Conference Report

Introduction

The Oslo Conference on *Right-wing Extremism and Hate Crime: Minorities under Pressure in Europe and Beyond* was held on May 14-15 2013 under the auspices of the Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs. Against a background of rising concern about xenophobic trends, exclusivist ideologies, and crimes committed against minorities, the Conference brought together experts and stakeholders of various backgrounds in order to discuss and formulate recommendations on counter-strategies.

The Conference brought together more than 150 representatives from over 25 European countries and 70 organisations, including the UN, the Council of Europe, the European Union, and the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe, UN special rapporteurs and independent experts, members of national human rights institutions, academics, and representatives of civil society organisations. **Ms. Bente Angell-Hansen**, Secretary General of the Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, chaired the Conference.

The conference was organized in plenary sessions with introductory presentations. Participants were subsequently divided into six working groups devoted to the following subjects: 1) 'The Extremists: Who, How and Why', 2) 'The Legal and Policy Framework', 3) 'How to Mobilize through Social Media', 4) 'Trust-Building and Identity in a Multicultural Society', 5) 'The Role of the Media', and 6) 'Civil Society: Troublemakers or Problem-Solvers?'. Rapporteurs from each working group presented a summary of their group's findings in a final plenary session, followed by a discussion wrapping up the conference. The reports from the six working groups are annexed to this report, in addition to the Chair's Summary of Conclusions, which State Secretary **Ms. Gry Larsen** presented at the closing of the conference.

This brief conference report is not a full account of the interventions, working groups and input that the conference produced. Based on the contributions[1] by speakers and the discussions of the working groups, this report distils the trends, themes and challenges related to right-wing

[1] A copy of the contributions can be found at www.rehc2013.org.

extremism and hate crime discussed during the conference. For more information about the conference' conclusions and key topics, please see the attached Chairs' Summary of Conclusions.

1) Trends

Foreign Minister **Mr. Espen Barth Eide** opened the conference by expressing the conference participants' shared concern about increased manifestations of exclusivist ideologies and right-wing extremism. Numerous contributors acknowledged that extremism is not uncommon in small minority groups, yet it was underlined that there is a unique threat inherent in right-wing extremism within the majority population that targets minorities.

Research findings suggest that increasing xenophobia is a pan-European trend. **Mr. Ralf Melzer**, of the Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung (FES) pointed to a survey of 23 countries that confirmed xenophobia is widespread throughout Europe.[2] There are also reliable indications that the incidence of hate crime in Europe is dramatically underreported. Director of the EU Agency for Fundamental Rights **Mr. Morten Kjærum** shared the results of a recent Agency survey of 93 000 respondents from 27 European Union Member States that examined the extent to which individuals report hate crime to the relevant authorities. The results indicate victims harbour a deep-seated lack of trust in the authorities. Eight out of ten victims of crimes motivated by bias or prejudice did not report these to the police, leading to a situation of 'de facto impunity' for perpetrators.

Questions of possible distinctions between right-wing extremism in Eastern and Western Europe were raised during the conference. For example, Chairman of the Hungarian Socialist Party **Mr. Attila Mesterhazy** observed that there has never been a *cordon sanitaire*, or dividing line, between conservative right and radical right in Eastern Europe. Nevertheless, the contributors were in agreement that there exists no reason for complacency anywhere in Europe in the face of growing right-wing extremism.

2) Origins of right-wing extremism

The role of declining economic conditions in fostering extremism arose several times over the course of the conference. Indications that economic downturns exacerbate the spread of extremism were not contested, but it was noted that countries such as Portugal and Spain have not registered a noticeable increase in right-wing extremism, despite high unemployment. Mr.

[2] European Values Study, 1999/2000 and 2008, http://zacat.gesis.org/webview/index.jsp?object=http://zacat.gesis.org/obj/fCatalog/Catalog5 (last accessed 15 May 2013).

Melzer pointed to a recent FES study[3] documenting a link between multiple unemployment and right-wing extremist views in Germany. The Working Group on 'The Extremists: Who, How and Why' noted that right-wing extremists use minorities as scapegoat during times of economic hardship. Nevertheless, several contributors, including **Mr. Hugh Williamson,** Director of the Europe & Central Asia Division for Human Rights Watch, cautioned against over-emphasising the impact of economic conditions. While an economic crisis may escalate and amplify the rise of extremism, a declining economy alone is inadequate to explain this development. Related factors such as a fear of social degradation and a lack of trust in public institutions play an equal if not greater explanatory role.

While social exclusion is not a necessary feature of hate crimes, Mr. Melzer emphasised that a feeling of being detached from progress is an important explanatory element. Similarly, UN Special Rapporteur on freedom of religion or belief **Mr. Heiner Bielefeldt** noted that appeals to collective manifestations of hatred play on two emotions inherent in the human condition: fear and contempt. A fear of being under siege ('imagined vulnerability') is combined with a 'pretence of superiority' towards the targeted group.

UN Independent Expert on minority issues **Ms. Rita Izsák** explained that the first step towards extremism involves differentiating between 'them' and 'us'. Mr. Bielefeldt added that extremist views frame the other as both 'powerful and despicable.' This perception forms the basis for what Foreign Minister Eide described as a the logic of pre-emption, through which right-wing extremists justify acts of hatred and violence against the targeted group as a means to prevent the perceived existential threat the targeted group poses to the majority group's culture and way of life.

The Working Group on 'The Extremists: Who, How and Why', for which **Mr. Jamie Bartlett**, Head of the Violence and Extremism Programme at Demos served as moderator and **Mr. Mutuma Ruteere**, UN Special Rapporteur on contemporary forms of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance[4] gave the keynote speech, highlighted lack of trust in public institutions as a factor that aggravates extremist dynamics. Rapporteur **Mr. Peder Nustad, from the Norwegian Centre for Studies of Holocaust and Religious Minorities,** recalled the Working Group's observation that right-wing extremists often feed on their followers' 'total collapse in confidence' that the established political parties represent their interests. Mr. Bielefeldt similarly identified widespread corruption as an aggravating circumstance for right-wing extremism, as this leads to a loss of trust in public institutions. The

[3] "The Changing Society: Right-Wing Views in Germany 2012" (Rechtsextreme Einstellungen in Deutschland 2012), http://www.fes-gegen-rechtsextremismus.de/pdf_12/mitte-im-umbruch_www.pdf (last accessed 16 May 2013).

[4] The UN Special Rapporteur on contemporary forms of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance recently presented two relevant reports to the UN Human Rights Council, http://www.ohchr.org/Documents/Issues/Racism/A.HRC.20.33_en.pdf (last accessed 22 May 2013) and http://www.ohchr.org/Documents/Issues/Racism/A.HRC.20.38_En.pdf (last accessed 22 May 2013).

public sphere disappears and thereby the most important arena for countering derogatory stereotyping. Other contributing factors include the existence of historic traumas that breed suspicion and encourage reliance on inward-looking focus. Politicians may also exploit identity politics to rouse support.

3) Legal approach: opportunities and limits

Although several contributors touched on the role of international law in regulating hate speech and hate crimes, there was broad consensus that legal efforts must be complemented by more wide-ranging efforts to tackle the various facets of intolerance and to address the root causes of right-wing extremism, discrimination, and negative stereotyping of minorities. The rapporteur for the Working Group on 'The Legal and Policy Framework', **Ms. Nazila Ghanea**, Lecturer in International Human Rights Law at the University of Oxford encouraged participants to work towards developing a broader toolkit, designed to build 'normative resilience against hatred'. **Ms. Snežana Samardžić-Marković**, Director General for Democracy, Council of Europe, served as the Working Group's moderator and both **Mr. Nils Muižnieks**, Council of Europe Commissioner for Human Rights[5] and **Ms. Elisabeth Ivarsflaten**, Associate Professor in Comparative Politics at the University of Bergen, gave the keynote speeches.

Ms. Agnes Callamard, Executive Director of Article 19, described the legal framework for regulating hate speech under international human rights law. In general, the standard under international law is not very well developed and is open to multiple interpretations. As a result, national definitions of prohibited hate speech vary dramatically. There is a lack of harmonisation across countries, even within Europe.

The main international human rights law instruments applicable to hate speech consist of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR), under Articles 19 and 20, and the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination (ICERD), under Article 4. Neither of these instruments provides a clear definition of hate speech, however. Article 19(3)(a) of the ICCPR allows restriction of free speech where necessary and provided by law '[f]or respect of the rights or reputations of others.'

Article 20 of the ICCPR requires States to prohibit '[a]ny advocacy of national, racial or religious hatred that constitutes incitement to discrimination, hostility or violence'. The UN Special Rapporteur on the freedom of opinion and expression, **Mr. Frank La Rue**, [6] underlined

[5] On 13 May 2013, the Council of Europe Commissioner for Human Rights published the comment "Europe must combat racist extremism and uphold human rights", http://humanrightscomment.org/2013/05/13/racist-extremism/ (last accessed 22 May 2013).
[6] On 7 September 2012, the UN Special Rapporteur on the freedom of opinion and expression presented a report to the UN General Assembly on hate speech and incitement to hatred, http://daccess-dds-ny.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/N12/501/25/PDF/N1250125.pdf?OpenElement (last accessed 22 May).

that ICCPR Article 20 does not oblige *criminalization*, but *prohibition* – an important distinction. As Mr. La Rue stated, although some forms of speech should be criminalized, states primarily enhance freedom of expression through protection and promotion – a preventive approach.

Several contributors also raised the concern for ensuring that legislation prohibiting hate speech complies with States' obligation to respect freedom of expression. Several contributors referred to the Rabat Plan of Action on the prohibition of advocacy of national, racial or religious hatred that constitutes incitement to discrimination, hostility or violence, which similarly reaffirms the indivisibility of human rights, and promotes state efforts to combat negative stereotypes, especially through counter speech, rather than a singular focus on prohibitive legislation. The Rabat Plan of Action calls for States to protect freedom of expression by distinguishing clearly between speech that is prohibited through criminal penalties, speech subject to civil penalties, and speech that is offensive, but not prohibited in a democratic society, and offers criteria for this distinction.[7] The Rabat Plan of Action also calls for the elimination of blasphemy laws in favour of encouraging inter-religious dialogue, and for the protection of religion or belief.

Turning to questions of legal implementation, **Ms. Floriane Hohenberg**, Head of ODIHR's Tolerance and Non-Discrimination Department, described an example of good practices in police investigative techniques for hate crimes. Ms. Hohenberg recounted how law enforcement authorities in the Czech Republic responded to a vicious firebomb attack against several members of the Roma community by pursuing leads suggesting the crime was racially motivated and gathering sufficient evidence to sustain a hate crime conviction of the main perpetrators.

Mr. Kjærum encouraged participants to remember that what makes hate crimes especially pernicious is the harm they inflict on not just the individual targeted, but on the broader society. Participants agreed that States should allocate adequate resources to enable swift and effective sanctioning of hate crimes.

4) Media and communication

Information technologies have transformed the media and social communication, creating a novel space for the dissemination of radical ideologies, facilitating recruitment, and forging of new types of extremist networks. On the other hand, media is instrumental in challenging

[7] Rabat Plan of Action on the prohibition of advocacy of national, racial or religious hatred that constitutes incitement to discrimination, hostility or violence, http://www.ohchr.org/Documents/Issues/Opinion/SeminarRabat/Rabat_draft_outcome.pdf (last visited 16 May 2013).

negative stereotypes, preventing misconceptions, and combating discrimination. Reference was made to the Camden Principles[8] in this regard.

Much attention was dedicated to the role of the professional media as a tool to counter simplistic stereotypes, contextualizing incidents such as the provocative burning of the Quran or films such as the 'Innocence of Muslims'. **Mr. Aidan White**, Director of the Ethical Journalism Network, outlined a dividing line between unfiltered communication through social media, and the provision of quality journalism. Mr. White defined journalism not as free expression, but as ' constrained expression – expression with a purpose.'

The Working Group on 'The Role of the Media', for which Mr. La Rue was the keynote speaker and Mr. White moderated, discussed strategies to ensure journalists avoid perpetuating stereotypes and promote diversity, while ever mindful of States' obligation to uphold freedom of expression and the independence of the media. Several participants noted that the economic downturn in the news industry as a whole threatens journalistic quality. Mr. La Rue opined that the media over-emphasises the commercial dimension, while under-emphasising the concept of journalism as a social vocation. Repeated calls were made for journalistic professionalism and 'ethical journalism'. At the same time, Mr. White cautioned against the temptation to replace negative stereotypes with positive ones, reiterating that in journalism, 'the facts are sacred'.

Several participants highlighted the dearth of minority voices in the newsroom – both in terms of viewpoints and of personnel. The Working Group on 'The Role of the Media' in particular underlined the need to mainstream minority perspectives into traditional news reporting, especially through public media channels. Referring to statistics in the UK showing that 17% of the population are non-white, but only 7% in the newsrooms, Ms. Izsák expressed concern that minority journalists will avoid bringing diverse perspectives to bear on their reporting out of fear that doing so would raise questions about their objectivity.

Contributors also addressed the topic of how extremist groups use both traditional and social media to spread hate. Participants were in agreement that extremist groups are generally very media savvy – both in terms of exploiting pressures for sensational news to gain coverage in traditional media and as 'early adopters' of social media. On this latter trend, the Working Group on 'How to Mobilize through Social Media' discussed how right-wing extremist groups use these new communication tools to recruit followers and spread extremist propaganda. The Head of Policy CEE at Facebook, **Ms. Gabriella Cseh**, served as moderator for the Working Group and **Ms. Rachel Briggs**, Research and Policy Director at the Institute for Strategic Dialogue, and Norwegian freelance journalist and author **Mr. Øyvind Strømmen** each held

[8] The Camden Principles on Freedom of expression and Equality, April 2009, http://www.article19.org/data/files/pdfs/standards/the-camden-principles-on-freedom-of-expression-and-equality.pdf (last accessed 22 May 2013).

keynote speeches. The Group's Rapporteur, **Mr. Gavan Titley**, Lecturer in Media Studies at the National University of Ireland, noted that social media outlets are now recognized as a critical platform for the proliferation of right-wing extremist views, but that more research is needed on the exact means by which extremists utilize social media.

5) Civil society

Mr. Mark Lattimer, Executive Director of Minority Rights Group gave the keynote speech for the Working Group on 'Civil Society: Troublemakers or Problem-Solvers?'. The rapporteur, Ms. Hohenberg, expressed the Working Group's caution against adopting a simplistic view of the role civil society organisations (CSOs) play in this space. While some organisations are part of the solution – by combating negative stereotypes and countering manifestations of hate – others are part of the problem, by actively promoting right-wing extremist views, and even encouraging individuals to commit acts of violence. The multiple roles that CSOs play in countering extremism and hate crime was nevertheless the main theme, and a general call was made for States to provide the legal and policy framework necessary for CSOs to carry out these important tasks.

Ms. Hohenberg observed that CSOs fulfil a watchdog role by monitoring and reporting on incidents of hate speech – even at the highest levels of politics – and by reaching out to marginalized communities that lack a voice. It was underlined that CSOs may serve as intermediaries between targeted minorities and authorities, and have also achieved success in programs to reintegrate offenders.

The rapporteur for the Working Group on 'The Role of the Media', **Ms. Milia Pesic**, Director of the Media Diversity Institute, presented the group's suggestion that CSOs play a watchdog role by monitoring media outlets' performance in providing news coverage that is both inclusive and non-discriminatory. Ms. Pesic stated that CSOs should invite and meet opponents with tolerance and respect for democratic principles. The Working Group on 'How to Mobilize through Social Media' offered a specific suggestion for communication, encouraging civil society organisations to adopt social media tools as a counterweight to right-wing extremist propaganda. These tools lend themselves to opportunities for satire and parody, allowing CSOs to expose the ignorance that underlies messages of hatred and intolerance.

6) Education and awareness-raising activities

A common theme during the conference was the potential for education and awareness-raising activities to nurture social consciousness, tolerance, and understanding across cultural and religious boundaries. Several contributors highlighted the need to encourage the development of what the Working Group on 'Civil Society: Troublemakers or Problem-Solvers?' described as

'civic courage', by equipping the next generation to respond to extremist appeals by basing notions of identity on clear and unequivocal expressions of tolerance, inclusiveness and respect for human rights.

Mr. Mesterhazy exhorted participants to develop educational and awareness-raising programs designed to 'remind us of crimes of the distant past and mistakes of the more immediate past.' There was consensus that educational initiatives should not be limited to the younger demographic, and that media literacy should be included. Others highlighted the need for diversity training within media organisations in addition to cross-cultural educational exchanges for journalism students. A specific need was also expressed for education of police and members of the judicial branch in order to address hate crimes properly.

7) Trust-building and dialogue

Much attention was dedicated to the dynamics of 'us' versus 'them'. This issue of identity is central to right-wing extremism. **Mr. Marwan Muhammad**, CCIF Director, emphasised in his keynote speech for the Working Group on 'Trust-Building and Identity in a Multicultural Society' that definitions of identity should be broadened and be more inclusive – both at the individual and the community level.

In terms of trust-building measures, Mr. Nustad reported that the Working Group on 'The Extremists: Who, How and Why' discussed the importance of political leadership to tackle real problems, however difficult. By leaving the most difficult problems to the right-wing extremists, this allows those at the fringe to set the tone for political debate, and reinforces the extremists' message that mainstream political institutions are unresponsive to voter concerns.

On the need for political leadership, Mr. Bartlett observed that 'the Devil always has the best tunes'. In other words, there is less rhetorical appeal in advocating moderate measures to solve complex, long-term problems as opposed to the extremists' simple answers built on base emotions of fear and contempt. **Ms. Catherine Fieschi**, Director of Counterpoint and rapporteur for the Working Group on 'Trust-Building and Identity in a Multicultural Society', urged participants to embrace emotional appeals in defence of progressive values, rather than risk being perceived as apologetic about vigorously promoting tolerance and diversity.

Several contributors advocated raising awareness about the value of interreligious and intercultural dialogue. The Working Group on 'Trust-Building and Identity in a Multicultural Society', for which **Mr. Zeljko Jovanovic**, Director of the Roma Initiatives Office at the Open Society Foundations, served as moderator, emphasised the need to openly 'deconstruct' the logic of radical groups. Shared platforms of debate and partnerships between different governmental and non-governmental stakeholders facilitate cooperation on emerging issues and the exchange of best practices. The Working Group on 'The Role of the Media' similarly

encouraged national and global dialogues on 'the role of the media in reflecting diversity and combating discrimination.'

Mr. La Rue underlined that it is particularly important for political and community leaders to not engage in complacency by ignoring or condoning derogatory stereotyping and stigmatisation. They should refrain from making discriminatory statements, but should also clearly condemn manifestations of hate in public discourse and acts of violence based on bias. As Mr. Bielefeldt pointed out, 'entrepreneurs of hatred' proclaim to speak on behalf of the silent majority. As a result, the 'silent majority must not remain silent', but rather, actively challenge the extremists' narrative through transparent communication and dialogue.

8) Knowledge gaps and implementation challenges

Deliberations at the conference pinpointed a range of knowledge gaps relative to hate crime, hate speech, and right-wing extremism. At a macro-level, Mr. Kjærum explained how the lack of sufficient data and reliable information on hate crimes makes it difficult to identify and confirm trends. States report crime statistics differently, preventing researchers from conducting comparative studies. State statistics also rarely identify the range of possible racial, ethnic and religious motivations among perpetrators. This lack of data on hate crimes is unfortunate not only for researchers; it also deprives policy-makers of reliable benchmarks to assess the impact of targeted measures. Civil society organisations have attempted to fill the gap through their own reporting, but contributors stressed that comprehensive state-level crime statistic reporting remains the ideal.

At the micro-level, Ms. Hohenberg lamented the lack of data on the inner motivations of those who commit hate crimes, opining that such data would help to develop effective rehabilitation programs. Mr. Nustad noted that more information is also needed on the 'grey area between the radical and violent extremists and the middle ground of society,' described as 'the people, groups and environments that are susceptible to extremist views and attitudes.' This type of information could help in developing an early warning system to survey the risk of increasing extremism.

The need for more information about the nature of right-wing extremism and a mapping of actors was also discussed as a means to create a 'segmented' approach to dialogue. As Ms. Fieschi explained, although it is possible to draw similarities across countries, knowledge about the specific actors in each context would allow for a more effective and targeted approach to dialogue. National plans of action, together with international cooperation and coordination, were mentioned as relevant means.

Attachment 1

CHAIR'S SUMMARY OF CONCLUSIONS

Based on the discussions at the Oslo Conference on "Right-wing Extremism and Hate Crime: Minorities under Pressure in Europe and Beyond" (14-15 May 2013), which brought together more than 150 representatives from over 25 European countries and 70 organisations, including the United Nations, the Council of Europe, the European Union and the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe, UN special rapporteurs and independent experts, members of national human rights institutions, academics, and representatives of civil society organisations and minority groups, we present the following summary of conclusions:

1. We reaffirm the universality, interdependence, indivisibility and interrelatedness of human rights as enshrined in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the Vienna Declaration and Program of Action, and as reflected in the international human rights conventions, particularly the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and the European Convention on Human Rights;

2. We further reaffirm the UN Human Rights Council resolution 16/18 and resolution 22/6 on protecting human rights defenders, the Camden Principles on Freedom of Expression and Equality as well as the Rabat Plan of Action on the prohibition of advocacy of national, racial or religious hatred that constitutes incitement to discrimination, hostility or violence, which have provided a solid foundation on which to build a framework for addressing manifestations of hatred while protecting fundamental freedoms, including freedom of expression;

3. We welcome the positive and necessary steps taken in all regions to address right-wing extremism, hate crime, hate speech and other forms of intolerance against minorities, including efforts to study, analyse and document such incidents, legal reforms, trust-building, public awareness and sensitivity campaigns, as well as the provision of support for activities aimed at protecting and promoting the fundamental rights of minorities, and to respond to hate speech with open and inclusive debates;

4. We express deep concern at the right-wing extremism, hate crime and hate speech directed towards minorities in Europe and beyond, and we are alarmed by the continued serious instances of derogatory stereotyping and stigmatisation of different minority groups, as well as programmes and agendas pursued by extremist groups aimed at creating and perpetuating negative stereotypes about minorities, in particular when ignored or even condoned by governments and political leaders;

5. We also express concern about the current situation in Europe, which remind us of the links between economic crisis, unemployment, and political and social instability, and we encourage States, when adopting coping-strategies, to enhance levels of trust and inclusiveness and to build upon broader definitions of identity, according to which, inter alia, political, ideological, cultural and/or religious affiliation would not be mutually exclusive, neither at the individual level nor as a community;

6. States, international organisations and other stakeholders should take effective measures to address and combat hate crime, hate speech and other forms of intolerance. States should in this regard allocate adequate resources, as well as swiftly investigate and effectively sanction such incidents, and provide access to justice and the right to remedy when appropriate, while at the same time fulfilling

their obligations under international human rights law to respect, protect and promote fundamental rights and freedoms, including protection against violence and discrimination, of all persons without distinction;

7. States should in a coherent manner enact legislation to combat and prevent intolerance, discrimination and violence against minorities, including through the Internet and social media, while at the same time safeguarding other fundamental rights, particularly the freedom of expression and opinion;

8. Any related legislation should be complemented by sustained and wide-ranging efforts to tackle the root causes and various facets of intolerance, especially in the educational field, as we recognise that the problems of right-wing extremism, discrimination and negative stereotyping of minorities are deeply rooted in socio-economic and political factors;

9. States should provide the mechanisms and institutions needed to guarantee the systematic and recurrent collection and analysis of standardised, comparable and comprehensive data on the nature, extent and trends, as well as challenges and opportunities pertaining to extremism, hate crime, hate speech and other forms of intolerance against minorities, in order to ensure informed public debates as well as decision- and policy-making based on sufficient and reliable information;

10. We call upon civil society organisations to contribute to the monitoring and reporting of incidents of discrimination and hate crime against minority groups, and to make use of their position to stand up and act as a voice for victims of hate crimes, through serving as intermediaries with the authorities, and providing practical assistance, such as legal advice, counselling and other services, while at the same time invite and meet opponents with tolerance and respect for democratic principles. States should provide the legal and political framework conducive for civil society organisations to carry out the afore mentioned activities;

11. We encourage States and other stakeholders to adopt positive and preventive measures, inter alia, by nurturing social consciousness, tolerance and understanding through education, training, social dialogue and awareness-raising about human rights, other cultures and religions, and the value of diversity:
    a. States should, in cooperation with civil society actors and representatives of various minority groups, develop educational and awareness-raising programmes to inform the population at large about the situation of different minorities and their human rights, while at the same time strengthening the voice of members of minority groups;
    b. States, national human rights institutions and civil society organisations should in consultation with different minority groups further encourage, support and facilitate intercultural and inter-religious dialogue, in order to foster mutual respect, trust and understanding;
    c. States and other stakeholders should further promote media literacy and make use of the opportunities presented by the Internet and social media to promote equality, non-discrimination and respect for diversity;
    d. States should encourage and support platforms for debate, partnerships and the dissemination of knowledge between policymakers, civil society organisations, media organisations and other relevant experts and stakeholders in order to facilitate cooperation on emerging issues and opportunities, as well as exchange of best practices;

12. We further encourage States and political leaders to demonstrate consistent and inclusive leadership, and to develop and implement national action plans to combat discrimination, hate crime and related forms of intolerance targeting minorities, as national action plans are vital in providing a comprehensive and transparent approach and roadmap regarding national-specific issues, while at the same time establishing benchmarks against which progress might be measured both nationally and regionally;

13. We call upon governments, politicians, national human rights institutions, civil society organisations and other stakeholders to engage in debate on these issues through all possible channels, and in a clear and consistent manner to publicly condemn manifestations of hate in public discourse and acts of violence based on bias, as well as to refrain from making discriminatory statements.

14. We recommend that all media, in enacting their moral and social responsibility, and through ethical journalism and self-regulation, play a role in combating discrimination and in promoting cross-cultural understanding, tolerance and acceptance of differences in communities, including by considering the following:
    a. Taking care to report in context and in a factual and sensitive manner, while ensuring that acts of discrimination are brought to the attention of the public;
    b. Being alert to the danger of discrimination or negative stereotypes of individuals and groups being furthered by the media;
    c. Avoiding unnecessary references to nationality, ethnicity, religion, gender, sexual orientation and other group characteristics that may promote intolerance;
    d. Raising awareness of the harm caused by discrimination and negative stereotyping;
    e. Reporting on different groups or communities in a balanced and inclusive manner;
    f. Strive to ensure inclusive media, in ownership and organisation, in order to reflect the diversity of the society they serve.

15. We further recommend regional and international coordination and cooperation in the search for new and more effective measures to counter right-wing extremism, hate crime, hate speech and other forms of intolerance, especially by;
    a. Building on the good work of the Council of Europe, the Organisation for Security and Cooperation in Europe, and the European Union, and ensuring continued and enhanced engagement in this field through coordination and collaboration both between these regional organisations and with the United Nations;
    b. Reaffirming the responsibility of the United Nations, particularly the UN Human Rights Council, including its Universal Periodic Review, the UN special rapporteurs and independent experts and the treaty bodies to address human rights violations against all persons, regardless of their perceived or real nationality, ethnicity, sexual orientation or gender identity, religion or belief, or any other status.

16. We all share the goal of working together towards a world where no-one faces violence or discrimination on any ground, and we commend the willingness of all stakeholders to participate in the discussions to this end, and look forward to working with all parties in an open, including and transparent manner to take concrete and practical steps to address violence and discrimination against different minorities, and to help ensure that those who face violence and discrimination are treated with equal dignity and with the fundamental respect to which all human beings are entitled.