Mapping European responses to identity-based violence

Transcript

Contents

Welcome

Day one

Day two

Day three

Discussion: Participant-led open discussion

Closing

Closing statement

Welcome

Welcome

By Kate Ferguson

On behalf of Protection Approaches, thank you for joining the *Mapping European responses to identity-based violence* online consultation!

The dialogue presents an opportunity to share knowledge, best practice, and experiences of combatting identity-based violence in all its forms. The different sessions, chaired by a number of experts in their field, will allow for in-depth discussions on specific topics. You will have the opportunity to have your work included in the final report that will be produced from the consultation, which will be distributed widely by Protection Approaches and Peace Direct.

In order to do so, please include a description of the work you do in your profile (accessible **here**) – **without this information, we will not be able to include your contributions in the final report.**

During the consultation, a number of discussion texts will be added to the Platform4Dialogue. In order to stay up-to-date with the conversations, we recommend that you read these texts carefully – some will base off the contributions of the previous day, while some will aim to push the discussion onto mutually beneficial topics.

The consultation will have the following schedule:

Day 1 (Tuesday 13 August)

Day 2 (Wednesday 14 August)

Day 3 (Thursday 15 August)

Session 1: Identity-based violence in Europe – the problem

Session 2: Linkages: how hate crime, violent extremism, and mass atrocities connect

Session 3: Prevention vs response: priorities

Session 4: What works? Sharing examples of best practice

Session 5: Campaigning and intersectional solidarity

Session 6: What doesn't work? Failed strategies and common mistakes

Session 7: Working better across sectors – academic, policy, and civil society

Session 8: Cross-regional cooperation – European collaboration

Session 9: Future challenges: what's next?

Please note that this outline schedule may be adapted as the week goes on. If you feel there are other sessions or topics that need to be addressed, please email hugo.lucas@protectionapproaches.org

We hope that all participants (regardless of your time-zone) will be able to log on each day, and contribute comments where you see fit. You can log in and engage at your convenience - though the earlier in the day, the better in terms of creating momentum.

Please report any technical issues to the Platform4Dialogue team: info@platform4dialogue.org

Thanks - we look forward to your participation!

Responses

How to participate

By Joel Gabri

Each session will feature a number of discussion topics. These discussions will typically be started with a short piece of text introducing the topic and posing some questions. Please use the discussion feature to add your responses to the questions, and explore further with the other participants throughout the day.

Click the "See more" button on the Topics pages to see responses so far and add your own. There is a text box at the top of each discussion, where you can add a response. Under each response is a link to reply directly to the response. You can also "tag" another participant

by typing "@" followed by the participants name (eg @Joel Gabri). Any participant you tag or reply to will receive a notification of your response.

Biographies

Please update your biography in the 'about you' section of your profile with a description of the work that you and your organisation do – this is a key component of the mapping exercise. **We will be unable to include contributions from participants in the final report if they do not complete their biography.**

Responding anonymously

The conversation works best as an open sharing of ideas. Therefore, our preference is that, where possible, participants post under their own name. However, there may be times that you do not feel comfortable doing so.

To comment anonymously, simply tick the checkbox above the "Submit" button, and your name and image will not appear alongside what you have written. Note that while the response will appear anonymously to other participants, the host organisations will be able to view the identity of the author.

If you do not want a contribution attributed to you in the final report, please make it anonymously: we will assume that any contribution that is not made anonymously can be included.

Recommending response

Above each response appears a "thumbs up" icon. Click this icon to 'recommend' a response. We encourage you to use this feature to highlight contributions that you find particularly insightful or important.

Language

The main and preferred language of this discussion is English, in order to allow for an effective exchange between participants. However, if you feel that you can better contribute in your native language (particularly if you would otherwise not contribute) then please use Google Translate to translate your response to English, and then post this alongside the original text.

If you are having any problems with participating, please email the Platform4Dialogue team on info@platform4dialogue.org and we'll provide the help you need.

Feel free to use the discussion of this post to become comfortable with creating and recommending responses.

Responses

Sarah Gough

If I am inspired by comments I read, can I share those out on social media (twitter) during the conference with the hashtag or would you prefer no quotes are shared at this point?

Ben Willis

@[Sarah Gough](1483) Hi Sarah, please feel free - we'd be more than happy for you to tweet about the discussions

---

Day one

Session summary

Thank you for your participation in the first day of this global consultation on **Mapping European responses to identity-based violence.**

We began with an agenda-setting piece from Adama Dieng on how civil society in Europe can respond to the rising challenge presented by the populist right, and a piece from Terri Beswick on the importance of frames and framing. We then handed over to participants to explore further issues related to prevention in Europe and beyond.

We have pulled together some key discussion points from the three Day 1 threads to give you an insight into how the conversations went today. The discussions were extremely stimulating, and this summary can only give a brief indication of the richness of the debates, so we do encourage you to log in and read the discussions in full. These discussions will remain open to new comments for the duration of the week, so please do feel free to continue to add your thoughts.

Identity-based violence in and beyond Europe: a prevention crisis

In the first of the day's discussions we asked participants to consider the "prevention crisis" in Europe. Despite facing a rise in identity-based violence of all kinds, the prevention of mass atrocities is typically still seen as necessary only for contexts outside Europe. Participants shared some of what they saw as the key challenges and barriers that we face in raising the necessity of prevention in Europe.

Key points:

- "In responding to the need of preventing proliferation of racism an issue of concern is the clash between forbidding racist activities and our liberal view on the freedom of speech and assembly." Jens Petersson (Senior Advisor, UNA-Sweden)
- "[In Bosnia and Herzegovina]...even after 20 years of war, we have EU mediation, but we have never achieved peace because the mediators do not seek peace through dialogue, but they want reconciliation at all costs." Violeta Berisha (Activist)
- "Drawing on insights from my empirical research work on identity-based violence and strategies of local civil society on addressing such violence in Pakistan, I feel that major driver of identity-based violence is intolerant

education system-both curriculum and pedagogy." Qamar Jafri (PhD researcher, RMIT University Australia)

- "From a German perspective, it is definitely the case that our memory culture, though often praised for its strong attention to the Holocaust and the Third Reich, has also created certain "silences". For example, there is a strong norm against comparisons of contemporary events here or abroad with the Nazi past, because many people see any comparison as relativising the singularity of evil that was the Holocaust and the Third Reich." Gerrit Kurtz (Researcher, Global Public Policy Institute)
- "I often notice that similar-minded individuals who have good intentions and want to address identity-based violence fail to find a common language. Sometimes it even goes as far as semantics and existing vocabulary of a given language (say English) that does not allow to grasp the complexity and specificity of some regional identity-related challenges." Andriy Korniychuk (Programme Manager, PAX)
- "It's unusual to try and prevent domestic manifestations of identity-based violence because by doing so we admit the existence in our own community. As humans we find it easier to acknowledge the far away over the close to home." Timothy Plum (PhD researcher, Trinity College Dublin)

Linkages between forms of identity-based violence

In the next discussion we turned to the prevention of different forms of identity-based violence. Here, participants were asked to explore the commonalities and differences between preventing identity-based violence in its different forms, including hate crime, violent extremism, and mass atrocities.

Key points:

- "As a starting point, I think that it is essential to see the extreme and mainstream as contingent - that is, what is extreme one day, can become mainstream the next." Aurelien Mondon (Senior Lecturer, University of Bath)
- "The thing that hate crime, mass atrocities and violent extremism seem to have in common is aggression towards anyone seen as challenging conformity and what is 'normal'." Terri Beswick (Facilitator, Peace Policy Research)
- "Ultimately, I see this as a trade-off on which stages and situations one would like to focus on." Jens Stappenbeck (Executive Director, Genocide Alert)
- "I think that the invisibility of whiteness may lead us to ignore the roots of the problem by focusing too much on the extraordinary (what we call illiberal racism in our research with Aaron Winter) and ignore the more structural/systemic forms of racism which have roots in our current hegemony (what we call liberal racism)." Aurelien Mondon (Senior Lecturer, University of Bath)

Prevention versus response

In the final thread of the day participants discussed the extent to which response activities are often prioritised over prevention. Participants shared their perspectives on the differences between prevention and response, the importance of building resilience, as well as their own experiences with the challenges they have faced in trying to prioritise prevention.

Key points:

- "In my experience there is a tendency to view acts of identity-based violence (hate crime, terrorist attack, genocidal violence) as unique acts of 'evil' particular to that individual or group's ideology. What follows is the belief that by understanding and countering that ideology, or blocking the spread of that ideology, we can tackle such violence. This means prevention activities tend to be very reactive (and often ineffectual)." Andy Fearn (Co-Executive Director, Protection Approaches)
- "A key issue for me is the lack of funding for work on conflict prevention and sustaining peace." Jens Petersson (Senior Advisor, UNA-Sweden)
- "Rather than a distinct activity, prevention needs to be understood as attitude that is forward-looking, pro-active and conflict-sensitive.." Gerrit Kurtz (Researcher, Global Public Policy Institute)
- "For us, the difference between prevention and response is not so delineated. The Post-Conflict Research Center (PCRC) deals with the past in order to restore a culture of peace and prevent violent conflict in the Western Balkans – to prevent further atrocities." Velma Šarić (Founder & Director, Post-Conflict Research Center)
- "As suggested by @Gerrit Kurtz there will probably always be political leaders or other actors looking to use identity-based violence as a strategy to create division. Education that nurtures critical thinking and information literacy (as mentioned by @Andriy Korniychuk) combined with social and emotional skills can enable young people to question divisive narratives and recognise disinformation." Dilia Zwart (Education Officer, Protection Approaches)

Welcome to day one: The rising threat of identity-based violence

By Hugo Lucas

Welcome to the first session of this online consultation on **Mapping European responses to identity-based violence.**

We begin with an agenda-setting piece from **Adama Dieng** on the challenges for prevention, old and new: the connection between hate speech and genocide, how civil

society in Europe can respond to the rising challenge presented by the populist right, and how we got to this point.

Terri Beswick, an analyst, facilitator and strategist, will moderate. Discussion threads cover:

- · Identity-based violence in and beyond Europe: a prevention crisis Go to discussion ⬚
- · Linkages between forms of identity-based violence Go to discussion ⬚
- · Prevention versus response Go to discussion ⬚

Process-wise, it is important to respond directly to these questions in each thread. On each of the threads, please review the questions and then add your responses, as well as reviewing and considering the comments shared by other participants.

You are also encouraged to 'vote up' those comments from other participants that you find particularly insightful.

If you think there are other important topics that we need to add to the agenda, either today or for subsequent days, drop me an email with your thoughts, or you can add a comment here.

Remember, if you have any questions or suggestions, please let us know! You can post a message or suggestion in this thread, or email me on hugo.lucas@protectionapproaches.org

Please report any technical issues to the Platform4Dialogue team: info@platform4dialogue.org

Thanks for taking part and we're excited to see how the conversations develop.

Responses

Adama Dieng: The Problem

By Adama Dieng

A groundswell of xenophobia, racism and intolerance, violent misogyny, anti-Semitism and islamophobia is rising around the world. Europe is not immune to this challenge. Reports of physical and verbal attacks towards migrants and refugees are no longer isolated incidences, instead they are becoming frequent.

Europe is facing a challenge of promoting and maintaining harmonious coexistence both within and at its borders. Immigrants and refugees continue to test the capability of

European countries to uphold fundamental rights and freedoms for all. These groups of people continue to suffer humiliation and dehumanisation.

At the same time, Europe's historical contributions to overseas development and human rights are being questioned, threatening not just the post-1945 hard won progress towards a more equal, multilateral world, but also its citizens, and those who cross borders to seek sanctuary on the continent.

The demonisation of immigrants by many of Europe's political leaders and commentators, and some sections of the public, has neither attracted widespread outrage nor condemnation.

Instead, politicians seem to exacerbate such attacks with hateful rhetoric. All over Europe, an ultranationalist resurgence is legitimising hatred, racism and violence, threatening the safety of groups in Europe, those seeking sanctuary within its borders, and around the world.

What is presented as rational sovereigntist policy, centred on the protection of 'borders', deliberately disguises its racist and nationalist connotations. In fact, these leaders deny the problem: their racism is an 'invention' by its critics. In the real world, these attacks are manifestations of racist violence.

In one country, the government's anti-immigration drive has been linked to a significant increase in violence towards immigrants, including threats, attacks on minors and murder. For example, a senior government official was quoted in the media calling for a 'mass cleansing' of immigrants, street by street, with force, if necessary.

While its manifestations may look different, identity-based violence is a challenge from which no country is immune.

To prevent the further harming of innocent people, we need a resilient Europe that defends civil society, the rule of law and stands up for the universality of human rights.

The actions of those in power matter; but civil society is also crucial in the prevention of atrocity crimes. Vibrant civil societies with authority to create civic spaces for the resolution of disputes, combined with civil society actors aligned with peace, stability and economic well-being are crucial – yet often overlooked – sources of resilience. The building of societies resilient to atrocity crimes involves paying attention to the roles of non-State actors. These actors push back when politicians go too far.

More moderate politicians need to be "speaking out" but so too does Europe's civil society.

We need to bring an end to this cynical discourse. Identity-based violence, from hate crime to violent extremism, starts always with small actions and language.

The Holocaust did not start with the gas chambers. It started with hate speech. Hate is not innate. It is not something we are born with, but something we learn. Something we are

taught.

The UN Charter was drafted after the world had witnessed genocide on an industrial scale, when hate speech against Jews, Roma, LGBT group, political dissidents, disabled people, culminated into the holocaust. Almost 75 years on, we are in danger of forgetting these lessons. Recognizing the risks associated with hate speech, the United Nations Secretary-General has launched the 'UN Strategy and Plan of Action on Hate Speech' in June 2019 to identify, prevent and counter hate speech.

Europe should be proud of its robust and varied civil society that at its best nurtures a plurality of different views and defends the right of groups to hold and express alternative perspectives while protecting the population from hate speech and incitement to discrimination, hostility and violence.

Europe can and should be a global leader in protecting populations from the threats of identity-based violence, including atrocity crimes. This responsibility to protect people from these crimes begins at national level including at state borders, and extends around the world.

This responsibility is first and foremost a responsibility to prevent. It's time for Europe's politicians and people to take that responsibility. Thoughts become actions; words become deeds.

Responses

Terri Beswick: Frames and Framing

By Terri Beswick

We think, we understand, and we express ourselves in frames. Framing is how we structure our understanding of the world. Yet, framing is partial in both senses of the word. First, because frames reflect ideology and second, because they are always incomplete. Dehumanising terms like 'cockroaches' have power as much for what they suppress (individual complexity) as what they emphasize (an undesirable, unrelenting mass). This is exactly because they are intended to serve as a cognitive heuristic, a "shortcut", a ready-made schema to process the otherwise chaotic world.

How we frame prevention and how we frame identity has the power to help or hinder the efforts, empathy and action needed to assure the full enjoyment of freedoms and safety for everyone. The same categories, relations, analysis and structures that work to exclude people and make them vulnerable to violence is built on our understanding - or framing - of

who we are and who 'they' are in relation to the challenges we see. If we are not alert to the insidious or lazy frames that become the new normal, we risk undermining efforts to counter the consequences.

Framing prevention

Contrary to the popular obsession with moments of drama and crescendo, violence emerges in painfully slow motion and there are multiple mundane yet horrifying steps of deterioration before we arrive at the acceptance of wide scale violence against a people. There are literally hundreds of opportunities and entry points for prevention. And yet, despite this, we still find ourselves frequently speaking about a "crisis of prevention".

However, if you consider the hundreds of billions spent on preventing "terrorism" and preventing the collapse of the banking sector globally, you could easily argue the converse: that prevention is actually quite popular and enjoys high levels of commitment and resources from governments and the private sector. In reality, a lack of attention and follow-through on preventing atrocities or identity-based violence is not likely due to a lack of knowledge around forecasting and risk analysis or a dearth of understanding on the causes of violence (unless politicians and policymakers have somehow overlooked the decades of scholarship on historical atrocities and genocide, criminology, peacebuilding theory and colonialism). It seems to matter very much *who* and *what* is at risk. So, perhaps it is not so much a 'crisis of prevention', but rather a crisis of prejudice.

Framing identity

Atrocities are rooted in (perceived) identities. They are the very opposite of indiscriminate violence. It is no coincidence that the risk of atrocities feels like it is rising at a time when the blossoming of rights and freedoms to express the complexity of our individuality is clashing head-on with reactionary and regressive politics; a brand of politics engaged in trying to narrow down and fix the frame of reference for who and what is typical. While the context and historical legacies dictate the manifestation of persecution, the pathways are remarkably similar. In reactionary politics, conformity is king (itself the ultimate symbol of patriarchy) and difference is deadly, which is why people who are 'racialised', 'sexual minorities', 'gender-diverse', 'neuro-diverse', 'differently-abled are so often the first and easiest targets.

There appears to be a concerted effort among reactionary political figures to assign value and reward an ever-more-restricted idea of what is typical while painting everyone else as 'atypical' and therefore, a threat to stability and prosperity. Understanding the current dynamics as a fight for individuality and freedom against hierarchical and supremacist politics highlights the scope of the collective struggle. And, understanding who is being rewarded and protected as typical and who is being painted as dangerous and deviant will inform coalition-building across identity-groups, sectors and geographic lines.

It is not an accident that juxtaposing the words 'atrocity-prevention' and 'Europe' can sound strange to some ears. In the hierarchy of world power as it has been framed for us,

we just cannot conceive of 'good' Europe doing bad things. But the challenges are interconnected and the tasks, mutually-supportive. Maintaining and reproducing categories of hierarchy and supremacy will only undermine efforts to prevent violence. Preventing the recurrence or acceptance of atrocities will only work through an interdisciplinary and collective approach.

Crisis response

A crisis of prevention implies that if we could only crack the code on early warning methodology, decision-making workflows and implementing the best operational practices, then crisis could be averted. But a crisis of prejudice is a much more human challenge. It is a cocktail of psychology, empathy, values, ideology and social incentives that are being shaped and reinforced by those with influence over how societies are structured. If the crisis is human, then the response can only flow from reaching across and within our collective humanity.

Responses

Discussion: Identity-based violence in and beyond Europe: a prevention crisis

By Kate Ferguson

What is identity-based violence? Protection Approaches developed the term **identity-based violence** and defines this as any act of violence motivated by the perpetrator's conceptualisation of their victim's identity, for example their race, gender, sexuality, religion or political affiliation. This encompasses hate crime, violent extremism, and genocide, and affects individuals as well as entire groups or communities. It is a global phenomenon from which no society is immune. Hate crime, violent extremism, and mass atrocities may look different: but their prevention often requires shared tools and approaches.

The prevention crisis: Europe is facing a prevention crisis. Identity-based violence of all kinds, from hate crime to violent extremism, is on the rise. Within Europe, at its borders, and in the work that European actors do in international development, approaches that build peace and community cohesion are not being prioritised.

Preventing in Europe vs preventing globally: The prevention of mass atrocities is generally something that is seen as necessary only outside of Europe. Why? The EU

External Action Service's "Atrocity Prevention Tool Kit" sets out the need to protect and improve the economic, political, and social rights of minorities; to counter discrimination and take action against incitement and hate speech; to ensure exclusionist ideology is marginalised; and to support education for tolerance. We have a prevention crisis here in Europe; we have seen two genocides in Europe in living memory; identity-based violence happens here, too.

Questions

- How are these challenges related?
- Why is it unusual to try to prevent domestic as well as international manifestations of identity-based violence?
- Do we just use different language to describe doing similar work?
- What are, in your view, the reasons for the prevention crisis in Europe?

Responses

Terri Beswick
Morning all. I'm looking forward to the discussion today. It'll be really interesting to hear the different ways that people are thinking, talking and working on identity-based violence...and whether we all even use terms like 'atrocity', 'identity', 'human rights', 'prevention' explicitly in what we do.

Lumenge Lubangu
I am African, I define the issue of identity violence in the way we observe it on our African terrain and the way of management. Identity violence is often conceived as an approach based on discrimination, stereotype, prejudice and perception and the result of which can be found in the consideration of human rights, despite its difference and through face-to-face dialogue .

Jens Petersson
"God morgon" from Stockholm and thanks for hosting a most needed discussion. Is mass atrocity prevention only necessary outside of Europe? Why do we seem to ignore the problems in Europe? What reasons are there for the prevention crises in Europe? I'll try to give you my 50 öre from the perspective of being active in a Swedish civil society organisation, the United Nations Association of Sweden. Sweden is famous as being one of the most peaceful and tolerant countries on earth. But if you look below the surface you will find racism and discrimination here too. Both historically and at the present day. Generally, I would say that there is a lot done in the long term to build the values we need in the society, not least by teaching school children values as tolerance from an early age. Still we see a rise in even the worst forms of intolerance. An example: the openly neo-nazi party got 113 votes in elections in 1984, their successor today gets 2 106 votes. When the neo-nazis marched in 1984 they walked in lines of less than 50 participants, today they

often gather 500 participants. These numbers are of course small but still signs that we (too) are heading the wrong way. You could also note that Sweden has become a world leader in proliferating so called white power music. Add to this that apart from the openly neo-nazis we have other political forces feeding on a reactionary and nationalistic agenda and ideals. Most notably the Sweden Democrats, which sprung from the same roots but currently rejects racism and fascism. The Sweden Democrats attract 17,5% of the voters and has risen to be the third largest party in Sweden. In responding to the need of preventing proliferation of racism an issue of concern is the clash between forbidding racist activities and our liberal view on the freedom of speech and assembly. Sweden has repeatedly been questioned by the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination on why Sweden doesn't implement the ban against organisations which incite racial discrimination. Since Sweden signed on to the CERD without any reservations against its article 4b the question is most valid. So far it has however been deemed that such a ban would be in opposition with our constitutions' paragraphs on freedom of expression and assembly. This may currently be about to change. In the summer of 2019, the government assigned a parliamentary committee to investigate the possibility to ban racist organisations. Looking at atrocity crime prevention on a Global or European level I do generally find it problematic that states are sensitive to any interference in their sovereignty. Sovereignty must have limits, which is why we as an organisation have been so fond of the concept of the Responsibility to Protect (R2P). Predictably, but sadly, the UNGA limited coercive actions to be done by the UNSC where the right of the veto is a problem. We would like to see a development where such decisions could be taken by the UNGA itself (see ideas as "Uniting for peace") or by regional organisations when problems occur within their member states. In theory we often applaud the AU for having the paragraph 4h in its charter making this possible. Introducing a similar paragraph within in the EU should have been done years ago. To make progress on such issues sadly doesn't seem likely, but I would be happy if you could contradict me on this… Promoting a general view that "other states may be right and that they should be invited to have views and take action against my own state under certain conditions" is in my view fundamental for solving the problems of prevention as well as reaction.

Terri Beswick
@[Lumenge Lubangu](1462) Hi Lumenge, Thanks for opening up the discussion. Given that we are talking about very human tendencies…to form stereotypes, prejudices and to act on those in the form of discrimination, do you think it's more helpful or harmful to speak about prevention differently in different parts of the world?

---

violeta berisha
From this I would like to give a summary of the situation in the Balkans. The Balkans is physically on the Continent, but it is still very patriarchal. No more like that Conflicts are frequent, hatred is in the air whenever another nationality is mentioned. From this I would like to give a summary of the situation in the Balkans. The Balkans is physically on the Continent, but it is still very patriarchal. No more like that Conflicts are frequent, hatred is

in the air whenever another nationality is mentioned. A culture very similar to many nationalities living in the Balkans, the big controversies. A culture very similar to many nationalities living in the Balkans, the big controversies. Frequent wars between peoples. Located at the intersection of the interests of the great peoples, the Roman and Byzantine empires, the Slavic conquests, have left great consequences today. Until the last war, Europe did not treat the conflicting parties properly. Territorial decisions are made on the basis of the interests of major states. The strongest has won the war! The recent war in the former Yugoslavia has revealed how cruel one can be driven by murderous desires, inhumanity and inter-ethnic hatred. Many peacekeeping troops were deployed within the borders of the former Yugoslavia and outside the borders of neighboring states! But in the eyes of internationals, thousands of civilians were killed, women and children massacred, massacred, and cities burned and bombed. Many displaced, many without families, many women raped. This was inter-ethnic. It is still a challenge for Europe to tackle violence in these countries, punish crimes, establish peaceful inter-ethnic relations and speak of love and respect 20 years later. Europe did not try, despite knowing full well who the aggressor was, to incite the aggressor in the former Yugoslavia to apologize to the victims and the damage done to human and material damages. the culprit is known, but he was never convicted For experiencing gender-based violence later.

Rosemary Forest

@[violeta berisha](1458) thank you for sharing your comment - do you seen links between formal state apologies and prevention of future violence?

Rosemary Forest

@[Jens Petersson](1449) Thanks for sharing, @[Aurelien Mondon](1448) highlighted similar links with racism in the discussion thread on linkages - do you see similarities in the contexts?

Terri Beswick

@[Jens Petersson](1449) Good morning, Jens. Great point on sovereignty as an obstacle. Especially when you juxtapose this with movements and protests of people that are actually calling for international solidarity and outside support. Do you think people-to-people solidarity (awareness raising, consumer activism, boycotts etc.) is still effective in pushing their own politicians to act? E.g. solidarity around SA apartheid? Or could people-to-people solidarity ever replace state-to-state sanctioning, and therefore bypass questions of sovereignty?

Jens Petersson

@[Terri Beswick](1455) Indeed I do, coming from the country that gave birth to the now famous Greta Thunberg, I most certainly believe in what individuals and groups of individuals can do. I see the term "individual responsibility to procect, IR2P" used in the academic debate more frequently. I think it has so far mainly been used when talking about

the responsibility of "key individuals" and "leaders". but I would gladly extend it to what each and everyone could and should do. A current example is in Swedish media these days following the disclosure that some of the charcoal Swedes put on their outdoor grills on summer evenings like these actually may help fund militant groups on the African continent. Naturally it is our "IR2P" to boycott such brands.

Jens Petersson

@[Terri Beswick](1455) But I don't see individuals *replacing* state-to-state sanctions. It will have a power of its own, and it will certainly also move our politicians, sometimes into following up with sanctions at the state level as well. And some sanctions could and should only be dealt with on a state-to-state basis.

Panayote Dimitras

Am I right to think that identity-based violence is what is also known as hate violence and racist violence? Greece is anyway a country where there is tolerance of intolerance or mainstreaming of racism. Can you imagine that yesterday the new head of the National Radio and Television was named and he has among other things twitted in the recent past "since blacks as they claim suffer from racism in America why did not they stay in Africa." Greek Helsinki Monitor has since 2016 filed complaints for more than 500 racist crimes (speech, profiling or violence) and only a few have been dealt with by the prosecutors some led to trials but not convictions is many of them, others have been archived with dismissal decisions that are agreeing with the racist texts!

Gerrit Kurtz

@[Jens Petersson](1449) Thanks for your points! I have been struck by the strength of society in Scandinavian countries, also expressed in your welfare systems. Such strength is probably also a good defense against hate crimes and atrocities - valuing solidarity. However, also given your comments about the Sweden Democrats (and there are, of course, similar parties across Scandinavia), I am wondering whether the strong historical bonds between citizens also make it harder to deal with newcomers. Clearly, this won't be the only reason, but it seems to me that in a society like in Canada that is explicitly based on an immigration narrative it can be easier to accommodate newcomers than in a society where native communities have existed for hundreds and hundreds of years, even if they were, of course, always in touch with the outside world. In other words, how do we foster in-group cohesion as resilience against othering/discrimination without losing the openness and flexibility required to adjust collective identity to accommodate newcomers? If integration is not to end up in assimilation to a majoritarian culture, how do we foster cohesion and openness at the same time?

Qamar Jafri

Drawing on insights from my empirical research work on identity-based violence and strategies of local civil society on addressing such violence in Pakistan, I feel that major

driver of identity-based violence is intolerant education system-both curriculum and pedagogy. As education system works to inculcate a particular narrative which favours only the majority and excludes belief system, customs and history of minority (ethnic, sectarian and religious) it leads to identity politics. Politicians and faith-based leaders create perceived identity threats in young individuals which may lead to identity-based violence: targeted killings, mob attacks, suicide bombings and lynching.

Terri Beswick

If there is the possibility of influencing negative trajectories or actions from outside, has anyone come across examples of people or countries outside Europe that have the potential to disrupt the aggressive, reactionary politics that is increasing the risk of violence in Europe?

Gerrit Kurtz

Hi from Berlin! In terms of framing, I found myself nodding along many of the points that you, @[Terri Beswick](1455) made in your introductory text. From a German perspective, it is definitely the case that our memory culture, though often praised for its strong attention to the Holocaust and the Third Reich, has also created certain "silences". For example, there is a strong norm against comparisons of contemporary events here or abroad with the Nazi past, because many people see any comparison as relativising the singularity of evil that was the Holocaust and the Third Reich. While the whole system of industrial-scale genocide may indeed be unique, there are, of course, many things that we can learn from the ways in which the Nazis came into power and quickly established a totalitarian regime, and how hate speech, as Adama Dieng writes, preceded the gas chambers. Perhaps that is the larger challenge for atrocity prevention: claiming that relatively small-scale events/statements could be the harbinger of genocide, when that escalation only happens under certain conditions and rarely, is often controversial. I think that is why many people use different language, partly for the racist and self-righteous reasons that Terri mentioned, implying "such things could never happen here." Civil society activism needs to communicate that this is a false assumption, and that resilience will never be complete.

Panayote Dimitras

@[Jens Petersson](1449) I agree that we need both state-to-state sanctions and individual or in general civil society actions, especially as so many of the latter eventually convinced states to impose sanctions.

Panayote Dimitras

@[Jens Petersson](1449) I agree that we need both state-to-state sanctions and individual or in general civil society actions, especially as so many of the latter eventually convinced states to impose sanctions.

Jens Petersson

@[Gerrit Kurtz](1468) Thanks Gerrit. Well, Sweden has had plenty of immigration after WWII and in general handled it well, but often we seem to need time to get acquainted to new groups of immigrants. I'm not sure if this is something special for us or if it simply the way we humans work, having a slight tendency to be scared of the unknown? Maybe Canadians and Americans - atleast prior to Trump - handle it better?! I've been told that when we had finnish and hungarian immigrants in the 50's Swedes were first a bit afraid of them and thought that they were different from the rest of us. A couple of decades later they *were* us. When I was a little boy in the 60's we had a first wave of immigrants from the Balkans. Again we saw them as something odd, but a decade later they *were* us (some of them even gave birth to the most famous Swedes there are, like Zlatan Ibrahimovic...). Same story with latinamericans and persians in the 70's and 80's. And the refugees from the Balkans in the 90's have a higher employment percentage than the average Swedes. The negative arguments in the current debate in Sweden could possibly be summarized as: "Well, all over those past decades the immigrants were well educated and more similar to us, than the current immigrants." and "Why should we be one of the few countries in Europe taking on this huge burden?" My feeling is that when we finally get to know our new immigrants from Somalia, Syria and Afghanistan we will find that they were as easy to deal with as our former "scary" immigrants from the Balkans and Finland. We will certainly also be happy that some of them are willing to take on less qualified jobs. So the first of the negative arguments isn't valid at all in my experience. The second one is more tricky. Why should some states in the EU "get away" with not accepting to help with the "refugee crises" in Europe? As I started out by saying, maybe Swedes need some time to learn new people, but we are generally positive towards them in the end. When there are many new people it will take a longer time to get to know them... And meanwhile the nationalists and reactionary people can use them to scare up a less positive attitude.

---

violeta berisha

@[Rosemary Forest](1217) Not so far, even after 20 years of war, we have EU mediation, but we have never achieved peace because the mediators do not seek peace through dialogue, but they want reconciliation at all costs. Reconciliation cannot come in the classical form because peoples now have more information and are more aware of their human rights events and rights. We have a crisis against humanity that is a priority, not just a crisis of political and economic damage

---

Andriy Korniychuk

Greetings from the Netherlands. Happy to be part of the discussion. What really stood for me while reading the introductory essays by Terry and Adama are questions of language and frames. In order to be prepared, you have to understand „the nature of the beast". One of the key steps in prevention for me is to define the problem you are dealing with. I often notice that similar-minded individuals who have good intentions and want to address identity-based violence fail to find a common language. Sometimes it even goes as far as semantics and existing vocabulary of a given language (say English) that does not allow to

grasp the complexity and specificity of some regional identity-related challenges. I feel that pursuit for a universal definition or all-encompassing concept often provides a big obstacle in an attempt to come up with effective prevention mechanism. Instead, elaborating on certain common elements that can be tailored to different contexts would look more promising. Moreover, in Europe this theoretical exercise of elaborating on certain definitions/framework is often driven by specific experiences on the national, regional or local level. It's hard to let go of the past. In research circles people are often trapped in 'a tyranny of concepts' being afraid to challenge the current paradigm. Similarly, we might try to address the deficit of democracy but rarely all can agree on our understanding of what democracy is and what it means, or whether basic human rights need a modern re-evaluation. So it should not come as a surprise that on the supranational level, cooperating nation-states or experts fail to agree on the definition of certain problems and thus often come up with varying solutions to them. The issues at stake are rooted in culture and history, and thus having a well-coordinated stance or response is difficult. Despite globalization and transnational challenges, we still mainly function within the nation-state paradigm and the accompanying concepts developed to comprehend its reality. Hence, we tend to think a priori about democracy rooted in one demos (not demoi) bound to the territory of a single state, indivisibility of sovereignty and identify which makes it much easier to produce a black and white frame of reference which provides fertile soil to promote exclusiveness instead of inclusiveness.

---

violeta berisha

@[Rosemary Forest](1217) I hope that the younger generations, those who today understand precisely the most important things are socio-economic development, with the development of modern technology where we can lay another infrastructure and realize that peace is something that is built and not donated. They must work towards lasting peace in the Balkans, where prosperity is concerned. Only a lot of hard work and a lot of respect for each other's values, the peoples will live in peace. Equality and respect for human rights should be a priority!

Terri Beswick

@[Andriy Korniychuk](1450) Unfortunately, wherever you are in the world, the resources dedicated to defining concepts into ever smaller and narrower semantic properties are not matched with resources for connecting phenomena across disciplines based on manifestation and experiences. If we started with describing the sequence of emotional, physical, material effects of hate crime on a person, we'd immediately see parallels across identities, and also with victims of bullying and even, in some cases, intimate-partner violence. And then a gap in interdisciplinary thinking follows us and reproduces itself in our workplaces. I often wonder what policymaking institutions would look like if they hired social geographers, historians, psychologists, anthropologists as well as people that studied law and political science.... Anyway, I digress!

Velma Saric

@[Qamar Jafri](1444) From my work in Bosnia and Herzegovina, I would agree that the education system has the potential to lead to identity-based violence. The post-conflict reconstruction processes in Bosnia and Herzegovina established the "two schools under one roof" system, where students attend school in the same building but are physically separated according to ethnicity and taught different curricula. In this way, multiple truths, memories, and historical narratives are disseminated, creating a massive barrier to reconciliation efforts. Scholars have called the segregated education system in Bosnia and Herzegovina a continuation of the war by different means. This raises the question of whether responses to conflict can be ill-suited for long-term prevention?

Andriy Korniychuk

@[Qamar Jafri](1444) Somewhat following your observation. In Ukraine, the armed conflict (so a huge amount of violence) allowed decision-makers to politicize and securitize the religious sphere as a defense mechanism against an external enemy (Russia). This decision results in the worrisome outcome: the threat to religious pluralism in the country and identity-based violence under the guise of protecting the state (sovereignty and territory) and its people. Another example of politicians (intentionally) covering violence "for the greater good" or trying to make a classification between acceptable violence and non-acceptable ones under certain circumstance. Makes one question how to counter the prevailing approach among European elites to focus on state security as the most important agenda point.

Andriy Korniychuk

@[violeta berisha](1458) I think this observation reflects much of what we've seen in the EU as well. The importance of addressing a phenomenon sometimes called naturalization of integration process in the EU, especially among the younger generations. Thinking of the EU (standard of living in Europe, peace etc.) as a given/deserved political reality with certain favorable conditions that seemingly have existed forever. Hence, while the parents of young Europeans might have fought/worked for the current state of EU/Europe, the new generations are simply born into it. The urgency to prevent violence from happening (again) is simply not there (yet). EU's fault is also there because for decades the emphasis (consciously) was on technocratic processes to boost the economic integration, while the symbolic dimension of ''staying united in diversity'' not given due attention.

Hugo Lucas

@[Andriy Korniychuk](1450) There's an interesting point here, of some (lucky!) members of the younger generations taking peace for granted because that's all they've known. This might be a consideration for the discussion tomorrow on what works, but how can the importance of peace (and peacebuilding), and the sacrifices made by older generations, best be communicated to them? How can the threat of the current prevention crisis be put into proper historical context, to illustrate what it might be a sign of in years to come?

Timothy Plum

It's unusual to try and prevent domestic manifestations of identity-based violence because by doing so we admit the existence in our own community. As humans we find it easier to acknowledge the far away over the close to home. We look for the "other" to not be one of "us." Even the history we are taught is replete with international examples. Our language remains stuck in a war-frame of reference and in the media we look to use "soft" words in the immediate aftermath. Only, in the academic articles months or years later are the more harsh words used to describe to a genocide or atrocity. Democracy has a component of freedom, speech, and action. In Europe, still within earshot of WW 2 and modern atrocities the desire to silence or mute opposition is read by both sides in differing ways. The more liberal view is to silence hate and ignorance while the far-right sees that muting as the very reason to raise their voice.

Gerrit Kurtz

@[Jens Petersson](1449) Thanks, Jens. It is good to hear your optimism that Swedes will be able to handle also more "foreign" newcomers in their community. My question regarding your immigration history - and I guess that of many European countries, including my own, Germany, is another though: did these waves of immigration change the collective identity of Swedish society in any way? Or did the Hungarians, Finns, Yugoslavs etc. become more Swedish? I think here in Germany there has been very little change, and only gradually is the majority society acknowledging that what it means to be German is not necessarily having lived here for generations, being white and Christian. But perhaps we digress too much from the original discussion topic...

Jens Stappenbeck

@[Timothy Plum](1439): " In Europe, still within earshot of WW 2 and modern atrocities the desire to silence or mute opposition is read by both sides in differing ways. The more liberal view is to silence hate and ignorance while the far-right sees that muting as the very reason to raise their voice." How to engange with proponents of hate and ignorance in a way that they (e.g. the far right or extremists) don't see as muting or as exactly the thing that they must (further) fight against?

Jens Stappenbeck

@[Gerrit Kurtz](1468) @[Jens Petersson](1449) If I might jump onto that: Does Sweden have a lot of local or national NGOs that focus on immigration and integration? Are there civil initiatives, e.g. in neighborhoods and so on? How does that integration process work? Is it too German to immediately look for an organized/institutionalized process? ;)

Peter Hassan Tijani

Identity-based violence in our context in Nigeria and Africa in general is based on discrimination, ethno-religious in nature, racial, regional and xenophobic in nature, this in most cases result in hatred, physical violence, mass atrocity and killings. Identity-based violence is a serious issue it manifest its ugliness in our Nigerian presidential elections resulting in electoral violence and most times targeted killings of other ethnic and religion backgrounds.

Osman Mohamed

Greetings to all, Given the causes of identity-based violence, it is important to consider the nature of Western social structure based on excessive privacy. This culture negatively affected social relations at the family, relatives, and neighborhood levels, and therefore on immigrants. Therefore, meta-treatments, through policies and laws, alone are not sufficient to reduce the manifestations of identity violence. It is important to strengthen social relations at the community level. In this regard, the responsibility lies, largely, on the shoulders of civil society organizations. Including organizing social activities that foster neighborhood relations among community members. The importance of religious values relevant to inducing neighborly relations should not be overlooked. Promoting social relationships based on community efforts is the guarantor for reducing identity-based violence.

Sarah Gough

Good evening! I'm joining the conversation a little late, at the end of my day here in Guatemala, but still very excited to be learning from all of you and so appreciative for the thought and care put into this event by the organizers. I will touch on the issue of prevention crisis in Europe. In any country, and countries in Europe are no exception, it is easier for policy makers and governmental leaders to focus on negative peace indicators (lack of war/violence) than positive peace indicators such as tolerance and resilience because the data is much more simple to track and the solutions to negative peace indicators can be short-term, and superficially, less expensive solutions. In the end, however, policy change/high level peace accords and talks without addressing the underlying cultural acceptance of identity-based violence allows for a culturally tribalist mindset to grow and even transfer hate from one set of identities to another if needed to survive. For true change, there needs to be an emotional connection to the peace-building efforts by the population at large, because we know that it is rare for anyone to be "talked" out of hate. Therefore reactive intervention strategies that remain at the nation/state level often allow hate to fester in pockets of society as long as it doesn't interfere with the quality of life of the majority. Looking at the spread of hate violence through a medical

model lens, with mass migration to Europe as a stressor to the cultural ecosystem, not just economically as is often argued, but culturally, the growth of hate violence is a contagion that was allowed to lay -somewhat- dormant and is re-emerging under this stress, mutated to fit the needs of this century. Since it is the very system (governments, policy-makers, etc.) that benefited at times from nationalistic/protectionist stances how can we expect that it would prioritize systemic change towards social cohesion?

Andreas Andreou

The power elite as well as high level civil society actors who work on those issues and have the power to draft policy, really have to get to the shoes of the victims in order to understand the wider manifestation/picture and harm of the topic in question. To make this happen in an effective way, we really need to take an interdisciplinary approach - bring on the table academic, victims, civil society... All those and other actors have to be the ones who will 'educate' and influence politicians in order for them to draft good policy. So, interdisciplinarity and bottom-up approach are the keywords I'd like to highlight. Why is it unusual to try to prevent domestic as well as international manifestations of identity-based violence? Exactly because those responsible for doing that, do not understand the full picture. In order to be understood effectively, it has to be experienced. If this is impossible, then it has to be communicated effectively from victims. On an other note, I'd like to thank the organisers as well as Adama Dieng and Terri Beswick for such an informative and inspiring text. It really offered me a new perspective. Thank you.

Andreas Andreou

@[Qamar Jafri](1444) This is very well the case in the Cypriot educational context as well, which promotes fanaticism and one-sided perspective on issues such as nationhood. Not to mention the lack of gender and sexuality education which is responsible for the high levels of homophobia and sexism.

Andreas Andreou

@[Terri Beswick](1455) I totally agree Terri. I wrote my LLM dissertation on homophobic and transphobic hate speech, in which I also check the harm of hate speech on victims. I can share it if it would be useful for you.

Andreas Andreou

Lack of meritocracy and direct democracy are of course extra strong reasons behind the phenomena we talk about. Through lack of meritocracy you have people in key positions who do not acquire high levels of knowledge, skills and attitudes for their portfolio. Through lack of direct democracy citizens do not have the opportunities to have their voices heard in an easy manner, thus collective wisdom cannot be spread and influential.

Mariana Goetz

@[Terri Beswick](1455) Yes, I think there are current and not so distant examples from outside Europe, such as Rwanda , which have have the potential to influence identity-based politics and ideologies. Being confronting with grafic and human comparisons about the local histories and personal stories that portray the progression of hatred and indifference that can lead to genocide can deeply influence individual's attitudes. But usually those who are open to explore the past and their own prejudices in this way are not those who need it most.

Mariana Goetz
@[Rosemary Forest](1217) From a transitional justice and reparations point of view this is a really interesting question. Those working on reparation (which in principle is a right of victims of mass atrocities, and includes a 'satisfaction' as a form of reparation, which in turn includes apologies - See UN Basic Principles on the Right to a Remedy and Reparation for Serious Violations of Humanitarian Law) tend to be human rights lawyers or victims' rights activists and do not necessarily consider further cycles of violence as the main goal of an apology. Anecdotally, with respect to individuals' apologies- Germain Katanga, who was convicted by the ICC made a recorded apology for victims in Eastern DRC. He may have done this to impact positively on his sentence, but in interviewing local activists, victims and affected communities have seen this as very important in terms of satisfying their sense of injustice. We know that unresolved injustices can further fuel violence and can be the root cause of local divisions. Conversely, Thomas Lubanga, also convicted by the ICC, did not make an apology and the conflict (which has significant ethnic dimensions) has now re-ignited - however there are many other factors, not least external influences. As for State apologies, the examples I can think of have come very late - when violence had stopped for other reasons.

Discussion: Linkages between forms of identity-based violence

By Kate Ferguson

This thread will explore the prevention of different forms of identity-based violence.

A major barrier to the prevention of identity-based violence is the disconnected relationship between those working to address its different forms, like hate crime, violent extremism, and mass atrocities. In your work, what are some intersections that bring different challenges or intersectional perspectives together? Do some approaches to the prevention of hate crime, violent extremism, or mass atrocities pose challenges for your work? Do you feel some work is prioritised more?

Questions

- What do the prevention of hate crime, violent extremism, and mass atrocities have in common?
- What are the differences?
- If there are common causes (like hate speech, grievances, perceptions of inequality, misinformation) are there common interventions?
- Why do the prevention of violent extremism and the prevention of hate crimes or atrocities often exist as totally distinct objectives?
- What can we learn from each other's work?
- Would your work benefit from a more intersectional approach?
- Are certain interventions or responses to hate speech prioritised more than others?

Responses

Aurelien Mondon

Good morning! Thank you for setting up this workshop! I think that the issues touched on in the Frames and Framing section are particularly important to understand what we actually talk about when we talk about identity-based violence, but also what we don't talk about and yet should. To add my two cents at this stage, based on my area of research, one of the problematic things I have witnessed in my work on such issues is that extremism (where violence of any kind is often contained) and its opposite, be it the centre, mainstream or norm can become reified and thought of unproductively as objective and neutral. As a starting point, I think that it is essential to see the extreme and mainstream as contingent - that is, what is extreme one day, can become mainstream the next. The means that justified the ends can then be accepted, even if they were violent - think of the way some minorities or groups had to fight to gain what we today consider basic rights. The contrary is true too and the mainstream can become extreme - think of the way the Ku Klux Klan fluctuated between the two positions throughout its history. This of course can lead us to consider what violence is, which brings me to my second issue. When we think about identity-based violence, we often ignore the hold that whiteness has on the daily workings of our society and the violence it imposes on many people constantly. This is because whiteness is often rendered invisible to those benefiting from it. Our elite discourse (media, politicians and researchers) thus turn their attention to more out-of-the-ordinary forms of violence (including white supremacy/extremism), neglecting (or even perpetuating) the more mundane and yet deeply harmful systemic oppression (and violence) inflicted upon many. Obviously, this is not to downplay the need to tackle extreme forms of identity-based violence, but simply to ensure that we look at it holistically. Apologies for the long post! It was meant to be a couple of sentences but I got carried away - happy to post a few sources to look at these issues in more detail if need be.

Hugo Lucas

@[Aurelien Mondon](1448) Thanks, that's a great point. What effects do you think whiteness has on the linkages between hate crime, mass atrocities, and violent extremism?

Terri Beswick

@[Hugo Lucas](1222) @[Aurelien Mondon](1448) The thing that hate crime, mass atrocities and violent extremism seem to have in common is aggression towards anyone seen as challenging conformity and what is 'normal'. Whiteness has often been - and still is - the synonym for 'normal' or 'typical' in many parts of the world. Even using the adjective 'white' is seen as superfluous or controversial. Whiteness doesn't need an adjective...because it's normal, it's the default. The same groups of people that require adjectives and qualifiers are (not) coincidentally the same groups of people that are viewed as 'deviant' (in all senses of the word)

Aurelien Mondon

@[Hugo Lucas](1222) Glad it was of interest! I was worried I was a bit off topic! In a nutshell, I think that the invisibility of whiteness may lead us to ignore the roots of the problem by focusing too much on the extraordinary (what we call illiberal racism in our research with Aaron Winter) and ignore the more structural/systemic forms of racism which have roots in our current hegemony (what we call liberal racism). This diversion/deflection approach has been problematic in two ways: - it has been used by the mainstream against the far right, leading us to ignore how the mainstream has embraced similar ideas. The best example here is Nicolas Sarkozy in France who positioned himself as the defender of the Republic in 2007 against Le Pen, while embracing much of his discourse and legitimising many of his ideas. - it has been used by the far right to position itself close to the mainstream by denouncing the more extreme right. For example, Nigel Farage in the UK once celebrated the fact that he and UKIP had helped defeat the BNP. This idea was quite pervasive in public discourse and for a long time, UKIP was given the benefit of the doubt when it came to positioning them as far right as 'they were not as bad as the BNP'. Sorry, I went on a tangent again but I hope that clarifies it a bit! I will not be able to log on for a bit now but looking forward to see where the discussion goes.

Hugo Lucas

One thing I'm really interested in finding out from our participants is whether they feel that some work, on preventing some kinds of identity-based violence, is prioritised or privileged. If so, what work? What kinds of identity-based violence?

Panayote Dimitras

I will paraphrase @[Terri Beswick](1455). "The thing that hate crime, mass atrocities and violent extremism seem to have in common is aggression towards anyone seen as challenging conformity and what is 'normal'. In "traditionally perceived as white-dominated countries" whiteness has often been - and still is - the synonym for 'normal' or 'typical' in many parts of the world. Even using the adjective 'white' is seen as

superfluous or controversial. Whiteness doesn't need an adjective...because it's normal, it's the default. The same groups of people that require adjectives and qualifiers are (not) coincidentally the same groups of people that are viewed as 'deviant' (in all senses of the word)." I then add that in other countries for example in Africa one should replace "whiteness" with whichever identity is perceived as "normal locally". Genocides in Sudan, the Congo, Uganda, Rwanda and more countries in the past are the characteristic examples..

---

violeta berisha

Depending on the region where we live we also notice different types of conflicts. are mainly based on three major sectors: The main basis of hatred is hatred of national identity. on this basis the warring parties, for the sake of reason and sympathy, who wish to create in support and detachment of war, occupation and occupation, use terms such as religious or cultural warfare. Mediating and preventing war in Europe should be a priority. It is understood that if the peoples were to live in peace, the weapons would not be sold and many magnates would lose their power and wealth. how much would this cost rich countries? Europe is very difficult to make peace with others because there are still contradictions between the most powerful nations within the European Union itself. The conflicts in the region itself increase radical forces within Europe, racism and hatred. Every war raises concerns even in the most powerful and secure states. European politics, although seemingly peaceful, must work harder on drafting peaceful documents, rules of law, prevention and repression. Must be precise with the prevention and sanctions that are not happening for the countries surrounding the European Union Courts for sentencing for war crimes have no sanctions for the criminals who killed in mass. There are no laws for the rehabilitation of victims of sexual violence. There are no peace projects for states in the region. Also, the parties to the conflict are not properly addressed, the political beliefs of local pacifists are not respected, and in most cases they are supported without sufficient rhetoric. There is no transparency in prior negotiations between the parties to the conflict; things are kept secret and threaten peace to a great extent To prevent the war: it takes a lot of communication, analysis, verification in the region. It should be possible for all stakeholders and representatives to sit at the table, rather than individually. Most importantly, the interests of the region are a priority, not individual interests, not the creation of individual power and capital. Corrupt persons should be removed from the talks. A popular word in our eyes: if you do not stop fighting in the village, it will come to your home.

Terri Beswick

From the Valladolid debate in Spain, 1550-51 to Carl Linneas in Sweden (1758) and his rather questionable taxonomy of human race and characteristics in the midst of the enlightenment period, there is a definite default to try to determine and assert hierarchy when encountering difference. It is a very particular neurosis that seems to underpin all forms of Identity based violence

Aurelien Mondon

@[Terri Beswick](1455) I think this is key. Essentialised dentities are pretty much always defined against an Other (either as inferior or a threat) even though it does not sustain any form of serious investigation. I usually start my teaching on such issues by asking my students what makes a British person British (since I teach on the UK). Common answers are tea, queueing, being polite to which I respond that as we all know tea is grown in the Yorkshire dales and students where I live are famous for being polite and their queueing at 3am after a night at the pub. I also try to get them to think how class, gender, ethnicity, geographic location, rural vs urban and all other forms of intersectional identities may impact on how people see being from a particular national identity and what that says about how contingent identity (in the singular) is. Therefore, embracing this intersectionality is key to fighting identity-based violence, but extremely difficult in political settings where national identity for one continues to play such an important part in our public narratives, dividing us where actually other identities should bring us together.

Jens Stappenbeck

To add a comment on why the prevention of violent extremism, hate crimes and mass atrocities is oftentimes perceived as totally distinct objectives and speaking from the perspective of Genocide Alert: At Genocide Alert, we mostly come from a background of International Studies and Peace and Conflict Research and focus on Foreign Policy. Prevention of mass atrocities (or way less specific: violent conflict) is the way to go there, if you want to reach the people in the Foreign Office and MPs. It's solely outward looking and given current trends in the EU, this might be a flaw. Prevention of mass atrocities imposes a high threshold: The need to demonstrate clearly before the fact, that the situation in the respective country might actually escalate to that level of mass violence. Only then, debating concrete strategies to counter hate speech, grievances, inequality etc. comes into play. However, of course it is hate crimes, hate speech etc. that needs to be addressed in their very early stages constantly to be able to effectively prevent mass atrocities. Of course it is linked! So while the demonstration of a clear risk of mass atrocities might peak the interest of the Foreign Policy community, it might actually be already to late to effectively counter already ongoing wide-spread hate crimes & misinformation campaigns. Ultimately, I see this as a trade-off on which stages and situations one would like to focus on. But it is also a result of the institutional set-up and responsibilities of Government bodies, isn't it? While the Foreign Office would def. be responsible to prevent mass atrocities, they won't necessarily feel responsible to response to a report of hate speeches in a certain country as long at is low-level. Especially when it concerns hate speech in Europe (and Germany), they'd more likely refer to the Ministry of Interior or Justice. Violent extremism on the other hand is rather linked to terrorism. Summing up these first thoughts: Usage of the terms is result and reinforcements of the bubbles that we work in. It makes sense to challenge them and look for common ground. It also makes sense to clearly communicate what exactly one aims to prevent though, right? The question then is, how to combine it in a strategically sound way without loosing focus?

Terri Beswick

@[Jens Stappenbeck](1452) @Andriy Korniychuk This was raised as well by Andriy in Thread 1. He also made the point about how well-intentioned people are being hindered by the terms and silos that frame their reality. Do others know of joint analysis processes on specific contexts where participants have engaged from different analytical and experiential perspectives?

Francine Esther Kouablan

J'arrive un peu tardivement aujourd'hui sur la consultation. La première question pour moi est de savoir comment tout cela voit le jour et se met en place avant même de parler des effets de ces études et des recherches. Je pense que les études et travaux visant à prévenir les différentes formes de violences fondées sur l'identité sont impactés par les "commanditaires" et l'absence de l'implication des "premiers concernés" par cette problématique dans la mise en place du processus même de ces actions. **Automated translation into English:** @[Hugo Lucas](1222) I arrive a little late today on the consultation. The first question for me is how all of this comes to life and sets in place before we even talk about the effects of these studies and research. I think that the studies and works aimed at preventing different forms of violence based on identity are impacted by the "sponsors" and the absence of the involvement of the "first concerned" by this problem in the setting up of the process even of these actions.

Hugo Lucas

@[Francine Esther Kouablan](1474) Bonjour Francine Esther - nous encourageons les participants à utiliser Google Translate pour traduire leurs contributions en anglais - comme je viens de le faire de traduire cela en français!

Andriy Korniychuk

@[Terri Beswick](1455) As someone who navigates between Western and Eastern academic bubbles on a regular basis, it is sometimes astonishing to observe that a mere language barrier leads to very different methodological and conceptual approaches experts decide to embrace. Hence, when we talk about preferences or priorities, often it's not a matter of ill-intentions or hidden agenda among authorities or local experts but rather a question of access to resources (in a certain language). Not all are ready to go that extra mile in terms of finding out more on the topic and getting themselves informed. What I've noticed in my work is that often due to a language barrier and/or the inability to deconstruct some of the hidden cultural cues, experts from abroad face difficulties in distinguishing propaganda statements from actual thoughts and opinions of their respondents or vulnerable groups they try to assist. As a result, their findings may present distorted reality, lead to the proliferation of the propaganda messages (certain agendas), and hinder the provision of assistance to those who are in actual need. In a way, they can lead to certain problems being treated as a priority while in reality, these issues might have a lower profile. Another obstacle is the funding and donor assistance schemes for local

CSOs/activists/experts sometimes set up in a such a way that in order for the CSOs to be financially sustainable (or sometimes simply exist) they have to take on board certain interventions and priorities (let's say violence against Roma communities), while in fact would have explored other problematic areas, given more opportunities and flexibility. Hence, long-term some problems might fly under the radar and then erupt while only a few will be prepared to react (not even talking about preventing).

Terri Beswick

@[Andriy Korniychuk](1450) This is a really important point. when certain issues or phenomena are made invisible, it impacts what we even see as a problem that needs to be solved. We are undoubtedly intellectually poorer for not being able to engage in critique and academic exchange that crosses language boundaries and academic cultures.

Timothy Plum

The prevention of hate crime, violent extremism, and mass atrocities share many things in common and different. Approaches by NGO's, funders and governments do not treat root causes. Poverty, deprivation, lack of education are three examples that are not given adequate support and follow-through. The world is inter-connected yet we only think inside a border. We present papers at conferences, perhaps visit once or twice but we don't look for and implement cross-border changes. Monies are divided by the funders for causes they deem important and NGO's run to fill the need. The priorities in one country usually differ from others and work is kept in country/community,

---

Jens Stappenbeck

@Andriy Korniychuk raised the issue that funding and donor assistance schemes for local CSOs/activists/experts sometimes passively force them to take on work that ultimately is less relevant and impactful than work they'd normally prefer to do. To all: Is that an issue that you or your CSOs encounter on a regular basis? And to link this to the debate about different forms of identity based violence or different ways to frame it: Did you ever have to reframe your work in order to get funding? Might intersectional approaches be better suited for funding anyhow? What are the downsides?

Panayote Dimitras

@[Jens Stappenbeck](1452) In the case of Greek Helsinki Monitor, we refused to reframe our work in order to get funding, so we have lost all funding.

Peter Hassan Tijani

I think the things prevention of hate crime, violent extremism, and mass atrocities have in common are discrimination, hatred, religion, race, tribal or ethnic bias. The differences are: Hate crimes can be as a result of tribal, race, religious and political differences, while violence extremism and mass atrocities can be majorly due to religion or political differences, to a large extent they do not have much differences. There are common causes

as highlighted in the question, and also there common interventions The prevention of violent extremism and hate crimes or mass atrocities often exist as totally distinct objectives because their different nature and in the manner they occur or manifested. We can learn a lot from each other, i was privilege to go on a month exchange program on peacebuilding and mass atrocities prevention in Dungu, Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC) i learnt a lot from their Techniques of mass atrocities prevention, using community engagement based approaches and also teaching human rights to people.

Ben Willis

@[Panayote Dimitras](1443) Thanks for sharing, Panayote - that's very interesting (and disappointing) to hear. Would you be able to expand on how and why you were asked to reframe your work - and the challenges that this posed for the organisation? Do you know if this was a similar problem for other civil society organisations in Greece?

Andreas Andreou

I'd like to share about the Monitoring of online hate speech in the framework of the Code of Conduct on countering illegal hate speech, hoping that it will be helpful. I'd like to emphasise that it is important, when discussing the topics that we discuss here, to pay attention also at the online world which on its own poses serious challenges but also it interrelates and affects the offline world. In May 2016 the European Commission agreed with Facebook, Microsoft, Twitter and YouTube a "Code of conduct on countering illegal hate speech online" in an effort to prevent and counter the spread of illegal hate speech online. The implementation of the Code of Conduct is evaluated through a regular monitoring exercise which is set up in collaboration with a network of organisations located in the different EU countries. The organisation I work at, Aequitas, is the only NGO from Cyprus which participates and monitors online hate speech in the Cypriot online context. Using a commonly agreed methodology, the organisations test how the IT companies are implementing the commitments in the Code. There were 4 monitoring exercise periods until today (August 2019). The last evaluation shows that this initiative delivers successful results: the companies are now assessing 89% of flagged content within 24 hours and 72% of the content deemed illegal hate speech is removed. Among others, the code of conduct provides that the IT Companies, commit: ● to have in place clear and effective processes to review notifications regarding illegal hate speech on their services so they can remove or disable access to such content. The IT companies to have in place Rules or Community Guidelines clarifying that they prohibit the promotion of incitement to violence and hateful conduct; ● Upon receipt of a valid removal notification, the IT Companies to review such requests against their rules and community guidelines and where necessary national laws transposing the Framework Decision 2008/913/JHA, with dedicated teams reviewing requests; ● The IT Companies to review the majority of valid notifications for removal of illegal hate speech in less than 24 hours and remove or disable access to such content, if necessary.

Hugo Lucas

@[Andreas Andreou](1467) Thanks for this contribution Andreas - @[Dan Nash](1440) this might be an interesting one for you - thoughts?

Panayote Dimitras

@[Ben Willis](1218) I will hopefully by Sunday. Thanks for your patience.

Jens Stappenbeck

@[Panayote Dimitras](1443) How? Sorry to hear that. I looked it up, what is it that you are doing? What was the alternative?

Mariana Goetz

@[Terri Beswick](1455) Yes, I agree, it has to do with challenging norms, hate crime and mass atrocities against women , LGBT individuals or minorities for instance, be it in Europe or Africa has been based on 'otherness' and challenges to pre-conceived ideas about what is normal. The specific characteristic that is targeted just depends on the context.

Mariana Goetz

@[Mariana Goetz](1496) And it is very useful to look at hate crime and mass atrocities against women, as they are not a minority group. This can tell us a lot about the psychology of 'perpetrators' and how the hate seems to be fueled from deep insecurity, and from how their perception of the 'other' fuels their insecurity. Hate crime (of which genocide is the ultimate form) against women has picked out characteristics of hate that relate to a superiority, deviousnous, spite or "snubbing" that men have interpreted women to be tormenting or deliberately spiting them with. I'm thinking of analogies between in the InCel (Involuntary Celebacy) hate crime against women in the USA and women victims of the Rwandan genocide (not dissimilar to domestic violenece too - which can be another form of identity hate crime). Is there a similarity with the perception of Jewish people in Nazi Germany as taking jobs/accummulating wealth, or Kashmir currently in India (as having a special status) or indeed 'Europeans' in the UK?

Mariana Goetz

@[Terri Beswick](1455) From a legal point of view the distinctions in the language are interesting. In the European context we monitor hate crime - all European countries provide data to the OSCE that publishes crime rates based on bias by country and various other disaggregations. At the UN level, there is no talk of hate crime, this is politically the remit of internal domestic affairs. We only see mention far as hate speech, which is prohibited more explicitly in (for instance) Art 20 of ICCPR. All the other hate crimes (apartheid, torture based on identity discrimination, genocide) do not use the language of 'hate', and as a result we lose sight of the bias / prejudice element that States should prevent and protect against that is so simple and useful in the concept of hate crime: any crime motivated by bias.

Panayote Dimitras

@[Ben Willis](1218) GHM was founded in 1993. In view of its expertise inter alia on minority rights, GHM along with Minority Rights Group-Greece launched in 1998 the CENTER OF DOCUMENTATION AND INFORMATION ON MINORITIES IN EUROPE - SOUTHEAST EUROPE (see https://web.archive.org/web/20081228015638/http://www.greekhelsinki.gr/english/organizations/cedime.html), which then became a co-founder of the Consortium of Minority Resources (COMIR) (https://www.minelres.lv/minelres/archive/06112001-09_18_13-2317.html). Initial funding was secured inter alia from the Greek Foreign Ministry. Then, during a regional Balkan meeting, the Panayotis Roumeliotis who was the Royaumont Project was caught congratulating in private the Serb Foreign Minister for the downing of the US Stealth on 27 March 1999. Considering such attitude unacceptable and contrary even to the purpose of that international meeting, GHM denounced the fact during the following session. Greece, instead of revoking Roumeliotis, informed Greek Helsinki Monitor that the substantial funding to be provided of the CEDIME-SE project upon a decision of then Foreign Minister George Papandreou, was canceled. This effectively killed the ambitious CEDIME-SE projects. GHM was also mentioned in Parliament by the MP Rapporteur as one of the two NGOs with whom the government consulted in 2002 on the draft bill of what became the fundamental anti-trafficking legislation (http://www.parliament.gr/ergasies/showfile.asp?file=1778_es031002.txt). Subsequently, GHM received generous funding for an anti-trafficking project that included support for litigation. While carrying it out, GHM uncovered a big scandal of granting visas to victims of trafficking in the Greek Consulate in Moscow. Rather than picking up on the evidence, the Greek Foreign Ministry told GHM to file a criminal complaint, which it did in 2006, and carried out a summary cover-up administrative investigation that found no wrong-doing. At the same time, a government official alleged publicly that GHM data on trafficking were false aimed only at securing further funding, even though UN CEDAW had based in 2005 its recommendations to Greece on this data. Hence, GHM funding was discontinued. For the record, the "visa scandal" had to reach the ECtHR with Greece getting a solid conviction last month (case of T.I. and others v. Greece http://hudoc.echr.coe.int/eng?i=001-194441). The third experience was a project on torture in closed institutions launched by the Bulgarian Helsinki Committee with the participation of several Helsinki Committees from the Balkans and Eastern Europe. in 2002. The European Commission approved it but under the condition that GHM be excluded as per Greek government veto (projects of 1 million euros + required the agreement of EU states) .

Discussion: Prevention versus response

By Kate Ferguson

Responding to identity-based violence is often prioritised over preventing it in the first place. However, effective prevention saves lives, time, and money. A growing consensus has formed that current approaches are not working. There is now focus across the breadth of the United Nations (UN) system on 'prevention'; from the Sustainable Development Goals, to the Human Rights Upfront Initiative, to the UN/World Bank *Pathways for Peace* report on 'Inclusive Approaches to Preventing Violent Conflict'.

Prevention is a matter for everyone. It requires sub-national, national and international commitment. *Pathways for Peace* concluded that prevention works, that it is cost-effective, and that attention must urgently be refocused on it. While response is important, prevention is often under-prioritised.

Questions

- What are the root causes?
- How early 'up stream' should prevention start?
- What does early prevention look like? What activities does it involve?
- Is prevention needed everywhere, all of the time, or some places some of the time?
- How do we know if prevention is working?

Responses

Ben Willis
Good morning everyone – we're very much looking forward to some wide-ranging discussions today. We're particularly interested in this thread on hearing your views about how the prevention of identity-based violence is and should be approached, and whether/how the current focus on response is failing to address the problems we face. The recent UN-World Bank Pathways for Peace report – which makes the case for early and sustained prevention, and highlights the vital role that civil society actors can play in this process - can be accessed directly at https://www.pathwaysforpeace.org/

Andy Fearn
In my experience there is a tendency to view acts of identity-based violence (hate crime, terrorist attack, genocidal violence) as unique acts of 'evil' particular to that individual or group's ideology. What follows is the belief that by understanding and countering that ideology, or blocking the spread of that ideology, we can tackle such violence. This means prevention activities tend to be very reactive (and often ineffectual). In reality, while their victims may be different, those who commit these dreadful acts share motivations; they have come to believe what they are doing is right, that they are protecting their group, their country, their loved ones from an outside threat. Hate-based attack is never

spontaneous because hate is something constructed, learnt, and normalised. No community, society or country is immune to identity-based violence; rather, constant and consistent effort is required from local grassroots to political leaderships to ensure that the fundamental rights and freedoms of all are protected and respected. So prevention must be happening everywhere at all times. This means prioritising the building of resilient communities, where all feel they have a stake, where people celebrate and accept differences, and where everyone has the understanding and skills to reject divisive/false narratives. It seems to me there is a huge amount that Europe can learn in this respect from peace-building / cohesion programmes focused on constructive dialogue, critical thinking, increasing representation of marginalised communities etc. taking place around the world in communities that have traditionally been thought of as more at risk of identity-based violence. I wonder to what extent those organisations leading this sort of work outside Europe have any plans to bring these lessons inside Europe's borders?

Panayote Dimitras

Prevention is indeed THE most important dimension. But in a state like Greece where there is mainstreaming of hate speech and racism prevention is the work of only a few individuals -mainly teachers- or organizations from the civil society and it has very important results at the (very) local level.

Jens Petersson

@[Ben Willis](1218) A key issue for me is the lack of funding for work on conflict prevention and sustaining peace. As shown by the Pathways for Peace report it would even be economically wise to invest in peace building. But who should pay for it? Well, if I remember correctly it's more or less exactly 50 years since states agreed upon the goal of having developed countries spend 0.7% of GDP on development aid, but still only five or six countries do so. If all states could level up to 0.7% we would have a huge sum of money which could be earmarked into these issues, maybe even allocated through the UN Peace Building fund? How much does your countries spend on development assistance?

Ben Willis

@[Jens Petersson](1449) Thanks for the comments Jens – what do you see as the main barriers when making the case for early prevention (e.g. why does the lack of funding persist)? Are there ways in which civil society can help to ensure that priorities are shifted towards prevention rather than response?

Gerrit Kurtz

I agree with @[Andy Fearn](1438) regarding the need to constantly build resilient communities, at home and abroad, and that therefore prevention is something that should be ubiquitous. Rather than a distinct activity, prevention needs to be understood as attitude that is forward-looking, pro-active and conflict-sensitive (this is how the Carnegie Commission to prevent deadly conflict understood it more than 20 years ago). However, I

think we also need to realize that we live in an imperfect world and there will probably always situations where governments or armed groups see identity-based violence as convenient strategy. Or we just need to look at the discourse in many of our own countries, including the UK, where there are incentives to appear ever more extreme on Brexit for electoral reasons. As such, we will continue to need the whole spectrum of engagement on the prevention, management and transformation of conflict.

Velma Saric

Hello everyone! Thank you for organizing this online consultation and starting important conversations. On the topic of prevention versus response, I wanted to provide some insight based on our work in Bosnia and Herzegovina and the region. For us, the difference between prevention and response is not so delineated. The Post-Conflict Research Center (PCRC) deals with the past in order to restore a culture of peace and prevent violent conflict in the Western Balkans – to prevent further atrocities. One of the methods at the intersection of prevention and response is reconciliation. In December 2017, the PCRC collaborated with Peace Direct on an online discussion related to local reconciliation tactics as methods for atrocity prevention. We shared about our grassroots reconciliation efforts which have shown positive impacts on intergroup tensions, social divisions, and discrimination. Our Ordinary Heroes Peacebuilding Program showcases reconciliation efforts as both responsive and preventative toward atrocities. The key aspect of this project is facilitating discussions for youth and exhibiting photos and stories of moral exemplars— heroic helpers who risked their lives to rescue members from other groups during the time of war. Research on the effectiveness of this program and similar projects confirms that contact-based interventions which employ stories of moral exemplars have positive effects on participants' willingness to forgive outgroup members, both victims' and perpetrators' perspectives toward reconciliation, improving damaged intergroup relations, and increasing participants' belief in humanity. In this way these efforts both respond to previous identity-based mass atrocities, as well as serve to prevent future violence.

Terri Beswick

@[Ben Willis](1218) I wonder with all the funding in the world if we'd still come up against the prevailing culture which is about being right and getting it right, rather than being informed, being willing to learn and adapt. Prevention is asking people to step out in front of a problem. At least in my experience of working with a bureaucracy, this is the very last thing anyone wants to do. If we want more prevention, we have to change the conversation from why do it, to why not do it. In much the same way that sustainability and reducing waste are viewed as virtues in and of themselves, not just for their preventive value in mitigating the climate crisis.

Giacomo Viggiani

Morning everyone. Speaking of Italy, most efforts have been made in the field of repression, regardless of the root of violence (including gender-based violence which still,

somehow, identity-based violence). There is no doubt that there should be moments of repression such as criminal prosecutions, but increasing the penalty has only a limited deterrence power. Mixing it with prevention is the obvious solution, but we must pay attention to clarify what prevention meand. In Italy it has been understood as a way to wide the praeter or ante delictum legal measures, which can endanger the personal liberty. In my opinion, prevention is more a matter of cultural and civic education, so schools and higher education insistitutions should be the core of it.

Qamar Jafri

I believe prevention is better strategy for sustainable peace than response. For prevention learning and understanding differences (cultural and faith) is more important than just promoting similarities. I found in my work those local civil society organizations in Pakistan which educate youth about differences in ethnicity, faith and race might have more impact than just talking about similarities in them.

Irina Ranaivosoa

Hi all, hope you are all doing well :) Regarding the question: How early "up stream" should prevention start, I'd say the earlier the better and by this I mean, building peace starts in our closest relationships - family and friends (I would even say, building peace starts within oneself but it may sound too much / complicated at first). Such prevention work should then start at home, in neighboorhoods, in communities, in the smaller parts of civil society then it can maybe grow bigger as movements. But as @[Jens Petersson](1449) there is a lack of (public) funding on peacebuilding, (public) finding that may be invested in other (short-term) solutions to prevent identity-based violence (security, army, etc). "What does early prevention look like? What activities does it involve?" I see in the discussions that it is always discussed about conflict, violence, crimes, hate and other negative concepts. It is never deeply and only focused about positive concepts and actions such as peace, peacebuilding, nonviolent communication, positive transformation of conflict, peace education or the culture of peace (how to promote and embed it in society instead of a culture of violence). If society would see, focus and invest on the positives of every human beings, regardless of the negatives that may have been done, this would be a positive prevention of identity-based (or any kind of) violence. From prevention of conflict to PROvention of conflict [provención del conflicto] (Burton, 1998). Is prevention needed everywhere, all of the time, or some places some of the time? Not prevention but PROvention or PEACEbuilding, and YES, EVERYWHERE, ALL OF THE TIME.

Hugo Lucas

@[Jens Petersson](1449) It's a good point - who should pay for it? But with the cost savings of prevention vs response, it wouldn't perhaps cost as much as we think, would it? Additionally it's worth highlighting that often, mass atrocities and identity-based mass violence takes place outside of, or is even the driver of, conflict. Thus conflict prevention is a necessary, but insufficient component of atrocity prevention (at least, in my view). What do you think? @[Terri Beswick](1455) That's a really nice framing - why *not* do

prevention?

Andriy Korniychuk

I agree that prevention is a much better solution than reaction. However, I prefer to think of resilience as an overarching goal (or a better-suited concept). By resilience, I understand a behavioral pattern with critical-thinking and information literacy as the centerpieces. And it would have to start on an individual level before we speak of civil society response. Moreover, education is an integral part of this process. For instance, EUROCLIO has activities that empower educators across Europe to enable students to acquire social and civic competences through debates, dialogue, and discussion on contested issues as part of their formal education. Similar initiatives are needed on a larger scale. I believe resilience is a better fitted concept to approach the crisis of communication and maybe even a paradigm shift, which impacts the way people understand or react (to violence included). We are dealing with arguably another Gutenberg revolution. Technological advancements influence the way we think (7-second attention span, more focus on the images than content), frame (simplistic messages, buzzwords, hashtags) and communicate (disinformation and fake news or click-bates, information bubbles becoming the normal). The level of information produced daily is unprecedented. The capacity to process new data is limited. The hateful rhetoric promoted by certain groups is very simple and usually provides clear messages. It does not need to be empirical-based. As long as it elicits an emotional reaction, 'everything goes'. As a result, old modalities may no longer be relevant to address the ongoing challenges. In this case, we need resilient individuals and communities and as @[Andy Fearn](1438) put it - who can produced constant and consistent effort.

Hugo Lucas

@[Andriy Korniychuk](1450) I couldn't agree more about creating spaces for debates on contested issues: all too often in the UK formal debate is something only done by the privileged (with some notable exceptions like https://debatemate.com/) - if we can democratise and extend this, we can really help with improving resilience. We'll talk about ways to address ongoing challenges in the threads tomorrow - I hope you can chip in there as well with your thoughts!

Terri Beswick

@[Hugo Lucas](1222) What if we just started asking sceptics: "Talk me through the downsides of promoting critical thinking, conflict resolution skills, debating techniques, recognising the need and value of different ways of knowing, and understanding world histories and different cultural contributions coming from across the world". Not doing it is genuinely baffling.

Rosemary Forest

@[Jens Petersson](1449) I think a challenge of emphasising the UN Peace Building Fund is that it's eligibility effectively excludes small organisations.

Rosemary Forest

@[Giacomo Viggiani](1466) Thanks for you comment - can you expand on the forms of repression you're referring to?

Anonymous

I would also like to flag the issue of education, and why so little seems to get actually achieved in desegregating schools, especially in places that experience religion or ethnic based violence. E.g. Northern Ireland, Bosnia-Hercegovina. From personal experience in BiH it seems those in power immediately after conflict seem to assume education will 'desegregate itself'. In terms of prevention, ending segregation in education on the basis of religion, ethnicity seems key (the work of the OSCE HCNM built up years of experience.)

Rosemary Forest

@[Velma Saric](1465) Thank you for your comment - @[violeta berisha](1458) made a comment in the first thread about they've never achieved peace because mediators do not seek peace through dialogue, but they want reconciliation at all costs. Do you see a distinction?

Dilia Zwart

Happy to see education included several times in this thread. Peace education has long been recognised – by the UN as well as grassroots organisations around the globe - as a powerful tool for prevention and peacebuilding. Research shows that it not only has positive impacts on students' attainment & attendance (thereby improving quality of education) but also prosocial behaviour. Peace education is often seen as needed outside Europe when in fact it promotes a holistic, human-centred learning process that enables learners to constructively resolve conflicts and build peace. As mentioned by @[Irina Ranaivosoa](1447) this process starts within oneself such as through self-reflection and learning how to manage and express emotions. As suggested by @[Gerrit Kurtz](1468) there will probably always be political leaders or other actors looking to use identity-based violence as a strategy to create division. Education that nurtures critical thinking and information literacy (as mentioned by @[Andriy Korniychuk](1450)) combined with social and emotional skills can enable young people to question divisive narratives and recognise disinformation. Through active listening and dialogue skills, education can also enable learners to engage with the 'other' in constructive, meaningful ways. I think that it is important to emphasise that education shouldn't value one skill above another but rather encourage learners to simultaneously apply them. For example, critical thinking on its own could encourage learners to reject any new information whereas critical thinking combined with curiosity and knowledge could encourage learners to make their own informed opinions and engage in constructive discussions with their peers. Peace

education is not simply a matter of instructing pupils about peace but rather an approach to teaching and learning. Whole-of-school approaches that involve everyone from school leadership to students and parents can foster inclusive, safe school environments. Such environments not only prevent prejudice and discrimination but also proactively promote diverse leadership and participation. In such a way education, when combined with other prevention and peacebuilding approaches, can be a powerful way to ensure the next generation have the skills and confidence to be active global citizens that build more inclusive, resilient societies.

Jens Petersson

@[Ben Willis](1218) Ben, I'm not sure we need to spend less on response. What is needed is more on prevention. Swedish taxpayers pay the equivalent of 1% of our BNP in ODA, 0.3% ABOVE the international goal. The EU average is somewhere around 0.45%. ~0.25 below the 0,7 target. I would encourage countries below 0.7 to increase their budget on ODA. If they have problems finding that money maybe they could check in their defence budgets? The world total military expenditure is at 1 700 billion dollars, more than 10 times higher than the sum of all development budgets together.

Jens Petersson

@[Hugo Lucas](1222) No, in the long run there would be cost savings of prevention vs response, but I would like to be very careful not to withdraw response budgets before we see the result of prevention. Currently I'd say that we need more money for both prevention and for better response when we've failed to prevent (which we likely will continue to do for decades to come).

Jens Petersson

@[Rosemary Forest](1217) Sorry, I don't understand. Maybe it is lost in translation, but more likely it is lost in me knowing to little about the PBF, please enlighten me.

Rosemary Forest

@[Jens Petersson](1449) I meant that while I agree we need to encourage donors and governments to invest more in prevention, I don't think that increased funding should all be channelled through the UN's Peacebuilding Fund because small organisations working on peacebuilding, identify based violence etc aren't able to access the funds. It instead goes to UN agencies or large well established organisations.

Hugo Lucas

@[Jens Petersson](1449) Do you think that it would make sense to cast atrocity prevention as a national security issue, as the US did with their atrocity prevention board?

Jens Stappenbeck

@[Ben Willis](1218) @[Jens Petersson](1449) @[Andriy Korniychuk](1450) raises a fair point: Prevention is a much better solution than reaction. Resilience is better than prevention. I think that each level adds further challenges to political decision-holders though: Reaction is comparibly "easy": The problem is clearly visible; making the choice to react or not to react is oftentimes publicly demanded. This is not to say that implications of any decision are easy to calculate or that decisions are easy to make. But usually the situation demands a decision (to act or not to act), although reports about the situation on the ground might still be challenged / not believed or Prevention is more complicated. I favour a narrow definition of preventive engagement in that to classify any engagement es prevention, it must be clear what exactly it is that needs to be prevented. We need assessments about that, about the factors or developments that might lead to the event we want to prevent, and we need to convince others of the benefits of engaging now. That's though, as if we engage in preventive action, we don't see any result. Successful prevention is a non-event. Did we prevent the onset of a mass atrocity? Who knows, maybe the risk assessment was wrong in the first place & we would not have needed to spend any money after all. The tendency to wait and see until we have clearer information or stronger public opinion is tempting. Even when numbers tell, that prevention would always be better than reaction. Btw, important point: Yes, Pathways 4 Peace makes that "business case", but the underlying study of risk assessment & success of prevention is way too optimistic (and someday I might write a longer response to that). It also includes the costs for the affected state & they dominate this calculation. The business case argument after all then must not convince outside states as others will still be more directly affected than them. (I am obv. for prevention, just ponting out problems). Resilience would be the optimal way to go, but it is even more general than prevention. When we talk about resilience, we don't talk about preventing very concrete events in a concrete timeframe, but take general.. precautions. This makes sense. This is honestly also the only real way to actually lower the basic risk for mass atrocities, as preventive programs designed in the Foreign Office don't last long enough to affect structual factors (e.g. inquealities, discrimination etc.). Building resilience then would be a job for development cooperation. But how to choose where to engage? And aren't we already doing that?

Joe Twilley

Afternoon everyone. I'm late coming into today's discussion, but I thought it might be helpful to share my perspective in relation to what we're doing at the Holocaust Memorial Day Trust in the UK. @[Kate Ferguson](1219) said in her introduction that 'prevention is a matter for everyone.' I'd agree with this and add that even when prevention work is taking place, many people are unaware that it is happening or that they are taking part in it. For example, at HMDT we support thousands of local commemorations for Holocaust Memorial Day. Our resources which are used by a very wide range of organisations (schools, local authorities, workplaces, prisons, community groups and many more) help people understand the processes which lead to persecution of people based on their identity. This education work has a role to play in prevention efforts – even if participants aren't always aware that they are part of that work. It's been really interesting reading about the different work that everyone is doing. It was good to see what @[Andy

Fearn](1438) and @[Gerrit Kurtz](1468) had to say about the need to constantly build resilient communities - this is what we're trying to do through our commemoration and education work. We see HMD as one opportunity for people to do some of this, and then it's vital that they do more throughout the year in other ways too. HMDT isn't expert in peace building, policy change or formal atrocity prevention work, but like so many efforts across civil society we have a role to play.

Gerrit Kurtz

@[Jens Stappenbeck](1452) I think we need work both with short and long term time horizons. Reforming a security sector, for example, is actually a long-term task, as it should involve changing mindsets, structures and behaviour, not just teaching classes on human rights. At the same time, teaching security forces to do their narrow tasks properly might be helpful in the short run, for example teaching police crowd control methods that do not involve shooting bullets. With regard to the decision-making process, I absolutely agree. Policymakers often do not have an incentive to focus on upstream prevention if it involves uncomfortable decisions vis-à-vis existing partner governments, or just because the risk isn't obvious yet. That is why prevention needs to be instilled in bureaucracies as overarching objective, and associated activities as "normal" things to do. I think the least that we should expect for policymakers across the board to show more sensitivity how their decisions might impinge on possible risks of violence and discrimination, in other words: at the least, we should do everything we can that everything we do anyway in foreign policy doesn't make things worse in other countries. If foreign policy/peace work can also improve a situation, all the better, but reflecting on the impact that governments already have on foreign states and societies should be the start.

George Weiss

Hi @[Andy Fearn](1438) : Radio La Benevolencija HTF (La benevolencija) is busy with just this: We have, for the last 15 years, been evaluating he impact of our work using soap operas to create populations who are resilient to incitement and identity manipulations in the African Great Lakes, mainly in Rwanda, the DRC and Burundi. It included a seminal evaluation by Betsy Levy Paluck which for the first time proved that norm change was possible with entertainment -education methodologies that "embed" anti-incitement knowledge and , most of all, present stories that show role models experiencing norm change for reconciliation. In November 2019 we will start work on a 2 year intervention in the Netherlands, Hungary and Italy that transposes the experiences from the African (radio) projects into the medium of online gaming in Europe- accessing the online communities of the major MPRPGs with cut-scenes that create critical moments that provide insight into the elements of manipulation brought to bear on the player in real life, with game play providing a "practice" element conducive to behaviour change for resilience. @[Gerrit Kurtz](1468): the issue is: Do we really expect Governments to intervene quickly when atrocity looms in a strategically unimportant country? - If/since a realistic answer is "no"- the only reliable element to intervene are the citizens themselves. This is exactly why large scale media interventions that make a real attempt to target a

reactant and scared citizenry and use fictionalised content instead of counter speech have often more potential in this fight than straight forward advocacy campaigns to rally outside interventions..

Hugo Lucas

@[George Weiss](1477) I'd love to hear more about your work in the thread tomorrow on what works!

Timothy Plum

Prevention needs to begin in basic society. Poverty needs to be addressed, basic human needs met, education needs to be more complete. We spend so much time and effort on STEM to get jobs that we have lost the civic and cultural aspects of education. As a people, we have never defined the areas of most need. In Western Europe (I work in Northern Ireland) the needs are different from Eastern Europe, even the understanding of needs is ill-defined. Total prevention is impossible, you never know what's in someone's mind all the time and if we did does that make it actionable? Who decides? "Prevention" is working when society has decided to change. National and sub-national borders must be removed for the thinking to work.

Peter Hassan Tijani

The root cause of identity-based violence (hate crimes, mass atrocities, extreme violence) are purely acts of 'evil' particular to the person or group's ideology. Very early, the early warning and early response {EWER} must be encouraged in communities Early prevention much consistently involve activities such as human rights education, training on early warning and early response techniques, inclusiveness of every segment of the community is key for holistic prevention Most times prevention is working but on incremental pace. We can see some change within the community or in the individual through their behaviour, actions and reactions to issues of peace in a positive manner.

Gerrit Kurtz

@[George Weiss](1477) You are right that countries with a low domestic salience often only receive attention (if at all) when atrocities are already under way. Do you refer to media campaigns in the countries concerned? What if governments are clamping down on media freedom? Have you had experience with such media interventions?

Andreas Andreou

I believe that prevention is indeed needed everywhere, all of the time. In regards to what does early prevention look like and what activities does it involve, I would stress the importance of awareness raising and capacity building, as well as education and in particular non formal education. One very successful example on awareness raising and capacity building is the No Hate Speech Movement of the Council of Europe. Regarding non formal education, I can share a bit about our approach as a human rights NGO

(Aequitas, Cyprus) in the framework of our work on hate speech for example and in the framework of our vision and mission - to contribute to the creation of a society in which human rights are understood, protected and promoted. Aequitas implemented training courses and other activities through which it raises awareness and builds skills, attitudes and knowledge around the topic. Four examples of such activities are the following: a) Combatting Hate: Training of Trainers (October 2015) Pilot activity funded by the European Youth Foundation of the Council of Europe - a training of eighteen trainers aged 21-30 from the formal and non-formal educational sector for purposes of empowering them to integrate the combat of extremism and hate speech online in their work. The overarching objective of the project was to facilitate the participants' understanding of the significance of human rights education and other innovative methodology as tools for combatting the aforementioned phenomena and become inspired and empowered through the cultivation of the necessary knowledge, skills, attitudes and confidence to use this method in their own educational settings. This was achieved through a threefold approach. More here: https://www.aequitas-humanrights.org/portfolio/combatting-hate-training-of-trainers-october-2015/ b) Youth against Hate (March 2015) The youth exchange 'Youth against Hate' took place in Limassol, Cyprus over a period of six days with 30 participants from Cyprus, Greece, Romania, Slovakia and Italy. The project was funded by the Erasmus Plus programme of the European Commission. The objectives of the youth exchange were to enable participants to understand and distinguish hate speech, to make them aware of the dangers posed by hate speech to any functioning democracy and also to the victim, to decrease the level of acceptance of hate speech and to inspire and empower young people to combat hate speech through a rights-based approach. Moreover, this project sought to address the urgent need for the de-normalization of hate speech within the daily reality of young people and the need to empower young people to take an active stance against hate speech all by allowing them to consider this phenomenon as a threat to democracy and human rights. More here: https://www.aequitas-humanrights.org/portfolio/youth-against-hate/ c) Say No to Hate Speech: Young People Empowered! The project 'Say No To Hate Speech: Young People Empowered' was funded by the European Youth Foundation of the Council of Europe and implemented by AEQUITAS. It contained two key actions, firstly the development of an online platform against hate speech and secondly a training course for young people on combatting hate speech which took place from in October 2016. During the course, participants used human rights education as the key methodology to develop the necessary knowledge, skills and attitudes to take an active stance against hate speech. More here: https://www.aequitas-humanrights.org/portfolio/say-no-to-hate-speech-young-people-empowered/ The platform can be found in the link http://www.notohatespeech.com.. The platform contains information on hate speech including a fact sheet on hate speech and resources relevant to the understanding of hate speech such as the governing national legislation and reports/documents drafted by national and supra-national organisations on hate speech. Such information is useful for young people, their parents or guardians, those working with young people and all other individuals and groups who wish to find out more about hate speech. In addition, the platform includes educational resources that can be used with young people, by formal or

non-formal educators, for purposes of combatting hate speech and/or developing the knowledge, skills and attitudes necessary for a human rights culture where solidarity and equality is embraced. Furthermore, from the 12th September – 31st December 2016, it provided an online chat system which offered support and information for victims of hate speech through psychoeducation as well as support and information for others such as parents, guardians and friends of victims. The official launching of the platform took place on the 12th September 2016 from 10-12.30 at the EU House in Nicosia. d) C.O.N.T.A.C.T. project Aequitas was a partner at the C.O.N.T.A.C.T. project which started in September 2015. C.O.N.T.A.C.T. (Creating an Online Network, monitoring Team and phone App to Counter hate crime Tactics) was a project funded by the European Commission and lead by the University of Cyprus. The project aimed at promoting the reporting and monitoring of online hate speech within European countries through cooperation established between universities, NGOs and key stakeholders. It included research activities, awareness-raising and educational activities for groups such as competent authorities and youth as well as the creation of ICT tools including an online reporting system. More here: https://www.aequitas-humanrights.org/portfolio/contact-september-2015-ongoing/

Velma Saric

@[Rosemary Forest](1217) Peace means different things to different people. To us, peace is the absence of violent conflict and the ability for people to resolve conflict in a democratic way. Reconciliation is also a debated term and can be controversial in the Western Balkan context. On an individual level, reconciliation can mean forgiving the perpetrator for their wrongdoing and many do not see that as a requirement for peace in the Western Balkans. On a broader scale, reconciliation requires the technical mechanisms of transitional justice to be accomplished: truth, justice (e.g. rule of law), reparation, guarantees of non-recurrence. None of these four pillars have been accomplished in the Western Balkan region in full, which is why the use of the term reconciliation is sensitive. The international community has made a lot of contributions in the field, e.g. by establishing effective institutions such as the ICTY, the Kosovo Tribunal, the ICMP, the national courts; by giving us effective tools and models to approach reconciliation and transitional justice; as well as providing the necessary resources and financial support. However, it is up to us to communicate effectively our needs to the international community and be proactive in creating strategies for our context-specific reconciliation. We should be more responsible and accountable for our own role in this process.

Day two

Session summary

Thank you for another day of engaging and stimulating discussions! Having examined the scale of the challenge yesterday – including interlinkages and the importance of prevention, today we turned to possible solutions and the various tools that we can deploy in response.

All of the comments so far have helped to stimulate our discussion by raising a number of thought-provoking points. In this summary we've done our best to include a representative sample of key points raised throughout the day – although we would encourage you to log in and read the discussions in full. Please feel free to review and continue to add comments to each of these threads over the next few days.

Once more, we would like to thank everyone for their continuing participation!

What works? Effective prevention

In the first thread of the day we asked participants to examine if similar tools and approaches can be used to tackle hate speech, hate crime, violent extremism, atrocities and other forms of identity-based violence. Participants shared how examples from their own practice might be useful in other contexts, and how we might identify opportunities for best practice to inform other areas of work.

Key points:

- "I feel what works best is when EU speaks in a single and strong voice to condemn atrocities but divisions commonly prevent this." Timea Spitka (Hebrew University/ICPRI)
- "What we do in MRAX, for example, in Belgium, is to provide training and awareness-raising activities, both to deconstruct the prejudices that tend to favor hateful identity discourses, and to provide our audiences with tools that allow them to do so." Francine Esther Kouablan (Director, MRAX)
- "In order for learners to get to that point of 'doing' there needs to be a process of learning and reflection. Peace education is not just about what is taught in terms of knowledge and content – but also about how it is taught and very much depends on the learning environment. Research shows that a 'whole-of-school approach' is the most effective way to ensure attitudinal and behavioural change is long lasting." Dilia Zwart (Education Officer, Protection Approaches)

- "To counter this [conflicts emerging from hate crime] a lot of advocacy and civic education brings information that locals normally do not have access to and combats hate and brings change though slowly." Naomi Gichuru (Senior Research Officer, National Cohesion and Integration Commission of Kenya)
- "I must echo the sentiment of @Gabriela Ghindea: having seen the effectiveness of grassroots organisations when it comes to deradicalisation, I do not agree that large institutions like the EU are the best "voice": while our institutions must support us, particularly when it comes to funding for researchers and efforts by law enforcement to crack down on hate speech, I believe it might be more fruitful to encourage grassroots organisations to take a targeted approach against specific instances or demographics who are at risk of committing identity-based violence." Dan Nash (Cybersecurity researcher)
- "The Global Raphael Lemkin Seminar for Genocide Prevention is one of the main pillars of the Auschwitz Institute's work and is organized at the former German Nazi Concentration and Extermination Camp of Auschwitz- Birkenau in Oświęcim...By harnessing the power of place, the program is built on an intellectually and emotionally stimulating curriculum that offers a global perspective to participants coming from a region with contested histories of past atrocities. We have learned that only when there is this emotional connection does the motivation to act stay with our participants after they have returned home." Gabi Ghindea (Director of Mediterranean Basin Programs, AIPR)

What doesn't work? Past errors

This discussion sought to unpack actions that have been less than successful, as well as look at past mistakes of the different sectors that we represent. Participants were candid and open in sharing failures and errors in both their own work and larger missteps from across the field.

Key points:

- "For me an unsuccessful intervention, tool or project always paves the way for a successful one. So if I made that mistake, you don't have to. This approach is not always visible in a working environment "where you have to deliver", especially with external financial support in mind – a researcher who is expected to find an answer (to that outburst of violence in a given context), an organization to solve a problem. So what happens from my experience is that instead of saying "right, this failed or we should have taken a different path" half-measure is produced to create an impression of progress being made." Andriy Korniychuk (Programme manager, PAX)
- "I think it is important to foster the ability for complexity thinking and nuance, and push back against narratives that are too simplified... The problem for civil society and academia is, however, that "it's complicated and multifaceted" is not a catchy narrative that is attractive for busy policymakers" Gerrit Kurtz

(Non-resident fellow, Global Public Policy Institute)

- "Information about risk factors of atrocities - including identity based violence, discrimination, marginalisation, and many others - is readily available; in fact, I believe there is so much information available that it has become (or has always been?) almost impossible to digest, analyze, utilize and act in a timely and decisive manner (further exacerbated by limited resources and capacity which Ministries, NGOs, and organisations are often dealing with)… I think one important "failure" - or, to frame it differently, "way forward", is to maximize the political impact of information available concerning early warning signs and risk factors" Elisabeth Pramendorfer (Research analyst, Global Centre for the Responsibility to Protect)
- "One instance where endeavours often fail is when people try to import a model from a different country with a different history, culture, traditions and politics. There is no one-size-fits-all; in my experience it's very important that campaigns are bespoke according to the specific time, place and country." Peter Tatchell (Human rights campaigner)

Campaigning: a special session with Peter Tatchell

For the final session of the day we were joined by Peter Tatchell, a global campaigner for LGBTI and other human rights, to share examples of good campaigning practice, to discuss effective campaigning, and to benefit from the knowledge of other participants.

Key points:

- "Our next campaign, to fight against anti-Semitism for example, is to organize around November 9th, the commemoration day of the crystal night, a week called: the week against anti-Semitism... It is planned during this special week, an intervention of people who fight against negrophobia and Islamophobia to bring together around the same table different actors in the fight against hate and identity discourse." Francine Esther Kouablan (Director, MRAX)
- Since 2016 PAX started a campaign to educate interested groups about the Syrian war from refugees' point of view. We work actively with schools. Students at first receive access to a richly illustrated online game where they can learn about the tragic war in Syria, seen through the eyes of 30 different characters. Each student works with one of them and is faced with radical dilemmas. After the game, Syrian refugee visits an educational institution to talk about his/her experience. Then, we encourage teachers to facilitate a discussion about the whole process (teachers receive various tips and working methods to do that). Andriy Korniychuk (Programme Manager, PAX)
- "My organization, the Post-Conflict Research Center, implemented the program "A Step Together," in partnership with the International Organization for Migration Bosnia and Herzegovina (IOM BiH) to encourage youth from across BiH to work in teams to create online campaigns in an effort to promote peace and intercultural understanding and to bring awareness to important topics

affecting their communities." Velma Šarić (Founder & Director, Post-Conflict Research Center)

- "I agree that the approach of collaboration between targeted minority groups is often more effective than single issue campaigns. In Uganda there is a civil society coalition that brings together around 50 groups, ranging from those representing women to others defending workers, ethnic minorities, LGBTs and local and regional community groups. When one is attacked, the others rally to support them. It is very effective." Peter Tatchell (Human rights campaigner)

- "I describe the recent (February-March 2019) example of successful campaign by local civil society of India and Pakistan named #YesToPeace and #NoToWar. This campaign was launched on social media to defuse tensions between armies of both countries which had increased after the Pulwama attack on Indian security forces on February 14 in Kashmir. Civil society members from India and Pakistan and diaspora of both countries effectively used social media to increase people to people contact and to reduce hate between them." Qamar Jafri (PhD researcher, RMIT University Australia)

- "Consolidating efforts to get any campaign's central message across seems to me to always be the way forward. Coordination is extremely important and a dialogue allowing to learn from each other is key. In our case - a research institute at an academic institution in the UK (The European Centre for the Responsibility to Protect, and University of Leeds) - we brainstorm, coordinate, learn from, and work with civil society and some extremely dedicated activists to convince the British government that introducing a specific atrocity prevention lens in government's approach is an absolute must." Cristina G. Stefan (Professor of International Relations at University of Leeds, Co-Director of the European Centre for the Responsibility to Protect)

Welcome to day two: Solutions

By Hugo Lucas

Welcome to the second session of this online consultation on **Mapping European responses to identity-based violence.**

Having examined the scale of the challenge yesterday – including interlinkages and the importance of prevention, we now turn to possible solutions and the various tools that we can deploy in response. Threads for today will include:

- What works? Effective prevention Go to discussion ⬚
- What doesn't work? Past errors Go to discussion ⬚
- Campaigning: a special session with Peter Tatchell Go to discussion ⬚

Process-wise, it's important to respond directly to the questions in each thread. On each of the threads, please review the questions and then add your responses, as well as reviewing and considering the comments shared by other participants.

You are also encouraged to 'vote up' those comments from other participants that you find particularly insightful.

If you think there are other important topics that we need to add to the agenda, either today or for subsequent days, drop me an email with your thoughts, or you can add a comment here.

Remember, if you have any questions or suggestions, please let us know! You can post a message or suggestion in this thread, or email me on hugo.lucas@protectionapproaches.org

Thanks for taking part and we're excited to see how the conversations develop.

Responses

Gabi Ghindea: Tools to combat identity-based violence

By Gabriela Ghindea

Mass atrocities have been – and are – committed all over the world. To this day, identity-based violence continues to serve as an effective tool for political regimes, who marginalize and brutalize victim groups, to stoke fear and secure power.

Genocide does not happen overnight. Instead, it is a dynamic process, composed of various elements and imposed conditions that develop over time, in which one can identify several risk factors. These include, among others, economic marginalisation and the state-orchestrated separation of people according to identity. Prior to genocide, one can always identify a process of dehumanisation in which a particular group is portrayed as the "other" or the "enemy." Understanding mass atrocities as dynamic processes that unfold during a longer period provides many opportunities for relevant actors to intervene to interrupt the process.

Philosopher Edmund Burke famously said, *"the only thing necessary for the triumph of evil is for good men to say nothing"*. To prevent history from repeating itself, societies can no longer be silent and act as passive bystanders; every individual bears a responsibility to recognise the warning signs and act before it is too late. Atrocity prevention should, therefore, be a holistic endeavour of different stakeholders (governmental institutions,

civil society, academia, international organizations, individuals), that collectively aim to prevent the occurrence of mass killings and other large scale human rights abuses committed against civilians. For this to be achieved, these actors must employ a broad range of tools and strategies for prevention that include education, capacity building, specific policy development, and cooperation.

In the field of atrocity prevention, we have observed that one of the most successful models for prevention requires the development of institutions, not only individuals, that have the necessary knowledge and capacity to regularly review and address the constantly evolving risk factors in a given society. These institutions are commonly referred to as **National Mechanisms for Atrocity Crimes Prevention** and are officially established bodies that include representatives from different areas of government relevant to the prevention of atrocity crimes. They support the development of a unified national prevention policy and have as their primary responsibilities, carrying out national risk assessments and developing policies to address the identified areas of risk.

AIPR also supports the coordination of States at the regional level through the establishment of inter-governmental networks dedicated to genocide and other atrocity crimes prevention. Networks allow States to establish region-wide priorities, develop plans for addressing them, and share best practices through the offering of bi-lateral technical assistance. This approach has been one of the most effective for prevention, as witnessed in Latin America through the work of the Latin American Network for Genocide and Mass Atrocity Prevention - recognized as an "effective partnership for prevention" by former UN Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon. Such a regional approach reflects the reality of how we observe risk factors today, which are not confined to a given country, but are transnational in nature.

Responses

Olivia Marks-Woldman: Holocaust Memorial Day Trust – our approach

By Olivia Marks-Woldman

At the Holocaust Memorial Day Trust, we encourage everyone to learn from genocide – for a better future.

Marking Holocaust Memorial Day on 27 January each year is an important act of **commemoration.** We honour the experiences of those who were murdered, and those

who survived, during the Holocaust, under Nazi Persecution and in more recent genocides in Cambodia, Rwanda, Bosnia and Darfur.

In addition to the important commemorative aspects of the day, it is fundamental to the purpose of HMD that people feel inspired and energised to do more. At more than 10,000 local activities in local authorities, libraries, prisons, workplaces, schools and more, people think critically about how lessons from these historic events can be applied to our lives today.

We use a model of **know, feel and do**. The impact of HMD is that people increase their **knowledge** of what happened during the Holocaust and genocide, **empathise** more with the experiences of individuals, and go on to take further **action** to build safer communities.

A study into the impact of HMD, carried out by the Centre for Regional Economic and Social Research at Sheffield Hallam University in 2016, found 70% of respondents who had taken part in an HMD activity, were afterwards more aware of the causes and conditions that can lead to genocide. Sixty-six per cent said HMD was responsible for them feeling more sympathetic toward people from different backgrounds and 93% of respondents took some form of action as a result of attending an HMD event.

Every year we see inspiring local activities which get participants of all ages thinking about the processes which lead to identity-based discrimination and genocide. One of our most popular resources is our ten stages of genocide poster, based on the model developed by Gregory H Stanton. It is always so encouraging to see people thoughtfully analysing life stories of those affected by historic situations of genocide to gain a better understanding of how discrimination, hatred, atrocities and denial are enabled and encouraged.

HMD has a valuable role to play in our combined efforts on atrocity prevention.

Firstly, in order for us all to effectively challenge prejudice and build safer communities, we need people to have a foundation of strong knowledge, rooted in history, to understand the consequences of unchecked hatred.

Secondly, HMD reaches people of all ages – not just young people in classroom settings. Atrocity prevention and tackling identity-based violence falls to all of us, working in many different ways and settings. Alongside our support for local HMD activity organisers, our communications strategy builds on public interest in the day, raising public awareness of developing situations on social media – including the treatment of Uighur Muslims in China, persecution of the Rohingya, developments in Sudan and incidents here in the UK.

Working with partners allows us to increase the reach and effectiveness of our work. We're thrilled to work with many different organisations doing fantastic work in this area – from Waging Peace to the Roma Support Group, IHRA to the Ishami Foundation. Collectively, we will continue to make a difference.

Discussion: Campaigning: a special session with Peter Tatchell

By Kate Ferguson

No campaign is quite the same as another. In each case, the issue, context and framing might change. But there are general principles that can help a campaign succeed – equally, there are things to avoid that can make a campaign fail.

I've campaigned on a wide variety of issues for more than 50 years: on LGBTI rights, the issue closest to my heart, but also for Aboriginal rights in Australia, for human rights in Russia, against apartheid, for a free East Timor and West Papua, against racism and fascist organisations in the UK, including the British National Party and the National Front, and on environmental issues and animal rights.

We've seen, over the last few years, a backlash against LGBTI rights in about 25 countries. Despite the overall positive global trend, countries such as Nigeria and Brunei have implemented new legislation that make it harder to campaign for LGBTI rights and, indeed, harder to be LGBTI at all. Chechnya has been engulfed by homophobic witch-hunts that have resulted in state-sanctioned torture and murder. In Europe, too, things are regressing in some countries. Look at the assaults on the Pride march in Bialystok in Poland; look at the refusal by the Hungarian government to back a LGBTI rights declaration last December.

In this session, I hope to facilitate a lively discussion on campaigning – hearing from you what you do, sharing what I do, and allowing a space to discuss the most effective ways to get our messages across. The challenge of identity-based violence is one that we all face - a violence that we all try to help prevent in our work.

Responses

Francine Esther Kouablan
Our next campaign, to fight against anti-Semitism for example, is to organize around November 9th, the commemoration day of the crystal night, a week called: the week against anti-Semitism. With the proliferation of acts and hate speech against Jews, MRAX wants to raise awareness of the repeated violence against Jews. This is a first in Belgium, and we already have the agreement of the Jewish Museum and some other associations with whom they agree to join us. We will organize the following activities: a conference, a visit to the Jewish Museum, a guided tour around the monuments, and a day of tribute to

people who have contributed to the fight against anti-Semitism in our association. It is planned during this special week, an intervention of people who fight against negrophobia and Islamophobia to bring together around the same table different actors in the fight against hate and identity discourse.

Rosemary Forest
@[Francine Esther Kouablan](1474) great to hear about how you're going to be campaigning with people who are fighting against racism and Islamaphobia. Do you think that coalition will be able to continue beyond the week against antisemitism?

Francine Esther Kouablan
@[Rosemary Forest](1217)Yes, because this type of collaboration is ongoing throughout the year. for example, MRAX is part of the Platform2103 coalition. It is a platform that organizes the annual anti-racism day. We meet several times a year to prepare for this national event. During the annual march, the floor is given to a francophone, a Dutch-speaking person, but also to actors fighting against Negrophobia and Islamophobia. Next year, the idea would be to give the floor to several other spokespersons for the fight against romaphobia, etc. We are already working in synergy on certain actions. to give them the floor during the week against anti-Semitism is to continue this field work that wants to be a unifying one, because together we can win the struggles we are waging. The other thing is that we, as MRAX, work on all types of racism and discrimination. We are the only association that does not work on a specific aspect, but works globally on all forms of identity violence. With the exception of a few protected areas.

Hugo Lucas
Hi all, Peter will be moderating from our office from 13:00-15:00 UK time - feel free to leave comments now, as we'll be going through what's already been posted to start with.

Andriy Korniychuk
Each year in September PAX organizes so-called Peace Week with active cooperation with our local Embassies of Peace throughout the Netherlands. Each year we choose a specific topic (for example, in 2019 - Peace beyond borders) that helps to organize and streamline better the activities, which include Walks of Peace, PAX colleagues going to local communities to talk about their work, festivals and events celebrating diversity, debates, discussions, and cultural events. We also hand out prizes to people that have the courage to stand for peace in a dedicated event in Amsterdam. It became a signature event of PAX with active community engagement throughout the years. Since 2016 PAX started a campaign to educate interested groups about the Syrian war from refugees' point of view. We work actively with schools. Students at first receive access to a richly illustrated online game where they can learn about the tragic war in Syria, seen through the eyes of 30 different characters. Each student works with one of them and is faced with radical dilemmas. After the game, Syrian refugee visits an educational institution to talk about

his/her experience. Then, we encourage teachers to facilitate a discussion about the whole process (teachers receive various tips and working methods to do that). Stop Blood Coal campaign with the aim of mining companies contributing to effective remedy for victims of violence in Colombia, which have included so far several phases and multiple activities. Article in which PAX already links mining to paramilitary violence and term blood coal is used. 239 emails send to Dutch Parliamentarians to ask for full disclosure of origin of coal. Letter from victims in lead up to a meeting with CEO's of energy companies. Publishing of report The Dark Side of Coal and presentation to Minister of Foreign Trade and Development Cooperation of the Netherlands linking mining and supply chain to grave human rights impact: 3100 people murdered, 55.000 displaced. 6400 consumers send emails to energy utilities demanding stop import of blood coal. Op-ed in national newspaper about link blood coal and energy utilities. Launch of a national radio commercial, linking energy companies to blood coal and now asking them not to forget about the victims. An action where people can send postcards to energy companies saying "do not forget about the victims of blood coal". Debates with mining companies. Examples of achieved results: Dutch Government presents a new action plan for the coal supply chain announcing support for energy companies to develop disengagement strategies and advocates the importance of corporate accountability within the Colombian peace process. Targeted coal companies attending commemoration of victims of a massacre that took place in their zone of influence.

Joe Twilley

Hi Peter. I'm increasingly aware that many of the same challenges and threats affect different minority groups. In your experience, how well connected are different minority groups in campaigning for each other's rights and interests? Are there any particularly good examples you can think of? (I ask this question whilst also realising the importance of the majority in fighting for minority rights, not just smaller groups helping each other!)

Velma Saric

My organization, the Post-Conflict Research Center, implemented the program "A Step Together," in partnership with the International Organization for Migration Bosnia and Herzegovina (IOM BiH) to encourage youth from across BiH to work in teams to create online campaigns in an effort to promote peace and intercultural understanding and to bring awareness to important topics affecting their communities. Projects have focused on religious diversity in Foča, combatting online hate speech in Tuzla, and youth unemployment in Bužim. This project raises political awareness in targeted BiH municipalities by pursuing a community-based and youth-led approach to activism. This activity has resulted in a greater willingness to maintain positive cross-cultural dialogue throughout BiH. The youth-driven aspect of the project is key to sustained efforts for peace and understanding, as inspiring critical reflection from a young age helps to overcome prejudices before they can become deeply inset. The work of young people on peace and conflict prevention is vital, not just because of the size of their demographic group: if the right investments in youth are in place, and their peacebuilding work is

recognized and nurtured, societies may reap a peace dividend. Youth are both a source of resilience and also the most important agents of change that Western Balkan countries so desperately need. However, youth need encouragement and support. Reconciliation activities need to address the fear that comes as a result of limited intergroup contact, empowerment activities need to focus on equipping them with means to create change, and affirmation activities are required to increase their resilience to the multitude of spoilers that continue to perpetually divide in Bosnia.

Peter Tatchell

@[Francine Esther Kouablan](1474) Sounds a great idea. But can I ask: was there a reason to not initially also flag up prejudice against LGBT, disabled, migrants and Roma people? I know you will do the latter next year. I was wondering if there was a specific reason for the seperation. Does it relate to specific circumstances?

Peter Tatchell

@[Andriy Korniychuk](1450) Congrats on your efforts. I agree that the approach of collaboration between targeted minority groups is often more effective than single issue campaigns. In Uganda there is a civil society coalition that brings together around 50 groups, ranging from those representing women to others defending workers, ethnic minorities, LGBTs and local and regional community groups. When one is attacked, the others rally to support them. It is very effective. Do any of you have similar expereince of coalition and alliance building? What were the results?

Peter Tatchell

Hi I am Peter Tatchell. Welcome everyone. Thanks for your contributions. Glad to hear your experiences and plans. Can anyone offer an example of a campaign that went wrong and how they rectified it (if a remedy was possible)?

Peter Tatchell

@[Velma Saric](1465) Hi Velma. What have been the main challenges and difficulties that you have faced? And were you able to overcome them?

Peter Tatchell

@[Joe Twilley](1461) Hi Joe, take a look at the Uganda example in my previous comment. The quest for better quality relationships and sex education in schools in the UK has brought together a very successful coalition of youth and family groups, womens' and LGBT organisations, plus teaching unions and educationists. We successfully pressured the British government to introduce improved and mandatory relationship and sex education in schools from September next year. Previous more narrow campaigning by single-issue groups was not successful.

Qamar Jafri

I describe the recent (February-March 2019) example of successful campaign by local civil society of India and Pakistan named #YesToPeace and #NoToWar. This campaign was launched on social media to defuse tensions between armies of both countries which had increased after the Pulwama attack on Indian security forces on February 14 in Kashmir. Civil society members from India and Pakistan and diaspora of both countries effectively used social media to increase people to people contact and to reduce hate between them. Consequently, the governments on both sides were on restraint position regarding conflict escalation between nuclear neighbours. Lesson learnt: Diverse local civil society members (leaders, celebrities, academia, journalist and activists) can potentially reduce intergroup hate and violent extremism by using social media such as Facebook and twitter through arts, music, poetry and film.

Joe Twilley
@[Peter Tatchell](1487) Great, glad to hear about the successes.

Peter Tatchell
@[Qamar Jafri](1444) That's a very good, positive example. Thank you and keep up the good work.

Andriy Korniychuk
@[Peter Tatchell](1487) Although this might not be the perfect example in this case, but my organization PAX has worked to abolish nuclear weapons for decades and was closely involved with making the ban treaty possible. We are quite proud of playing an important role in The International Campaign to Abolish Nuclear Weapons (ICAN), which is a coalition of non-governmental organizations in one hundred countries promoting adherence to and implementation of the United Nations nuclear weapon ban treaty. Any organization that agrees with the campaign's aims and does not use or advocate violence may become an ICAN partner organization. The coalition has won the Nobel Peace Prize and we consider the undertaken approach and activities to be quite successful.

Peter Tatchell
@[Andriy Korniychuk](1450) This is a great campaign that I fully support. But I wonder why you think it has had very limited success in that none of the nuclear states have given up their weapons, and more countries have acquired them?

Andriy Korniychuk
@[Peter Tatchell](1487) I regret to say that my colleagues working specifically on this topic would have much more to say. But what I noticed is that US and Russia (e.g. collapse of INF treaty), and some other bigger players have set the "aggressive" tone, especially in recent memory. Many tend to follow. Moreover, the failure of soft approch, provisions of international law that have limited impact on some states' behavior turns the tide in favour of militarization. Ukraine is a perfect example. Give away your nuclear arsenal and then get

chunks of land taken away with tacit agreement from the international community despite international commitments. Doesn't look convincing for others to follow a similar path, quite the opposite. So a lot depends on that ability to "sell" multilateralism in global affairs that can be embedded in soft power approach.

Velma Saric

@[Peter Tatchell](1487) The first challenge that we faced was that many youth participants were reluctant to work on topics of combatting violent extremism and radicalization due to the close tie in the media/public discourse between the term "violent extremism" and religious extremism and terrorism. However, our team conducted background research into every project target community and was able to suggest a number of topics that weren't related to religious extremism and terrorism. PCRC was able to show its youth participants that violent extremist narratives fall under a broad range of categories; thus, final campaigns included a diversity of topics such as memorialization, inclusive educational systems, youth unemployment, and hate speech. Another challenge was an overall lack of media literacy, research skills, and work ethic between young people. However, each youth team had mentors who were asked to instruct teams on how to gather materials, conduct research, take photographs, identify interviewees, and conduct interviews. Mentors provided written and oral instructions on how to approach peers in their community and discuss matters related to their campaign, how to conduct interviews with relevant people in the communities, and how to gather photo and video materials necessary for the composition of their campaign. Despite the initial hesitation and lack of skills, the project has been successful. During the first campaign promotion period (1 month), 10 youth campaigns reached a total audience of 195,412 users. These pages and materials are still online, and the numbers are continuously increasing. Furthermore, over 200 young people were directly engaged through the peer-to-peer training workshops.

Andy Fearn

Hi Peter, a lot of the work we do in in the UK focusses on building capacity and increasing representation of marginalised communities to break mutually reinforcing cycles of social exclusion and prejudice. Many of those who we engage are reluctant to lead or engage in campaigns as they have been made to feel that political spaces are not spaces they could, should, or would ever occupy. Many others, particularly those from the most marginalised communities are sometimes unable to engage as their most pressing concerns are fulfilling primary needs such as food, clothing, shelter, and security. I'd be keen to hear any examples you know of best practice or from your own experience when people most excluded by society have been supported to truly lead on campaigns that break down prejudice or tackle other issues that are important to that group.

Peter Tatchell

@[Velma Saric](1465) Well done- good for you and your organisation.

Peter Tatchell

@[Andy Fearn](1438) Hi Andy. You wanted an example of a successful campaign that has empowered marginalised people to lead on campaigns. I guess that one would be LGBT refugees. My foundation provides office space and phone usage to the African LGBTI group which advises and supports sexual and gender minorities who have escaped from Africa. We have helped organise them to get speaking slots at conferences, TV interviews and pride of place in some of the big UK Pride parades. Our philosophy is to empower and lift marginal refugees, to amplify their voice and give them a platform to speak for themselves.

Peter Tatchell

I'm off now, but it was great to read your contributions and experiences. I wish you success in your endeavours. Peter

---

Cristina G. Stefan

Sorry to join this dialogue a bit late, however I think it is immensely important to have this space here to exchange best practices and discuss effective ways to create successful campaigns. Consolidating efforts to get any campaign's central message across seems to me to always be the way forward. Coordination is extremely important and a dialogue allowing to learn from each other is key. In our case - a research institute at an academic institution in the UK (The European Centre for the Responsibility to Protect, and University of Leeds) - we brainstorm, coordinate, learn from, and work with civil society and some extremely dedicated activists to convince the British government that introducing a specific atrocity prevention lens in government's approach is an absolute must. Providing research-based studies to highlight both analytical and empirical evidence is something we add to the overall efforts, so I would add here that I think it is important for researchers to work together with campaigners . Solidarity in approach and central campaign message is key. Those researchers devoted to significant themes around prevention of identity-based violence do need to work closely together with civil society representatives and other key stakeholders to be able to trigger reflection from targeted audience and ultimately find allies in consolidated efforts to provide policymakers with incentives that might change overall government discourse on the topic. In our case, it is various UK stakeholders all working together through the Atrocity Prevention Working Group to create one coherent message to trigger change and to account for what we hope will amount to a successful campaign.

Hayley Davidson

One challenge that we always struggle with is striking the right balance between trying to with influential voices who have the power and who are listened to by policymakers, and with trying to give a platform to those who are marginalised (such as civilians living in warzones, women, or people from minority communities) - but who are often easily dismissed or ignored by decision-makers, and who the 'general public' may find it more

difficult to identify with. Any thoughts on how to better strike that balance?

Anonymous
@[Qamar Jafri](1444) Congratulations on a wonderful initiative. But I think it's a bit much to say it was a success - given that right now tensions between India and Pakistan are the highest they have been since 1999. Obviously that's Modi's fault and not yours but I think that does say something about how we as civil society communicate. We're under pressure from donors and stakeholders to endlessly talk about our successes, but the reality is we are pawns dealing with forces that are far more powerful than we are. That's not to say our work isn't valuable, quite the opposite, but sometimes I think we should be a bit more honest about our lack of power. Posting anonymously because I don't want to personalise this, and meaning absolutely no disrespect to the wonderful work you do.

Hugo Lucas
@[Hayley Davidson](1490) The media plays a role here, I think it's worth pointing out. In my last job we were constantly trying to get more marginalised and diverse voices on broadcast, writing pieces for national media, etc. and the response we almost always got was "have you got a bigger name?".

Francine Esther Kouablan
@[Andy Fearn](1438)What we do in our organization is to materially and financially support marginalized groups, particularly undocumented groups. For example, we have housed the coordination of undocumented migrants in one of our offices for several years now. they have access to the internet, we have given them a computer, and they can meet there whenever they want. We also support them by paying transportation tickets for their various trips. They have paper and photocopying facilities and the activities they organize are supported by our organization. The other thing we do is support for groups called "occupations". Occupations are places invested by the "undocumented". And we help them pay their bills, bring clothes but also we buy essential equipment to help them to feed themselves. To name just these few examples.

Francine Esther Kouablan
@[Peter Tatchell](1487)Regarding LGTBs in particular, we do not have the authority to process reports at this level. Just like gender and disability. But when we receive, for example, a person who is a victim because of his or her sexual orientation, we redirect the person to UNIA, which is the federal public body that has jurisdiction. The MRAX is competent for the following criteria: the MRAX is competent for seven protected criteria, namely: - the nationality ; - the so-called race; - Skin color ; - religious or philosophical conviction; - Culture ; - national or ethnic origin; - and the language. As it happens, in Belgium, certain so-called protected criteria are not treated by all associations. This does not prevent us from working with people who are victims of these discriminations. For example, we attended a little before the summer, at the inauguration of Refuge Belgium,

which is an association gathering young people rejected by their families because of their homosexuality. We are in constant contact with this association, and we are setting up collaborative spaces to support the association in its fight.

Discussion: What works? Effective prevention

By Hugo Lucas

This thread will examine if similar tools can be used to tackle hate speech, hate crime, violent extremism, atrocities and other forms of identity-based violence. Hate crime, violent extremism, and mass atrocities may look different, but their prevention may require similar or common tools and approaches.

Questions

- If they can, how? How do we identify them?
- Are there key distinctions that means some forms of IBV require their own responses or interventions?
- What are the barriers to bringing global best practice to the current prevention crisis inside of Europe's borders?
- What work or examples do you have of work that helps reduce violence, affects behaviour change, or measurably reverses negative pathways. What are the cross-cutting benefits of building community cohesion, early warning systems, horizon-scanning or communications-based approaches of prevention?

Responses

Gabriela Ghindea
Good morning, everybody! I am looking forward to a productive discussion today! Although I have joined the consultations later, I have read your interesting comments from yesterday. I am happy to see that so many of you see constant education as an essential tool in the prevention work. Our work at the Auschwitz Institute for Peace and Reconciliation (AIPR) is based on education, training, technical assistance, networking. I am excited to find out which tools/approaches you consider to be effective in your work?

Francine Esther Kouablan
Bonjour à tous. Il semble évident que pour lutter contre les discours de haine et les crimes de haine, il est utile et et nécessaire de réaliser une approche intégrale pour coordonner

les efforts afin de mettre en place une politique qui favorise et concre�tise les mesures de lutte contre ces discours de haine et la violence identitaire. Ensuite, il s'agira d'accroi�tre davantage les partenariats avec les acteurs de terrain que constitue le monde associatif et renforcer l'implication de la socie�te� civile en faisant de la lutte contre la violence identitaire un enjeu socie�tal et politique dote� de moyens propres, renforce�s et de�die�s aux acteurs sociaux reconnus à tous les niveaux de notre société, qu'il soit local ou régional. Puis, renforcer et mutualiser les dispositifs existant et de�velopper des interventions pre�ventives contre les faits de violences identitaire. Par l'e�ducation et la sensibilisation, pre�venir les attitudes et les pre�juge�s tendant a� susciter le rejet de l'autre et a� conduire au discours de haine et aux crimes de haine. Enfin, sanctionner les actes de haine et de crime de haine en apportant une réponse ferme et structurée contre les faits de violences identitaires, tout en protégeant et soutenant les victimes.

Automated English translation Hello everyone. It seems clear that in order to combat hate speech and hate crime, it is useful and necessary to take a comprehensive approach to coordinate efforts to put in place a policy that fosters and concretises measures to combat such hate speech and identity violence. Secondly, it will be necessary to further increase partnerships with grassroots actors in the voluntary sector and strengthen the involvement of civil society by making the fight against identity violence a societal and political issue endowed with its own means, strengthened and dedicated to recognized social actors at all levels of our society, whether local or regional. Then, reinforce and pool the existing devices and develop preventive interventions against the facts of identity violence. Through education and awareness, prevent attitudes and prejudices that lead to rejection of others and lead to hate speech and hate crimes. Finally, punish acts of hate and hate crime by providing a firm and structured response against acts of identity violence, while protecting and supporting the victims.

Timea Spitka

Greetings from Jerusalem. Here in the past 15 years I have seen things going from bad to worse and they keep tumbling downwards. Civil society is under serious attack, is considered enemy of the state, is underfunded and people take personal risks to monitor human rights as no authority is keen on human rights monitoring of its own activities. Although civil society is financially supported by the EU, the state of Israel is supported more. I feel what works best is when EU speaks in a single and strong voice to condemn atrocities but divisions commonly prevent this. There are no repercussions to even atrocity crimes. Unfortunately from within there is little incentive to change behavior or reduce violence since it keeps the nationalistic leadership in power which feeds on fear.

Francine Esther Kouablan

Ce que nous faisons au MRAX par exemple, en Belgique, c'est de dispenser des formations et des animations de sensibilisation, tant pour déconstruire les préjugés tendant à favoriser les discours identitaires haineux, que doter nos publics d'outils qui leur permettent de faire face à ces discours en apportant des réponses, non pas violentes, mais des réponses qui tendent également à déconstruire ces discours quand les personnes sont

face à ce type de comportement. Que ce soit en éducation permanente ou en cohésion sociale, nous travaillons dans une logique d'émancipation de la personne par elle-même. Que ce soit un travail pédagogique de type transmissif à orientation normative, de type incitatif à orientation personnelle ou de type appropriatif centré sur l'insertion sociale, les dispositifs pédagogiques que nous mettons en place visent à favoriser l'autonomie de notre public, à le libérer de la domination en l'aidant à sortir de l'aliénation, à l'aider à construire ou à re-construire son identité. Cela pour atteindre un changement personnel, social et visible de nos publics, pour les amener à remettre en question leurs savoirs et en constituer de nouveaux. **Automated English translation** What we do in MRAX, for example, in Belgium, is to provide training and awareness-raising activities, both to deconstruct the prejudices that tend to favor hateful identity discourses, and to provide our audiences with tools that allow them to do so. facing these discourses by providing answers, not violent, but responses that also tend to deconstruct these discourses when people are facing this type of behavior. Whether in continuing education or social cohesion, we work in a logic of emancipation of the person by itself. Whether it is pedagogical work with a normative orientation, a self-directed incentive type or an appropriative type centered on social integration, the pedagogical devices we put in place aim to promote the autonomy of our public, to liberate from domination by helping him to break out of alienation, to help him build or re-construct his identity. This is to achieve a personal, social and visible change in our audiences, to bring them to question their knowledge and build new ones.

Gabriela Ghindea

@[Francine Esther Kouablan](1474) Thank you for your thoughts! I also think that atrocity prevention should be a holistic endeavour of different stakeholders (governmental institutions, civil society, academia, international organizations, individuals), that collectively aim to prevent the occurrence of mass killings and other large scale human rights abuses committed against civilians. However, the quality and the scope of the preventive measures can be very different, depending on the political and social leverage exerted by each type of actor, but also on the knowhow and capacity to transform this leverage into effective action. Are there any positive examples when NGOs successfully cooperated with the government in their prevention work? Merci pour vos pensées! Je pense également que la prévention des atrocités devrait être un effort global de différentes parties prenantes (institutions gouvernementales, société civile, universités, organisations internationales, individus), qui visent collectivement à prévenir les meurtres de masse et autres violations des droits de l'homme commises à grande échelle contre des civils. Cependant, la qualité et la portée des mesures préventives peuvent être très différentes, en fonction de l'influence politique et sociale exercée par chaque type d'acteur, mais également du savoir-faire et de la capacité à transformer cette influence en action efficace. Existe-t-il des exemples positifs dans lesquels des ONG ont coopéré avec succès avec le gouvernement dans leur travail de prévention?

Francine Esther Kouablan

What we do in MRAX, for example, in Belgium, is to provide training and awareness-raising activities, both to deconstruct the prejudices that tend to favor hateful identity discourses, and to provide our audiences with tools that allow them to do so. facing these discourses by providing answers, not violent, but responses that also tend to deconstruct these discourses when people are facing this type of behavior. Whether in continuing education or social cohesion, we work in a logic of emancipation of the person by itself. Whether it is pedagogical work with a normative orientation, a self-directed incentive type or an appropriative type centered on social integration, the pedagogical devices we put in place aim to promote the autonomy of our public, to liberate from domination by helping him to break out of alienation, to help him build or re-construct his identity. This is to achieve a personal, social and visible change in our audiences, to bring them to question their knowledge and build new ones.

Francine Esther Kouablan

Hello everyone. It would seem that we need an integral approach for each effort to put in place a policy that promotes and concretizes these measures. of hatred and identity violence. Then there was a partnership with the actors on the ground who created an associative world and who reinforced the application of civil society against violence. strengthened and dedicated to recognized social actors at all levels of our society, whether local or regional. Then, reinforce and pool the existing devices and develop preventive interventions against acts of identity violence. For education and awareness, prevent attitudes and prejudices from causing rejection of others and leading to hate speech and hate crimes. Finally, punishing acts of crime and crime in violation of a firm and structured response to acts of violence, while protecting and supporting victims.

Rosemary Forest

@[Timea Spitka](1484) Do you think European civil society has a role in getting the EU to speak out more as a single voice? And can you provide specific instances where you've seen this have an impact?

Rosemary Forest

@[Francine Esther Kouablan](1474) thanks for you comments - do you have any specific examples of where you have seen this working effectively?

Gabriela Ghindea

@[Timea Spitka](1484) , greetings back from Bucharest and thank you for contribution! Unfortunately, democratic pluralism and civil society have been continuously under assault worldwide in the last years. Europe makes no exception. NGOs, in general, have been depicted as representatives of "foreign interests", sometimes due to targeted and government-sponsored campaigns. Could one think in this political climate of general distrust at strategies to convince the State to participate in common programs of prevention? Are there any positive examples that you can share with us?

Francine Esther Kouablan

@[Rosemary Forest](1217) in Belgium, under the pressure of the associations, the legislator has relaxed, for example, the law for victims in civil matters: 1. The magistrate can put an end to a discriminatory act, it is the action in cessation A provision of the Anti-Discrimination Act provides that, at the request of the victim of discrimination or of an organization competent in this field, the president of the court may establish the existence of a discriminatory act and order its cessation, even if this act is criminally repressed. The president of the court may order the lifting of the cessation as soon as it is proved that the offenses have been terminated. The president of the court may also authorize measures to publicize his decision or the summary thereof, all at the expense of the sentenced person. 2. Evidentiary Facilities: Lightening the Burden of Proof The Anti-Discrimination Act contains civil provisions to facilitate the burden of proof for the victim of discrimination. When, in the context of a civil trial, the victim provides evidence that discrimination exists, it will be up to the person implicated by these elements to demonstrate that he has not discriminated against him. The facts that may constitute such a beginning of proof are, for example, statistical data or situation tests. This does not concern criminal matters. It is now provided that "Where the victim of discrimination or one of the groupings relies on facts, such as statistical data or situational tests, before the court of competent jurisdiction, which presupposes the existence of direct or indirect discrimination. indirectly, the burden of proving the absence of discrimination lies with the defendant. "Situational test: Proof of discrimination may be provided by means of a situational test which can be established by a bailiff's report. The use of a bailiff will not be mandatory to establish a fact of racism by test situation. There are many situations in which a bailiff can not establish a finding: for example, we will think of a job interview with a potential employer where we can not justify the presence of an attendant and therefore a bailiff. The inclusion of this possibility in the law is a better guarantee of its admissibility as a means of proof in civil matters. In criminal law, proof may be provided by any means of law. The situation test was therefore admissible in criminal matters. Of course, there is still a lot of work to be done, but the associations are not releasing the pressure and the idea of setting up a federal plan against hate crimes and hate speech is an important project for us associative actors. Before the elections of May 2019, a meeting was initiated with all the political parties of the country. For the parties that agreed to meet the coalition, it was an opportunity to introduce them to the platform. Apart from that, the MRAX challenged all the progressive political parties on the responsibilities in the fight against the identity violence by handing them a memorandum in which we took again all of our waitings to fight effectively against the identity violences.

Lumenge Lubangu

To prevent atrocities and crimes of identity-based violence, the actions of EU members must be well-structured and well-coordinated for the benefit of all, and the decisions made to eradicate these scourges must be the consensus of all members. and. In addition, punish acts of hatred and hate crime by appropriate acts.

Francine Esther Kouablan

@[Rosemary Forest](1217)In our organization at MRAX, we encourage discriminating situation tests to obtain evidence for victims of discrimination. This evidence enables victims to file a complaint and sue the perpetrators. When we receive a report of aggression, after verification of the facts, we inform the prosecutor of the king and in some cases, we file a complaint and accompany the people to file a complaint against the aggressors. After the elections, several hate speech circulated on social networks. We brought them together, and with the people and organizations who were willing to join these complaints, we filed all the evidence in court. The most difficult thing is to get the victims to dare to denounce what they are suffering. and it is also in this sense that our training and activities are directed. We found that in 2018, for example, the number of people reporting hate speech and acts of hate increased. it is true that the freedom offered by social networks may have influenced this growing number of identity drifts, but I think that our publics have more and more the courage to denounce acts of hatred. And it is by denouncing and communicating around the statistics of all these acts that we also contribute to raising awareness and working on the change of mentality of the populations. There are still people in our populations who do not believe in the existence of violence and hate crimes. It is by effectively communicating around this violence and by raising the awareness that we can hope to achieve positive results.

Andriy Korniychuk

Good morning from Utrecht! I would like to build on the statement „atrocity prevention should, therefore, be a holistic endeavour of different stakeholders". I think this conclusion provides a backbone to make sure that the proposed interventions are demands-driven, practical and implementable. I am in favour of creating and actively looking for platforms that enable different stakeholders to meet, interact, exchange information and elaborate on joint solutions. And if the national capitals are hesitant to take the lead in preventing identity-based violent while looking for short-term political gains, international fora usually can provide such an opportunity. In this case, the EU example is interesting because it is a multilevel system of governance that in some cases allows to bypass your own capital. In terms of regions with shrinking civic space, one could also explore alternative tools for cooperation – crowdfunding, crowdsourcing etc. A simple example from my recent experience are academia-practitioners roundtables. Such activities correspond to what I mentioned yesterday – the ability of different stakeholders to speak a common "language" (define the nature of the problem, frame it, work on solutions, prevent). I would also like to refer to another argument I made yesterday – work with youth, context of EU was mentioned by me in particular, to raise awareness about the fact that human rights, peace (even if you define it narrowly as lack of violence) should not be taken for granted, rather they require constant work and considerable attention. I would group it with another problem – growing fatigue. Fatigue understood as treating democracy, rule of law, basic human rights (and their protection) as a purely normative and possibly quite isolated concept that should be dealt on a procedural level, which becomes "ritualistic" in its essence, hence we lose the practical touch with the individual. Fatigue as a lack of motivation from an individual to engage in protecting someone else (his/her

rights). Partially influenced by the modern age of social media and the amount of information that is available, which can contribute to dehumanization/normalization of violence. The perception that everything is increasingly fake and staged, hence it's better to disengage. Work with media (code of conducts etc) seems like an immediate task, also because technology and social media (being relatively an open source of information) can play a significant role in investigative journalism (work of Bellingcat). Finally, fatigue as a lack of political leadership to change these processes. This is why I believe the discussion on how to mainstream human rights work (or peacebuilding which I am focused on) is so crucial as one of the key solutions. For me this task has two angles: 1). Making sure that citizens can own the process. Hence, it is important to show the practical consequences of sacrificing human security for state security (e.g. total surveillance); 2). Looking for areas to highlight that prevention of (identity-based) violence or protection of human rights do not exist as a theoretical exercise or a "hobby activity" of some lawyers or a bunch of activists. On the contrary, violations leading to atrocities and violence, in general, will not allow "to carry out business as usual" and will have an impact on economic stability, investments, infrastructure, your life – if you turn a blind eye on violence, it will catch up with you sooner or later. Mark Rutte in one of the speeches made a good point in reference to the state of affairs in the EU "The single market can flourish only if the rule of law applies in all member states, and if all businesses know their investments are safe and any disputes will be resolved by judges who are independent of the government in office. Erode the rule of law and you erode the single market. Erode the single market and you erode the Union". Making sure these connections are better understood could also help.

Gabriela Ghindea
@[Francine Esther Kouablan](1474), these are very interesting examples of influencing the policymaking process and, as far as I understood, holding also the political parties accountable for their positions related to identity-based violence. Thank you for sharing!

Francine Esther Kouablan
@[Gabriela Ghindea](1457)To my knowledge not too much at the federal level. But in smaller territorial proportions, yes. As in municipalities and regions. For example, municipal leaders, therefore elected representatives of the people, politicians, call on associations to initiate actions for their populations. This can be done in the form of training, animation or cultural activities. MRAX for example had initiated an action against racism through football with the municipality of Saint-Josse-Ten-Nood. Other examples at the communal and regional level are legion, but major actions at the federal level, take more form of consultation for the opinion of associations. We regret that these consultations do not always lead to concrete political action to advance the fight against hate speech and hate crime. The organization of our country is quite atypical compared to other European countries. We have linguistic entities, regional entities and the federal government. The objectives of each other do not always coincide.

Rosemary Forest

@[Andriy Korniychuk](1450) thanks so much for your comment - how do you think citizens can increase their ownership of processes and which specific processes are you referring to? and how to you think we get more 'everyday' people to take action on protection / prevention?

Naomi Gichuru

Good morning from Kenya, for us we do see a lot of conflicts emerging from hate crime which is more often than not politically instigated with one group being incited against another as intruders. To counter this a lot of advocacy and civic education brings information that locals normally do not have access to and combats hate and brings change though slowly. Hate also borders on exclusion and lack of recognition. If everybody can be included and all forms of discrimination eliminated there can be a good chance of handling most of the circumstances for positive change. Equality of opportunities would also go a long way in positive change, when one group feels marginalized/left out, aggression is easily and most likely as option as a ways of fighting for rights.

Gabriela Ghindea

@[Andriy Korniychuk](1450), thank you for your insightful comments! We also embrace the academia-practitioner approach and think a lot about the sustainability of our programs. We have developed an educational curriculum on atrocity crimes, which can be adapted to different program formats (national and regional seminars, online courses, etc.) and different public categories. Perhaps I can give at this point an example from our praxis: The Global Raphael Lemkin Seminar for Genocide Prevention is one of the main pillars of the Auschwitz Institute's work and is organized at the former German Nazi Concentration and Extermination Camp of Auschwitz- Birkenau in Oświęcim. Each week-long training seminar spans the entire conflict cycle of upstream, midstream, and downstream prevention, and brings together government officials from at least 15 States from around the globe. The Seminar welcomes participants who have professional responsibilities in relevant areas including atrocity prevention, human rights, and international criminal justice. By harnessing the power of place, the program is built on an intellectually and emotionally stimulating curriculum that offers a global perspective to participants coming from a region with contested histories of past atrocities. We have learned that only when there is this emotional connection does the motivation to act stay with our participants after they have returned home. Following the Seminar, alumni become members of the 2PREVENT community, AIPR's growing network of officials from countries around the globe who have attended Lemkin Seminars. Through continuous engagement with its alumni community, AIPR offers ongoing capacity building programs for their institutions towards atrocity prevention policy development at the regional and national levels. In other words, this seminar functions as both the point of initiation as well as the cornerstone of our continuing work with a designated country. Do all of you have other examples of initiatives that had a noticeable impact over a longer period of time? They do not have to involve necessarily government officials. In my opinion, one relevant question when designing this type of programs is how to reach considering also the existing

resources a certain number of persons who could become valuable multiplicators for our work?

Rosemary Forest

@[Gabriela Ghindea](1457) I'm really interested by your reference to the importance of an emotional connection to ensuring action and how you use the power of place to do this. Thinking about the discussion thread on campaigning - do you have suggestions about how could campaigners incorporate this into their work?

Jens Petersson

@[Lumenge Lubangu](1462) Isn't consensus a part of the problem from a European perspective? I'm not sure that I wish for my country to accept consensus on issues like this since it could mean accepting the lowest common denominator of other EU-states.

Jens Petersson

Thanks for an important introduction by @[Gabriela Ghindea](1457). Reading your report on the National Mechanisms in latinamerica was useful. Also learning about the way the R2P Focal Point in Finland works was extra useful for me. Do you, or others here, have any thought on how national mechanisms for atrocity prevention could or should link to National Institutions for Human Rights? https://www.coe.int/en/web/commissioner/-/paris-principles-at-25-strong-national-human-rights-institutions-needed-more-than-ever

---

Gabriela Ghindea

@[Rosemary Forest](1217) I would say what works best is a combination of power of place with the power of storytelling. We "expose" our participants, for example, during our programs relatively soon to memory sites (sometimes former atrocity sites) and tailored guided tours which permit not only an intellectual but also an emotional approach to the discussed topics. We incorporate in our agendas extended discussions/reflection exercises with eyewitnesses or survivors of atrocities. Of course, the power of place is overwhelming at Auschwitz, but from my experience, this combination was very effective too, when debating with guests from Bosnia in Bucharest.

Andriy Korniychuk

@[Rosemary Forest](1217) I had in mind such processes like protection of human rights, rule of law, democratic governance, prevention of violence. The less favorable scenario is a reactive one - to increase the ownership is to wait for an external stimulus from the perspective of that individual. In the case of Europe, we could wait for the new "coal and steel community" as it happened in 1950s in response to two wars having that favourable momentum to change things due to fresh memories of the atrocities. Climate change might emerge (maybe it already has) as a modern contender that could change the thinking from exclusivity to inclusivity (doesn't matter the identity, it affects us all). In terms of everyday motivation of people to join protection/prevention efforts, we do struggle a lot at PAX (as

everyone else) in terms of finding mobilizing factors for average citizens as active ones are always a minority. I think that it's important to facilitate a paradigm shift from representative governance (democracy) to participatory one (or a mix of both to start with), having that citizen-centred approach more visible when average citizen no longer feel that they are detached from decision-making or need to delegate the decision-making to someone at all times. At least in academia, the discussion is going for a while on how should we approach collective decision-making considering all the latest developments. This is a bulk of work that also has to do with using technology for the greater good. There is research suggesting that virtualization of civic space can be also conducive to building social capital. I reckon this discussing might be too theoretical/academic at the moment. Simpler solution that I find thought-provoking is to illustrate in the frame of pevention for people not only the added value but actually the consequences of current state deteriorating (violence breaking out). If we have a Europe Day in the EU, one could show what happens if there is no peaceful and united Europe – symbolically or even practically for a day or two close borders, take away certain rights. In case of identity-based violence, at least attempt to switch perspectives. What we did at PAX recently, we launched an initiative Saving the EU as peace project and proposed different scenarios of Europe in 2040. In one of the cases, Europe is at war and Europeans end up as asylum seekers. We actively debate these scenarios with different groups of citizens, try to have certain discussion points as part of the more general discourse.

Dan Nash

@[Timea Spitka](1484) I must echo the sentiment of @[Gabriela Ghindea](1457): having seen the effectiveness of grassroots organisations when it comes to deradicalisation, I do not agree that large instutitions like the EU are the best "voice": while our institutions *must* support us, particularly when it comes to funding for researchers and efforts by law enforcement to crack down on hate speech, I believe it might be more fruitful to encourage grassroots organisations to take a targetted approach against specific instances or demographics who are at risk of committing identity-based violence. Proponents of identity-based violence are often anti-establishment in nature and a lot of their misinformation specifically target larger institutions like the EU (Kalergi plan, white replacement, "new world order" e.t.c.). To me, it doesn't feel appropriate to create a "channel" in which our message is communicated but rather a framework in which those who campaign and work against identity-based violence are supported, funded and trained. I would love to hear examples of centralised initiatives by the EU which you feel have been particularly successful

---

Dan Nash

@[Andriy Korniychuk](1450) I think the point regarding the active protection of human rights being important for economic stability is an incredible one: too often are governments with laissez-faire approaches to human rights protections seen as having positives like "good for the economy" or "stable". In terms of social media and how the availability of misinformation & "political fatigue" play hand in hand: this does seem like a

structural issue. When sites like YouTube prioritise for engagement, content which doesn't provide instant solutions or gratification for those who have already started being radicalised will never be as widely viewed by content which does provide these things. In response to that, I would like to bring your attention to the online phenomenon of "response" videos, particularly when it comes to those in the alternative influencer network: content creators will create informal responses to videos which are particularly rife with disinformation (often encouraging identity-based violence through supporting conspiracy theories or encouraging "political fatigue" through the perception that it's all a sham). There are many examples, but it feels inappropriate to link specifics: but generally, if advocates of identity based violence are attracting attention through a particular medium we might find it helpful to represent ourselves on the same platform, or through the same medium. Whether it would catch the same virality is another issue.

Dan Nash

For background, I am a cyber security researcher who has done a lot of work around gathering lots of information from publicly available sources (referred to as "open source intelligence"). Currently, I am working on a project which indexes the relationships between mainstream far-right groups on Telegram and how they interact with explicit neo-Nazi, white supremacist and other identity-based violent groups. When it comes to online content creators and public figures on the far-right who are responsible for putting fringe ideas into the public consciousness (for particular examples, we can use white replacement, or anything regarding George Soros) they seem to benefit from a plausible deniability: we would find it unacceptable for mainstream politicians to share content from explicitly violent extremist groups. However, when they raise the same talking points and in some cases share media which was produced by the same extremists there seems to be difficulty to correctly attributing this. Do any participants have experience with cataloguing or indexing what explicit, public proponents of identity-based violence are talking about? How they frame their arguments? I believe a key part of ensuring that we limit the impact of identity-based violence has on our society is to limit how easy it is for public figures who enjoy mainstream attention to lift explicitly violent talking points/collaborate with known violent extremists and yet have the deniability of "It's just a joke" or similar.

Gabriela Ghindea

@[Jens Petersson](1449), Thank you! From our experience, national mechanisms are interministerial or interdepartmental, officially established bodies that have, as their mandate, the prevention of atrocity crimes. Essentially, their role is to lead the development of coordinated state policy for atrocity prevention on behalf of their government. In terms of structure, the mechanisms look different in each state and reflect the societal and political needs of that country. However, there are some core features, in terms of the offices that are a part of these bodies. They always have ministries of foreign affairs, ministries of justice, ministries of interior, but often also high human rights authorities like the ombudsman's office, at the table etc. For instance, in Tanzania, there

are not only different government offices that are a part of the mechanism, but also civil society organizations, representatives of academia and the private sector, that also sit alongside their government counterparts. From our experience, in countries in East Africa, it's very important to have these different societal actors involved in policy development because they play a crucial role in prevention, considering the conflicts and crises that they are trying to prevent. The Tanzanian National Committee for Genocide Prevention or the Kenyan National Committee for Genocide Prevention, are well established in that they have been running programs for many years. They have a long history of outputs for atrocity prevention. They have been conducting training programs for their officials, as well as members of society. However, the process of establishing a mechanism is very lengthy, an ongoing activity. Essentially, there are three major stages of the development of national mechanisms. The first is an informal stage, with irregular or informal activities between and among different departments or ministries within the government that start to coordinate policy development together. But they don't call it a national mechanism, and there is no formalization (a written mandate) to it. Horizontal coordination is a very normal function of government. But it is important to identify these processes as the beginnings of what could lay a foundation for a mechanism because it is often that these are the foundations. At this point, if there exists a dialogue with the State, one could possibly suggest coopting also other human rights institutions into the structure. The next stage is that of an emerging national mechanism when offices take a decision to formalize this structure. An example of an emerging mechanism at an early stage of emergence would be Ecuador, where they have taken a decision to turn their reparations program into a national mechanism. Until the final stage of institutionalization, which would include a formalization by the legislature, as well as a formalized budget, which is essential, I would say there are plenty opportunities to try to become a part of them. The dialogue with key-institutions is vital.

Elisabeth Pramendorfer

Hello everyone! Grateful for the brilliant team at Protection Approaches to facilitate all these highly relevant discussions around identity-based violence and effective prevention and for all the participants for sharing their experience and insights. I am joining in from the Global Centre for R2Ps office in Geneva. A couple of thoughts on the question "What are the barriers for global best practice to the current prevention crisis inside Europes borders?". We at the Global Centre for the Responsibility to Protect work very closely with a large number of European governments, both through their missions in NY and Geneva and in the context of our R2P Focal Points Network, which is comprised of capital-based government officials. These partnerships are often of crucial importance for mobilizing action to respond to atrocities (or a a risk of potential atrocities) outside of Europe. Our engagement in Geneva specifically is focusing to a great extend on early warning and early action, as Geneva-based human rights mechanisms are often times the first ones to raise alarm about risk factors. Here, there is full and outspoken recognition by most of our European partners that incitement to violence, hate speech, inflammatory rhetoric, identity-based marginalisation, discrimination or violence can, and often do, constitute such risk factors, and require immediate attention and robust response. Nevertheless, as

mentioned, this only applies to situations located in zones of instability or conflict far away from Europe. Neither R2P, atrocity prevention, "early warning" or tackling root causes of violence and hatred is understood by many western states to refer to themselves internally to the same extent as it constitutes a foreign policy issue; this was also highlighted by the UNSG in his 2019 Annual Report on R2P. I believe this is to a large extent based on the assumption that atrocity prevention only concerns action taken when there is an immediate risk of war crimes, crimes against humanity, genocide or ethnic cleansing - "late prevention", which applies to Syria, South Sudan and Myanmar, but not to Hungary or Austria. To sum up therefore, I believe one of the greatest barriers is that European actors - most importantly governments - need to have the (political) will to recognize that atrocity prevention begins at home, and that no society is immune. Western nations do not hesitate to take the lead to share their "best practices" with countries they associate with R2P and atrocity prevention, but are refusing to understand that they are themselves responsible for maintaining legitimate and accountable national institutions and government policies supporting diversity, all of which is at the core of effective prevention. Here, both civil society and a pluralistic media can have a crucial impact on countering dangerous rhetoric which may facilitate identity-based violence and other risk factors or early warning signs. Hence, it is important to encourage dialogue on how states not only have a responsibility to assist other states to uphold R2P, but first and foremost to strengthen atrocity prevention (including structural prevention through addressing discrimination, hate speech, and dangerous rhetoric) domestically - and why this applies and matters to them - "no country is immune to atrocity crimes". Political manipulation of existing or perceived tensions or inequality is not only a defining feature of many of todays armed conflicts or atrocity situations, it has also become a tool used by European authorities as a response to the "migration crisis", justifying the criminalisation of asylum seekers, refoulement and strict anti-immigration legislation. Discourse around R2P and atrocity prevention therefore also needs to include how prejudice and stigmatisation of refugees and migrants, to give only one example, may not only exclude certain people and communities from legal protection frameworks, but also provides a justification for acts of violence against vulnerable groups. In addition, it is important to understand that it is not only conflict, poverty, or lack of good governance that can trigger perceived instability or fear, but also a sudden change to societal order, including a so-called "crisis" of migration. This, also, creates a context in which societies are particularly receptive for marginalisation and violence. As mentioned above, though, there is little recognition that current political trends, including growing xenophobia or the growth of anti-immigration policies, in fact, forms part of a "prevention crisis" as such - hence, in my opinion, creating a barrier for subsequent discussions. A very last word on "effective prevention" and identifying risk factors/early warning: I do believe that specifically for the European context, Geneva-based human rights mechanisms are of crucial importance to contribute to discussions around atrocity prevention on a domestic level. I am particularly thinking of the work of thematic special procedures mandate holders - including e.g. the Special Rapporteurs on minority rights, migrants, racial discrimination, xenophobia or freedom of believe, which all have a unique mandate to advise states and report concerns on emerging patterns of violations - not only for states which usually are associated with "atrocity

prevention", but also for example addressing my very own government, located in the heart of Europe. In addition, the Universal Periodic Review also provides a very useful and important mechanism to apply best practices and emphasize the need for structural prevention in countries which are not at imminent risk of atrocities. Together, these are crucial mechanisms for understanding early warning and structural prevention and response regardless of which "stage" of prevention a country is in. Looking forward to the discussion!

Peter Tatchell

@[Gabriela Ghindea](1457) Hi Gabriela, in the UK we have successfully persuaded the government to include in the curriculum discussions about diverse forms of prejudice, discrimination and hate crime. The implementation of this requirement is however quite patchy: some schools do it very well, others less so. Our mantra is that no child comes out of the womb with prejudice. That is learned behaviour. If prejudice can be learned, then it can be prevented or unlearned through effective educational interventions. Work on anti-racism has in particular led to a dramatic decline in racism among young people, who have been through this education process.

Peter Tatchell

@[Francine Esther Kouablan](1474) Thanks for your feedback and perspective. While it is very necessary to affirm and defend the identity of marginalised social groups, we have found in the UK that it is also important to avoid the fragmentation and polarisation of identities by simultaneously promoting ideas around our common humanity. Do you have any similar experience?

Peter Tatchell

@[Timea Spitka](1484) Congratulations on your perserverance under difficult, dispiriting circumstances. Are there specific things that you would want the EU to do? What about other international bodies like the UN etc.?

Peter Tatchell

@[Francine Esther Kouablan](1474) What funding do you get for the great work you do? And how many people do you reach? Can you give us an example of a success you've achieved?

Peter Tatchell

@[Gabriela Ghindea](1457) I agree with your thoughts on a holistic approach. As an example: in the UK, anti-racist, women's rights and LGBT organisations have often worked in partnership with the government, police, schools and other official institutions to tackle hate crime. This includes acting as a go-between between police and the public where some black people, for example, based on past negative experiences are reluctant to go directly to the police. Another example: child welfare and protection agencies work with

the police to tackle child sexual abuse and have submitted very powerful and effective evidence to the current government inquiry. Of course, there is always the danger that groups or their representatives can be co-opted by the authorities or used as PR and windowdressing to suggest a serious engagement by officials when the reality is much less satisfactory. Do any of you have experience of this?

Peter Tatchell

Hi all. What, in your experience, is most important and effective in the first instance: changing the law, or changing public attitudes? In the UK, the main LGBT organisation, Stonewall, had an exclusively law-reform focus to end anti-LGBT legislation. The other significant LGBT organisation, OutRage! recognised the importance of legal equality, but also the necessity to bring the public with us, so much of its work focussed on information and education to change hearts and minds. It reasoned that if public opinion shifted in favour of LGBT equality, then politicians would be more likely to enact equal treatment in law and legal protection against discrimination. So for example, parliamentarians were very reluctant to fully end the criminalisation of same-sex relations, but after we succeeded in winning clear majorities in favour, according to public opinion polls, the politicians eventually felt brave enough to enact the necessary reforms.

Gabriela Ghindea

Hi @[Peter Tatchell](1487) , it is great to hear that these initiatives were successful in the UK. I could also name here exemplary an interesting project initiated by the Elie Wiesel Institute, in cooperation with the Foundation Remembrance Responsibility Future, called WITHOUT HATE, which targets the main themes of hate speech from several online-platforms and attempts to provide counternarratives. The project also provides a kit for teachers how to address these topics. However, up to this point, these efforts have not been sufficient, and hate speech and distortion remain very persistent. This is particularly true of online hate speech targeting the Roma, which is apparent when viewing the comments left after articles calling for the inclusion of vulnerable groups. While Romania has had some success in the field of Holocaust education, concerns remain. In the core curriculum, the number of hours of history overall has decreased, incoming history teachers have not been properly trained to teach students about atrocities from the past/ prevention, etc. It is alas a persisting education problem on so many levels.

Peter Tatchell

@[Andriy Korniychuk](1450) Thanks for your helpful observations.

Peter Tatchell

@[Naomi Gichuru](1486) Appreciation re your contribution. As a practical example: I have some knowledge of the severe persecution (including violence) inflicted on LGBT refugees who have fled persecution in Uganda and sought a safe haven in Kenya. They're being threatened and assaulted by fellow refugees in the camps. Those who escape to Nairobi

face vigilante violence from the local population and even alleged assaults by the police. All efforts to educate and mediate have come to nothing. The UNHCR has seriously failed in its responsibility to protect these vulnerable LGBT refugees. It is really hard to see a positive way forward in this toxic homophobic atmosphere. Surprisingly, and shockingly, Kenyan LGBT groups are not interested: they say refugees are outside their remit, or that they don't have staff or funding, but that's a bit implausible given that they seem to have done absolutely nothing at all, not even a modest effort.

Velma Saric

Hello everyone! Thank you for your engaging and insightful comments thus far on this subject. On the topic of effective prevention approaches, my organization has conducted a variety of projects that range from reconciliation efforts through contact interventions to youth education and training. Yesterday, I talked about our Ordinary Heroes program. For those that may not have seen this post, the program facilitates discussions for youth and exhibits photos and stories of moral exemplars — heroic helpers who risked their lives to rescue members from other groups during the time of war. Research on the effectiveness of this program and similar projects confirms that contact-based interventions which employ stories of moral exemplars have positive effects on participants' willingness to forgive outgroup members, both victims' and perpetrators' perspectives toward reconciliation, improving damaged intergroup relations, and increasing participants' belief in humanity. PCRC also understands the role that social media plays in promoting disinformation and contributing to political fatigue, a subject which @Dan Nash has delved into in this forum. Acknowledging the role of youth in combatting these trends, PCRC has partnered with the International Organization for Migration (IOM) to equip young people with the tools and knowledge to launch "countering violent extremism" (CVE) campaigns on social media. As part of the program, 125 young people from around BiH were taught the basics of CVE social media campaign creation including messaging design, graphics design and selection, audience targeting, and social media best practices. These young people have been placed into municipal teams to formulate an idea for their CVE campaign targeted to other youth in their municipality, and therefore addressing relevant local issues. A mentorship program followed this initial training, with each team launching their campaign at the conclusion of this program. While we fully endorse the role of youth and individual actors in civil society, we also recognize that collaboration is integral to achieving long-term, structural impact. With this understanding, we worked with the United Nations Office for Genocide Prevention and the Responsibility to Protect (UNOGPRP) to initiate the Western Balkans Coalition for Genocide Prevention (WB_CGP) in May 2017. The Coalition provides a formal platform for collaboration and information exchange among 30 leading CSOs and NGOs in the Western Balkans. Examples of our work include drafting the Regional Action Plan of 2017, which supports working collaboratively to: educate youth and other decision-making bodies about the impact of their decisions, create campaigns to encourage online activism against hate speech, lobby for the adoption of appropriate legislation, and advocate for improved vetting processes of stakeholders that impact the peace process. Such collaborations often occur in the form of trainings and sharing of information to achieve the long-term goal of increasing the

participating organizations' capacity to prevent, identify, and respond to genocide and mass atrocity crimes.

Peter Tatchell

@[Rosemary Forest](1217) I agree that campaigns that trigger an emotional reaction of support tend to be more effective than more cerebral and theoretical campaigns (although there is a role for both). For example, in seeking to overturn anti-gay laws in Britain, being able to produce victims of homophobia to testify about their own personal suffering was probably the most effective tactic to win public opinion and change the law. When we made homophobic persecution personal and gave it an individual face, the public tended to be more engaged and sympathetic, as did the media and politicians.

Peter Tatchell

@[Jens Petersson](1449) I agree and share your concern. The requirement of consensus often holds back serious action against discrimination and hate crime.

Gabriela Ghindea

@[Dan Nash](1440) , Thank you for your pertinent comment and question. I am also very interested if there are consistent studies on public figures who shared irresponsible content (explicit hate speech or innuendos) and were not held accountable for it in any form, despite the public outcry, because it is "only shared content".

Peter Tatchell

@[Dan Nash](1440) In the UK, one of the most effective organisations challenging hate groups is a small NGO called Hope Not Hate - it is independent of government and has succeeded in exposing far right groups by infiltrating them and then releasing the evidence the infiltrator has acquired. Much of its leverage is moral and publicity-based rather than legal. It is probably one of the most effective groups exposing/challenging far right identity-based prejudice and violence.

Dan Nash

@[Peter Tatchell](1487) I'm familiar with their work: inspiring stuff. I'm thinking more in terms of projects like Unicorn Riot's "Discord Leaks" project: for those unaware, Discord is a platform which hosts public/private chat rooms, usually per locale / subject. It was used extensively by fringe political groups on social media to move from public "edgy humour" to explicit violence, and again in the organising of the Unite the Right rally in Charlottesville. Their work is important because, as we've seen, these fringe social media figures move on to more mainstream politics: Mark Meecham, Carl Benjamin and Paul Joseph Watson here in the UK with UKIP. Building a dataset of these "private" (read: public, but only available through an invite link or a shared post) interactions might help dispel some of that plausible deniability.

Andriy Korniychuk

@[Gabriela Ghindea](1457) This will not answer the question but it reminded of an initiative in Ukraine called VoxCheck which aim is to fact-check what politicians say and thus confirm whether their statements correspond to the factual situation. Done on a regular basis. Recently, its team was invited to mainstream TV shows during elections campaign, sometimes providing that on spot fact-checking to what guest speakers were saying in the studio and you would see an example of societal control (on live TV). Their focus, however, is usually on the economy but it would interesting to see whether it can be broadened to include more areas and topics and actually also indicate clearly "shared content".

Cristina G. Stefan

Good afternoon from Leeds, joining the discussion later in the day. Many of the successful examples mentioned in this space bring out a key message to carry on moving forward, namely the "holistic endeavour" of various stakeholders as @[Gabriela Ghindea](1457) and @[Andriy Korniychuk](1450) put it earlier. The examples above illustrate that it is indeed possible to speak with "one voice" and that collectively, all of us, as various stakeholders can identify a "common language" in regard to protection and prevention of (identity-based) violence. This message is paramount especially when considering the work researchers do, to show why studies and research projects are much more than simply theoretical exercises but a necessary part of the researchers-civil society-practitioners constructive dialogue showcasing how identity-based violence has such wide-reaching implications (on economy, investments, our lives).

Gabriela Ghindea

@[Andriy Korniychuk](1450) We have similar platforms in Romania, that have developed advocacy tools, with the goal to encourage especially young citizens to engage in accountability and government responsibility initiatives. The focus is on fact-checking, anticorruption, transparent justice, public spending, etc. They also have very useful civic education infographics (for ex. Funky Citizens). We have also several NGOs, but also governmental institutions who monitor the press and signalize messages with antisemitic, racist, anti- LGBTI content. The anti-discrimination laws are also aligned with the EU-framework. However, often there is a profound discrepancy between the existing legislative framework and its transfer to reality, having several front-line politicians or public persons posting or sharing on social media controversial content without any repercussions whatsoever. I was wondering if there are consistent studies about political careers built on this patterns to attract votes, hopefully with examples of successful campaigns against them.

Dilia Zwart

In terms of 'what works,' I wanted to delve a bit deeper into how education can be a powerful tool for not only reducing violence but also affecting long-term change by

transforming attitudes and behaviours. Of course, education is not a panacea, and can even be exploited to create division, but through a multidimensional approach with other sectors it can lay the foundation for sustainable peace. I have seen in previous threads discussion around civics education, digital literacy, human security, and positive peace – all important aspects of education for peace. Peace education is a powerful tool for long-term change because it not only teaches about these different concepts, but also equips learners with the attitudes and skills they need to engage in informed, meaningful action. In such a way, peace education has a social purpose and can nurture in young people a sense of civic responsibility. I see this as very much in line with what @[Olivia Marks-Woldman](1475) shared about HMDT's model of know, feel and do. In order for learners to get to that point of 'doing' there needs to be a process of learning and reflection. Peace education is not just about what is taught in terms of knowledge and content – but also about how it is taught and very much depends on the learning environment. Research shows that a 'whole-of-school approach' is the most effective way to ensure attitudinal and behavioural change is long lasting. In light of this I thought it might be interesting to share some examples of whole-of-school best practice that I have observed through my research as well as experience working in the UK and BiH, including but certainly not limited to - • There is no 'one size fits all' as mentioned by @[Peter Tatchell](1487)– approaches need to be tailored to local community and individual school needs; • Engage and train school staff on an ongoing basis so that they can feel confident to model the attitudes/behaviours of peace education and constructively transform conflict in schools; • In and outside the classroom, emphasise experiential and participatory learning, and encourage learners to connect new knowledge and experiences with local and global affairs; • Actively engage students in peacebuilding initiatives such as through peer mediation or inclusive student government; • Engage parents or carers so that they also feel confident modelling peace education attitudes/behaviours and feel included in the learning community; • Create safe classrooms and wider school environments that promotes inclusiveness and respect, such as through restorative practice and administrative policies that reflect equality and non-discrimination; • Engage policymakers to ensure legislation supporting peace education is implemented; • Find ways to bring young people together around shared interests to promote meaningful interaction with the 'other.'

Gabriela Ghindea

I also want to share with you a successful example at the intersection of the two threads: a tool in prevention work and campaigning because it was also a lesson for us to think outside the box. In our work we focus on education, networking, technical assistance programs, and our main dialogue partners are governments. This year, however, we became visible for the wider public by organizing at the Biennale in Venice a complete pavilion on atrocity prevention. ARTIVISM: The Atrocity Prevention Pavilion is a project that through art urges people to confront head-on the consequences of genocide while bringing them together and empowering them to become agents of change. The artworks exposed at the Pavilion create a personal connection with communities and/or victims of mass atrocities, generating an individual sense of urgency to compel the public to take part

in prevention and peacebuilding. In this context, Artivism provides also concrete actions that visitors can take according to each individual's availability: 60 seconds, 60 minutes or 60 days. Ultimately, the exhibition aims to show that everyone has a role to play in genocide prevention, which is both an individual and collective responsibility. I encourage you to visit it at least online if you cannot make it until November to Venice. This project has proved to us that there are plenty of creative ways to engage with the public and to transform fatigued bystanders into responsible citizens, if not activists. https://www.artivism2019.com/ Have you ever organized something "out of the box", given the profile of your organization that proved to be a great success?

Hugo Lucas
It's good to see a strong focus on education, holistic programs and strong communities in this discussion. I would be interested to hear about some more "out-there" ideas that people have put into practice and used to their advantage - harnessing the power of the media like @[George Weiss](1477) has done, for example. Does anyone have any examples they'd like to share?

Gabriela Ghindea
@[Dilia Zwart](1456) Thank you for your thoughtful observations! We have made similar experiences in our Educational Policies Program.

Gabriela Ghindea
@[Cristina G. Stefan](1488) Thank you for the comment. I agree. Prevention work should constantly check the latest studies in the field of their practicability and this is possible only through dialogue between different stakeholders!

Gabriela Ghindea
Dear discussion partners, I have to leave now, but it was a true pleasure to read your comments. I have learned a lot today from your vast experience in the field. You are doing an amazing job and I am looking forward to meeting you again. All the best & lots of success! Gabriela

---

Hugo Lucas
@[Gabriela Ghindea](1457) Thanks for your moderation Gabi!

Gregor Hofmann
Hello everyone from Germany. Sorry for joining the discussion so late, but thank you for all your inspiring thoughts. I want to add one last thought that has been mentioned in other comments, too: the idea of not saying nothing. What do I mean by that? We are currently observing the rise of right-wing populism. And a major problem is that the protagonists of these movements have difficult relationships with the truth and objective facts and they

get away with it. People that are supportivebof those parties and movements do not seem to care. The important thing for them seems to be that someone is against the so-called liberal-cosmopolitan mainstream. Hence, it seems to me that it is of upmost importance to challenge the lies and "alternative facts" of right-wing populist wherever possible in order to convince those that are not yet ideologically socialised that alternative facts do not go hand in hand with real political alternatives. Hence, one must not stay quiet and should not shy away from engaging with those people that seem at least quietly supportive of right-wing parties. (Sorry for any typos, I have to use my mobile)

Francine Esther Kouablan

@[Peter Tatchell](1487)We receive funding, but that is not enough to allow us to do whatever we want. That's why we use donations, and this is the hardest thing to have because the world of patrons who help the causes we defend is difficult to access. Our resources also come from the training and entertainment we provide in certain structures that call on us to train either their staff or their own public. The lack of material and financial means, remain a big handicap in the associative world.

Francine Esther Kouablan

@[Peter Tatchell](1487) At MRAX we try to avoid polarization on a particular community. The past has not always been simple for our structure. But our mission and beliefs require us to treat all communities equally. However, the fact remains that each community has its particularities. It is to ensure that in all our actions, everyone can find their place. I do not know if I answer your question, but do not hesitate to raise me.

Timothy Plum

I work in the loyalist community in Northern Ireland among former and present paramilitaries. While the community as a whole has forsaken violence, there is still people that cannot forget or forgive the past. In NI, IBV has expanded due to Brexit. The rhetoric from the supporters in Great Britain has made immigrants unwanted and fearful. Interestingly, in NI the "other" is not first immigrants, rather its Catholics. The "us v. them" is still stuck in 100 years ago. With the struggle around IBV in NI mostly between natives (higher percentage, not exclusive) the options to limit IBV are more narrow. No sitting government makes enforcement or policy impossible to garner. Much of the work at prevention is among community-based groups, working from EU Peace Programme or USAID funding. While successful at a certain macro level the communities are not safer, The IBV has passed to the younger generation and education is a segregated, piecemeal approach. One group called ACT Initiative has worked across communities while remaining focused on its own loyalist community inside the country. A tightrope that is harder to traverse under Brexit.

Laura Livingston

Thank you all for this fascinating discussion and hello from Washington, DC! Over Zero's work focuses on leveraging communications to counteract identity-based violence and other forms of group-targeted harm. We've been working in Central Europe and the United States for the past few years, and are excited to learn from other approaches. In designing interventions for identity-based violence in all forms — from hate speech to violence — we've found it's helpful to consider and respond to the broader context that the concerned speech/violence is interacting with. This includes not just the speech itself, but the reasons why it's resonating — whether the history it's tapping into, the tensions between relevant groups/actors, the social norms its promoting, and the the group identities and divisions its reinforcing. Using this contextual understanding as a starting point, we layer in insights from disciplines like social psychology, neuroscience, communications, and linguistics, as well as from marketing, tech, and peacebuilding to further examine the problem and develop responses. What does this look like in practice? Often it means bring different groups and sectors together at the grassroots level to engage in collective problem-solving. This involves convening NGOs, community leaders, others with deep contextual knowledge, researchers across different fields, and representatives from the private sector to pool their collective understanding and experiences and together design and test different interventions tailored to the specific context.

Peter Hassan Tijani

In order to reduce identity-based violence and hate speech in Nigeria and Africa contest, it is necessary to continuously use grassroots approach, efforts must be made to increase capacity supports (technical and funding) for grassroots and local CSOs and actors to make the campaign against identity based violence community based issues, this will address it gradually and will bring about inclusiveness and understanding. Also policy makers must be engaged to foster strong measures to end identity based violence and hate speech and hate crimes. sensitization and awareness campaigns and human rights education are always key to reducing identity based violence, hate speech and hate crimes.

Peter Hassan Tijani

There must also be strong international sanction against countries and individual politicians/leaders found wanting or found promoting hate speech, mass atrocities and identity based violence.

Timea Spitka

@[Peter Tatchell](1487) - I would the EU to speak with one voice and be consistent in its approach. Because of the Holocaust and cases of anti-Semitism, EU is commonly hesitant to take a stance plus Israel has been able to buy off the small states and foster divisions. I also feel that human rights and well being of civil society appear to be less important than bilateral trade, including military sales. The UN faces even deeper divisions because of US veto in the Security Council and it lacks EU's financial clout. Though EU, I feel has yet to really use its clout.

Timea Spitka

@[Rosemary Forest](1217) This is a very important point. Yes I think that European civil society could have a strong role in getting the EU speak out more in a single voice on important issues and call it out when there are serious contradictions. I am afraid I do not, perhaps others might.

Andreas Andreou

I'd like to share something that I shared also yesterday (Day 1, Discussion: Linkages between... since it is relevant here as well. The below is an example of effective work towards tackling hate speech online. Of course there are much more that are needed to happen. I'd like to share about the Monitoring of online hate speech in the framework of the Code of Conduct on countering illegal hate speech, hoping that it will be helpful. I'd like to emphasise that it is important, when discussing the topics that we discuss here, to pay attention also at the online world which on its own poses serious challenges but also it interrelates and affects the offline world. In May 2016 the European Commission agreed with Facebook, Microsoft, Twitter and YouTube a "Code of conduct on countering illegal hate speech online" in an effort to prevent and counter the spread of illegal hate speech online. The implementation of the Code of Conduct is evaluated through a regular monitoring exercise which is set up in collaboration with a network of organisations located in the different EU countries. The organisation I work at, Aequitas, is the only NGO from Cyprus which participates and monitors online hate speech in the Cypriot online context. Using a commonly agreed methodology, the organisations test how the IT companies are implementing the commitments in the Code. There were 4 monitoring exercise periods until today (August 2019). The last evaluation shows that this initiative delivers successful results: the companies are now assessing 89% of flagged content within 24 hours and 72% of the content deemed illegal hate speech is removed. Among others, the code of conduct provides that the IT Companies, commit: • to have in place clear and effective processes to review notifications regarding illegal hate speech on their services so they can remove or disable access to such content. The IT companies to have in place Rules or Community Guidelines clarifying that they prohibit the promotion of incitement to violence and hateful conduct; • Upon receipt of a valid removal notification, the IT Companies to review such requests against their rules and community guidelines and where necessary national laws transposing the Framework Decision 2008/913/JHA, with dedicated teams reviewing requests; • The IT Companies to review the majority of valid notifications for removal of illegal hate speech in less than 24 hours and remove or disable access to such content, if necessary. According to the European Commission, The EU Code of Conduct is providing a robust response to illegal hate speech online. Two and a half years after its adoption, the Code of Conduct is delivering continuous progress, and the recent evaluation confirms that IT companies provide a swift response to racist and xenophobic hate speech content notified to them. You can check fact-sheets here: https://ec.europa.eu/info/policies/justice-and-fundamental-rights/combatting-discrimination/racism-and-xenophobia/countering-illegal-hate-speech-online_en And you can also contact me directly should you require any further info. My email is

andreas.andreou@aequitas-humanrights.org

Hugo Lucas
@[Laura Livingston](1480) Hi Laura, thanks for your contribution. Can you give a practical example that displays what you talk about in your post?

Discussion: What doesn't work? Past errors

By Kate Ferguson

It's important to be able to talk about the failures and limits of certain approaches. In civil society, as in academia and policy-making, there are actions that look good, and feel good, but don't actually help to solve the underlying problem. Sometimes interventions do more harm than good.

This thread is about unpacking those actions, as well as looking at past mistakes of the different sectors we represent.

Questions

- What have we failed to do, as a collective?
- Are there particular failures of civil society, academia, and policy-making that should be better learned from?
- What strategies do you or your organisation use to minimise mistakes, and learn from the ones you make?

Responses

Hugo Lucas
Hi all, This thread will be a useful way to examine actions and interventions that don't actually solve the problem. Whether that's (for example) flashy fundraising events that cost as much to put on as they end up raising, or specific techniques that might work in other contexts, but don't when the aim is to reduce identity-based violence. Looking forward to reading your thoughts - and feel free to share your own past mistakes anonymously if you prefer!

Andriy Korniychuk

Organizational learning comes to mind, which can be viewed as a goal internally and externally (exchange of information and best practices with others). If you are part of a larger organizational structure, you often notice how easy it is to duplicate the same outputs and ineffective tools/solutions in different regions because there is simply not enough time or lack of internal culture, infrastructure and procedures to share information on a regular basis. So what we try to do in my organization is to think about easier access to colleague's experience through creating a user-friendly database (for a start). Work in the progress at the moment. We did try to conduct so-called "gold-digging" to harvest experience we have internally but the process simply took too long to implement and did not materialize yet in concrete deliverables. Changing the narrative. Seeing mistakes as lessons learned. Taking one step back to take two forward. For me an unsuccessful intervention, tool or project always paves the way for a successful one. So if I made that mistake, you don't have to. This approach is not always visible in a working environment "where you have to deliver", especially with external financial support in mind – a researcher who is expected to find an answer (to that outburst of violence in a given context), an organization to solve a problem. So what happens from my experience is that instead of saying "right, this failed or we should have taken a different path" half-measure is produced to create an impression of progress being made.

Gerrit Kurtz

I think it is important to foster the ability for complexity thinking and nuance, and push back against narratives that are too simplified. I think about campaigning on Sudan/Darfur and South Sudan, particularly in the US. "White saviour" phenomenon was also very visible in the Kony2012 campaign. On South Sudan, there was (and still is in many quarters) this narrative that the civil war came down to a fight for power among two leaders, Salva Kiir and Riek Machar, who purportedly represent their respective ethnic groups, Dinka and Nuer. This approach led to the failed power-sharing agreement in 2015, and the disastrous endorsement of Kiir's power grab after the Juba crisis in July 2016. The problem for civil society and academia is, however, that "it's complicated and multifaceted" is not a catchy narrative that is attractive for busy policymakers. I have seen texts with quite effective negative framings (e.g. "South Sudan's civil war will not end with a peace agreement" by de Vries/Schomerus in 2017), but even they have usually been less clear on how a constructive resolution could look like, except to say that it needs to come through grassroots national dialogue and reconciliation. My (incomplete) strategy to deal with such challenges is to promote transparency, accountability and reflection, both for civil society and policymakers. It may not always be possible to come up with the "grand strategy" to "resolve" a conflict comprehensively. Instead, it is necessary to try to try out narratives and approaches that seem promising, and frequently check whether they are effective, adjusting them if necessary. Such a tolerance for mistakes isn't exactly common among bureaucracies, however.

Hugo Lucas

@[Andriy Korniychuk](1450) I agree: hopefully, in this thread, we can learn from each other's mistakes. Failure is a necessary component of success - you're right that we have to change the narrative!

Andriy Korniychuk

What I also came across several times (not the case of my organization, fortunately) is getting experienced people, albeit with a background, to deal with a certain situation/crisis. So let's say, you get a colleague from country/region A relocated to work in country/region B, where his/her skills do not match the local context. It can go the other way round - having the right person on the ground, but looking for local staff having language proficiency (in English/French you name it) as the main requirement. Both options might quickly undermine the legitimacy of an organization because the community learns that these people have a somewhat limited understanding of what they are doing. Gaining that trust back is costly and difficult.

Rosemary Forest

@[Andriy Korniychuk](1450) I think this is a very important point, we (international community and INGOs) often undermined local actors and their legitimacy by doing this.

Naomi Gichuru

Every approach as its own shortfalls and no one approach can achieve all. However, being in a position to consult widely, use a multi-disciplinary approach so that diverse capacities are brought on board and work together towards the same direction, all set goals can be achieved or improved. Integrating M&E; in the process is also a good measure to progressive monitor achievement /failures and changes made appropriately while also examining other external factors which can hinder performance. Forming strong partnerships with all stakeholders is an added advantage as platform with all becomes more effective where all forces are joined ensure policies and all other recommendations can be effectively implemented, progress monitored and impact measured. Political goodwill or lack of it is one of the main reasons for failure.

Andriy Korniychuk

@[Rosemary Forest](1217) fully agree. Unfortunately, we can also undermine the work of one another. I work a lot in Eastern Europe, Caucasus, Central Asia. Many people have a tendency to refer to organizaitons/actors as Americans, Germans, Dutch, French...not really going deeper into the profile of an organization. Hence, if one organization has a questionable intervention it can impact other actors from the same country at a minimum but could also influence an overall perception of that external support, and the willingness of local communities to cooperate and be open to certain solutions.

Anonymous

What doesn't work is consociationalism. Especially the more rigid versions of it - Lebanon, BiH, Northern Ireland. It doesn't end conflict, but entrenches division, does not create stable govt, and forces politics for generations after to be forced through the ethnic/religious divide of past conflicts. And yet it keeps being repeated, often as a 'short-term' solution that turns into a long-term problem. I am not sure why this lesson is never learned.

Fred Carver

@[Gerrit Kurtz](1468) I think this is a really important point. I've been working with Sabrina White (Leeds) on writing up our Chatham House conference on Kofi Annan's legacy and she's put together some quite interesting thoughts on "managing complexity". I don't want to do her a disservice by paraphrasing but essentially her argument was that inclusivity is a key tool in demanding a hearing for complexity: in other words by advocating for the right for ignored and marginalised groups to participate in the conversation you reveal how many different sides and agendas there are, and therefore require a reckoning with complexity. In other words you make the argument that simplifying is excluding. Again it's an incomplete strategy (and I'm not representing it thoroughly - wait for the writeup for that!) but I think it's a helpful starting point.

Rosemary Forest

@[Anonymous](-1) can you explain what you mean by consociationalism?

Elisabeth Pramendorfer

Hello again! Very interesting discussion on failures of prevention and what we can learn from them - thank you everyone for brilliant inputs and food for thought. I will once again bring in a "Geneva-perspective" to this discussion - based on our experience with human rights mechanisms and early warning. I believe "we" - including governments, civil society, multilateral institutions and mechanisms - still have a lot to learn in terms of putting early warning into actual early action. Information about risk factors of atrocities - including identity based violence, discrimination, marginalisation, and many others - is readily available; in fact, I believe there is so much information available that it has become (or has always been?) almost impossible to digest, analyze, utilize and act in a timely and decisive manner (further exacerbated by limited resources and capacity which Ministries, NGOs, and organisations are often dealing with). With regards to ongoing atrocities in situations such as Myanmar or Venezuela, to give only two examples, data and reports, including by UN mechanisms (most importantly Special Rapporteurs), have been raising alarm about possible systematic human rights violations since years, often decades, identifying early warning signs and risk factors which are likely to further escalate. Yet, this information unfortunately does not receive enough "attention" as would be needed to mobilize effective response at an early stage. This may be because at a certain moment in time, other situations, at a more imminent risk of exploding, require our attention, creating a vicious cycle of "late prevention" and late response, often at times where atrocities have already occured. As a result, then, we tend to focus on post-atrocity measures including

accountability and reconciliation, which of course form a key component and vital aspect of deterrence and future prevention. Nevertheless, I am wondering how it is possible we can shift attention to early, structural prevention, tackling warning signs at the earliest possible stage, instead of "emergency response" to situations that unconsciously have been on our radar for years, maybe decades. I think one important "failure" - or, to frame it differently, "way forward", is to maximize the political impact of information available concerning early warning signs and risk factors. As mentioned, Special Rapporteurs are key actors in identifying such signs and risk factors, long before a situation may escalate into atrocities. Yet, even for someone based in Geneva, not all reports may receive enough attention, let alone result in follow-up action. Utilizing this information, including the recommendations for necessary action given by Special Rapporteurs, at an early stage, can make an important contribution to effective prevention. In addition, maximizing political impact also requires this information to make it beyond the Geneva-human rights bubble. Capitals, regional organisations as well as New York mechanisms should systematically engage with special procedures and the information they provide, and civil society can play an important role in pushing for such an engagement (including, for example, Special Rapporteurs to brief the UN Security Council). Communication and exchange are key for bridging the gap between human rights and atrocity prevention agendas. This is just one of many examples of how we can strengthen effective, long-term, structural prevention. The information is available, but greater focus must be put on how to ensure this information maximizes its political impact on a local, national, regional and international level, and therefore result in early action.

Peter Tatchell

Hi all. One instance where endeavours often fail is when people try to import a model from a different country with a different history, culture, traditions and politics. There is no one-size-fits-all; in my experience it's very important that campaigns are bespoke according to the specific time, place and country. As an example, the Western model of LGBT activism is often not appropriate in developing countries. Each LGBT movement has to be rooted in the culture that it's seeking to influence. To give another example, decades ago, some individuals in India sought to replicate Western-style LGBT groups and their methods and agenda. They had very limited success. Others more successfully focussed on resurrecting acknowledgement of same-sex relations in traditional Hindu culture, and argued that homophobia was a colonial import imposed by Britain in the 19th century. The latter approach gained more public and political resonance over time.

Fred Carver

@[Peter Tatchell](1487) Completely agree, and this strongly resonates with my previous experience working for a western NGO on identity based violence issues in the global south. I think it can be helpful to broaden the question about power between countries to also consider power relations within countries. That way one can clearly differentiate between a problematic external intervention, with colonial baggage, and an attempt at solidarity with oppressed and at-risk groups. (I also think the question of where leadership

is coming from - who is calling the shots - is key here). This can also help flush out the notion of a south-south solidarity against the imposition of "western" rights agendas as a solidarity between political elites in opposition to the solidarity between southern rights defenders. Sorry that's rather glib.

Hugo Lucas

@[Fred Carver](1442) excellent point. How best can we/should we communicate and demonstrate this solidarity, as "western" human rights defenders?

Fred Carver

@[Hugo Lucas](1222) I'm sure others here are much better placed to answer in greater depth, but a few things we tried (this was when I worked for the Sri Lanka Campaign): trying to make as much of our advocacy as possible about amplifying local voices rather than using our own. Linked to this is by having as much of the comms as possible be in local partner's own words rather than ours - regular and highly visible exercises of listening to CSOs and allowing these listening exercises to shape our advocacy (and making sure these listening exercises crossed the various cliques and divisions in civil society) - getting out of the way if, when and as the security situation allowed local civil society to do the job themselves - communicating our value add in being a western NGO (ie answering the "what do we need you for?" question) which in our case was to begin with about the fact that we had a security and ability to be outspoken that local civil society lacked, and later became about access and expertise when it came to influencing decision makers here and in Geneva - having a diverse global advisory group and pushing the centre of gravity of that advisory group to the global south to add legitimacy and credibility - being careful and self critical about language, and about what it is we were doing. For all this I'm sure I didn't always get it right, in fact I know I didn't. But I do think good faith and sincerity also go a long way.

C B

@[Rosemary Forest](1217) It's the 'hard' form of political power-sharing. Often after conflicts - where a political system that is set up that effectively requires political parties, individuals to declare themselves of one religion/confession/ethnicity and then share power. It's often set up supposedly as a temporary measure but in fact entrenches the division. See the political systems in Lebanon, Bosnia-Hercegovina, Northern Ireland, Cyprus.

Hugo Lucas

@[Fred Carver](1442) Thanks Fred that's an excellent series of points!

Andy Fearn

Completely agree with all these points, @[Fred Carver](1442) and actually I think they are important when doing any work in communities where your organisation isn't rooted - including inside our own borders. For example, we are doing a lot of work with communities most vulnerable to hate crime in East London and nearly all of what you said fits that context too. e.g. • amplifying local voices, • listening to communities and ensuring this leads our advocacy, • working to build capacity at local organisations and moving aside where and when this is successful • Asking ourselves if we are best placed to add value – and communicating that value add • Ensuring we have diverse voices advising any projects...

Timothy Plum

My apologies for the lateness of response. One of the biggest failures I see is the belief by funders and NGO's that solutions must be within borders. Solutions that understand problems as without borders, violence in one place is almost certainly copied or learned from another place. Academia is almost entirely reactionary (I'm in academia), policy-makers react to civil society but never with speed. So much bureaucracy has to be moved for action at the government level at that is reactionary. Policy-makers ignore the papers written by academics that look back at events by civil society. A greater understanding of the wider world and removal of the silos of the field will be a small step but ultimately governments need to acknowledge the importance that peace over war has in the world.

Peter Hassan Tijani

We failed to do bottom top approach in our campaign against identity based violence and hate speech, the top to bottom approach have not yielded good results. if the citizens understands the negative impact of hate speech, mass atrocities and identity based violence, and they stand against it, no politicians or ideology will easily push them into committing it. Also inclusiveness was lacking in our approach in the past. Also in Nigeria human rights education is very low especially at grassroots and community levels, if people did not know their rights how can they know the rights of others and protect their rights?.

Andreas Andreou

A particular failure of both the civil society as well as the academia is the inability to reach out to the wider community. Both the civil society (at least in Cyprus where I have experience) as well as the academia work, interact and deliver, mostly (of course there are some exceptions but are limited) to a very narrow circle of persons who usually are already empowered and aware of the issues. Any capacities building, awareness raising and knowledge, quite often is recycled between the 'usual suspects' and there is not much success in reaching the perpetrator or the average unaware person.

Gerrit Kurtz

@[Fred Carver](1442) I am looking forward to the writeup then! Sounds very interesting.

Gerrit Kurtz

@[Elisabeth Pramendorfer](1471) Thanks for your Geneva perspective! Special Rapporteurs are indeed often a great source of information and insight. Conceptually, my approach to this problem that available information does not reach the right people at the right time is to make conflict- and atrocity-sensitivity mainstream in UN Country Teams and embassies, for example through Peace and Development Advisor, whose number has skyrocketed in the past few years. They should be the ones that track things like reports by Special Rapporteurs on their countries, and have a close ear to the ground anyway. I am skeptical whether the solution lies in better formal cooperation between the human rights mechanisms in Geneva and the UNSC in New York. There is so much resistance by China and Russia. Often by the time a situation is serious enough to be discussed at the UNSC, we already take about late prevention. Informally, certainly there should be more cooperation, but I would be careful only to use the political capital that any human rights briefing in the UNSC requires if it could really make a difference.

Day three

Session summary

Over the last two days, we have consulted you on some of the challenges that we face in our work, and some of the tools that can work to face up to those challenges. Today, we've discussed how to build the networks necessary to collaborate effectively against hatred, division, and identity-based violence.

Some participants have continued to add further comments to the topics from earlier days, so if you wish to see how those conversations have continued to evolve, or if any of the summary below prompts more thoughts, please do visit the platform again.

Thanks again to all participants for your time and dedication to this consultation.

How do we work better across sectors?

In the day's first discussion participants have explored how we can work and communicate more effectively. We asked participants to examine the barriers to information sharing; ways of breaking down the obstacles to effective cooperation between researchers, NGOs, wider civil society and the state; and examples of best practice of cross-working.

Key points:

- "The current incentive structures in academia mean that even academics interested in communicating findings to NGOs working for social change struggle to do so, as the way we are expected to report our findings is wholly inaccessible to anyone who doesn't speak the lingo of that particular field." Ruthie Pliskin (Assistant Professor, Leiden University)
- "I find it useful when individuals who are interested in or tend to follow a purely academic path are provided with an opportunity to improve their presentation skills and adapt their knowledge and skills to a more general (labor market) needs, which could help them navigate better between the academia and practitioners worlds." Andriy Korniychuk (Programme manager, PAX)
- "I think being clear in the audiences for different outputs from an academic/NGO collaboration is a crucial step. That way some outputs can still be relevant (and be taken serious by fellow academics) but likewise outputs that are directed at the public or NGO sector use equally accessible (and acceptable) framing and language." Rosemary Forest (Senior Advocacy Officer, Peace Direct)

- "One of the biggest barriers I have faced when working with groups is that they can sometimes take a very narrow approach, often and probably somewhat naturally, working through the frame with which they are most familiar (legal, political, sociological etc.) This is sometimes even evident in the language used to define different stakeholders within the group (lawyer/non-lawyers). Identity-based violence is such a nuanced and multi-faceted issue that it would benefit from understanding, on a number of different levels, which can only come through successful collaboration across actors and sectors." Louise Pyne-Jones (Head of Research, International Observatory of Human Rights)
- "I am also convinced that we need to create a culture of dialogue and that this means investing time and resources on face-to-face/virtual meetings where we can exchange ideas, give and receive feedback, and develop a common language. We tried to do this with the EU Task Force and I think this is why we somehow succeeded (somehow)." Chiara De Franco (Associate Professor of International Relations, University of Southern Denmark)
- "It is not only a huge challenge to strengthen this exchange externally [cross-learning]- with other NGOs, civil society, and governments - but also sometimes challenging to internally keep a constant, daily (or hourly) flow of information and exchange, and to consider how e.g. action/advocacy in NY will influence Geneva, or vice versa." Elisabeth Pramendorfer (Research analyst, Global Centre for the Responsibility to Protect)

Working better across Europe

This thread looked at the power of networks, and asked participants to discussion how, and whether, we can work together across Europe in a more consistent way. Participants were asked to consider if working across borders would increase effectiveness, and what is needed to enable more collaboration.

Key points:

- "Remove travel/mobility barriers and encourage people to people contacts. I have encountered numerous examples when individuals could not travel to another partner country (e.g. to attend a meeting) due to visa regulations or other bureaucratic procedures." Andriy Korniychuk (Programme manager, PAX)
- "One of our strategies to involve our network members was to bring the dialogue directly to the members of the coalition by organizing workshops, seminars, and meetings in each of the Western Balkan countries. Flexibility is a key part of our strategy because rather than waiting on the government to change things, we have to act." Velma Saric (Founder & Director, Post-Conflict Research Center)
- "I think civil society in Europe should develop cross-cutting strategies-engaging moderate voices from immigrants and local- to develop a mechanism of inclusive peace. The inclusive peace, I mean, explain the concepts of peace and tolerance from faith perspective. If faith-based identity can become explosive,

then faith-based solution is a natural deterrence to hate crime and violent extremism." Qamar Jafri (PhD researcher, RMIT University Australia)

Future challenges

During this discussion participants we ask to think ahead and consider future challenges that face our field. Participants shared an array of potential challenges ahead, such as how climate change might empower far-right narratives.

Key points:

- "A particular challenge which may emerge from this is the treatment of asylum seekers fleeing from ecological disaster: current attitudes across Europe on immigration and asylum seekers would (in the event of an ecological disaster) potentially provide popular support for governments who would support violence against those seeking refuge." Dan Nash (Cybersecurity researcher)
- "How to ensure that technology is used as a force for good: Technology can be both a force for good and for evil, a tool for peace as well as for harm and even oppression. Moreover, not only state actors but also non-state actors can wield the power of technology. 'Terrorist' or 'Big Brother'-like dystopias are easily imaginable. While governments often focus on hedging against technological threats from non-state actors and other governments, civil society in particular has a major role to play in monitoring governments and using technology in support of dialogue." Andriy Korniychuk (Programme manager, PAX)
- "A lot of people have considered how the direct effects of climate crisis and ecological collapse might stoke mass population movements, identity-based violence stoked by scarcity of resources, etc. But what has been less considered is how the solutions to the climate crisis might also drive an increase in IBV. For example, the mining industry will be needed to supply many of the materials necessary for large scale PV solar - and many of the minerals required are, or could become, conflict minerals." Hugo Lucas (Senior Policy Officer, Protection Approaches)

Participant-led open discussion

In the final discussion of the day participants were given a space to share thoughts or begin conversations on issues that were not addressed in previous threads. Participants to the opportunity to look at issues such as …

Key points:

- "I wouldn't hesitate to describe myself as a pacifist, but my view is more complex. Is it really a shift from response to prevention we need? Isn't it rather a shift from in-action to action?" Jens Petersson (Senior Advisor, UNA-Sweden)
- "The racist irony, the stereotypes, the offenses, all from childhood affect the personality and self-esteem, giving birth to a spiritual wound carried all the life,

which the Roma generally do not speak, of a kind of embarrassment, or sometimes ignorance. I believe that this problem should become a European concern, as Roma children are also children of the "Tomorrow Europe", and a society that does not care for its children is a society without a future. Tolerance and respect should be the basis of our children's education otherwise we make again the mistakes of the past." Liliana Ene (PhD researcher, National School of Political and Administrative Sciences, Romania)

- "I think one of the most important drivers for identity-based violence is the concept of nationalism. Whether it is Europe, Asia, Africa or Americas forced narrative of nationalism, which might be part of foreign and national security policy, tries to exclude certain groups (religious, race, colour and ideology) from the stakes of nationhood (sense of belonging). At one side it creates alienation in individuals, and far-right extremists (e.g., Daesh, Taliban) might find easy way to recruit youth from across the world to fulfil their desire for nationhood. On the other side, politicians could exploit ingroup threat perception in young individuals, particularly white nationalists, and this threat perception to white identity across Europe has been increasing mass violence directed at racial and faith-based identity of the victims." Qamar Jafri (PhD researcher, RMIT University Australia)

Welcome to day three: Networks and next steps

By Hugo Lucas

Welcome to the third and final session of this online consultation on **Mapping European responses to identity-based violence.**

Over the last two days, we have consulted you on some of the challenges that we face in our work, and some of the tools that can work to face up to those challenges. Today, we're interested in discussing how to build the networks necessary to collaborate effectively against hatred, division, and identity-based violence. Discussion threads for today include:

- How do we work better across the sector? Moderated by Chiara de Franco Go to discussion ⬚
- How do we work better across Europe? Moderated by Velma Šarić Go to discussion ⬚
- Future challenges: the climate crisis and more Go to discussion ⬚

As before, process-wise, it's important to respond directly to the questions in each thread. On each of the threads, please review the questions and then add your responses, as well as reviewing and considering the comments shared by other participants.

You are also encouraged to 'vote up' those comments from other participants that you find particularly insightful.

If you think there are other important topics that we need to add to the agenda, either today or for subsequent days, drop me an email with your thoughts, or you can add a comment here.

Guest moderators: Velma Šarić to moderate a session on working more effectively across. Chiara de Franco to moderate a session on working better across sectors.

Discussion piece: Fred Carver looking forward + Velma Šarić on networks

Remember, if you have any questions or suggestions, please let us know! You can post a message or suggestion in this thread, or email me on hugo.lucas@protectionapproaches.org

Thanks for taking part and we're excited to see how the conversations develop.

Responses

Velma Saric: Prevention of Genocide and Mass Atrocities in the Western Balkans: a United Step Forward

By Velma Saric

Over two decades have passed since the conflict in the Western Balkans began, which followed the dissolution of Yugoslavia. The end of the conflict, which caused the greatest human suffering in Europe since World War II, came with a promise of change, mainly through economic integration within the European Union (Impunity Watch, 2018). Today, the countries of the Western Balkan Region (WBR) are parliamentary democracies, but they are also fragile states. Tensions between different ethnic, cultural, and religious groups, if unaddressed, pose a threat to stability and peace of the region.

To contribute to further development of the region and foster an environment where human rights are respected and theprinciples of transparency, rule of law, and non-recurrence are upheld, the WBR built its first coalition for the preventionof genocide and mass atrocities. The Western Balkans Coalition for Genocide Prevention (WB_CGP) was created by The Post-Conflict Research Center (PCRC), a Sarajevo-based non-governmental organization dedicated to restoring a culture of peace in the Western Balkans, and the United Nations Office for Genocide Prevention and the Responsibility to Protect (UNOGPRP), under the patronage of Adama Dieng, United Nations Special Adviser on the Prevention ofGenocide.

Since 2011, PCRC and UNOGPRP have worked together to design and deliver a series of seminars and trainings for non-governmental (NGO) and civil society organization (CSO) representatives from the Western Balkans working in the fields of transitional justice, human rights, law, youth education, media, and peacebuilding. The overall goals of the trainings were to increase the participating organizations' capacity to prevent, identify, and respond to genocide and mass atrocity crimes. Trainees were educated on the causes and dynamics of genocide and violent conflict, how to recognize early warning signs, as well as what policies and strategies exist for prevention. The trainings focused on educatingparticipants on response strategies, how to report conditions on the ground to the appropriate actors, how to organize local communities to counter inter-ethnic turmoil, and how to use social media and other technologies in their efforts toprevent violent conflict.

After training over 120 representatives from 82 organizations, the overall strategy of the program was shifted to createa regional coalition with an aim to give rise to new processes and joint initiatives for tackling discrimination, hate speech, genocide denial, judicial and media reform, the prevention of violent extremism, dealing with the past andhistorical memory, and other important issues that contribute to region's overall stability. Thus, under the initiative ofPCRC and UNOGPRP, the WB_CGP was officially established in 2017 and currently consists of 30 of the region's leading CSOs and NGOs from Bosnia and Herzegovina, Serbia, Montenegro, Macedonia, Croatia, and Kosovo. By incorporating the ethos of the United Nation's Responsibility to Protect and Sustainable Development Goals, PCRC and UNOGPRP also intend to further educate coalition members on effective communications methods for interacting with host governments and other relevant political, social, educational, and media institutions in order to raise awareness ofproblems and catalyze positive change.

Responses

Fred Carver: The problems of the future will cross borders, so the solutions should too.

By Fred Carver

Populism successfully marries the real grievances of those for whom our global system has not delivered with the anxieties of those whose historical privilege is being eroded. Over the past few years we have seen that the result is a powerful coalition which can command widespread electoral support and exert a significant (perhaps disproportionate) influence on the political discourse. But over time it is inevitable that this coalition will fragment. One cannot simultaneously provide redress to the losers of historical injustice and protect the primacy of the winners. It does not however follow that populism is therefore a short-term phenomenon: repeated cycles of dissolution and outrage are just as likely an outcome: one which has historically led to increases in identity-based violence.

Fake news, and the increasing ideological selectivity of news consumers, has led to a fragmentation of the polis into an overlapping and competing set of ideologically divided poleis. This makes it harder to find common understanding: which depends on shared underlying assumptions. It also leads to a greater tolerance of radical (and frequently intolerant) ideas and makes it easier for would-be perpetrators of identity-based violence to find validation and allies. At the same time, it allows those historically excluded by the mainstream discourse to find an audience for their truths, facilitating solidarity and protection.

Climate change will require the mass movement of populations around the earth. This will place national boundaries under unprecedented strain. Atrocities have already resulted as a consequence of attempts to maintain 20th century notions of national sovereignty and boundaries in a world where far greater flexibility will be required. At the same time the concept of nationality has never been weaker, as identities become fuzzier due to the transnational reach of capital and culture and the lack of regard for borders shown by digital information. Yet if Westphalian notions of the state are dying then they are doing so very noisily; is this nationalism's backlash, its death rattle, or the start of its recovery? And either way what will the consequences be for identity-based violence?

Our global system is far from innocent in the creation of these problems. As they cross borders, so too must the solutions, and so that same global system will be integral to protection from identity-based violence in the future, as it has been in the past. But systems, by their very nature, represent the interests of the powerful, and identity-based violence is at its most dangerous when waged by the strong against the weak. How, then, do we manufacture political will to persuade our global system to act against its own interests and radically redistribute power? And/or can protection be performed more effectively in the presence of our current inequalities?

Discussion: Future challenges

By Hugo Lucas

This thread will consider future challenges.

- Unchecked, what will rising populism, fake news, and population movements mean for European civil society working to prevent, reduce or respond to identity-based violence?
- Where will these trends of rising identity-based violence, climate crisis, and the gradual unknitting of the multilateral, rules-based system take us?
- Can one be effectively prevented without treating the others? Does this crisis also offer opportunity to redress some imbalances embedded in the history and practice of human rights?

Responses

Fred Carver

Hello everybody. I'm really looking forward to facilitating this discussion. Please bear with me, I'll be popping in and out throughout the day but I promise I will read everything and do my best to develop the discussion. In the meantime I know we have the expertise here to have a really interesting conversation. Please don't feel constrained by the tacks taken either in my think piece or the questions here. We've highlighted some specific dynamics which we think could lead to significant challenge in future, but if there's other challenges you feel are important and equally worthy of discussion then by all means bring that up too!

Aurelien Mondon

Hello, One of the challenges we will face as the climate crisis worsens is attempts by the far right to try and hijack it for its own purpose through anti-immigration and overpopulation discourses and eco-fascist politics more broadly. This of course is nothing new and there has always been an ecological focus in parts of the far right (stretching back to the Nazis in particular). However, we can see clear attempts recently to bring this back to the fore as it can help them disguise their reactionary discourses under a veneer of progressivism. We can witness this in traditional far right circles and organisations, but also, perhaps more worryingly in some more mainstream ones. Such ideas, based on flawed and biased

understandings of demographics have also been given legitimacy by opportunistic academics in recent years who have tried to revive long discarded racial theories (including phrenology and eugenics!), couching their shoddy work in pseudo-scientific terms. While I am certainly not arguing that history repeats itself or that the situation today is the same as the 30s (it is not), I think that we must learn from past mistakes and not fall for the strategies deployed by the far right to legitimise and mainstream their ideas. We must avoid debating these people as this lends them credibility, creating false equivalences. For example, the urgency of the climate crisis has been downplayed for a long time by our public discourse being polluted by the idea that unbiased coverage meant having a climate scientist and a climato-sceptic on every media panel. We seemed to have moved on from this recently thankfully, but my concern is that we are heading the same way with issues of identity and racism, where the far right uses flawed free speech arguments to ask for a seat at the table to push some very dangerous ideas. Apologies if this is unclear! It seems this format makes me go on tangents but hopefully there will be a few things of interest in there!

Andriy Korniychuk

Good morning from rainy Netherlands, "The problems of the future will cross borders, so the solutions should too" is a very accurate observation that Fred proposed in his introduction. At PAX recently we've organized a Scenario Exercise on the future of Europe as a peace project, looking at how Europe could look like in 2040 considering all the recent challenges. And we also took into account that many of the challenges will cross borders. For those interested, you can have a look at the full scenario report at https://www.paxforpeace.nl/eu2040 as it contains many interesting details about possible alternative futures (and how they might come about – so called future histories) that were elaborated as a joint effort by participants from various backgrounds coming from the EU, Balkans and Eastern Neighbourhood countries. There's also a short animation for people who might not have time to read the report. We asked two key questions: • Will respect for the EU values remain, or will they be more disregarded? • Will the EU further integrate, or disintegrate? When thinking through the answers to these questions and their implications for democracy, human rights and peace within the EU and the wider continent—the Western Balkans and the Eastern Neighbourhood — we wanted to collect thoughts on possible long-term developments by identifying alternative futures in order to prepare and plan for what lies ahead. We as an organization do not favor a specific scenario but rather try to explore how to make sure the good elements from each scenario might be enhanced while the impact o of negative ones – mitigated. Not going into details of all 4 scenarios, few overarching challenges were identified in that pursuit of developing the positive elements. 1. How to bring internal and external solidarity in line: Both forms of solidarity and EU values are not always aligned and may at times even conflict. A perceived excessive emphasis of liberal politics on external solidarity may lead to a bigger demand for internal solidarity through populism. Similarly, an internal 'peace project' does not necessarily imply an external 'peace project'. 2. How to ensure that technology is used as a force for good: Technology can be both a force for good and for evil, a tool for peace as well as for harm and even oppression. Moreover, not only state actors but also non-state actors

can wield the power of technology. 'Terrorist' or 'Big Brother'-like dystopias are easily imaginable. While governments often focus on hedging against technological threats from non-state actors and other governments, civil society in particular has a major role to play in monitoring governments and using technology in support of dialogue. 3. How to ensure that liberal policies include solutions for those who lose out or feel they lose out from them: The divide between elites and those they claim to represent, between experts and laypeople, between highly educated and less educated citizens, and between urban and rural populations may, if unmanaged, lead to social unrest and populism. The less educated and rural populations in particular may not necessarily benefit directly from globalisation or climate policies, for example. Transparent and inclusive decision making is a minimum requirement. 4. How to put citizens at the centre of all efforts: From the scenario descriptions it appears that the participants in the scenario-building meetings who helped to develop them felt that citizens alone and their civic activity would not suffice to change the outlook of the EU as a 'peace project.' In the scenarios, citizens do not play a major role and groups often do not feel represented by the EU or their governments.

Fred Carver

@[Aurelien Mondon](1448) Thank you. I found that a really helpful and useful intervention. Is there any mileage in turning the argument on its head and using climate justice, and the need to safely manage climate driven migration, as a rationale for a move away from strongly identarian politics?

Hugo Lucas

Hi all, very excited for this thread. One of the things I'm interested in, that you touch on @[Aurelien Mondon](1448), is how the climate crisis will stoke identity-based violence. A lot of people have considered how the direct effects of climate crisis and ecological collapse might stoke mass population movements, identity-based violence stoked by scarcity of resources, etc. But what has been less considered is how the solutions to the climate crisis might also drive an increase in IBV. For example, the mining industry will be needed to supply many of the materials necessary for large scale PV solar - and many of the minerals required are, or could become, conflict minerals. Here's an interesting paper on it: https://www.iisd.org/story/green-conflict-minerals/ Is this something that consultation participants have considered? Planned for? I would be interested to hear what kind of climate prep is being done.

Fred Carver

@[Andriy Korniychuk](1450) Many thanks for this. I'd love to talk about your project further, and opportunities to maybe work together? (My email carver@una.org.uk). We're running a consultation which is a little different but with some overlap, called Together First, it's about identifying the changes needed in global governance to make it fit for the mid-to-late 21st century, and where a critical mass is coalescing around specific ideas. We're soft launched now http://together1st.org and our consultation is already open, but we're doing a full launch with a fun new website in September

Aurelien Mondon

@[Fred Carver](1442) I think there is and it's essential in fact but it would require systemic changes and a severe loss of privilege from parts of the global population of we are to find equitable sustainable solutions. This will be a hard sell obviously, and my concern is strong borders may seem more palatable. This is why it will be essential not to sit on the fence and give these ideas (which are not solutions to our global crises) undeserved air.

Andriy Korniychuk

@[Fred Carver](1442) that also sounds very interesting. I am happy to stay in touch and will definitely follow up to see if we can also join efforts on some activities.

Fred Carver

Alongside future challenges, what do we think about future work? What do you think your, or your organisation's work, is going to look like in the future? (short, medium or long term) How far out are you planning, or does the current political uncertainty caused by populism, climate change, eroding trust in institutions etc... make planning less useful and require a more flexible approach? If any of you have strategic plans that you'd be happy to share (or which are public) please do!

Gerrit Kurtz

I think the growing disconnect within our societies in Europe makes it more difficult to settle on "bold" policies, including on atrocity prevention and multilateral solutions. Furthermore, there is a section of the population that denies facts, not just on the climate crisis, but on IBV, too. The AfD in Germany, of example, also wants refugees to be sent back to Syria right now, which is part of their anti-immigrant stance, of course, but also includes a denial of the fundamental situation on the ground. In other situations, for example in Sri Lanka and Myanmar, fake news online have contributed to pogroms and inter-communal violence. I fear that we are going to see more of this behaviour in the future.

Fred Carver

@[Gerrit Kurtz](1468) Good points. I appreciate its a huge question but: what can we do about that disconnect? And on the denial of fact, what's the counter? Making a better emotional argument? Making a strong case for objective reality? Sidelining and marginalizing forces that deny reality? All/none of the above?

Dan Nash

The responses to this thread have been incredibly interesting: I don't think it's a bold prediction to say that governments & regimes who perpetrate identity based violence will turn the effects of climate change as justifications for violence. A particular challenge which may emerge from this is the treatment of asylum seekers fleeing from ecological

disaster: current attitudes across Europe on immigration and asylum seekers would (in the event of an ecological disaster) potentially provide popular support for governments who would support violence against those seeking refuge. In terms of tackling this, I think the most effective way would be to continue to destigmatise seeking asylum and urge governments to tackle the push factors which encourage people to support political parties who oppose this: for example, in the UK a talking point of the previous main anti-immigration party UKIP (United Kingdom Independence Party, now Brexit Party) is that migration causes increased strain on public services: in my experience, this is a point which resonates with supporters often because not all of their interaction with these services are positive. By addressing the root cause of points like these, we can (hopefully!) limit the support of populist parties and prevent identity-based violence against asylum seekers.

Fred Carver

@[Dan Nash](1440) Nothing really to add here, just wanted to say thanks for a great comment!

Andy Fearn

I find the challenges v frightening – most have been covered by @[Fred Carver](1442) in the initial discussion and by subsequent contributions from other participants. But I'll add a few other bits and pieces that keep me reaching for the scotch… - The increasingly international nature of the movements who seek to spread division - The attack (at least in the UK) on legitimacy of charities who work on international issues or human rights issues, and on international development spending – as the sense of grievance grows at home so does the belief in "we need to help our own first", as the challenges increase, the money will be drying up - Governments (certainly in the UK) are cutting local community services and organisations that knit communities together then spending millions on ill-conceived counter narrative campaigns designed by international comms agencies to tackle the community divides that result - We have very little understanding of how to deal with how technology has changed the content we interact with on a daily basis. This goes far beyond the issues of extremist content or fake news. How do we ensure communities (and especially young people) feel positive about their futures and therefore more resilient against populist narratives when everything they interact with reminds them they don't look good enough, they're not cool enough, they're not rich enough, and they're not having enough fun? - And we can't overstate the challeng we face from climate change – I sometimes think about who of the thousands of young people we've worked with in the last couple of years will remember our messages of being responsible, kind, thoughtful, active global citizens when they're fighting for the last tin of beans in the shop Apologies I'm being gloomy – but I do think we need to be honest with ourselves that the challenges facing us are huge and we're not even close to turning the tide. @[Fred Carver](1442) I love the Together First initiative – we really need bold thinking about how we can make global changes. Also really pleased see so much conversation in today's other threads because it will take us all working together across sectors and geographies to tackle these issues. In

terms of strategies I think we need to remain flexible and dynamic, and test new approaches - but we do so while ensuring that all the work we do is guided by our theory of change. To end on a small positive – while things look bad at the moment and we don't know where they will end up – we can be sure that without all of us doing what we can to push back things would be worse.

Fred Carver

@[Andy Fearn](1438) And that positive is huge. Things might look dark but they could definitely be darker, and the work is clearly needed now more than ever. Thanks for your kind comments on TF!

Hugo Lucas

@[Andriy Korniychuk](1450) I feel that the point you raised earlier in the consultation about "fatigue" is important here - how can we connect those who have never had to fight for freedoms/rights/democracy with the processes in a way that creates and continues an emotional connection with them? It's a canard to say that my generation take for granted the freedoms that we have - but all too often, we do. What's the solution?

Fred Carver

Thanks everyone for great comments and insights. I have to go and rewrite a report now, but you're in very capable hands here with @[Hugo Lucas](1222)

Hugo Lucas

@[Fred Carver](1442) Thanks Fred! Keen to hear your comments, everyone.

Gerrit Kurtz

@[Fred Carver](1442) If I only knew the answer to your questions! I think the work that More in Common has started doing in several countries is promising (https://www.moreincommon.com), but too early. I also think that we need to re-assess the value of large institutions that have held society together in the past: churches, trade unions, associations, political parties. People have left those in droves all across Europe. But they used to bring together people across many divides. It is not easy to see what can replace them in our age. At the same time, I can see all around me that many people are becoming more political, for example join parties. Think about the turnout at the recent EU elections. There are also strong forces countering extremism, and they are gaining strength. This is a time to be more political, to engage, take responsibility, and not shy away from confrontation. On denial of facts, there certainly can be no platform for fact-deniers. It simply doesn't make sense to talk with a climate science-denier about the climate crisis - only if the goal is to expose that person in front of an audience. So such views need to be sidelined and properly challenged and contextualised by the media whenever they appear in the mainstream. More attention to transparency, including about mistakes and errors in reporting, in media, academia and civil society, can also help foster critical thinking. I find it

troublesome that many people then say: oh, you cannot believe anyone anymore, everyone falsifies statistics and only uses the facts that pleases them. In the way that we construct arguments, we need to show that that is not the case.

Jens Stappenbeck

@[Fred Carver](1442) @[Gerrit Kurtz](1468)I'd like to add this tweet to Gerrit's comment: https://twitter.com/gavinsblog/status/1160839549565771776 Fake news and social media bubbles are already tearing societes apart, so do funded intelligence campaigns and bots that feed on small divisions and the effect that these bubbles have. I don't feel like an over-reacting alarmist on this, really. I am sincerely convinced that what we have seen so far, and what contributes massively to the rise of the right-wing AFD in Germany for example, is only a very, very tiny sneak-preview of what is about to come. And we are not ready for it. Neither in our somewhat "elitist" or scientific bubbles and certainly not in ways of actually comprehending or addressing the effect of this development, that is increasing by the day. Sorry for not being optimistic here. This has me genuinely worried.

Lamyaa Abdellateef

I think there are many root causes have an impact on Future challenges resulted from many aspects including climate change such as global warming specially in Africa Asia West and Middle lacking sustainable solutions at the same time both regions continue to pose overwhelming challenges with multiple and complex emergency situations on an unprecedented scale as well as refugees' situation uprooted from several countries remain volatile, and where the only rapid act is displacement and crossing to Europe by Sea in an irregular manner, facing all hazardous and violation of human rights that stipulated in universal declaration of human rights, 1951 convention relating to Refugee Status Determination, Global Compact on Refugees and Migrants, UNCRC will have a serious impact on identifying Based Violence that will increase significantly causing serious failures to all the planned prevention efforts including and not limited to protection & justice approaches to identity-based violence. Governments of European states need to collaborate in more effective manner in playing a role for supporting protracted refugees and IDPs situation in Africa and Asia West and Middle and put a reliable mechanisms in relation to population movements and mass migration, and particularly in post conflict situations aiming at strengthening coherence of international responses and opening avenues for international burden and responsibility sharing through the lens of solidarity.

Dr Chloë McRae Gilgan

Another concern for the future is the complete erosion of the legal promises enshrined in the 1951 Convention around asylum. As states like the UK have made their borders unreachable via containment and externalisation, claiming asylum has been made nearly impossible. Also, the perception that asylum seekers are illegally crossing borders to claim asylum needs to be corrected as "irregular migration" is expected when seeking asylum which means state parties are required to let asylum seekers enter/stop at the border and claim asylum--this would put an end to people dying in lorries or airplane baggage holds!

Three challenges then emerge : (1) Educating states on their legal responsibilities and correcting their misunderstanding/misconceptions; (2) Focusing more on building resettlement as a discretionary norm as providing asylum is diminishing (there are some good reasons to do this since states like the UK prefer the discretionary/controlled nature of resettlement over asylum); and (3) If states want to slow migration then they need to be better at helping to fix the policies in those countries where mass displacement/migration are and will take place (due to conflict and soon climate over everything else) and especially where the state refusing to provide refuge may have interfered in that state previously. I do think there are some positive roads to look out for, one being the recent decision on the UK's selling of arms to Saudi Arabia.

Discussion: How do we work better across sectors?

By Hugo Lucas

Academics, policy makers, and different kinds of NGOs often use different words, forms of communication, and evidence to justify and improve their work. Many feel, rightly or wrongly, that barriers exist to communication and/or cooperation between academics, civil society organisations, and the state.

While recognising the variety of expertise, and the value of different forms of evidence, both quantitative and qualitative, this session aims to look at improvements that could be made to the current state of cross-sector working. A key barrier to an effective prevention sector is the largely fragmented, sometimes competitive, approach taken to preventing individual forms of identity-based violence.

This thread will explore how we can work and communicate more effectively. It will examine the barriers to information sharing; ways of breaking down the obstacles to effective cooperation between researchers, NGOs, wider civil society and the state; and examples of best practice of cross-working.

Questions

- How would you like to work better with others from other sectors?
- What have the biggest barriers been to cross-sector working, from your and/or your organisation's experience?

Responses

Jens Petersson

As a CSO-representative I would argue than my own attitude is sometimes a barrier against close co-op with the state. To me it's a question of roles. We need a vibrant civil society which sometimes are in opposition to the state/government. Generally a state such as (my) Sweden understands this and we generally have a lovely relation where we can co-host seminars etc, but I would be lying if I said that my advocacy on what the state should do could sometimes also lead to the state not wanting to co-op on all my crazy ideas, naturally. It's about the same with the academic world. When academics should be objective as a CSO I often shouldn't. Again this doesn't stop us from having joint seminars etc, but sometimes my eagerness to package messages and demands in a simple way must seem strange for researchers. Again, as long as we all respect each others roles to break *unnessesary* barriers.

Lumenge Lubangu

Knowing that conflict arises, grows and matures, and in cases where effective conflict management measures have not been taken into account, this conflict changes direction and becomes a violence with negative repercussions on human lives, with effects on crimes and acts of genocide and other atrocities. Preventive measures are the work of all and require the commitment of all to the benefit of all communities. To achieve this, working together with civil society and different local organizations and other sectors can be one of the appropriate responses.

Panayote Dimitras

It has always been effective that NGOs/CSOs cooperate across borders especially in areas/regions where there are cross-border problems or "problems" and/or there is a (semi-)common regional historical development. The Balkans has been such an area/region and when the region-based concerns were acute there were many regional NGO cooperation projects. More generally, having been involved in several international NGOs and/or projects, I cannot exaggerate their often crucial importance. Now that we face the "new" problem of "identity"-based extreme right hate, there is a need for a renewed effort of international cooperation to combat it.

Ruthie Pliskin

@[Jens Petersson](1449) I agree with the differences you recognize between academics and practitioners, but I think these are precisely the reason we have to identify ways to facilitate communication nonetheless. The current incentive structures in academia mean that even academics interested in communicating findings to NGOs working for social change struggle to do so, as the way we are expected to report our findings is wholly inaccessible to anyone who doesn't speak the lingo of that particular field. Academic journals are full of insights that could dramatically improve persuasion efforts, tolerance, etc., but packaged in a way that no one but other academics (from that specific field) can utilize. While the responsibility of findings better modes of communication is first and foremost that of academics, I believe that the only way this can be effectively solved is

through joint work by academics and practitioners to identify the optimal ways of bridging these gaps.

Rosemary Forest

I think being willing to leave semantics at the door when reaching out across organisations is crucial to working across sectors and actor. The UK working group for atrocity prevention is a good example - its a very diverse group of organisations and while the language we use that brings us all together may not be specific to my organisation (peacebuilding) seeing the linkages makes it relevant.

Hugo Lucas

@[Ruthie Pliskin](1489) I think this is a crucial point. For CSOs looking to bring in research from academia, the barrier to entry can be quite high, especially for grassroots practitioners. For academics, there is, I think, a risk (or maybe just a perceived risk) that using accessible language in your work means other academics don't take you as seriously. How can we bridge that gap?

Andriy Korniychuk

@[Ruthie Pliskin](1489) I would like to support this point. I have noticed in recent years a small push into the direction of increasing the readability of research findings, but it nevertheless is not enough to challenge the current academic ways. Researchers who strive for this are an exception. While new ambitious students (future researchers) enter the academic world, they are indoctrinated into the same routine of working within a specific framework that requires a certain style of delivering the message. To use a real-life anecdote when a PhD supervisor tells the student "Your dissertation is no good. I understand everything". Having that strong push for praising those who can deliver the findings in a digestible manner could really help, especially in the digital age when simplicity is being favoured. It is an art in itself, which many far-right movements and populists seem to have mastered. much better.

Ruthie Pliskin

@[Andriy Korniychuk](1450) Yes, I agree completely, and I would like to add to this point that it's not just socialization - it's also the incentive structures. To get jobs/promoted, you need publications - and journals expect very specific kind of language and writing. Within the current structure, that means that developing accessible-language skills, and contacts outside academia, must be in addition to any effort to advance in your career - rather than an integral part of those efforts. If journals began demanding summaries of results in lay terms + identifying key audiences that could benefit from these findings, we could see dramatic change here. Perhaps a good starting point would be identifying specific, policy-oriented journals that would be opening to integrating such changes. Another route would be governmental funding that is tied to cooperation between academics and civil society.

Andriy Korniychuk

@[Ruthie Pliskin](1489) These ideas are interesting. To chip in some more. I find it useful when individuals who are interested in or tend to follow a purely academic path are provided with an opportunity to improve their presentation skills and adapt their knowledge and skills to a more general (labor market) needs, which could help them navigate better between the academia and practitioners worlds. I also noticed that the academia-practitioners meetings/roundtables, even if painfully slowly, but nevertheless instill a better understanding of the existing gaps in work and open some eyes on possible improvements.

Rosemary Forest

@[Panayote Dimitras](1443) What are some of the ways to encourage cooperation across boarders, and what are some of the challenges NGOs/CSOs face when trying to do so?

Rosemary Forest

@[Hugo Lucas](1222) I think being clear in the audiences for different outputs from an academic/NGO collaboration is a crucial step. That way some outputs can still be relevant (and be taken serious by fellow academics) but likewise outputs that are directed at the public or NGO sector use equally accessible (and acceptable) framing and language.

Rosemary Forest

I think regardless of which sector you're working in (or across) we underestimate the amount of time collaboration requires - in terms of planning, outreach (both framing and language aspects), campaings and general reporting. Giving ourselves more time to work through differnet ideas and approaches, strengthens and helps organisations work across sectors.

Hugo Lucas

@[Rosemary Forest](1217) Thanks, that makes sense. Do you have any examples in mind of a collaboration that has produced both? As in, produced technical and jargon-heavy outputs for one audience, and also easily digestible material for the public/NGO sector?

Julie Penshorn

I write children's books on peace, conflict resolution, and the latest, called, "The Barnyard Buddies Meet a Newcomer", is an attempt to provide young children, their parents, and teachers with an understanding that compassion is a necessary ingredient, along with the "smarts" of intelligent decision-making when answering the needs of immigrants, refugees, and other displaced persons. The book informs children that climate change will cause people to suffer and others will be asked to go beyond their comfort zone to help them. Since we are dealing with such polarization and enmity these days-- as we no longer agree on the "facts"-- (as Fred Carver noted), kids now believe that "normal" is confrontational

and winner-takes-all. Thus, this book also helps kids ponder how they make decisions, and introduces the concept of consensus and consent. "If we want to have real peace, we shall have to begin with the children." and you all know who said that. Thanks for the great discussion. I won't be able to return to the forum all day since I will be working.

Louise Pyne-Jones

As mentioned by previous posters, I think greater efforts need to be made to collaborate between actors. Not only does this need to happen across geographical borders, but it could also happen more widely across disciplinary borders. An interdisciplinary approach could facilitate a more holistic understanding of, and solutions to identity-based violence. One of the biggest barriers I have faced when working with groups is that they can sometimes take a very narrow approach, often and probably somewhat naturally, working through the frame with which they are most familiar (legal, political, sociological etc.) This is sometimes even evident in the language used to define different stakeholders within the group (lawyer/non-lawyers). Identity-based violence is such a nuanced and multi-faceted issue that it would benefit from understanding, on a number of different levels, which can only come through successful collaboration across actors and sectors. As @Ruthie Pliskin mentioned, the development of communications would be crucial here. Such as creating a specific language for IBV that is usable for all audiences. The investment that would be necessary to do this would of course be significant, but the advantages for effective cross-sector and cross-border collaboration could also be considerable.

Chiara De Franco

Hi all, I've been asked to facilitate this discussion, which I am really grateful for as this is an important issue to me. I'd like to throw at you a few points for reflection based on my own experience but also on what you have been writing so far: 1. I agree with @[Ruthie Pliskin](1489) but not fully! It is true that at the end of the day it is a matter of incentives because what counts most for promotion in the academia is top tier publications. However, in the US, UK and now also here in Denmark there's increasing pressure on academics to produce high quality research and at the same time demonstrate that it is socially relevant and that has 'impact' on policies. Some universities have started putting a premium on researchers' ability to contribute to policy discussions. Universities are also investing on initiatives like 'the conversation' which are aimed at making research more visible outside of the ivory-tower. I wrote a few pieces for the conversation and it has been an excellent experience. They have in-house editors that help making the message sexy for a wider public. There are also prestigious publishers like Oxford University Press that have started investing on publications meant to 'bridge the gap' as they have a book series with this very name publishing research in international politics. I think that there are now some incentives to cooperate with practitioners, but I think this is still a very top-down approach where we are all forced to be everything: excellent teachers, excellent researchers and policy-relevant. All these activities are very time consuming and setting priorities can be difficult. 2. Connected to the point above, it is important to stress that it is still unclear how impact is measured really. Some of us meet policy-makers in the flesh, talk with them and

sometimes manage to persuade them to listen but it might be difficult to document it and therefore to 'earn credit'. In other words, sometimes the more persuasion is successful the more it remains invisible. A few years ago I coordinated research for the Task Force for the EU prevention of mass atrocities and I think we managed to convince the European External Action Service to develop 'mass atrocity lenses' and I can now see that their toolkit for atrocity prevention uses the language of our report. However, can I really argue that this is because of our work? This kind of influence is difficult to prove, which means that often if we want to be relevant we have to accept the fact that we might not get much recognition for it. 3. Another problem, I think, is that if in your attempt at being relevant you convey a message that NGOs or policy makers don't like you might end up alienating people you might need to carry out research. I know that colleagues sometimes practice self-censorship when publishing policy-relevant pieces, out of fear of becoming persona non grata in the organisations that they are studying. This is of course problematic and not just from a scientific point of view. 4. As underlined by @[Andriy Korniychuk](1450) we academics are not trained to communicate with policy-makers and/or the wider public. I think this is a serious problem as it means that many of us trying to reach out to policy makers and/or NGOs improvise a bit. Maybe it is time to collaborate on how we can talk to each other? I hope this conversation can come up with some ideas about what researchers need from practitioners and vice versa what practitioners might need from us: this is often taken for granted as a self-evident thing, but it is certainly not the case in my experience. 5. A final issue I would like to flag is that academics are often not prepared to produce policy recommendations. Many of us are very much at ease when producing critical assessments of policies and much less at ease with coming up with recommendations. In some environments policy recommendations are seen as being at odds with serious scientific research and many of us think that it is enough to flag problems and that it is not up to us to come up with solutions. However there is research about the fact that policy makers pay attention to messages coming up with solutions more than to those offering only critical assessments of a given situation. So, yes, I agree with hat some of you already said: we need also to discuss about roles! I hope this is some useful food for thought!

Rosemary Forest

@[Hugo Lucas](1222) Nothing that is currently published but it is something we're actively including in joint research proposals my team is working on at the moment.

Ben Willis

@[Andriy Korniychuk](1450) @[Ruthie Pliskin](1489) You both make some vital points about how academics are (dis)incentivised to work with civil society (EDIT: also some great comments from @[Chiara De Franco](1464)). I'd also add – along with issues of terminology, policy relevance, and timeliness – the problem of access. Reputable academic journals are typically still paywalled and inaccessible to CSOs. And the same is true for parliamentary researchers here in the UK, with its own knock-on effect for government/academic sector relations. Both often rely on open access websites to get an insight into the latest academic research (this is where the likes of The Conversation can

be particularly useful). Given the incentive structures within which academics operate, are there particular ways that civil society can help in reaching out to bridge the gap?

Andriy Korniychuk

@[Chiara De Franco](1464) Thanks for your excellent feedback. I want to add an observation to point 5 in reference to policy recommendations. In some countries/regions (arguably in those with less of a democratic record), there is an issue with perception of roles between decision-makers and civil society member in policy preparation and implementation, reaction and prevention. Civil society is percieved by authorities as inherently critical of its work and even trying to constantly undermine its legitimacy in the eyes of the community. While CSOs tend to look at the decision-makers as a constant threat to democracy (and its values), corrupt and hence in need to be effectively tamed. Such a culture promotes distrust and competition. Hence, even if you look at recommendations that are being produced by NGOs through their work (with or without academics), the tone is less constructive and you don't see the positives and achievements (of authorities) being even mentioned in the deliverables. It's difficult to build on such a platform. At PAX we worked to address the problem by giving both groups time to get to know one another, facilitating the process, explaining certain terms, showing the value of the common approach to certain issues. It does take time and working through animocities but can produce a good spring board to change things for the better. Side note, it's also useful to think when you are an academic on how to phrase these policy recommendations. Sometimes, it's hard to remember that there will be a similar human being reading it. Drawing some parallels could also help. I imagine all researchers know well the peer-review process and kind of reaction they have when the article is totally destroyed (with comments that author is not competent) as opposed to constructive criticism that recognizes author's contribution. I think these small details matter.

Andriy Korniychuk

@[Ben Willis](1218) I believe that collaboration can produce also some obvious yet often neglected tips to improve joint activities between CSOs and researchers. Hence, if an organization applies for a project to be funded externally to deal with important issues and wants to carry out empirical-based research of high quality to boost credibility, it should remember about including costs associated with obtaining articles (as an example), so that its experts or involved members of academia have good sources to start their work. Maybe, it can also become an additional incentive for that researcher. I also believe that having researchers involved as early as possible is a strong motivating factor. Then the process is co-owned. Moreover, it might be useful to think about the variety of deliverables, hence create more options to choose from. If the recommendations or report are too 'academic' - that's fine because there is also an audience for that type of findings and by working with it you also create a safer space for that researcher and his reputation. But then adding a separate document with a shorter, tailored content is also useful to approach different type of audience. I also like when organizations go a step further and record a podcast or short video, hence expand their channels of communication.

Chiara De Franco

@[Andriy Korniychuk](1450) thanks for these important lessons learnt. I am also convinced that we need to create a culture of dialogue and that this means investing time and resources on face-to-face/virtual meetings where we can exchange ideas, give and receive feedback, and develop a common language. We tried to do this whit the EU Task Force and I think this is why we somehow succeeded (somehow).

Chiara De Franco

@[Andriy Korniychuk](1450) again very good points. @[Ben Willis](1218) I think you could also follow the example of the European Peacebuilding Liaison Office which is an association of NGOs. They have created a network of 'academic friends' who are always invited to their events and receive regular updates on EPLO's activities and whose work is given visibility so that EPLO's members are encouraged to read the work of those researchers.

Chiara De Franco

@[Ben Willis](1218) including researchers in projects that can give researchers access to data they can use for publications might be a good idea. Invite them to meetings or round-tables that can allow researchers to build a strong network of practitioners that can then turn useful in their research + see my other facilitation comment below.

Elisabeth Pramendorfer

Hi everyone and good afternoon from Geneva. Not directly answering the question, but some thoughts on "cross-working" and effective cooperation based on our work at the Global Centre. We have offices in both New York and Geneva, and one of the main reason for expanding our work on R2P and atrocity prevention from the UN Security Council to cover Geneva-based human rights mechanisms was precisely the need for greater exchange and information sharing between different stakeholders, institutions and mechanisms. It is not only a huge challenge to strengthen this exchange externally - with other NGOs, civil society, and governments - but also sometimes challenging to internally keep a constant, daily (or hourly) flow of information and exchange, and to consider how e.g. action/advocacy in NY will influence Geneva, or vice versa. For us, one of the underlying principles for having expanded to Geneva was to actually "bridge the gap" between various agendas, institutions, mechanisms and actors working around atrocity prevention, R2P, early warning and early action, and to avoid "bubbles", as both New York and Geneva often feel. As such, one of our priorities is to strengthen a systematic exchange or even engagement between the human rights agenda (and its actors) and atrocity/international peace and security agenda by bringing discussions amongst partners in Geneva to NY, and from NY to Geneva. This includes government missions (through GoF and Focal Points), but also focuses on institutions - for example, making sure that information from Geneva-mechanisms (including on early warning of possible atrocities) actually "make it out" of Geneva. This can take many forms: the High

Commissioner briefing the UNSC; an HRC-mandated investigative mechanism reporting to UNGA; or identifying links between OHCHR and, for example, the Joint Office for Genocide Prevention and R2P. This is how we began to systematically apply an atrocity lens to our engagement in Geneva, where most actors still do not see a natural connection between human rights and atrocity prevention - it had to be cultivated through constant discussions, underlined by country-specific and thematic work which emphasized that atrocity prevention is, in fact, intrinsically linked to other agendas and approaches. For example, we organized public events in Geneva on the linkages between the Women, Peace and Security Agenda and R2P. This allowed for both NGOs and civil society actors working in the field of gender and the protection of women and sexual violence, humanitarians and members of investigative mechanisms, as well as actors in the R2P/prevention field, to better understand the intrinsic link between the two frameworks, how our work overlaps or can complement each other to apply a gender-lens to atrocity prevention, and how to recognize the unique role, knowledge and experience of women in atrocity prevention. It also allowed for a discussion on how structural discrimination and gender-inequality - a conversation which is not necessarily associated with R2P and prevention, but more with "human rights" in general - can be indicators or risk factors, and how structural changes in society can impact its resilience to atrocities. Hence, it merged actors, topics and areas of work - ranging from health care for survivors of sexual violence, to women inclusion in peacebuilding processes, to IHL frameworks, war crimes investigations and engagement with non-state armed groups, as well as those specifically working on R2P and atrocity prevention, into a broader discussion on how these protection frameworks can be linked. This is only one example of how we try to overcome the barriers to communication and exchange - opening discussions on how the work and focus of individual organisations, institutions, mechanisms and frameworks overlaps and connects, and how we can strengthen these linkages in a systematic manner.

Fred Carver

@[Elisabeth Pramendorfer](1471) This is a really good point about making sure ideas make it out of Geneva. At our recent Chatham House conference Stephen Stedman quoted the saying "what happens in Geneva stays in Geneva" for the lack of join up between Geneva and NY diplomatic agendas, particularly at the UN, so great if you are tacking this.

Elisabeth Pramendorfer

@[Fred Carver](1442) Hi Fred, thank you for your comment - the "what happens in Geneva stays in Geneva" sounds very familiar.... On the one hand, there is often a sense of "this is a Geneva/human rights issue, it has nothing to do with NY"; on the other hand, it has very interestingly also happened (although only once) that an HRC-mandated mechanism has argued that there needs to be a sense of caution when engaging too much with NY/UNSC, to avoid conflicting agendas, including e.g. if there is both a peacekeeping mission/sanctions and an investigation into criminal accountability for one and the same atrocity situation. On a positive note, it has been great to see how many states, e.g. during the last Formal Debate of R2P at UNGA, highlighted the need for greater linkages between

Geneva and NY, and outlined the crucial role of UPR, Special Procedures, HRC investigative mechanisms, technical assistance and capacity building and treaty bodies in early warning and early action. I feel that at least this recognition has definitely grown over last couple of years, and has now opened the conversation on "how".

Fred Carver

@[Elisabeth Pramendorfer](1471) Completely agree. I also wonder if, as the UNSC stalls, stuff that traditionally fell to the council will move the Geneva. It's already moving to UNGA (IIIM) and to OPCW, and arguably that's starting to happen with the HRC setting up the IIIM for Myanmar.

Chiara De Franco

@[Elisabeth Pramendorfer](1471) could you also tell us about how you at the Global Centre collaborate with academics? Do you have any lessons to share?

Elisabeth Pramendorfer

@[Fred Carver](1442) I am somehow biased for being based in Geneva, but it is really interesting to observe the room for opportunities for action in Geneva compared to New York for a number of different atrocity situations that we at the Global Centre are monitoring. I think the environment in Geneva - the modus operandi of the Human Rights Council, as compared to the UNSC, for example - often times allow for a group of states, including e.g. regional coalitions, to take leadership and mobilize action on certain thematic or country-specific agenda items which may not be as fruitful in NY given veto power (depending of course on the specific situation, and it may also be the other way around). A good example that comes to my mind is the September 2018 resolution on Venezuela, the High Commissioners strong response, and possible follow-up action in September 2019 - while the UNSC unfortunately remained deadlocked throughout all this time. The HRC proved to be a vital and effective "alternative". Thank you also for highlighting the role of investigative mechanisms, and particularly the innovative IIIMs. In general with regard to CoIs and FFMs, very interestingly the HRC has become the leading mandating authority over the past years, and sometimes their political impact (thinking about DPRK, for example) actually resulted in follow-up action in UNGA and/or calls for ICC involvement. I am aware that a mere "proliferation" of these mechanisms in and of itself is not the solution, but I think that there is, as you mentioned, incredible potential to support future accountability processes and to "step in" when UNSC lacks consensus - and, also, to then actually strengthen these conversations in NY, for example by directly mandating a CoI to brief UNGA, or to report to related UN agencies, or to be invited to brief UNSC. In an ideal situation, and something that is very important for us focusing on R2P, this could then strengthen the UNSC and its response - instead of bypassing it.

Timothy Plum

As an academic and worker in various NGO's I find the lack of internet usage bewildering. Many tools allow for real-time collaboration but NGO's are ill-equipped to handle high-tech and lack resources to make connections. We have found org's that understand high-tech also grasp the cross-border needs of NGO's. One issue that has plagued academics and NGO's since the beginning of time is territoriality. Money and resources such as human capital are hard to find and we tend to guard our own rather than work together.

Elisabeth Pramendorfer

@[Chiara De Franco](1464) Thanks Chiara for the question! We do engage and exchange with academics in different ways, for example when it comes to publications, including "policy briefs" or "occasional papers" which can either focus on thematic or country-specific issues relating to atrocity prevention and R2P. A good example that comes to my mind is our recent publication on possible crimes against humanity in China, which was published jointly by the Asia-Pacific Centre for the Responsibility to Protect and the Global Centre. I believe being able to work closely together and bring in an "academic lens" to publications and (legal) analysis is very important. In addition, we are also grateful to be able to participate in academic conferences on R2P - including the "Annual R2P Conference" in Slovenia hosted every year. It brought together academics, policy makers, NGOs, members of the R2P Focal Points Network and diplomats from missions and capitals to all exchange on current and future challenges in atrocity prevention, and I think this combination of different backgrounds and ways of looking at it was very useful for us to bring back to NY/Geneva. Lastly, we also always invite academics to participate and/or to be panelists in our events both in NY and Geneva - especially in situations where we explore new thematic areas and the linkages to R2P (for example for our peacekeeping workshops).

Fred Carver

@[Elisabeth Pramendorfer](1471) This is absolutely fascinating. We've been thinking along similar lines, but not so much about Geneva as intra-New York Mechanisms (ie strengthening the work of the GA on Peace and Security, using Uniting for Peace more, strengthening the Peacebuilding Commission etc...) I hadn't thought so much about where Geneva fits into that and so thanks for flagging. I don't know if you saw when I mentioned this earlier but we're running a consultation on global governance reform currently (together1st.org) I'd love to speak to you about if you might be interested in contributing to it in terms of how Geneva mechanisms can be strengthened and better integrated into New York. Do drop me a line if you'd like that, or get in touch via the website! My email carver@una.org.uk, And thanks again for your comment.

Elisabeth Pramendorfer

@[Fred Carver](1442) Fred, absolutely! I would love to be part and, if useful, share more about our Geneva engagement. I will get in touch via e-mail - thanks so much and looking forward!

Mariana Goetz

@[Ruthie Pliskin](1489) Yes, this is very important. In the transitional justice / human rights sector there seems to be some cross over between academia and practice, with many practitioners spending time in academia or publishing (but less the other way around perhaps), and human rights clinics and conferences often bring practitioners and academics together (see LSE's Centre for Women Peace and Security). My experience has been getting the lawyers out of their silos to think about prevention beyond the potential deterrent effect of justice after the fact - and hence founding Rights for Peace which is taking this approach.

Dr Chloë McRae Gilgan

One thing I would add to working across sectors is the importance of including the public as part of the state. When we talk about working with the state, I think a large part of that is understanding the role of the state in relation to the public, particularly in a democratic state, the electorate empowers the state and the state represents the people's interests (ideally). The point is that while politicians often tell the public what they think it wants to hear (at best to be of service and at worst to stay in power), they also need to tell the public what it should know, such as explaining the international treaties and commitments the state has agreed to follow. I meet too many people in daily life who do not even know what the Refugee Convention is and have never heard of R2P. When I have explained the Convention to everyday people, their opinion on refugee protection has changed to one of greater hospitality. Moving from rhetoric to practice means fostering understanding of international legal responsibilities across the public so we can have more transparent conversations about the tensions between perceived interests and legal commitments. Too often, people see these international legal/political commitments as something elitist--something the government deals with--but these agreements are on behalf of the people and so they need to be part of the conversation.

Discussion: Working better across Europe

By Hugo Lucas

There are advantages to building formal and informal networks but they can also be time consuming and frustrating, as well as consume resources. If we accept that Europe is experiencing a prevention crisis, what can we do differently to better support and strengthen civil society efforts?

The forces of nationalist populism and extremism are becoming increasingly cross-cutting, international, and coordinated.

Questions

- Can we work together, across Europe, in a more consistent way?
- Would working together across the continent against the root causes and drivers of identity-based violence make our work more effective?
- Would that help you or your organisation to contribute more to prevention rather than response?

Responses

Panayote Dimitras

It has always been effective that NGOs/CSOs cooperate across borders especially in areas/regions where there are cross-border problems or "problems" and/or there is a (semi-)common regional historical development. The Balkans has been such an area/region and when the region-based concerns were acute there were many regional NGO cooperation projects. More generally, having been involved in several international NGOs and/or projects, I cannot exaggerate their often crucial importance. Now that we face the "new" problem of "identity"-based extreme right hate, there is a need for a renewed effort of international cooperation to combat it.

---

violeta berisha

To respond to the challenges we must work together. To cooperate we must accept the values of each other. Find the positive values of the other side and work on the positive values. Collaboration is very difficult to develop because we have to move on the wounds that need to be healed! During my long work in the reintegration of repatriated persons, we have encountered many communication difficulties. Our target has been all displaced persons during the war and through the Ministry of Interior in Kosovo we have developed a strategy for the reintegration of repatriated persons. We have established a Department in Ministry and since 2007 there are over 50,000 beneficiaries of the many services we have provided, they belong to all ethnicities living in Kosovo. The largest donor in this regard has been the German GIZ and the Kosovo Consolidated Budget Initially, Albanians did not want to work on cases written in Serbian, although in many cases the cases were Albanian. Then, by implementing many joint workshops with all NGOs working in this field, we have managed to stabilize the situation for the benefit of the parties by creating better socio-economic conditions for them and peace and security for their families. . The beneficiaries of the large number of reintegration services were Roma. Services have included home construction, renovations, food and hygiene packages, business planning and employment training, children's education and many other services.

Hugo Lucas

What mechanisms can we put in place to improve cross-border cooperation?

Velma Saric

Hello everybody! Welcome to the Working Better Across Europe discussion. You had the chance to read about our work with the UN office on establishing a coalition for genocide prevention in the Western Balkans. We would like to know if you have any thoughts and suggestions regarding cooperation across Europe. If you would like to know more about our experience building this coalition, please let us know. We are looking forward to this fruitful discussion!

Velma Saric

@[Panayote Dimitras](1443) Thank you for your comment! We completely agree about the importance of cooperation across borders. The Western Balkans had a lot of initiatives, some more successful than others. There was one regional coalition set up called RECOM that many people hoped would be successful and bring reconciliation in the Balkans; unfortunately, up to now, there has been no political will from the regional politicians to support this initiative. The Post-Conflict Research Center is aiming to educate our coalition's civil society representatives about the mechanisms for genocide and mass atrocity prevention as a response to the denial of genocide and to support war crime procedures as the first step for prevention.

Velma Saric

@[violeta berisha](1458) Hello Violeta, it is great to see that you are part of the consultation because you have been doing an amazing job for the last 20 years in the field of human rights and conflict prevention. I completely understand your struggle regarding the search for missing persons. We all know that that is one of the most important transitional justice processes, and a long and painful one, especially when there is not enough collaboration between politicans from Serbia and Kosovo. The experience from Bosnia in the field for searching for missing persons was quite successful because the International Commission for Missing People did important work and was pushing a lot in this effort. Also, the ICMP was crucial for establishing the state BiH institute which continued to collaborate with the ICMP and different governmental bodies in this process. We still have 10 000 missing people. For us, this work continues. I also know that there is a regional initiative by the ICMP with a goal to find all missing persons. In the Western Balkans, the NGOs play an important role in applying pressure on the politicians to continue with this process. It is encouraging that one of the EU flagship strategies for the Western Balkans from 2018 is finding all missing persons so I do hope that we will keep pushing the politicians in this process.

Rosemary Forest

@[violeta berisha](1458) You mentioned communication difficulties - can you provide more details on this and how you've overcome them?

Andriy Korniychuk

@[Hugo Lucas](1222) Remove travel/mobility barriers and encourage people to people contacts. I have encountered numerous examples when individuals could not travel to another partner country (e.g. to attend a meeting) due to visa regulations or other bureaucratic procedures. So that possibility to see a new perspective on your own eyes is taken away. Surely, you have other means to communicate but physical presence is often of paramount importance. The current tendency is to close/reinstate borders, exemplified even by the Schengen area developments in the EU in the last 3-4 years. I would promote various financial possibilities for projects/initiatives that encourage such contacts. I remember participating in a Grundtvig project (now it's part of Erasmus+) where certain funds were avaliable to travel and visit partners. This created stronger partnerships between some organizations that have lasted for years now and led to new activities.

Velma Saric

From our experience, building an effective coalition takes the following: 1) Identifying the appropriate actors, partners, supporters, stakeholders, and participants of the network. 2) Educating the coalition members about the mechanisms for genocide and mass atrocity prevention, as well as the indicators and factors on the ground that signal problems could be developing. 3) Creating a channel of communication between the network members, the international body (in our case the UNOGPRP), and the local stakeholders. 4) Finding the appropriate spaces for dialogue and continuing to follow-up with and engage the network over time (e.g. We engaged the relevant network members in a program called Dealing with the Past of the Sarajevo Film Festival, in which CSOs and NGOs pitch local stories that deal with conflict-related pasts to be made into documentary films by professional filmmakers. We engage our network members in these kinds of projects because it amplifies their outreach and provides us with new tools for conflict prevention and education) 5) Reaching a consensus on shared goals of the coalition and appropriately updating the goal (e.g. PCRC's goals when the coalition was formed was to educate the members. The goal shifted to collectively developing Western Balkan-specific recommendations for the governments and the international community in the fields of media, youth education, corruption, genocide denial, the rule of law, etc.) 6) Coming up with a shared plan of action and developing reasonable steps to carry it out, as well as revisiting, adjusting, and updating the action plan regularly. 7) Monitoring and evaluating the steps taken toward the action plan, the meeting of the goals, and the effectiveness of the network. It is important to mention that this is a very time-intensive and involved process, which requires strategic planning.

Velma Saric

We have summarized a few of the key elements that are needed to create an effective, regional prevention network. We would now like to ask for your input regarding other important elements involved in the creation of an effective network.

Panayote Dimitras

@[Velma Saric](1465) Let me lits our Balkan networking experiences: Helsinki Committee regional projects; Minority Rights Group regional projects; Balkan Neighbors; Alternative Information Media; Search for Common Ground; International Commission on the Balkans.

Velma Saric

@[Andriy Korniychuk](1450) That's a very important issue to address. One of our strategies to involve our network members was to bring the dialogue directly to the members of the coalition by organizing workshops, seminars, and meetings in each of the Western Balkan countries. Flexibility is a key part of our strategy because rather than waiting on the government to change things, we have to act. In an ideal world, we would not have these visa barriers, but in the mean-time, we are working around the systematic and structural changes that are needed because they take a long time.

Qamar Jafri

I think civil society in Europe should develop cross-cutting strategies-engaging moderate voices from immigrants and local- to develop a mechanism of inclusive peace. The inclusive peace, I mean, explain the concepts of peace and tolerance from faith perspective. If faith-based identity can become explosive then faith-based solution is a natural deterrence to hate crime and violent extremism.

Velma Saric

Since we do not have any questions/comments, we wanted to share a bit about the coalition's plans and activities for 2020. I am not sure if all of you are familiar with Aida Šehović's artistic, nomadic monument "Što te nema" (Why you are not here), which commemorates the victims of the Srebrenica genocide. This project was displayed in Venice this July as part of the Venice Biennale together with the Auschwitz Institute for Peace and Reconciliation. It showed how we can effectively use arts for genocide and mass atrocity prevention. Together with 30 coalition members, PCRC will display this monument in Belgrade in July 2020. For the first time, we will involve organizations from the entire Western Balkans to collectively commemorate the Srebrenica genocide, gather young activists, conduct a set of youth educational activities, and develop a collective outreach strategy. These activities have the goal to prevent genocide denial, lobby for the importance of state law against genocide denial (which we are missing in the region), raise awareness about the Srebrenica genocide among the ordinary people from the Western Balkans, and involve the regional and international stakeholders. This project is an excellent opportunity for collaboration across Europe. Any of you who are interested can contribute by spreading the project on social media, participating, or connecting us with relevant parties. Feel free to reach out if you are interested in collaborating.

Velma Saric

@[Qamar Jafri](1444) Thank you for bringing up the importance of religion in our work. Last January, the Special Representative for Genocide Prevention, Mr. Adama Dienge, visited the Western Balkans and had a series of meetings with the religious leaders and communities. Our coalition acknowledges the importance of inter-faith and inter-religious dialogue for genocide and mass atrocity prevention. Hence, this is an important aspect that we will incorporate into the work of the coalition.

Velma Saric

Thank you all for engaging with us on this important topic. At the end of our moderation period, I wanted to let you know that this Fall, PCRC will publish a report on genocide and mass atrocity prevention in the Western Balkans together with Impunity Watch. We will keep you updated and share the report with anyone interested. This report is a start to our future collaboration with Impunity Watch with the intention to strengthen and connect civil society organizations in the Western Balkans, as well as to educate them in policy recommendation writing. If any of you would appreciate guidance regarding the models, strategies, and expertise that we have in coalition building, we are of course happy to connect with you and share our knowledge. Thank you all once again for taking the time to discuss this important topic.

Timothy Plum

I believe a set of standards for the industry needs to be developed. That way everyone is playing on the same field. Central repositories of data can be setup and maintained through a collaborative effort, perhaps even EU funding. I have written consistently over the past few days that root causes and drivers of IBV ignore borders. Work across orgs. needs to be more integrated and less territoriality.

Ben Willis

One of the broader concerns of recent years (and something which overlaps with today's other discussion of future challenges) has been the shrinking of civil society space in all regions of the world – with Europe being no exception. Increasingly restrictive legislation, reduced availability of funding, limited access to decision-makers, and the attempted delegitimization of the work done by civil society organisations have all contributed to this contraction. Would greater cross-border cooperation and solidarity also help in addressing some of these broader problems? Would there be unintended downsides to such cooperation? Very interested to hear everyone's thoughts! @[Fred Carver](1442) @[Andriy Korniychuk](1450) @[Jens Petersson](1449) @[Elisabeth Pramendorfer](1471) @[Louise Pyne-Jones](1441) @[violeta berisha](1458)

Jens Stappenbeck

@[Hugo Lucas](1222) To answer the question "What mechanisms can we put in place to improve cross-border cooperation?" Having informal (!) ways to exchange information and best-practices would be one way to go, I guess. To know what kind of political agenda

settings worked best on related issues in another country that now affects the own organization or country, to know who to reach out to for cooperation, to get a feeling of the situation in others coutnries, or even just for inspiration. Online exchanges and e-mail-lists are ofentimes a lot of work, at it comes with a lot of reading assignments. It's hard to keep up with that and not everything relates. That's the downside. But to have a network ready to go, possible also a way to filter the amount of debates and discussions (like tags). I'd like that. Mapping organizations in Europe would also be a big step.

Jens Stappenbeck
@[Ben Willis](1218) I feel like there should be a network of solidarity amongst NGOs, to help to raise the profile of those directly and mostly affected by restriction or even delegitimization and explicit repression. I don't actually know if something like this already exists somewhere? If yes, I would like to know about it.=)

Andriy Korniychuk
@[Ben Willis](1218) I believe in Europe the way forward is to slowly develop a truly European public sphere and European civil society. In the framework of the EU (integration process) certain progress has been already achieved. Umbrella organizations uniting CSOs in Brussels, helping to coordinate the efforts. EU's multilevel governance also gives much more points of access for CSOs during the decision-making process (it's not a zero-sum game). Hence I think the EU itself can do a lot to offer additional support to civil society that would not be necessarily tied to national authorities but rather direct support. I touched in other threads on the need to change the thinking about the civic space (or other concepts such as democracy) as located only on the "national level" but being open to a new conceptual framework to address cross-border challenges (academia should also actively explore this).

Discussion: Participant-led open discussion

By Hugo Lucas

This thread serves as an open space for you to broach different issues that have not yet been addressed in this consultation. We would like to encourage you to browse the various topics, and add any final thoughts in the relevant sections in light of the discussions that have taken place over the last three days.

Responses

Jens Petersson

I get the feeling that most of us would like to move from response to prevention and from military interventions to civilian prevention. I wouldn't hesitate to describe myself as a pacifist, but my view is more complex. Is it really a shift from response to prevention we need? Isn't it rather a shift from in-action to action? I do think that even military means are from time to time a necessary tool when we have failed to prevent. And I do actually think it is important that *civilian* non-governmental organisations are ready and willing also to demand the use of military means when they are needed. (Naturally not *any* military means and in *any* cases, but in a responsible way.) For this reason I seldom compare the costs of prevention with the cost of for example UN (military) peace operations. I think both are needed. I also think there's a need of more civilian *response*, not only civilian prevention or military response. What we don't need is passivity or in-action.

Hugo Lucas

@[Jens Petersson](1449) Thanks Jens, a good topic to get the ball rolling! I've been asked by a participant to post this, as they aren't able to drop in today: @[Liliana ENE](1451): The Roma Minority - An inside view One of the most controversial minorities over time, and despite the fact that is the largest minority in the European Union, about 10-12 millions, left on the margins of society, the Roma have been considered the "„Apple of the discord" of the Romanian society, carrying with them its great failures" (see Viorel Achim, Gypsies in the history of Romania, Bucharest, CEU Press, 2005). There are not a few voices that consider the Roma as "scapegoats", responsible for the unfavorable image of the Romanian nation abroad, but only a few of them focus on the analysis of the causes that have determined over time this unfavorable situation of Roma peoples on the territory of Romania and other countries. The European Commission against Racism and Intolerance (ECRI) in 2017, in its report, stated that "AntiGypsysm" is a very persistent, violent, recurrent and common form of racism", considering that "discrimination against Roma is based in particular on their ethnic origin and on their style of life and recommended combating "this phenomenon at all levels and by all means" (See the Report on fundamental rights issues regarding Roma integration in the EU: combating negative attitudes towards Roma, Committee on Civil Liberties, Justice and Home Affairs, Rapporteur Soraya Post (2017/2038(INI) The same report highlights that "The Roma have undergone unimaginable and unacceptable treatments for centuries. They were deprived of their human rights. The Roma were made Slave(500 years, in Romania, the longest in human history!) were deprived of goods, persecuted, exterminated and not even the emancipation of our societies caused the negative attitudes against the Roma at the societal level to be eradicated. The negative attitudes against the Roma derive from the belief that the Roma are inferior, less capable, deprived of perspective or willingness to rise to the level of non-Roma, not to be good citizens of the countries where they have lived for centuries; and the negative attitudes against the Roma also include the actions based on this belief". According to the Eurobarometer for the countries of the European Union, carried out by the European Commission in 2015, the interviewees consider ethnically and racially motivated discrimination to be the most widespread (64%). In the field of employment, the least comfortable working colleague would be a Roma person

(20%). As a result of his mission in Romania, the Special Rapporteur of the UN Human Rights Council, Philip Alston (2016) emphasized "the systematic and deeply rooted discrimination that exists in society with regard to people affected by extreme poverty, especially Roma people". The declaration also included a series of recommendations, regarding the improvement of the situation of the Roma, starting with the recognition of the discrimination they are subjected to.According to a qualitative study from July 2015, entitled "The perspective of Roma and Hungarians on discrimination in Romania" (performed at the request of the CNCD by TNC, unpublished study)" while Hungarians perceive discrimination against them less than 20 years ago, Roma are increasingly aware of the phenomenon of discrimination, especially regarding employment. The results of the EU MIDIS II survey (2016) presents an unacceptable picture of the reality of Roma living in the EU: • 80% of Roma parents and their children interviewed are exposed to the risk of poverty, as opposed to the average of 17% among the general population; • 1 in 3 Roma children is at risk of going to bed hungry at least once a month; • 47% of them do not benefit from education at an early age; • one of three Roma households among those who participated in the survey does not have running water; one of two Roma families lives in a dwelling inside which there is no toilet, shower or bathroom; one in five households is found in a house with a broken roof, walls or foundation with glazing or window frames affected by rotting; • 63% of Roma youth aged 16-24 at the time of the EU MIDIS II survey were not professionally employed and did not attend any educational or training program, unlike the average of 12% at European level for the same age group ; • 41% of the Roma feel they have been discriminated against in educational institutions, jobs, housing and hospitals. The annual report on hate speech in Romania, produced by ActiveWatch, shows that Roma, Hungarians, Jews, members of the LGBTIQ community, Muslims, refugees and people left for work are particularly targeted. A number of other reports of the European institutions, communications and official documents of the European Commission, of the European Parliament signal the worrying situation of the Roma in the entire European Union not only in Romania. But, in my opinion, as a researcher, and as a Roma mother, I think the most worrisome aspect, is getting rid of our view, namely the discrimination based on racial considerations on children, the racial bullying. The painful finding is that, this phenomenon amplifies in an alarming way, in the groups of children, the school being the favorable environment in which this phenomenon manifests and, nevertheless, in Romania there is much less talk, information and awareness campaigns in this sense is in a small number, in relation to the incidence of cases reported by the abused victims. The targets of bullying are children from groups considered inferior, or vulnerable, who are reproached with behaviors sanctioned by "norms", for example Roma, poor children, girls or boys accused of being "gypsy, ugly, black" The results of the report "Hidden in Plain Sight - A statistical analysis of violence against children" (UNICEF, 2014), which includes data from 190 countries, presents a harsh reality: almost 60% of Romanian students, aged 11-15, participated in acts of intimidation, harassment, verbal or physical violence against colleagues, Any manifestation of an act of harassment, humiliation, aggression or racial discrimination is primarily an emotional abuse with both immediate and long-term effects. As devastating effects of these phenomena are fear and anxiety, low self-esteem / identity stigma, inferiority complexes, crises of identity and loneliness, frustrations and deviant

behavior. In other words, a child subjected to bullying is a traumatized child with an unhappy childhood. Childhood abuse has an unexpectedly high impact on the individual, and any child who is bullied in childhood will suffer throughout his or her life, if subjected to a regime of terror, his or her brain will become accustomed to alertness. It will be exaggerated by sensitivity to stimuli that can generate fear (becoming adults, they will want to use drugs and alcohol to relax). Adult individuals beaten in childhood, offended. (7-11 years old), reaching the age of 50, demonstrates poorer physical and mental health; suffering from depression, anxiety disorders, suicidal thoughts, have problems with employment and of course, take refuge in alcohol The racist irony, the stereotypes, the offenses, all from childhood affect the personality and self-esteem, giving birth to a spiritual wound carried all the life, which the Roma generally do not speak, of a kind of embarrassment, or sometimes ignorance. I believe that this problem should become a European concern, as Roma children are also children of the "Tomorrow Europe", and a society that does not care for its children is a society without a future. Tolerance and respect should be the basis of our children's education otherwise we make again the mistakes of the past.

Hugo Lucas

@[Jens Petersson](1449) What kind of civilian response would you be looking for? Something CSO-based or from ordinary citizens?

Jens Petersson

@[Hugo Lucas](1222) Actually all, Hugo, but I think I mainly meant something arranged by states. Or maybe I first of all wanted to make clear that I understand that even the UN peace operations today are not only military but multidimensional and includes civilian components as well, although they are still primarily military in their character. The UN-soldiers returning from Mali that I have spoken to however all say that they see a huge need of more civilian response for the circle of violence to be ended. "We soldiers can't build peace, we can only limit the violence for a while. What is needed is to get the kids in schools, get the society working again." are things I'm told. Often with additional comments that the soldiers see too little done by the civilian branches of the UN, which sometimes can be explained by the fact that the UN sometimes work through NGO's or true the host states authorities, but in the case of Northern Mali my own feeling is that it may be true that too little is done in the form of civilian response. But I would not use this as an argument for having even fewer militaries in the mission.

Jens Petersson

@[Liliana ENE](1451) Thank you for the insight on the Roma situation. What is your view on the Romanian governments way to help solve these problems? Do they show that they need to protect the human rights of all their populations? Does Romania as a country ask for and recieve help? Or is the problem simply hidden or ignored?

Qamar Jafri

I think one of the most important driver for identity-based violence is the concept of nationalism. Whether it is Europe, Asia, Africa or Americas forced narrative of nationalism, which might be part of foreign and national security policy, tries to exclude certain groups (religious, race, colour and ideology) from the stakes of nationhood (sense of belonging). At one side it creates alienation in individuals, and far-right extremists (e.g., Daesh, Taliban) might find easy way to recruit youth from across the world to fulfil their desire for nationhood. On the other side, politicians could exploit ingroup threat perception in young individuals, particularly white nationalists, and this threat perception to white identity across Europe has been increasing mass violence directed at racial and faith-based identity of the victims.

Hugo Lucas

@[Jens Petersson](1449) Thanks for that Jens - how could the civilian response be structured?

Jens Stappenbeck

@[Jens Petersson](1449) I agree. I like the concept of NOT comparing the costs of prevention with the cost of for example UN (military) peace operations for that reason. I will copy that.;-) To add an argument to this point: Prevention, even with a lot more money invested into it, does never guarantee escalation to violent conflict & we need to be ready and prepared to act when it does or when the window is closing. Do you have any advise on how to become more effective in raising public awareness and how to increase the effectivity of advocacy on these issues, especially when it is about prevention of a non-observable event, as it did not manifest yet?

Liliana ENE

@[Jens Petersson](1449) Thank you, for you replay. Romania has integrated the notion of discrimination by transposing into the national legislation the Racial Directive, through the Government Ordinance No. 137/2000 on the prevention and sanctioning of all forms of discrimination, but according to this discrimination is a sanction that is punished at most with a fine. I think that Romania does not take care of all its citizens, as it really should. There are many NGOs, which point to the same thing, and there are many discrimination lawsuits won at the ECHR against the Romanian state. I am currently working on an article on the analysis of petitions regarding discrimination of the Roma minority, and I am worry how many are there , but surely there would be many more, if Roma were aware that it is not normal to be discriminated and themselves must know that they have some fundamental rights that should not be violated. I think that Romania is facing a great degree of hypocrisy to which it should really give up, and find real solution. Just as an example where the state did not do its duty, on April 9, 2016 (the International Day of the Roma) the tent of an institution that promotes the Roma culture was vandalized. Of course, more NGOs, cultural personalities and even ministers they took attitude, condemned this act of vandalism and racism, but no culprits have been found and no measures have been taken so far. https://www.realitatea.net/cort-vandalizat-cu-mesaje-r

asiste-de-ziua-internationala-a-romilor_1921220_foto_1505097.html

Closing

Closing statement

By Kate Ferguson

On behalf of Protection Approaches, I would like to extend a sincere thank you to everyone that has taken part in the discussions over the last three days.

We hoped that it would be an opportunity to bring together civil society practitioners, academics, activists and campaigners from across the region to explore the problem of identity-based violence. We think it's been a great success and I hope you all have found the exercise valuable.

There has been an impressive level of engagement throughout the three days of discussions. Over 150 participants applied to take part across the region, and we have had close to 300 comments over the 10 individual sessions.

Thanks to all the participants and moderators the three days produced a wide-ranging discussion that highlighted many core commonalities and points of shared agreement, despite the broad spectrum of expertise and perspectives. There was near-universal support for an holistic approach to prevention; participants were also united on the central role of education, and on the need to prioritise early prevention over last minute response.

With the politics of exclusion and intolerance apparently strengthening across the continent these challenges to our work are clear. We hope that in bringing together -– for the first time – Europe's experts in preventing different forms of hate and identity-based violence, this consultation has begun a dialogue of regional solidarity, lesson learning, and collaboration.

We also wanted the week to be an opportunity for people to get to know the work of other colleagues from across Europe. If it would be helpful for us to help facilitate any direct introductions, please get in touch.

For those who joined the consultation later in the week and who are still catching up on the rich discussion, or for those of you who may still have more to add, we will be keeping the **threads open for comments until 10am UK time (0900 UTC) on Monday, the 19th of August**. At that point, the platform will stop accepting comments. However, all of the discussions here will remain online, and you'll continue to be able to access them at any time, using the same login details.

Meanwhile, we will be bringing together the various contributions to the consultation into a public report that we will share with you all in the near future. The report will share these critical insights with a broader audience, set out proposed next steps and key recommendations, and provide a map of European civil society contributions to preventing identity-based violence.

My final request is for you to please respond to the closing survey, which will help us better understand what has worked well, what can be improved, and to inform our next steps.

I'd like to end with sincere thanks to our partners at Peace Direct who have helped us to host this exciting and rich discussion, and to all participants for giving us your time and enthusiasm. We look forward to continuing to work with you all and to meeting our shared challenges together.

With best wishes,

Dr. Kate Ferguson, Co-Executive Director, Protection Approaches

Responses

Participants

Admins

Kate Ferguson
Co-Executive Director, Protection Approaches (UK)

Rosemary Forest
Senior Advocacy Officer

Joel Gabri
Peace technology programmes officer at Peace Direct

Hugo Lucas
I'm Hugo, working at Protection Approaches as a Senior Policy Officer. I'll be helping with moderation across the three days of the consultation. If you have any questions or comments, please drop me an email on hugo.lucas@protectionapproaches.org

Melanie Moran
Digital Fundraising and Marketing Officer at Peace Direct

Ben Willis
Senior Research Officer, Protection Approaches (UK). Our organisation works to defend the rights of peoples around the world who are violently targeted because of their identity. We work with decision makers and decision shapers in order to strengthen prediction, prevention, and protection approaches to identity-based violence worldwide.

Facilitators

Terri Beswick
Analyst, facilitator and incurable eclectic working on the politics of peace, conflict and social justice.

Fred Carver
Head of Policy - UNA-UK

Chiara De Franco

Associate Professor of International Relations at the University of Southern Denmark and Director of 'Protection Complexity: how EU, UN and AU practice protection of civilians' - an international research project funded by the Danish Research Council

Andy Fearn
Co-Exec Director at Protection Approaches leading on our UK focussed Education and community coheasion programmes

Gabriela Ghindea
I am working for the Auschwitz Institute for Peace and Reconciliation (AIPR), a nongovernmental organization that provides education, training, and technical assistance to States to develop and improve their atrocity prevention policy. We also encourage and support the cooperation of States through regional and international networks to advance prevention.

Velma Saric
Researcher, journalist, peacebuilding expert, and human rights defender from Sarajevo, Bosnia and Herzegovina.

Jens Stappenbeck
Executive Director of Genocide Alert.

Peter Tatchell

Dilia Zwart
Education Officer at Protection Approaches

Participants

Lamyaa Abdellateef
Protection Officer work in the field of Protection of Civilians, Counter Trafficking in Persons and Peacebuilding

Eamon Aloyo

Andreas Andreou
I am a Researcher and Project Manager at the human rights NGO Aequitas (Cyprus). Aequitas takes a two-fold approach for combating hate speech; 1. monitoring of online hate speech in collaboration with the European Commission, in the framework of the Code of Conduct on countering illegal hate speech, and 2. Awareness Raising and Capacity Building Trainings and Research; part of it is a Horizon2020 project on Artificial Intelligence, Big Data and Ethics/Human Rights.

C B

violeta berisha
Activist, policymaker and humanist

Maddy Crowther
We undertake monitoring, research and analysis on the political and humanitarian situation in Sudan, and also support the country's asylum-seekers, refugees, and the wider diaspora in the UK.

CWWPP CWWPP

Hayley Davidson
Crisis Action UK Director

Adama Dieng

Panayote Dimitras
Human and minority rights advocate focusing on hate speech litigation

Liliana ENE
I am a researcher and a PhD Student, in the field of Political Science at National School of Political and Administrative Sciences (Romania), interested in the history of racial biology, racial policies, biopolitics and eugenics in the inter- and post-war period. As a Roma activist I am the President of a very new NGO, called M.A.M.A. - Allied Movement of Anti-racist Mothers a non-profit, non-governmental, apolitical association, whose main purpose is the defense and promotion of human rights, especially Mother and Roma child, by combating and preventing racism, intolerance and racial discrimination in all areas of life. As a main activity, we try to combat racist bullying in schools, focusing on promoting dialogue and mutual learning.

Naomi Gichuru
I am a peacebuilder, social research specailist and a certified Mediator working in Kenya

Dr Chloë McRae Gilgan
ESRC Post-doctoral Fellow, Associate Lecturer at York Law School

Mariana Goetz
Human Rights Lawyer with Transitional Justice and Peace Building expertise.

Sarah Gough
Executive Director of Play for Peace, a peacebuilding organization developing compassionate young leaders in communities in conflict around the world.

Sadia Hameed

I help convene communities of practice that being together practitioners from around the world who are working to combat hate and violence.

Peter Hassan Tijani
Peter Hassan Tijani is the visionary Founder/Coordinator, Network for Empowerment and Development Initiative (NEDIN) a Local NGO based in Kano, Nigeria working to promote Peace, Justice, Security, Good governance, Anti-Corruption & Human Rights etc.

Gregor Hofmann
As a volunteer, I am a member of the board and the chairman of Genocide Alert, a German civil-society organization comitted to raising awareness for the prevention and persecution of atrocity crimes around the world. As a professional, I am a International Relations researcher and academic advisor to the executive director at the Peace Research Institute Frankfurt (PRIF) in Germany.

Qamar Jafri
Qamar is a PhD candidate at RMIT University Australia. He conducts research on identity conflict, local actors and peacebuilding in South Asia.

David Kay
Senior Outreach Faculty and sustainability research at Cornell University's Community and Regional Development Institute; member/trainer, Mediators Beyond Borders International

Andriy Korniychuk
Programme Manager Eastern Europe and Eurasia at PAX (The Netherlands)

Francine Esther Kouablan
Directrice du MRAX, de formation psychopédagogue, je porte un intérêt particulier à la lutte contre le racisme et les discriminations sous toutes ses formes.

Gerrit Kurtz
Non-resident fellow, Global Public Policy Institute, Berlin

Daria Kuznetsova
Innovative virtual dialogue platform created in April 2015 in eastern Ukraine that seeks to reconnect members of divided communities amid an ongoing conflict by using a sophisticated crowdsourcing methodology and Nansen dialogue approach

Laura Livingston

Lumenge Lubangu

Olivia Marks-Woldman

Aude Mellet

Martin Mennecke

Osman Mohamed
An Independent Researcher

Aurelien Mondon
Dr Aurelien Mondon is a Senior Lecturer in politics at the University of Bath. His research focuses predominantly on the impact of racism and populism on liberal democracies and the mainstreaming of far right politics through elite discourse. His first book, The Mainstreaming of the Extreme Right in France and Australia: A Populist Hegemony?, was published in 2013 and he recently co-edited After Charlie Hebdo: Terror, racism and free speech. He is currently working on a book project with Aaron Winter titled Reactionary democracy: How racism and the 'populist' far right became mainstream, which will be published early 2020.

Dan Nash
Cybersecurity researcher and technologist. Keen observer & archiver of the extreme right at home & abroad.

Julie Penshorn
Director Growing Communities for Peace: Smart Tools for Life

Jens Petersson
Senior advisor on peace and security issues at the United Nations Association of Sweden. UNA-Sweden does advocacy work for the concept of the Responsibility to Protect (R2P) and its various components. We arrange seminars, produce articles and reports, give lectures etc. As a Swedish civil society organisation our main target groups are national. We are, however, members of the World Federation of UNAs as well as members of the International Coalition for R2P (ICRtoP) as well as for ICC (CICC). Occasionally we arrange international seminars as well, even at the UNHQ and similar important places. We also co-op on a more practical level with our sister organisation in the DR Congo.

Ruthie Pliskin
Assistant Professor of Social Psychology at Leiden University

Timothy Plum
PhD student studying Northern Ireland loyalist identity in the context of Brexit.

Elisabeth Pramendorfer
Research Analyst and representing the Global Centre for the Responsibility to Protect in Geneva, focusing on atrocity prevention, early warning and role of Geneva-based human rights mechanisms in strengthening implementation of R2P.

Louise Pyne-Jones

Head of Research at the International Observatory of Human Rights

Irina Ranaivosoa
Peace student

Benediktt Rhiel

Brittany Roser
UN Advocacy Advisor for PAX in New York, working on global peacebuilding and civilian protection issues.

Sudaba Shiraliyeva
Director International Center Women and Modern World from Azerbaijan

Timea Spitka
I live in Jerusalem where I work on projects with civil society and conduct research on intervention in violent conflicts, Responsibility to Protect (R2P), gender, children in conflict, international mediation, human security and protection. Previously, I worked for international organizations including for the United Nations (Bosnia) and Oxfam (Occupied Territories).

Cristina G. Stefan
Researcher and Professor at University of Leeds, Co-Director European Centre for the Responsibility to Protect (ECR2P)

Kellie Strom
Syria Solidarity UK activist

Molly Tepper
I am a conflict resolution practitioner, trainer, university faculty, scholar and coach focusing on community-based cross cultural identity insecurity conflicts

Joe Twilley
Head of Communications at the Holocaust Memorial Day Trust.

Giacomo Viggiani
Assistant Professor in the Philosophy of Law (University of Brescia))

George Weiss

Michael Whine
Practitioner and investigator of identity-based extremism

Kate Williams