending to fill a perceived gap in policy. Certain governments do provide resources on areas like citizenship and diversity training, yet there is a demonstrated gap in ownership, coverage and coordination regarding how the education is offered. Select practitioners cited that state material was often not applicable to the current refugee and migrant context and failed to include some of the historical drivers of migration.

There is also a lack of clarity on who determines the curriculum in different spheres, i.e., the classroom, the place of worship or on the job. In many European nations, governments and local authorities are less active and have less oversight

when it comes to programming, compared to FBOs and civil society. While not considered in this context, in many places the private sector is influential in creating hate speech policies and monitoring online hate. The private sector often collaborates directly with governments, posing a potential risk in that companies can act to censor freedom of speech or fail to stem inflammatory hate speech that can be a precursor to hate crimes.

FBOs can and often do play an important role by engaging their congregations and communities through faith-based advocacy. Yet, it is intrinsically problematic if FBOs or grassroots civil society entities become a substitute for state-led education and programming. Faith-based programming can be a partner and collaborator, complimenting education within the public space and bolstering relevant policy. While the state regulation of education programming to counter hate speech is not recommended, there is significant risk in FBOs owning or determining this space by default if not legally mandated, instead of complimenting and expanding on public offerings. Even within the FBO space, it was evident that interfaith dialogue and coordination is limited and differs from country to country and denomination to denomination.



Defining Purposes, Approaches and Targets

The majority of those interviewed operated with somewhat generalised purposes, where the link between what the programme offered and how it would impact trainees was underdefined. Programmes were categorised by type to include facilitating human encounters with refugees and migrants, positive messaging, reporting and anti-bias, dialogue, advocacy and inclusion, although only a select few programmes articulated their specific purpose beyond the themes. Objectives that could be considered include working to prevent hate speech, focusing on re-educating and deradicalising groups, or in some cases, supporting regulation or censoring hate speech.

Taking this argument further, there are some programmatic and methodological gaps in linking what types of education are most effective at reaching each audience, i.e., can positive messaging influence organised anti-migration groups or individuals, does reporting hate speech prevent it in the public arena and does it get to the root cause of this hate?

Distinct trends emerge across programmes that adhere to the most prevalent approaches. Faith-based advocacy combined with positive messaging, dialogue and inclusion-focused programming were most commonly employed within the case studies and external research. All 13 FBOs cited that they drew on their creeds, morality and “doing right in the name of faith” as evidence to support how religion should intrinsically counter anti-refugee and anti-migrant hate speech. The programmes that employed a training methodology and had a documented curriculum or training content in place appeared to be able to reach a wider audience. This was evident in Facing Facts, CHANGE, Schools for All, and the Dialogue Pilot Programme of the Church of Norway. Social Sustainability had a similar capacity given its access and sourcing of existing content.

Training programmes being developed relatively organically, often based on a perceived need within a community or country, was a reoccurring theme across most entities. Few programmes have matured to a point where their programming and the demarcating of their target audiences is based on analysis and data that is derived from the drivers and root causes for hate speech. While there is value in grassroots programming and localized solutions, more developed understanding and research on the drivers of hate speech could help expand on educational programming and create a stronger base of practices that can be used more widely, especially when targeting harder to reach segments of the population.

////// Target Audience

While several of the organizations did conduct consultations as they developed programming, few said they engaged migrants and refugees or anti-immigration and extremist groups. These perspectives are useful as part of content creation and to measure impact. Additionally, there was a marked lack of mapping of target audiences. Without specifying and understanding the audience, programmes cannot link what offerings are best suited to different groups, what the desired impact of a given training is and why.

Many of those interviewed mentioned engaging policymakers, law enforcement and educators in developing or amending their material, but in only three instances was there a clear correlation between the aim of the programme and how the target audiences and partners were engaged. While nine of the programmes cited taking a consultative approach to designing their programmes, the range of those they engaged varied widely. Only a few focused on bringing the voices of refugees and migrants into their programming, and none cited measuring whether their programme resulted in perceived improvements for the refugees and migrants as part of the evaluation.

The correlation between the programming approach was lacking in most cases, e.g. whether it aims to counter negative stereotypes, educate on how to report illegal hate speech or draw on faith-based advocacy, and what audiences can be best reached by this intervention. This gap in prioritizing the target audience and then matching an educational approach to that demographic remains a major obstacle. This gap can impact the development of meaningful and targeted content, evaluating the effectiveness of the training material, and understanding how it is received by trainees.

Some programmes such as CHANGE, Facing Facts and Schools for All were clear on who they wanted to target, whereas others included a wide range of audiences who it can be assumed require different techniques and approaches based on their roles and relationships to using or supporting hate speech. The Swedish, Norwegian and German churches did acknowledge that their parishes included far-right and anti-refugee groups and individuals, but they did not cite engaging with them or soliciting their perspectives as part of their consultative methodology.

All of the interviewees touched on the fact that they needed to adapt the context for the audience, including a growing awareness of the need to focus on

varying segments of society – early education was a key starting point for all. The target demographics that were identified by practitioners and in the literature include children, youth, educators, social workers, faith communities, migration officials, decision makers, policy people, authorities, law enforcement, the “movable middle” and the far right.



Focus on Anti-Immigration Groups and Individuals

A widespread omission in many educational programmes is a focus on deradicalisation, targeting far-right groups and religious extremists of all faiths, as well as exploring the societal conditions and circumstances of their emergence. None of the surveyed programmes targeted these groups. Only one interview focused on the deradicalisation of foreign fighters and support for their families who experienced hate speech in their communities in Europe. Most of the programming targeted the “movable middle” or those predisposed to more tolerant mindsets. Even in cases where a congregation statistically included anti-immigration or far-right supporters, such as the churches of Norway, Sweden and Germany, there was no indication of adjusting content to reach them. Likewise, many programmes fail to define whether their aim is to change perceptions and tackle hate or to educate audiences against using derogatory and hateful speech itself, though the vast majority lean towards the former.



Knowledge-Sharing, Collaboration and Evaluation

There is a need for increased coordination across FBO programmes and the overall sector, including state and civil society initiatives. Only a few programmes drew on material or insights from other organizations. Given that hate speech education remains fragmented, practitioners can continue to take a more active role in documenting and sharing their content and evaluations. While many programmes conduct self and third-party evaluations, the lack of accessible data regarding the challenges, successes and participant and facilitator feedback remains a hurdle in learning from or leveraging the practices and materials of others in an effective manner.

Lutheran, Jesuit and Quaker organizations do focus on engaging with members across Europe. Most organizations cited a growing appetite among the majority of FBOs to collaborate more extensively across faiths, particularly interactions among the Lutheran, Quaker, Jewish, Muslim and Jesuit organizations. The majority of interviewees were extremely interested and motivated by learning about the work of others and sharing best practices as an outcome of this undertaking.

In terms of evaluation, metrics to measure the effectiveness of educational programming in countering hate speech are challenging to develop, yet it is evident that if the programme's purpose is well-defined and linked to its target audience, this would support efforts to quantify and qualify results. While questions about impact measurement and performance frameworks are often complex and operational, they remain an important factor for funding and expanding these programmes.



Historical and Geographical Context

Cycles of hate speech are not new or specific to the current refugee and migration trends; and while target groups change, the rhetoric and messaging remains the same, or similar. It is recommended that hate speech against migrants and refugees be addressed as a distinct challenge that considers the political climate, integration and causation of migration, and also within the greater context of historical racism, xenophobia and generalised hate speech. As this cannot immediately be measured, further research is needed to ascertain whether programmes that consider the wider issues of hate, including historical context, systemic dynamics and trends, have more or less impact than those focusing on countering current issues, targeting specific groups.

In 9 (8 FBOs and 1 civil society entity) out of 15 interviews it was revealed that previous trends of hate speech had been experienced, in some form or another over the last several decades, in a different context from the current anti-refugee and anti-migrant focus. The political and popular rhetoric within a given country or region and its policies often influence the normalisation of hate speech and its spread. In countries where refugees and migrants were entering as their first point of entry, the prioritisation of anti-refugee and anti-migrant hate speech tended to be lower than for other basic services.

An additional challenge in addressing these cycles lies in how to protect and educate practitioners themselves – 6 out of 13 FBOs cited being directly targeted, threatened or harassed for their work with refugees and migrants, something that often happens during times of elevated hate and xenophobia such as in 2015. The Archbishop of the Church of Sweden decided to withdraw from Twitter in April 2021 after being targeted by an overwhelming amount of hate speech.

Section 4: Conclusion

FBO educational programming has been developed as a means to counter local trends in hate speech and to work at a European level. Although the programming is varied, targets distinct populations and there is strong commitment, it would benefit from further development and expansion as well as a better understanding of the drivers of hate.

For educational programmes to act as levers in stemming hate speech and its underlying causes, significant efforts and collaboration are required from member states, relevant government entities and FBOs themselves. Resources, public sector guidance and fragmented knowledge represent challenges to further developing the types and impacts of educational campaigns.

A significant barrier is the inadequate understanding of underlying drivers, causations and triggers of hate speech within divergent segments and groups within society. This includes considering the historical context of Europe's involvement in the transatlantic slave trade, the colonial era and armed conflicts in what are today some of the leading refugee-producing nations as part of formal education. Without drawing on at least some of these primary and secondary drivers of hate speech, and subsequently correlating them with particular profiles and groups within a given society, there is a serious risk that programming will continue to target a limited demographic that is not responsible for perpetuating hate speech, but instead is perhaps only stereotyping or underinformed. If programmes countering hate speech continue to rely on organic evolution and reactive measures, they may not cause harm, but they are less likely to be effective.

This risk is compounded by a serious deficit in programmes that seek to address hate groups, far-right movements, supremacy groups, religious extremists and political parties. These groups and individuals are often the most vocal online and within the public space, therefore their influence can normalise hate speech and negative stereotyping amongst the same “movable middle” that the majority of current educational programmes engage. While there is no guarantee of successfully re-educating them, hate speech programming cannot sideline or disregard the groups or individuals who are most actively using hate speech, such as anti-immigration and white supremacy groups.

Appendix 1: Glossary of Terms

Civil society organization: a group operating within a community in a way that is distinct from both government and businesses

Europe-wide: all of Europe irrespective of EU member status

FBO: faith-based organization

Faith-based communities: communities or groups that identify with a particular belief system or faith

Interviewees: individuals or organizations that participated in interviews or written Q&As as primary sources for this research

KAICIID: King Abdullah bin Abdulaziz International Centre for Interreligious and Intercultural Dialogue

Migrant: an individual who has left his/her country of origin for political, economic or other motives but is not eligible for refugee status within Europe

Movable middle: societal demographics sympathetic to a way of thinking that can be easily convinced or educated in the same direction

National level: European country level

State: relating to government, including local, state or EU bodies

Practitioners: anyone working to counter hate speech through initiatives, programmes, advocacy or education

Refugee: an individual unable or unwilling to return to his/her country of origin owing to a well-founded fear of persecution based on race, religion, nationality, membership of a particular social group or political opinion – in this context, it includes people eligible for legal refugee status within Europe

Appendix 2: Selection Criteria Matrix

Criteria 1: Established programming or existing resources

Formal education, toolkits, ongoing awareness campaigns, coalitions etc. that are either fully or partially focused on countering hating speech and xenophobia towards or amongst refugees and migrants

Criteria 2: Purpose/intent has an impact on countering hate speech

The purpose, aim and method of the programming is focused on a means of educating or raising awareness to counter hate speech with a full or partial focus on migrants and refugees

Criteria 3: Relevant organization

Fits into the category of FBO or NGO, civil society, public or private sector in Europe

Criteria 4: Geographical spread

The programme is run or has a chapter within Europe

Criteria 5: Recent/timeliness

The project took place post-2015/2016 or was established before but remains ongoing

Criteria 6: Accessibility of data

There is publicly available or accessible data, or an interview or questionnaire can be obtained from the organiser

Criteria 7: Measurable impact

Impact and reach will be evaluated during interviews and data collection phase

Appendix 3: Interviews

ORGANIZATION	COUNTRY	INTERVIEW
Lutheran World Federation (Global/Europe)	Europe	19 May 2021
Lutheran World Federation (Church of Norway)	Norway	26 May 2021
Lutheran World Federation (Church of Germany)	Germany	3 June 2021
Finn Church Aid Programme – Shoulder-to-Shoulder	Finland	10 June 2021
Muslim Association of Greece*	Greece	27 May 2021
Apostoli	Greece	21 May 2021
Quaker Association	UK, Belgium and Pan European	31 May 2021
A World of Neighbours	Sweden	21 May 2021
Church of Sweden Programme – Social Sustainability	Sweden	7 June 2021
JRS	Belgium + Pan European	3 June 2021
CEJI	Belgium + Pan European	3 June 2021
Caritas	Pan European	Q&A in 2021
Schools for All	Greece	Q&A in 2021
Nahla	Bosnia and Herzegovina + Serbia	15 June 2021
MEERU	Portugal	16 June 2021

References

- ⁱ KAICIID, “The power of words, the role of religion, media and policy in countering hate speech” <https://www.kaiciid.org/what-we-do/power-words-role-religion-media-and-policy-countering-hate-speech>, accessed 7 July 2021.
- ⁱⁱ Paz, Montero-Diaz and Delgado, Hate Speech, A Systematized Review, Sage Journals: <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/full/10.1177/2158244020973022>, November 2020.
- ⁱⁱⁱ United Nations, Office on Genocide Prevention and Responsibility to Protect, *United Nations Strategy and Plan of Action on Hate Speech*, published 2018: <https://www.un.org/en/genocideprevention/hate-speech-strategy.shtml> accessed 22 August 2021.
- ^{iv} Walters, Brown and Wiedlitzka, *Causes and Motivations of Hate Crime*, Equality and Human Rights Commission, Published 2016: <https://www.equalityhumanrights.com/sites/default/files/research-report-102-causes-and-motivations-of-hate-crime.pdf>
- ^v Commission of Europe, *European Commission Against Racism and Intolerance*, <https://www.coe.int/en/web/european-commission-against-racism-and-intolerance/hate-speech-and-violence>, accessed 22 July 2021.
- ^{vi} Interview #3, 3 June 2021.
- ^{vii} WACC Europe, Communication for All, “We must counter hate speech against migrants and refugees,” <https://waccglobal.org/we-must-counter-hate-speech-against-migrants-and-refugees>, accessed 23 June 2021.
- ^{viii} Vatican Basilica, His Holiness Pope Francis, cf. *Homily at Mass for the World Day of Migrants and Refugees*, 2018, https://www.vatican.va/content/francesco/en/homilies/2018/documents/papa-francesco_20180114_omelia-giornata-migrante.html, accessed 7 June 2021.
- ^{ix} BIC, Biannual Conference of INGOS in Europe, *Social Cohesion and Inclusion Session*, 2017, <https://www.bic.org/news/bic-attends-biannual-conference-ingos-council-europe>, accessed 6 July 2021.
- ^x Council of Europe, *No Hate Speech Movement Youth Campaign*, <https://www.coe.int/en/web/no-hate-campaign/no-hate-speech-movement>, accessed 23 July 2021.
- ^{xi} European Union for Fundamental Human Rights, *Prevention and Detection of Racism, Xenophobia and Related Intolerance in School*, 2015, https://knowledge4policy.ec.europa.eu/projects-activities/frida-prevention-detection-racism-xenophobia-related-intolerance-school_en, accessed 30 May 2021.
- ^{xii} Barbieri and Ferede, *A future we can all live with: How education can address and eradicate racism*. UNESCO, published June 2020: <https://en.unesco.org/futuresofeducation/ideas-lab/barbieri-ferede-education-eradicate-racism>, accessed 23 July 2021.
- ^{xiii} OHCHR, *Freedom of expression vs incitement to hatred: OHCHR and the Rabat Plan of Action*, <https://www.ohchr.org/EN/Issues/FreedomOpinion/Articles19-20/Pages/Index.aspx>, accessed 9 July 2021.
- ^{xiv} Positive Messengers, *Legal Frameworks, Societal Responses and Good Practices to Counter Online Hate Speech Towards Migrants and Refugees*, <https://ec.europa.eu/migrant-integration/?action=media.download&uuid=E11AD9A4-DF62-998A-6D5EA6955B72F11F>, accessed 20 July 2021.
- ^{xv} Politico, *Commission to propose making hate speech a crime*, May 2021, <https://www.politico.eu/article/commission-to-propose-making-hate-speech-a-crime/>, accessed 8 July 2021.
- ^{xvi} Council of Europe, *Council of Europe’s work on Hate Speech*, <https://www.coe.int/en/web/no-hate-campaign/coe-work-on-hate-speech>, accessed 27 May 2021.
- ^{xvii} European Commission, *Measures to Combat All Forms of Intolerance*, https://ec.europa.eu/info/policies/justice-and-fundamental-rights/combating-discrimination/racism-and-xenophobia/combating-racism-and-xenophobia_en, accessed 4 July 2021.
- ^{xviii} Council of Europe, *Education*, <https://www.coe.int/en/web/no-hate-campaign/education1>, accessed 24 August 2021.



About the Author

Olivia Quinn is the founder of ESG Collective, a social and environmental consultancy that covers labor market inclusion, education and social policy. She heads programmes and partnerships at Code on the Road, a civil society organization for women in refugee contexts. Olivia has a BA in Middle East Studies and Political Science from the American University in Cairo and an MSC in International Development from the London School of Economics.