Using education to counter anti-refugee and migrant hate speech in Europe

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.

In addition to this, 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 a serious deficit in programmes that look to address and consider hate groups, far-right movements, supremacy groups and religious extremists, and political parties despite the fact that many members of these are also part of congregations and faith groups. Historical cycles and contexts of hate speech in Europe are not always 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, causation 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 policy-makers, 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 until 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.” 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 programming 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 and its desired impact in countering hate speech. 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 for schools, universities, religious leaders and communities, policy-makers, 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 gives way to a diverse but fragmented approach that would be well-served by increased collaboration.

SECTION ONE
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. 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. 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 to reach 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 crossing; 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 about eradicating certain peoples. 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. 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)

---
² The methodology for this research project includes desk research, a relevant literature review of key 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 as well two written Q&As with a select grouping 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). The graphic 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.
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. 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, drawing on biblical elements that condemn hate speech towards the ‘stranger.’ In 2016–2017, a project called Refugees Reporting revealed patterns of invisibility and misrepresentation concerning migrants and refugees in seven European countries. 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.” This laid an important foundation for the work of Catholic FBOs such as Caritas Europe. 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.

USING EDUCATION AND AWARENESS TO COUNTER ANTI-REFUGEEE AND ANTI-MIGRANT HATE SPEECH – A growing body of research has addressed the role of education in countering hate speech in Europe, something that was traditionally more common in the U.S. From 2013 to 2017, the Council of Europe ran the No Hate Speech Movement to train young people to identify
and react appropriately to hate speech; however, there is still a considerable gap in introducing this education more widely. 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. 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.

Policy and Institutional Landscape

In 2012, the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights 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). 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. 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.

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 in 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.
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.4

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. 5

---

4 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.

5 Refer to Appendix 1 to review the case studies by entity
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

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 PURPOSE, APPROACHES AND TARGETS**

The majority of those interviewed operate with somewhat generalised purposes, where the link between what the programme offers and how it will impact trainees is 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 have articulated their specific purpose beyond the obvious themes. Objectives that could be considered include working to prevent hate speech, focusing on re-educating and de-radicalising groups, or in some cases, supporting regulation or censoring hate speech, among others.

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 thirteen 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 programs 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 understandings and research on the drivers of hate speech could help expand on educational programing 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 organisations did conduct stakeholder consultations as part of developing their programming, few cited actually engaging migrants and refugees or anti-immigration and extremist groups; perspectives or input as part of content creation and importantly, in measuring the trainings impact. Additionally, there was a marked lack of mapping and identifying the target audiences. Without specifying and understanding the relevant audience groupings, programmes cannot link what offerings are bested suited to different groups, what the desired impact of a given training is and why.
Many of those interviewed mentioned engaging policy-makers, 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 Change 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 interviewers 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 de-radicalisation, 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 de-radicalisation 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 out of 15 interviews (8 FBOs and 1 civil society entity), 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 are entering as their first point of entry, the prioritisation of anti-refugee and anti-migrant hate speech tends to be lower than for other basic services.

An additional challenge in addressing these cycles lies in how to protect and educate practitioners themselves. Six out of thirteen 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 FOUR
Recommendations

These recommendations serve as suggested areas for further discussion, research and exploration and aim to prompt new thinking while addressing the foundational and operational challenges that can often deter programme development and reach. They are derived from the individual and thematic case study findings, deduced gaps and external research and literature to support collaboration and knowledge sharing within this space.

EUROPE AND MEMBER STATE-LEVEL RECOMMENDATIONS

**Policy mapping and resources** – member states and local authorities should outline the policies, coverage, reporting pathways, legal ramifications and support services for victims or observers of hate speech. This includes a defined articulation, a mapping and resources database on official hate speech policy and how these can be applied in relation to refugees and migrants.

**** Suggested material: A consolidation and flow chart of the existing laws and policies that are in place in relation to anti-refugee and anti-migrant hate speech. This should include a Europe-wide edition as well as specific member state charts.

**** Suggested partners: Partners or accountability setting for this consideration would require further research and consultation and does not fall within the scope of this undertaking.

**** Considerations: In addition to the policy disparities between countries, the differing refugee and migrant contexts should be considered in terms of the types of resource and legal advice practitioners may require.

**Hate speech education mandates** – states, FBOs and civil society should have clearly defined roles in tackling this issue. Given the significant gap and disparity in who develops, directs and operates counter hate speech programming within given countries and the risk of this inadvertently falling to FBOs or civil society entities, it is recommended that decision makers set a direction or provide formal guidance on countering hate speech education. This could also include EU-level guidance and resources.

Should states decide to delegate this responsibility to FBOs, or nominate specific civil society entities, this should be officially defined and made public to ensure all entities and individuals have clarity on the affiliations and practices of the educational entity in question. For example, in the German context, this can be mandated as part of the church’s role in religious education in schools.
Suggested material: Guidelines on the roles of government and civil society should be developed along with education strategies.

Suggested partners: Further research and mapping would be required to identify actors at a member state level, but this could include ministries of education, policy-makers, law enforcement, immigration, border control, local governments and municipalities. Consultation and collaboration with leading FBOs and civil society entities is advisable.

Considerations: N/A

**Forums for discussions on school, university and government training curricula** – a diverse EU, member state and international working group should be established to review and amend educational materials and teaching. More accurate historical education and accountability are needed on issues such as systemic racism, xenophobia and historical implications of migration. Better education is also necessary on current affairs. Discussion on how educational material can serve to amend outdated ways of thinking and acknowledge historical and contemporary drivers of migration. They can also foster more inclusive thinking by delving deeper into the history and cultures.

Suggested material: Reviews, amendments and additions to curricula, lessons and textbooks at EU, member state and school district levels. This can also include a review of material that is inadvertently xenophobic or not updated to reflect current terminology and information.

Suggested partners: Educators, schools, universities, relevant ministries, government entities, researchers and experts, civil society entities, advocacy groups and FBOs.

Considerations: More research and planning is required to define the structure, participants, funding, frequency and decision-making required for a working group. This group should ensure educational material is well developed, current and that it does not foster negative stereotyping and hate speech. It should ensure this exercise is only conducted as required and neither acts to censor nor promote inaccurate national narratives or specific political agendas. This is especially relevant in countries that are a first point of entrance for refugees and migrants.
FBO-SPECIFIC CONSIDERATIONS

**Interfaith charter** – a clearer “call to action” through an FBO charter should involve religious leaders and FBOs that condemn hate speech and are committed to using educational programmes to counter it. This should include a clear delineation between what is covered by the state and how this can be coordinated to avoid duplicating civil society programming. This charter would serve to create a more coordinated effort among organizations and denominations and drive a shared vision in understanding the drivers of hate, which programming is most effective for each target audience, and what target audiences are most responsive to FBOs and faith leaders.

**Suggested material:** A documented charter, guidelines and the creation of a virtual library where member FBOs can upload and access material. Ongoing generation or use of data, insights and trends that are driving hate speech.

**Suggested partners:** All interested FBOs and relevant belief-based groups/leaders who support countering anti-refugee and anti-migrant hate speech. Experts, officials and researchers could be engaged where relevant and have clear lines of communication with governmental entities relevant to the programming geographies.

**Considerations:** A charter can be included in any relevant, pre-existing material and/or it can be created through an existing platform or event if applicable.

**Interfaith community of practice and taskforce** – the creation or leveraging of a multinational, cultural, and faith-based taskforce that works with experts to develop the appropriate strategy, methodology, curriculum, evaluation, and measurement tools and convene on topical events and developments. This would act to create a strong and connected network across faith and geography, which is paramount to better collaboration and avoiding duplication of efforts and challenges.

**Suggested material:** A platform or virtual library to house new and existing content. Consideration can also be given to a more technically focused community of practice or subgroups to commission research and develop curricula and material that can be adapted for the varying needs of each group.

**Suggested partners:** Interested FBOs and participants, further planning, research and detailing is required to define the structure and participation model. This should include representatives across all faiths and belief systems to ensure diverse representation and should include in-depth analysis of existing programmes to leverage relevant practices and learnings.

**Considerations:** Existing platforms or groups could be expanded or repurposed as a community of practice where applicable to avoid duplication. Accountability and practitioner incentives are pivotal to its success in terms of practitioners agreeing that it adds value and is an achievable use of their time and resources.
PROGRAMMATIC CONSIDERATIONS

**Correlating the drivers of hate with programming** – further consideration and systematic use of research, societal dynamics and trends to better understand the drivers of hate speech within each demographic to develop clear targets by group as part of the programme design and evolution. This requires mapping and analysis of the manifestations and underlying causes of hate speech within different areas of society that include the far right, extremist and supremacy groups, religious extremists, anti-immigration groups and individuals, economically disenfranchised and unemployed groups, religious and belief-based communities, victims of religious extremism and violence, typically homogeneous communities, interfaith groups, students, public servants, law enforcement, educators, migration officials, policy-makers and politicians. This would act as a starting point to address their biases, prejudices, lack of information and negative encounters, amongst other factors, in order to address the spectrum of hate speech drivers and hate speech itself. Without working towards a purpose that is aligned to the audience, there is a serious risk that educational programmes could remain overly generalised, essentially addressing only the “movable middle” and those already inclined to counter hate.

**Suggested material:** Further research and analysis is required but this could include inputs such as rigorous investigation into the impact of media, incidents such as crime and violent extremism mapping, demographic transition and diversity linked to hate speech. In addition, it would require extensive research into the historical, economic, migratory and faith-based context and events within a given society. These factors could be assessed alongside hate speech monitoring, hate crime prevalence and rates, as well as interview and survey narratives from individuals and groups across a full spectrum of beliefs around migration.

**Suggested partners:** A non-exhaustive list includes historians, educators, economists, criminologists, psychologists, law enforcement, migration and border officials, community groups and leaders, far-right and anti-immigration groups, advocacy groups, online activists who work or focus on this space and refugees and migrants who have (and have not) been the targets of hate speech.

**Considerations:** The suggested elements are illustrative. Further discussion and planning would be required to ensure the frameworks and means of gathering insights and data are achievable and accessible.

**Audience research and analysis** – rigorous study, analysis and the segmentation of audiences should be a primary area of focus for new and existing programmes working to use education to tangibly stem hate speech towards refugees and migrants. This includes engaging and gathering the inputs of a wide range of entities, players and drivers within the arena of countering anti-refugee and anti-migrant hate speech. At a primary level, the most active hate groups and demographics should not be sidelined or disregarded.

**Suggested material linked to partners:**

- **Far right and extremists:** expand countering extremism and violence programming to address hate at the root.
• **Far-right and anti-immigration congregations:** theology to appeal to far-right members of faith-based congregation/religious communities.

• **Officials:** targeting law enforcement, border control and legal systems on countering, reporting, monitoring and penalising hate speech within the existing legal framework.

• **Young children:** education to counter hate early on and from the root.

• **Refugee and migrants:** engage people from different backgrounds and consider their views/experiences when planning solutions and programming.

• **Practitioners:** communities of practice for practitioners to collaborate.

• **States/policy-makers:** engage governments and policy-makers to ensure the right laws are in place, but more importantly, that they are having a tangible impact on deterring and penalising hate speech and discrimination.

***Considerations:*** While there is a wealth of literature calling for the inclusion of the voices of beneficiaries or targeted groups, research and interviews indicate that this is still not widely considered, or when it is, it comes in the forms of asking refugees to share experience or talk about their journeys. It is neither factored into the creation and development of training material nor is the impact of the lives of refugees and migrants widely considered as a means to gauge whether training is shifting societal behaviours and treatment of people.

**SECTION FIVE**

**Conclusion**

FBO educational programming has been developed as a means to counter local trends in hate crime 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 a lever 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 is 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.

[SEE APPENDICES FOR FURTHER INFORMATION]
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