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Hate speech. It is in the name: hate. Hate is a powerful force; it is strong and can be contagious, like a disease. Passed from generation to generation or from population to population, hate is something that spreads easily if left unchecked.

Hate speech’s online aspect is no exception. In fact, it is arguably worse. Online hate speech experiences less censure or opposition than hate speech in the public sphere. It also benefits from the availability of online anonymity and transnational interactions. People can and will say hateful things online that they would never express in public, and its reach and consequences are wider. Young LGBTQ individuals, particularly those who are subject to multiple forms of discrimination, are particularly vulnerable to hate speech that targets them because of their sexual orientation or gender identity.

Here at IGLYO, with our member organisations and partners, we are determined to join in the fight against online hate speech. We work towards tackling the root causes of hate speech in an attempt to ensure that no one feels victimised or driven to extreme measures because of hateful discourse.

For the first time ever, IGLYO uses the medium of an illustrated narrative to present some of the key aspects of online hate speech.

This issue of IGLYO On Online Hate Speech seeks to explore the concept of hate speech in relation to freedom of speech. We also introduce our readers to the existing situations and campaigns at a wider European context as represented in the Council of Europe’s No Hate Speech Movement and at a smaller national and regional scale in Norway and Turin, Italy.

Hate Speech is not something to be tolerated but to be combated. And we have the tools to do just that.

Hate Speech is not something to be tolerated but to be combated. And we, as individuals and organisations, have the tools to do just that. So join us and speak up and speak out against online hate speech.

Yours in solidarity against hate,

Jenn Byrne
Junior Communications and Policy Officer Intern
The search for hate
I must admit, when I first heard of the No Hate Speech campaign, my internal response was: What? We don’t have that issue here in Norway, not really. Maybe in other countries. I’ve never seen any of this hate speech. We don’t have a human rights issue. We hardly mention human rights in a national context. And we don’t learn about them in school. Human right violations don’t happen in Norway. So why would we need a campaign against Hate Speech? Out of solidarity?

Despite those initial reservations, I wanted to give it a chance. I started my own quest in identifying what hate speech is in a Norwegian national context. Is it about online bullying? Is it about the echo chambers of radicalization and extremism? About young people travelling to the middle east to do holy war? About Anders Breivik, the terrorist? Public discourse already labelled hate speech as mandatory political correctness. Was there any hate speech in Norway? How could we recognize it?

As I started searching for hate speech, I read the comment fields of online newspaper, looking for what could be trigger words. I was almost hoping to find some loose canon, some wild extremist opinions so far out of control that it would go under hate speech legislation and had to be stopped, once and for all. Haters needed to be gone: let’s out the trolls and fight them bravely.

But the result was scarce. The ones I found were lonely wolfs, hunting in packs of one, perhaps two. People with a lot of hateful opinions, a lot of free time, and who felt like their opinion should triumph over the ones of other. They took pride in rejecting the identity and values of minorities and members of vulnerable groups targets of their intolerance.

I left them there, alone in their hate. The words they wrote still were not the hate speech for which I had been searching. It was the hate speech that made people stop reading the comment field, the meaningless intolerance that drew the focus away from real debate and made the interaction space of the internet into an unattractive desert. The content they spread was bad, no question about it. But it wasn’t worth sticking your hands into it- let alone the law.

I kept following the public debate, the words of populist politicians, online haters, but I couldn’t find any big monsters worth fighting—just the well-accepted, every-day racism and intolerance targeted towards everything and anything from asylum seekers to Roma and LGBTQ people. The price you had to pay for freedom of speech. But what is freedom of speech?

Democracy in a free nation
Next year is the year of the 200-year anniversary for the Norwegian constitution. In 1814 the “founding fathers” of Norway sat down and wrote one of the then most modern constitutions in the world. A constitution that even today still brings fascination and respect. Each paragraph could be a source for hours of studies. What few remember is that when it came in 1814, it stated that “Jews are still not allowed into the Norwegian kingdom”.

This text stayed unchanged for over 40 years.

How can a democracy be built on the discrimination and exclusion of others? How can one of the most renowned democracies in the world have a hateful constitution?
The last time I read about Roma people in a Norwegian context, it was about police breaking up Roma-settlements and a suggestion of reintroducing a ban on begging. The newspapers wrote about the “Roma-problem” that needed a solution. In the 1990s Czech president Vaclav Havel once described the treatment of the Roma as “a litmus test for democracy”. How can papers and media speak about a group of human beings as a problem? Politicians follow not far after, underlining the problem of Roma people in Norway. Could this be that stone I had been looking for; was this discourse hate speech?

Saying no to hate speech is saying yes free speech. It is about creating a space for open debate where everyone can contribute. As Council of Europe’s Director General says it – “hate speech is the dark side of democracy”. The public debate that feeds on hate is destroying democracy. We don’t have real debates, we have parties struggling of how to win the haters over to their side. Why aren’t politicians taking responsibility?

A campaign of possibilities
The No Hate Speech campaign is that it is a place where you can embrace diversity. In my work, I’ve observed some taboos that still exist within human rights; not everyone is in included in the conversation, even in 2013. But what is counted as a taboo is different from country to country.

LGBTQ rights are a prime example. In Norwegian society and public discourse, sexual orientation and gender identity are given respect and much consideration. To use the language of international law, Norway mainstreams LGBTQ rights into the human rights discourse. Many people take pride in our nation as a front fighter for human rights, bringing the values to countries that don’t respect fundamental rights and freedoms. And done in the right way, supporting the grassroots movement working for human rights for LGBT people, this is a great thing.

But when it is overshadowing our own human rights issues, taking away the focus from the rights of Roma people, the disabled, asylum seekers, immigrants, or religious minorities, then it becomes a threat to true equality. Human rights are for all, not for one- or one group. You can’t pick your favorites and leave the rest.

A world of discrimination
A definition, intersectionality: Seeing the way different types of discrimination interlink and how multiple identities can lead to multiple discrimination. For instance, consider a person in a wheelchair who is also queer. Risking both discrimination from both “camps”, and not fitting into either, or mainstream society.
Removing discrimination from its various boxes and placing the various types next to each other makes you realize something—not just about discrimination as a whole, but about humanity. We need to fight discrimination as humans, not just LGBTQ, Roma, disabled, ethnic minority, Jewish, Christian.

When members of groups that are targets of discrimination then discriminate against those that are different from them, how can they expect that others should respect their human rights? I was dismayed to find much discrimination and hateful speech within the online LGBTQ-environment. I found dating profiles with “please no Asians”, or “only real boys, no girl-boys”. Comment fields that question the identity of trans-people and bisexuals. Speech in online forums advocating for the criminalisation of people living with HIV. The list of terribles goes on.

Where it all comes from
A survey from Britain showed that a vast majority of hate speech is being perpetrated, not by extremists or radicals, but from regular people. The extreme hate speech reflects general attitudes in society. This might be used as an argument for giving space for more hate. We have to make sure the “pressure boiler” of hate doesn’t explode in our faces from not have been given enough public space. But that, in my opinion, would be like throwing gas into the fire.

I still hadn’t found the hate speech I sought. It was like the answer was right in front of me, but still I couldn’t grasp it. Until I realised that it had just been neatly wrapped in silk paper. Hate speech was made attractive for all who saw it and justified with love. The love for traditional society, for what is Norwegian, for what is reasonable, the love for truth. These are the ways that newspapers portrayed Roma issues, in how politicians speak of immigration.

And from there and down, or maybe from down and up, it is hard to say what comes first, the chicken or the egg. In the comments field, social media, on Facebook, there was hate speech. People stating the need of taking the law into their own hands and dealing with the ‘criminal rapist asylum seekers’. Heterosexuality as the only normal, leaving homosexuality disgusting and unnatural. All justified by the need for traditional values.

How come I hadn’t seen in before? Was I locked up within my own safe and inclusive environment that I was blind to the hate of others? Do I move to little outside my own comfort zone? It was like having been equipped with X-ray vision without really know how I got it.

I realized that if you don’t have the tools to recognize hate speech—if it is not in your language, not in your culture, not in your awareness—how would you ever find it? How would you recognize it for what it is? Maybe the biggest danger is of seeing it, but without being able to recognize it for what it is.

Hate Speech in a public discourse
A few months ago there, elections were held in Norway. We went from a left-center government to a right-right populist one. The new government has criticized the previous one for not having done enough against extremism. They have stated that extremism needs to be fought at an early stage, and that youth are an important key. But on the other side, one of the suggestions is to take away the passports of youth who are believed to
travel abroad to do holy war in the Middle East. I realize now that that the fear of extremism in the current government might just be another expression of Islamophobia.

The public debate on Hate Speech has never really lead Norway anywhere. It stands stranded in the discussion on hate speech versus freedom of speech. A discussion that usually gets landlocked in questions of principle. If you ban or criticize any kind of speech, the freedom of speech will fall. At the same time hate speech is allowed to do exactly that: it undermines the freedom of speech of all by pushing the target group out of the discussion. It becomes the free speech of the majority and the true victims of human rights violations, minorities, get dehumanized and removed from public discourse, their fundamental freedoms limited.

**Love in a capital of hate**
If there is one thing Anders Bering Breivik taught us, it is that hate does not know nationality. There is no culture free from hate. Hate is a human emotion. But it should not be a human ideology, nor a human capital. It should not be caressed as good of society, nor as an accepted and encouraged form of expression.

I have always had faith in that if people really can choose, they will do good and that there is no such thing as a purely hateful society. But people in society can be blinded by hate. Blind hate has lead to unimaginable crimes. Hate speech encourages hate, promotes it as a freedom of speech.

And maybe this is where the key is hidden. As a response to Breiviks, atrocities the public answered Breiviks message of hate with symbols of love. It sounds naive, but what if we managed to put some of that message online? A counter-narrative of love to answer the one of hate. This would create space to the real discussions and debates online, where all can participate. Free speech should be about encouraging participation. To ensure that all parts are present and are able to speak. Without this there is no democracy.

**The change of narratives**
I have already noticed a change in the comment fields online. People are actually taking a stand. Maybe they were just fed up. The solution is not so much about winning over the other, as to present the counter narrative. To show that at least a few grams of common sense exist online. That people are not afraid to defend the freedom of speech against the rotten fruit that is being thrown mindlessly onto the web. But the counter narrative doesn’t always come by itself. The stories need to be found, the stories written, before they can be read.

The quest of identifying what hate speech is in a Norwegian context and how to tackle it is a process that is far from over. The truly exciting phase of the No Hate Speech campaign has in many ways just begun and it is now first starting to become truly interesting.

Hate Speech has always existed. In many ways it is reintroducing an old topic. One that has lead to many genocides and human right violations though the centuries. Now we have the chance to do something about it, with new tools and new approaches. We have the knowledge to recognize and fight hate speech in particular. It’s time to use those tools to create positive change and create a world where love comes first and hate can take a long step back.
The main problem is that once you put information online, that information is impossible to retract.

Introduction
My name is Marta, and I am part of a Torino, Italy youth organization called Youth without frontiers – University of Torino (Giosef-Unito). Youth without frontiers is not only our name – it is our motto and our approach to things. As an organisation we work on human rights education with young people, believing that knowledge and education can help people to better understand the world and themselves.

Recently, Giosef-Unito responded to an open call for projects from the Educational Policies Office of the Municipality of Torino. We proposed a project called LGBTQI@UNIVERSITY, a creative and innovative use of technology as a means of addressing the needs of LGBTQI young people. We decided to propose a project about LGBTQI that was delivered online. We are happy to say that our project received funding!

The project
We realised that at the University of Turin, students and professors are not aware of LGBTQI issues, and most people are not accustomed to and comfortable with discussing LGBTQI topics. The main aim of the project was to develop an online campaign against homophobia and transphobia targeting university students and young people in general. With these activities, we hoped to raise awareness and make the entire university community comfortable in discussing LGBTQ issues.

We started our project in June 2013, using videos by young people that explore their personal experiences concerning LGBTQI issues, with a particular attention to the University context. This campaign operated in several phases. The first phase aimed at gathering young people and students through existing LGBTQI initiatives. We organised three days of activities and workshops aimed at creating a safe space for discussion and, most importantly, an opportunity for young people to share their experiences about LGBTQI issues. We also invited some other LGBTQI organisations based in Turin to talk about their other LGBTQI campaigns.

In the second phase, we created the campaign itself. In periodic open meetings, we brought together young people and students to discuss LGBTQI issues while brainstorming ways to achieve our goal. Our main goal is to present the issues of homophobia and transphobia in a way that is accessible, using a language and a way of thinking that are relatable to young people. Our further goal is to raise awareness and curiosity in young people about the topic.

The third phase is the presentation of the campaign to students and young people. In order to do this, we will organise a promotional event in Giosef-Unito that invites the university community. The fourth and final phase entails the promotion and dissemination of the campaign online through online tools: we will have the main video of the campaign and then some other correlated videos about safer sexuality, IDAHO, coming out, and other relevant topics.

We have also set up other tools that allow young people to take action and participate in the online campaign: we are creating a wiki-glossary on the website that goes in depth into LGBTQI concepts and terminology; young people also have the
opportunity to upload photos or videos containing a message against homophobia and transphobia to our facebook page. It is also possible to write and share reviews about books we have in our Rainbow Library. And finally, we also have a section where photos or screen captures of homophobic and transphobic hate speech seen online or on the streets can be shared.

**Motivation**

Our organisation decided to take this action online because we believe that the internet is a wonderful tool for knowledge sharing. Giosuf-Unito is run by young people, and Facebook and other online media platforms are our main tools of communicating our activities. As such, we are highly aware that we must be very clear about the message we wish to spread online and how we shape it, in order to be inclusive and to share information that respect human rights.

Unfortunately, Internet media is often exploited to be destructive, particularly toward LGBTQI people. We often see insults on the facebook pages or blogs of Italian politicians towards other members of society that are vulnerable to hate speech. Reports of homophobic and racist statements made by famous people are always evident on the web; most of time, the internet is the main tool chosen to send out hateful statements.

Cyberbullying is also a phenomenon that is quickly spreading in Italy, especially in the context of homophobic and sexist attacks and threats. The number of young people committing suicide because of hostility and lack of acceptance towards their sexuality or gender identity is increasing. The most deplorable fact is that such attacks are often committed through online tools, with little understanding of the harm they cause or how to stop such attacks.

**Conclusion**

The main problem is that once you put information online, that information is impossible to retract.

Giosuf-Unito believes that the most effective way to work towards understanding and preventing discriminatory behaviours before they actually happen is to educate young people. This is particularly true when it comes to online hate speech, which utilises new media that is largely unable to be regulated. We hope to raise awareness about online hate speech before the problem spread.

For this reason, we decided to connect our project to the No Hate Speech Movement and the “Young people against hate speech online” campaign of the Council of Europe. In fact, one of the main aims of this project is to highlight discrimination and hate speech online: as I wrote earlier, the main tool we are using to promote our project is a facebook page where we are sharing with other online campaigns about homophobia and transphobia and promoting good practices to highlight discrimination and hate speech online. The project wants to spread the idea of using a language that is not homophobic or transphobic, not sexist or racist and with a particular attention to online language. We think that the use of internet nowadays is very important and fundamental for young people and students to access information, that’s why we are trying to create a culture of online inclusiveness and openness.

Facebook: www.facebook.com/LgbtqiUniversity?ref=hl
Tumblr: www.gbtqi-at-university.tumblr.com
Email: lgbtqi.uni@gmail.com
WHAT IS HATE SPEECH?

THE COUNCIL OF EUROPE DEFINES HATE SPEECH AS:

ALL FORMS OF EXPRESSION WHICH SPREAD, PROMOTE OR JUSTIFY RACIAL HATRED, XENO-PHOBIA, ANTI-SEMITISM OR OTHER FORMS OF HATRED BASED ON INDIFFERENCE.

WHILE DENMARK DEFINES HATE SPEECH AS:

“ANY PERSON WHO PUBLICLY OR WITH INTENTION OF DISSEMINATION TO A WIDE CIRCLE OF PEOPLE MAKES A STATEMENT OR IMPARTS OTHER INFORMATION THREATENING, INSULTING OR DEGRADING A GROUP OF PERSONS ON ACCOUNT OF THEIR RACE, COLOUR, NATIONAL OR ETHNIC ORIGIN, BELIEF OR SEXUAL ORIENTATION.”

IS EVERY STATE THE SAME?

NO, EVERY STATE IS DIFFERENT.

SO FOR OUR PURPOSE—

HATE SPEECH CAN BE SEEN AS ANY SPEECH THAT ACTIVELY BROADCASTS HATEFUL MESSAGES ABOUT A PERSON OR GROUP WHICH MAY INCITE VIOLENCE OR PREJUDICE AGAINST ANY INDIVIDUAL OR GROUP OR LEAD TO A FEELING OF INTIMIDATION AND VICTIMISATION.
HATE SPEECH

WHAT DOES ONLINE HATE SPEECH LOOK LIKE?

SOCIAL NETWORKING SITES

KILL ALL LGBTQ

PURE FRONT

THIS IS A WEBSITE FOR TRUE BELIEVERS. WE BELIEVE IN A PURE HUMAN RACE IN WHICH EVERYONE IS WHITE, HETEROSEXUAL AND CHRISTIAN. ALL OTHERS ARE EXTINCT. LET US CREATE A PURE LAND.

RECENT THREADS
WEB FORUMS

INBOX (203) SEARCH HATELGTQ

https://hate.lgtq.blogspot.com

WHY LGBTQ PEOPLE ARE UNNATURAL AND SHOULD BE CULLED FROM OUR POPULATION.

ARCHIVES
OCTOBER (43)
SEPTEMBER (20)
**GAMING**

**GAMER HATER SAYS:**
Die f***** let me show you what we do to homo q*****s where I come from!

**WHAT ARE THE EFFECTS OF SUCH ONLINE HATE SPEECH?**

**IS IT OKAY TO SAY THESE THINGS? EVERYONE DOES IT AND BEING LGBTQ IS WRONG.**

**EVERYONE SAYS SO.**

**HATE SPEECH HAS A REAL AUDIENCE AND A REAL INFLUENCE.**

**HATE SPEECH IS HARMFUL.**
I AM OFFENDED!

What is the difference between offensive speech and hate speech?

It seems like a hard distinction to make.

Hate speech is distinct from offensive speech. Offensive speech is not immediately harmful and falls under free speech.

So opposing hate speech does not mean censorship.

It is the recognition of the difference between harmful and hateful versus offensive.

WHERE DO YOU DRAW THE LINE?

But there are many grey areas.
SHOW THAT YOU DO NOT SUPPORT GAY MARRIAGE

WE MAY NOT AGREE WITH THE CONTENT OR OPINIONS, OR WE MAY FIND THEM OFFENSIVE, BUT THEY ARE NOT HATE SPEECH.

AGAIN, THIS MAY BE HORRIBLY OFFENSIVE, BUT IT IS NOT HATE SPEECH.

I DON'T KNOW. I THINK IF YOU WERE BORN ONE WAY AND WANT TO BE ANOTHER, THAT IS UP TO YOU. BUT I DON'T WANT TO USE MY TOILET AND CHANGE MY BIRTH CERTIFICATE JUST BECAUSE YOU WANT TO.

WHAT ABOUT FREE SPEECH?

SO WHAT ABOUT FREE SPEECH?

I DON'T UNDERSTAND HOW ANYBODY COULD BE GAY LIKE SERIOUSLY KISSING ADOLESCENTS.

THE CASE FOR FREE SPEECH

THE CASE FOR FREE SPEECH

WE MUST ALWAYS BE AWARE OF OUR RIGHT TO FREEDOM OF SPEECH. THE FIGHT AGAINST HATE SPEECH DOES NOT MEAN CENSORSHIP, BUT THE FACILITATION OF VULNERABLE COMMUNITIES AND PROTECTION OF HUMAN RIGHTS.

ONLINE HATE SPEECH v1.indd 14
08/01/2014 12:57
CHALLENGES

WHAT ABOUT THE PARTICULAR CHALLENGES OF ONLINE HATE SPEECH?

HOW TO SOLVE EVERYTHING

LIKE ANONYMITY?

ANONYMITY IS THE ABILITY TO COMMENT AND SHARE INFORMATION ANONYMOUSLY OR BY A PSEUDONYM, WITH ANONYMITY PEOPLE CAN SAY HURTFUL AND HARMFUL THINGS WITHOUT FEAR OF CONSEQUENCES OR OF IT BEING TRACED BACK TO THEM.

THE RAINBOW BRIGADE IS AT IT AGAIN! NEWS ARTICLE: “GENDER RECOGNITION BILL TO BE DISCUSSED BY PARLIAMENT.”

IT’S NOT MY FAULT THEY ARE UNNATURAL... AND I DON’T WANT MY GOVERNMENT LISTENING TO THEM.

IF I EVER MET ONE, I WOULD HELP “FIX” THEM. THE FINAL WAY! HA HA!

SHOULD ANONYMITY BE ALLOWED?

OKAY BUT IF WE GET RID OF ANONYMITY THERE’S STILL THE PROBLEM OF SIZE.

THE INTERNET IS GLOBAL, HOW CAN YOU TACKLE SOMETHING SO BIG?

AN IRISH CITIZEN SPREADS HATE ON A BELGIAN WEBSITE

AN AMERICAN CITIZEN ON A NIGERIAN WEBSITE ADVOCATES THE MURDER OF LGBTQ PEOPLE.

AN ITALIAN ON AN AUSTRALIAN MESSAGE FORUM ENCOURAGES LGBTQ PEOPLE TO COMMIT SUICIDE.

WHAT CAN BE DONE?
In the struggle against online hate speech we must always be aware that any attempts to tackle the problem must do so without hindering people’s enjoyment of the fundamental right to freedom of speech.
WHAT CAN WE DO TO TACKLE HATE SPEECH?

Monitoring and research to gather information and statistics regarding the extent and experience of online hate speech.

**Survey on Online Hate Speech?**

- Have you ever witnessed hate speech online? 
  - Yes 
  - No
- Have you ever been a victim of online hate speech? 
  - Yes 
  - No

Internet service providers and social media platforms have terms of service and acceptance of use policies that prohibit hate speech. Make use of the "Report" option on these services. In this way, such sites can self-regulate and remove hate speech. Empower the user to highlight online hate speech.

If something is not respectful and acceptable to say in real life, it is not acceptable to say it on the Internet.

Raising awareness of what hate speech is and teaching respect and online etiquette.

**Key Concepts**

- Respect
- Awareness
- Reporting + Monitoring
- Education
- User empowerment
THE NO HATE SPEECH MOVEMENT
A CAMPAIGN FOR YOU
AILEEN DONEGAN, NO HATE SPEECH MOVEMENT EUROPE

Aileen Donegan, Campaign Officer of the NHSM
I began work at the No Hate Speech Movement (NHSM) as a volunteer in February 2013. As a young online activist, my main mission was to raise awareness of hate speech online and share with people how to combat it. In April of this year, I and 30 other volunteer online activists across Europe travelled to Budapest. In a training seminar organised by the Youth department of the Council of Europe at the European Youth Centre, five facilitators taught us how to combat hate speech, racism and intolerance on the internet.

How it all started – the stats
The campaign preparations started in 2012; it was officially launched by the Secretary General of the Council of Europe on 22 March 2013. The campaign was originated by the youth representatives in the Council of Europe – the Advisory Council on Youth – who were concerned by how much hate speech they came across online. The results were stark and formed the basis of the No Hate Speech Movement today.

The Council of Europe’s Youth Department carried out a survey in 2012. ‘Young People’s Experience and Attitude Toward Hate Speech Online’ surveyed over 1,000 young Europeans aged 14–30 who use the internet regularly. The survey found that 32% of young Europeans use the internet 2–4 hours a day, 36% at 5–8 hours a day and 29% of respondents use the internet ‘always’.

78% of internet users encountered hate speech online
78% of internet users encountered hate speech online; of those, 37% claim to see or experience hate speech regularly and 45% experience hate speech online ‘sometimes’.

According to the respondents, of the categories provided in the survey, perpetrators of online hate speech target members of the LGBT, ethnic minority, female, and Muslim communities. Hate speech is mostly found on social networking sites and internet pages, with hate speech in the comment or forum sections of news portals also ranking high. Most respondents admitted to feeling ‘upset,’ ‘uneasy’ and, one a positive note, ‘motivated to take action.’

The behavioural questions in the survey reveal that most respondents either ignore hate speech or report it to Internet Service Providers (ISPs). Mostly, the respondents claimed to ‘reply and react against it’. Asked whether they ever posted hate speech online, respondents answered: 5% Yes, 74% No and interestingly 21% affirmed that they were ‘not sure’. Seventy-eight percent have never received training or education on using the internet or online safe behaviour. Sixty-nine percent of those surveyed do not know where to get help, compared with 31% that do.
Tackling the issue
The respondents of the survey make it clear that defining hate speech is difficult. Unlike hate crime and criminal activity, the use of hate speech is not uniformly defined in legal texts across Europe. This is why the Council of Europe developed their own definition and continues to raise awareness of online hate speech through the No Hate Speech Movement (NHSM). According to the Council of Europe, hate speech covers ‘all forms of expression which spread, incite, promote or justify racial hatred, xenophobia, antisemitism or other forms of hatred based on intolerance, including: intolerance expressed by aggressive nationalism and ethnocentrism, discrimination and hostility against minorities, migrants and people of immigrant origin. Other forms of discrimination and prejudice, such as antigypsyism, christianphobia, islamophobia, misogyny, sexism and discrimination on the grounds of sexual orientation and gender identity fall clearly within the scope of hate speech.’

Yes, it’s long-winded. It has to be. Every human being on the planet can be subjected to hatred. Hate speech, however, is more specific and harmful than hate: anyone that identifies with the target group of hate speech feels concerned and threatened. And this is what the NHSM aims to mobilise young people and online users to stand up for human rights online and to reduce the levels of acceptance of hate speech online. To build an information and cyber society that caters for all, it takes individual responsibility and the mobilisation of young people to work together.

European and national levels
The campaign is currently being run or prepared in 38 of the 47 member states of the Council of Europe. We still hope to get everyone on board in all Council of Europe member states; this is a European problem and the issues may arise at the local or national level in your country. One of my jobs is to encourage and liaise with the national coordinators and committees who are implementing the campaign at home. I need to investigate some of the following questions. How do you motivate young people and society to get involved? What activities can your national campaign do? Since you are not limited in what you can do to promote the message of the campaign, I want to hear the innovative approaches across Europe.

The campaign is currently being run or prepared in 38 of the 47 member states of the Council of Europe

Continued over
Every month the NHSM actively raises awareness of an issue related to hate speech by our ‘European Action Days’ (EADs). On these Days we ask online users to set a status, or a tweet, or make a video in solidarity with the issue. For example, in October we celebrated European Local Democracy Week where we asked all users online to find one way local democracy helps communities live together. The results can be found on the NHSM Campaign in Action blog. Specifically for this European Action Week, we also set debates on our website www.nohatespeechmovement.org, and we asked our followers to contribute to the discussions. But the online sphere isn’t the only place where action happens.

In November 2013, we held our European Campaign Conference to bring together all stakeholders of the campaign to plan the activities of the next year. Online activists, NGO partners, members of national campaign committees, the follow-up group, Ambassadors of the Permanent Representations of the Council of Europe and other Council of Europe departments attended the event, with over 170 attendees overall. The conference was opened by Gabriella Battaini-Dragoni, Deputy Secretary General of the Council of Europe and closed by Snežana Samardži -Markovi, Director General of Democracy, Council of Europe. Many workshops relating to hate speech and the campaign were discussed during the conference, with one workshop specifically dealing with hate speech in political discourse around the European Parliament elections coming up in May 2014.

**Campaign material**

The NHSM is an online campaign, which means that much of our action happens on our campaign website, our Facebook page and our Twitter account. But this isn’t a strict rule. We prepare offline events like flashmobs, living libraries and street art actions – which we encourage all national campaigns to do for every EAD. Then we ask everyone to send in their photos and videos so we can publish them on our website. This is what our Join the Movement section is— a photo/video collage of all your actions! This part of website is also where we ask new followers to join the NHSM, to register with an account and sign up to our newsletter to keep updated.

The most important function of our NHSM website is to teach young people the definition of hate speech. We want young people to find
What they think hate speech is and send it to us. Our Hate Speech Watch feature is a collection of online hate speech that users send in to us; we verify that it is hate speech according to the Council of Europe definition, and the content is added to our growing list of hate speech reports. [Editor's note: for a detailed discussion of what can be classified as hate speech, please see Grey Areas on page 20.]

Take Action
The European level of the campaign ends in 2015, and by then we hope to have raised a critical amount of awareness of hate speech and how young people combat it. The national level campaigns may continue the NHSM at home – maybe your country’s hate speech problem needs more time? Keep at it. Ideally, if you find that you are the target of sustained hate online we would hope the NHSM gives you enough strength to fight back. Motivate yourself into action – you don’t have to tolerate the hate on the internet, and you should never believe what the haters say about you.

Just as important: if you see someone else becoming the victim of hate speech online, please help them out by working together to combat it. Challenge all hate speech you see online. And keep in touch! The No Hate Speech Movement is a campaign for you. Let us know your stories, let us know how you overcame hate online. Our Campaign in Action blog shares the experiences of others and if you would like to get involved email us at youth.nohatespeech@coe.int #nohatespeech

Mobilise those around you to take action and stand up for those more vulnerable than you.

18-19
Currently, much attention is being paid to destructive speech online. Governments across the world are seeking to address hate-motivated language targeted at specific groups. This issue of IGLYO On... brings up the challenges of combatting online hate speech, including regulation across borders and the anonymity of the internet users.

This article addresses a more principled challenge to combatting online hate speech: the argument that freedom of speech trumps any regulation of speech, on or offline.

Discourse is enriched by the variety of perspectives that are expressed, and the validity of a position is substantiated when that position is deemed by the majority to persevere as opposed to other options presented. In the same way, non-valid perspectives are disregarded by demonstrating their fallacies.

Proponents of freedom of expression argue that this discursive process regulates any falsehoods or faulty arguments, and therefore the state should not step into the process by regulating speech for any reason. Freedom of speech advocates believe that arguments should change minds, not laws.

However, hate speech has an effect more than that of a mere insult. Hate speech harms the dignity of an individual based on the fact that the individual is a part of a group that has shared characteristics. The way hate speech harms the dignity of an individual is by implicitly removing the assurance that the individual can participate fully in society. Effectively, hate speech removes the voice of an individual based on membership in a protected class of people- that is, people who are united by a characteristic already protected by law, such a ethnicity, sex, gender, national origin, disability, age, religion or belief, or sexual orientation.

If we see hate speech as a denial of the fundamental right to participate in society, including the discourse of the public sphere,
then hate speech can therefore be regulated by governments. Freedom of speech arguments lose their strength if we look at how speech is already regulated, with laws on copyright of protected material, laws against libel, and laws against slander. In light of the fact that the law already limits speech when it concerns registered trademarks and falsehoods against a person, it is not out of the realm of a government that recognizes freedom of speech that the same government can regulate hate speech.

However, the law is only one part of the puzzle to stop hate speech, both online and offline. The court of law is only one forum to work against the violation of dignity of individuals. Indeed, it is arguable that a court of law is not even the most effective place to find remedy. Instead, the court of public opinion should be utilized to combat hate speech.

By relying on the principles of freedom of speech, mainstream politicians and intellectuals, as well as mainstream media, can combat hate speech by disproving the dehumanizing messages contained in hate speech. When legal sanction for hate speech does exist, the challenges discussed elsewhere in this issue—such as anonymity and cross-border activity—make online hate speech a very slippery offense to pin on a perpetrator. Instead, the unequivocal inclusion of all members of society in social discourse by leaders takes away the argumentative power of hate speech.

By condemning hate speech, and the animus that underlies hate speech, public leaders can use argument to promote the inclusion of groups that are targeted by hate speech. Yet positive statements alone are not enough to win in the court of public opinion; campaigns and public awareness projects should not only point out the destructiveness of hate speech, but actively encourage social participation of all people in a society. Laws can be put in place to give strength to the condemnation of hate speech, but the laws are only part of the discourse-changing actions that can be taken to promote inclusion.

The lines between protection from hate speech and the right to freedom of speech are not clear. The legal culture of each country also contributes to how likely a measure limiting the freedom of speech will become part of the law. The grey area will not be cleared up, as the nature of speech and communication is changing, and continues to challenge conventional ideas of free speech and expression.

Language both on and offline continues to have a powerful impact in the lives of individuals. Human rights advocates and leaders should attempt to dominate discourse, promoting the human rights of all people, leaving no room for arguments of hate. Let’s work toward a world that is respectful of difference that promotes inclusion of those aspects that distinguish us from each other.
Hate Speech is not something to be tolerated but to be combated. And we have the tools to do just that.