

LIGHT ON: CROSS-COMMUNITY ACTIONS FOR COMBATING THE MODERN SYMBOLISM AND LANGUAGES OF RACISM AND DISCRIMINATION

Understanding the perception of racism
Research as a tool against racism

LIGHT ON
your turn to stop racism



LIGHT ON is a project co-financed by the Fundamental Rights and Citizenship Programme of the European Union

The project “LIGHT ON - Cross-community actions for combating the modern symbolism and languages of racism and discrimination”, funded by the Fundamental Rights and Citizenship Programme of the European Commission, aims to tackle racism and its related images and habits, providing a set of tools for the community and law enforcement professionals, through a preventive and participatory approach.

LIGHT ON is carried out by an interdisciplinary consortium of European actors engaged at different levels in activities to counter discrimination.

LIGHT ON objectives are:

- To challenge the normalization of racism and xenophobia and their acceptance in the dialogue and social dynamics of everyday life, through scientific research that identifies the images that explicitly and implicitly express racism while at the same time analyses how communities perceive them;
- To strengthen the capacity of professionals and authorities against hate crimes and discriminatory behaviours, through a highly specialised training model and a toolbox;
- To encourage citizens to report if they become victims or witness an incident of discrimination.

The editors of this volume are Anna Maria Boileau, Daniele Del Bianco and Ramona Velea, researchers at the ISIG - Institute of International Sociology, Gorizia.

The volume summarizes the main findings of the LIGHT ON research activities, as coordinated by the project Scientific

Board, composed by Eötvös Loránd Tudományegyetem (ELTE) (G. Csepeli), Peace Institute (PI) (V. Bajt) and the Institute of International Sociology of Gorizia (ISIG) (D. Del Bianco).

Main contributions of consortium partners:

Introduction

Institute of International Sociology of Gorizia (ISIG) (AM. Boileau, D. Del Bianco, R. Velea)

Mainstream research to combat racism
Peace Institute (PI) (V. Bajt, A. Frank)

Putting a spot on racism: case studies and qualitative analysis

Eötvös Loránd Tudományegyetem (ELTE) (G. Csepeli, G. Bernath)

Finnish Ombudsman for Minorities (J. Forbom)

Migrant & Refugee Communities Forum (MRCF) (Z. Bralo)

Abruzzo Region (A. Cerase)

Peace Institute (PI) (V. Bajt, A. Frank)

Perceptions and interpretations of racist expressions

Institute of International Sociology of Gorizia (ISIG) (AM. Boileau, D. Del Bianco, R. Velea)

DISCLAIMER

This report has been produced with the financial support of the Fundamental Rights and Citizenship Programme of the European Union.

The contents of this report are the sole responsibility of the authors and can in no way be taken to reflect the views of the European Union.

Contents of this publication may be quoted or reproduced, provided that the source of information is acknowledged.

INTRODUCTION	2
CHALLENGING RACISM ACROSS EUROPE: PROJECT METHODS AND TOOLS	2
UNDERSTANDING THE PERCEPTION OF RACISM – RESEARCH AS A TOOL AGAINST RACISM.....	2
MAINSTREAM RESEARCH TO COMBAT RACISM	4
THEORY AND CONCEPTS OF RACISM	4
<i>Historical roots of racism</i>	4
<i>National identity construction and the Other</i>	4
<i>Contemporary racism</i>	5
<i>Neo-racism and immigration</i>	6
DISCRIMINATION AND INTOLERANCE AS PRACTICE OF INEQUALITY	6
A SNAPSHOT OF RACISM AND DISCRIMINATION PRACTICES IN THE 5 PROJECT COUNTRIES	7
<i>Finland</i>	7
<i>Hungary</i>	8
<i>Italy</i>	8
<i>Slovenia</i>	9
<i>United Kingdom</i>	10
CONCLUSIONS.....	11
PUTTING A SPOT ON RACISM: CASE STUDIES AND QUALITATIVE ANALYSIS	12
METHODS AND INSTRUMENTS	12
RACISM UNDER THE LOUPE: KNOWING FOR COUNTERACTING	12
<i>Visual racism: the LIGHT ON Visual Database</i>	12
<i>Languages of racism: the Glossary of racist terms and the LIGHT ON Bliki</i>	13
RACISM IN EVERYDAY LIFE - A SELECTION OF CASE STUDIES	13
ANALYZING RACISM MANIFESTATION IN EVERYDAY LIFE	20
<i>General characteristics of social psychology of exclusion in contemporary Europe</i>	20
PERCEPTIONS AND INTERPRETATIONS OF RACIST EXPRESSIONS	24
MATERIALS, INSTRUMENTS AND METHOD	24
<i>The proposed items</i>	24
<i>The sample</i>	26
<i>Previous knowledge and experience with the proposed items</i>	27
<i>Dimensions of meaning ascription</i>	28
<i>Significant differences in ascribing meaning to the items</i>	30
<i>Dimensions of meaning intentions</i>	32
<i>Significant differences in interpreting the meaning intentions of the users</i>	34
<i>Dimensions of meaning eteroperceptions</i>	37
<i>Significant differences in interpreting the eteroperceptions</i>	38
<i>Dimensions of social value/disvalue</i>	40
<i>Significant differences in figuring out future scenarios</i>	42
SOME IMPLICATIONS FROM RESEARCH FINDINGS	47
REFERENCES	48

INTRODUCTION

CHALLENGING RACISM ACROSS EUROPE: PROJECT METHODS AND TOOLS

The LIGHT ON project aims to contribute to the European efforts in the fight to racism through an innovative approach by making racism a matter of common interest for all citizens.

Project activities have been developed within a preventive approach to racism, focused on the recipients, with the purpose of helping them to recognize discrimination. The main actions carried out were:

- **scientific analysis** of typical and hidden manifestations of racism and their social perceptions throughout Europe;
- **targeted supportive actions** for key community stakeholders (i.e. law enforcement agents and legal professionals) strengthening their capacity to recognize the racist disvalue of an offence and to report it correctly;
- **primary prevention actions**, across the five countries, empowering citizens (i.e. victims and witnesses) to recognize discrimination and to self-report cases to the relevant authorities;
- **dissemination of positive models** through high impact communication systems.

The LIGHT ON project established the anti-racism National Watching Points¹ (NWP) in all of the project countries. They represent the project core operational centres. Through their work of data collection and results dissemination alike, the NWPs ensured constant contact with local socio-political contexts in Finland, Hungary, Italy, Slovenia and the United Kingdom.

UNDERSTANDING THE PERCEPTION OF RACISM – RESEARCH AS A TOOL AGAINST RACISM

LIGHT ON research activities aimed to investigate and analyse the contemporary expressions of racism and discrimination in European communities, focusing on people's perception of symbols and words with typical or hidden racist contents. The ultimate goal is to provide scientific-based knowledge about the social disvalue of such manifestations and their dangerous negative influence on daily social life.

¹ Hungary - Eötvös Loránd Tudományegyetem (ELTE); Slovenia - Peace Institute (PI); Italy – Abruzzo Region; Finland – Finnish Ombudsman for Minorities; UK - Migrant & Refugee Communities Forum (MRCF)

The LIGHT ON research architecture was structured in three main parts:

- **Desk research** – depicting the social context in which racism is manifested.
- **Qualitative research** - investigating expressions of and reactions to racism, highlighting the most common racist, xenophobic and extremist symbols and words, while explaining their traditional and current meanings.
- **Quantitative research** - investigating the main perceptions and interpretations of racist visual and verbal items among youth across Europe.

MAINSTREAM RESEARCH TO COMBAT RACISM

The chapter explores some of the key concepts and theories on racism, nationalism, xenophobia, discrimination, intolerance, processes of *othering*, and practices of exclusion. Reference is made to case studies and reports on racism collected through secondary data analysis for the five project countries.

THEORY AND CONCEPTS OF RACISM

HISTORICAL ROOTS OF RACISM

Seeing contemporary forms of racism in isolation from the past, means ignoring the history of racism. The idea of different “races” emerged when European and non-European peoples came into contact in the late 15th, early 16th century. The European era of exploration and expansion was significantly related to the rise of the African slave trade, resulting in European imperial domination and colonization. The 18th century Europe can hence be understood as the cradle of modern racism. In the 19th century, racism was developed as a scientific theory and as such used as a pretext and justification to colonise and exploit different parts of the world. Colonial racism postulated the inferiority of colonised people. By the end of the 19th, start of the 20th century, the idea of white racial superiority was widespread, while this was also the time of the rise of modern anti-Semitism.

After the Second World War, racism and its practices of discrimination became regarded as a breach of human rights and equality. The concepts of “ethnicity” and “ethnic group” were brought in as the word “race” became problematic. Yet even though the preferred choice for expressing inter-group differences, even “ethnicity” has become associated with violence (especially because of the so-called ethnic cleansing and “acts of genocide”). Racism as a form of discrimination can exist without the assumption of races, and can be imbedded in the concept of “different cultures”.

NATIONAL IDENTITY CONSTRUCTION AND THE OTHER

National identity contains feelings of belonging to a political and social community, which represents a nation organised as a state. National identity describes a condition in which a group of people share the same identification with specific national symbols. Through the construction of the stigmatised others, the “real” members of the nation are recognised as striving for the “national interests” and the general national common good. Nation, “race”, religion, etc. play an important role in constructing one another through invoking the “us” versus “them” divide, the exclusion of the other. Accompanied with prejudice aimed against selected groups that are

perceived as different and, thus, categorised as the other: intolerance is frequently aimed against migrants, Jews, Roma, and various other minorities and marginalised social groups.

CONTEMPORARY RACISM

Racism is “an ideology of racial domination based on i) beliefs that a designated racial group is either biologically or culturally inferior and ii) the use of such beliefs to rationalise or prescribe the racial group’s treatment in society, as well as to explain its social position and accomplishment” (Wilson 1973 in Bulmer and Solomos 1999, 4). There are several definitions in use, especially because of the ambiguity and ubiquity of racism and its practices. In the narrowest sense, racism is an ideology or discourse about “higher” and “lower” races related to supposedly fixed biological and genetic characteristics, and is connected to aggressive practices of discrimination, subjugation and exclusion of the other. In a wider sense, racism encompasses any kind of aggressive attitude (hate speech, hostility, humiliation, aggressive speech, and call for aggressive acts) that legitimises or mandates racist behaviour.

The “newer” forms of racism are embedded in social processes and structures and are more difficult to explore and challenge. Balibar (1991) refers to this form(s) of racism as neo-racism, based on claims of cultural differences. Strengthened by nationalist and ethnocentric attitudes, the concept of race and racial superiority has therefore evolved or changed into cultural difference and superiority.

Contemporary racism has also been termed “new” or “cultural” racism. The belief is that cultural differences explain why some groups are backward. Cultural racism needs to prove the superiority of “Europeans” (replacing “whites”). This Eurocentric view claims that progress has spread from Europe around the world: the core is thus Europe and European settlement overseas, especially the USA, while “periphery” means everything else.

In the early 1980s, Taguieff defined a new form of “differentialist” racism, according to which different groups of people (ethnic or national) are not superior or inferior but simply “different” (Baskar 2004, 126). Upon this concept Balibar (1991) further develops the change in terminology of racism, showing how the concept of race (biology, nature) is replaced by the concept of culture. The antagonism between “higher” and “lower” races has hence been replaced by the antagonism between “different cultures” (i.e. between “our” and “foreign, other” culture. Racism no longer requires the race and at least seemingly can maintain an equivalence and relativity of cultures, while beneath the surface lies a deeply rooted belief in the inferiority of certain cultures (Baskar 2004).

Discussing new racism, Balibar (1991) notes how the category of immigration becomes a substitute for the notion of race – it is “racism without races”. The dominant theme is no longer biological heredity but the (inability to overcome the) cultural differences. New racism does not seem to claim superiority of certain groups, it “only”

emphasises the damage being done by abolishing boundaries because certain lifestyles and traditions are simply not compatible. It is therefore also inherently antagonistic to multiculturalism. Importantly though, new racism tries to be politically correct. Racism as a “social phenomenon” is not embedded only in the practice of violence, contempt, hatred, humiliation and exploitation, but also in discourses, imaginaries and representations (e.g. the notion of purifying the national body, the preservation of “our” identity against mixing, etc.) and through the stigma of Otherness (e.g. skin colour, religious practice, food ceremonies, etc.) (Balibar 1991).

NEO-RACISM AND IMMIGRATION

Because of stigmatization of racism after WW2, racist practices have frequently been reformulated in less conspicuous forms. If, as explained, race has been replaced with culture, colonialism has been replaced with immigration (Balibar 1991, Baskar 2004). Differentiation between cultures of immigrant and “local” people is based on the psychology of masses and builds its justification on ordinary peoples’ state of mind, who supposedly “cannot bear” immigration and the “dangerous limit” of immigration. The elites propagating these kinds of interpretations are allegedly non-racist, since they claim to acknowledge the equality of different cultures (Baskar 2004, 128, 144). However, underneath such politically correct claims, unequal treatment of different cultures as inferior is revealed in rhetoric as well as in certain policies. In this vocabulary, migrants represent a problem not because they are inferior but because they have irreducible “different” characteristics.

DISCRIMINATION AND INTOLERANCE AS PRACTICE OF INEQUALITY

Discrimination is a complex phenomenon with many guises and a great number of transformations, closely intertwined with questions of intolerance and hatred (Kuhar 2009). “If intolerance is a demeanour towards other people, then discrimination is the subject of this demeanour” (ibid, 41).

Intolerance has been defined as those ideas and convictions that “include the submission of others, or their goal is to prevent their rightful participation in society, which is achieved by declaring them unsuitable, barbaric, stupid, lazy, exploitative, criminal, immoral, in short, potentially dangerous for the majority” (Leskovšek 2005, 9). The most basic forms of categorising discrimination include direct and indirect forms (Kogovšek and Petković 2007). “Direct discrimination is a form of exclusion where an individual or a group are directly treated unequally and less favourably due to personal circumstances” (e.g. gender, religion, ethnicity or any other personal circumstance). Indirect discrimination is “a practice where seemingly neutral criteria are used, but they nonetheless result in placing an individual with a certain personal circumstance in a less favourable situation” (Kuhar 2009, 18). One can also distin-

guish between individual and systemic discrimination (the latter is also referred to as institutional or structural discrimination). Individual discrimination is practised by a person or a group in relation to another person or another group. The systemic forms of discrimination, however, are “practices of exclusion and unequal treatment (...) embedded in the system itself or in the rules of a certain social institution’s system of functioning (for example, discrimination embedded in a law)” (ibid, 19).

Hate speech is another common form of discrimination. Hate speech means calling for exclusion and/or marginalization of a certain group or an individual, or inciting physical or verbal attacks and similar action against certain groups or individuals (Kogovšek and Petkovič 2007; Meddaugh and Kay 2009). In relation, Boréus (2006) talks about discursive discrimination which is exercised through the use of language. This means that discursive discrimination draws on linguistic means to treat certain groups or individuals less favourably.

A SNAPSHOT OF RACISM AND DISCRIMINATION PRACTICES IN THE 5 PROJECT COUNTRIES

Finland, Italy and UK are countries with large immigration, especially from Muslim/Arab countries from Africa, Middle East and Far East/Asia. In all three countries, the Muslim communities are the most vulnerable victims of racist prejudice and discrimination². Even though Hungary and Slovenia are not dealing with mass immigration, migrants have been frequently used as a scapegoat and discriminated against. Moreover, Roma people are by far the most frequent victims of racist discrimination, as well as the “erased” of the former Yugoslav republics and Muslims in Slovenia, and Jews in Hungary. Religious and ethnic characteristics seem to reinforce the inequality and discrimination of these communities in an intersectional manner.

FINLAND

Although according to some data, racially motivated crimes in Finland have decreased since 2010, street violence towards Somali immigrants is higher in Finland than anywhere else in Europe, despite Finland having a lower proportion of Somalis than the rest of Europe. Somalis and Muslims are the most negatively affected minority groups in Finland. In December 2012, the Finnish Police reported (YLE News 13.2.2013) an increase in cases of racism and related physical abuse towards migrant and minority communities. In order to deal with rising racist expressions and acts, since 2011 several legal changes have been introduced in order to promote equality and fight racism. The aim of the new Act on Integration of Immigrants (1386/2010) is

² Eurobarometer (2012) SPECIAL EUROBAROMETER 393 “Discrimination in the EU in 2012”, European Commission, Bruxelles

to promote equality, non-discrimination and positive interaction between different population groups. In the same year, the Criminal Code (511/2011) and Cybercrime Act (TSF 84/2011) were introduced in order to increase the protection of citizens most vulnerable to discrimination, xenophobia, and acts of hate speech. For example, several members of parliament from the True Finns party have committed hate speech crimes in the public media and were subsequently convicted and fined. Whilst internet monitoring has increased, overcoming hate speech in online forums and blogs remains a challenge. Measures have been undertaken to improve the representation of minority groups in media forums, such as television and newspapers, to promote diversity.

HUNGARY

In Hungary, the most evident form of racism exists against the Roma and the Jews. The issue of racist discrimination against the Roma and Jews is often not properly tackled and not sanctioned by the state. After the Jobbik, a party known for its anti-Roma propaganda, managed to get into the parliament in 2010 as the third largest party³, it used its absolute parliamentary majority to change legislation. The government introduced and passed legislation including the amendment of the Constitution which was widely criticised as violating Hungary's international human rights obligations. Migrants and the Roma continue to face difficulties in accessing rights in the areas of employment, housing, health, education; and accessing public and private services. Although there are various endeavours to facilitate the integration and social inclusion of migrants and Roma, there is no mechanism in place to evaluate the effectiveness of the initiatives. This, coupled with the lack of a comprehensive social inclusion and migration strategies, hinders the ability of these initiatives to reach the most vulnerable groups.

The Jobbik party has ties to a banned paramilitary group, Hungarian guard (Magyar Garda) co-founded in 2007 by Jobbik leader Vona who stated that the group had been set up "in order to carry out the real change of regime and to rescue Hungarians". The insecure economic environment led to the continuation of targeted attacks and violence against members of the Roma community by far-right and radical organizations. As of 2013, over 15 extremist, xenophobic, anti-Semitic, anti-Roma and racist organizations are or were recently active in Hungary (Athena Institute), most of them being declared illegal.

ITALY

Racism remains an unresolved problem in Italy. Jewish, Roma, Muslims, migrants, refugees and asylum seekers are particularly vulnerable, they encounter everyday

³ And became the second largest party after the 2014 elections.

discrimination in forms of hate speech, as well as institutional discrimination and violations of their rights in employment, housing, and education. In addition, media representation fuels discriminatory attitudes towards these minority groups, migrants and asylum seekers. Hate speech is not limited only to media and extremist groups, but is a part of the political discourse of far-right groups which are well represented in the Italian Parliament, particularly *Forza Nuova* and the anti-immigration party *Northern League*. High levels of (undocumented) immigration, which has increased in recent years due to unrest in the Northern African region, seems to be the main issue in the racist discourse.

Italy has adopted an Immigration Decree in 1998, which provides a set of remedies against racial, ethnic and religious discrimination. This Decree was the first specific and detailed legislation against discrimination in respect of race, ethnic origin, and religion that has been introduced into the Italian legal system. Before that, the only specific legal tool was criminal legislation on hate speech. In 2004, the equality body in charge of dealing with racist and ethnic discrimination (*Ufficio nazionale antidiscriminazioni razziali* - UNAR – the National Anti Racist Discrimination Bureau) was established. However, this body is established as a section of the Department for Equal Opportunities of the Presidency of the Council of Ministers, which makes it vulnerable to political discourse. Especially Muslim and Roma communities are being in the focus as the most vulnerable groups.

SLOVENIA

The link between racism and nationalism is obvious in the case of Slovenia, where the “erased” people⁴, as well as migrants, the Roma, Muslims etc. are constructed, discriminated against or even persecuted as the undesired Other, frequently on racist grounds.

Xenophobia and intolerance towards Muslims in Slovenia originated in the late 1960s, when the Muslims first raised their wish for building a mosque in Ljubljana. Public debates about the mosque and the Islamic presence more widely went from latent to explicit xenophobia. Even though the Constitutional Court blocked the referendum on building a mosque in Ljubljana municipality (which represented a blatantly Islamophobic attempt to thwart the Muslims’ religious rights) and even though the latest developments show that the Islamic Community is getting close to having its mosque built, the Muslims nevertheless feel they are being treated as second-class citizens.

After years without a comprehensive and systematic approach or coordinated policies in areas such as education, accommodation, employment and social security, the situation of Roma has failed to improve. Police surveillance and neglected areas of municipalities continuously strengthen long lasting historical discrimination and the

⁴ See paragraph “Slovenia - Erasure: legal and state discrimination” for a fuller presentation of the topic.

constitutional guarantee is not implemented (ENAR Slovenia). The Italian and Hungarian minorities also face problems in enforcing their rights due to a lack of necessary infrastructure.

After the dissolution of Yugoslavia, the Slovenian national identity has been predicated on the distancing from the Balkans, from the so-called southern nations. Since most of the migrants, the erased and the Muslims of Slovenia have ties to other Yugoslav republics, they have been stigmatised as “non-Slovenians” and vilified as “the other”.

In the past years, the rise of discrimination has been detected, including intolerance toward nationals of former Yugoslavia, attacks on migrants, Islamophobia, homophobia, as well as sexist and racist incidents.

One of the key milestones of xenophobia, nationalism and racism is connected to the silent and secret removal of more than 25,000 persons from the register of permanent residents of Slovenia that took place in February 1992, known as the “erasure”.

UNITED KINGDOM

The United Kingdom has one of the most advanced equality and human rights legislation. The UK has also accomplished big cultural and social shifts in attitudes that proactively reject racism. The Race Relations Amendment Act was accepted in 2000. It has a statutory duty on public bodies to promote race equality, and to demonstrate that their procedures to prevent race discrimination are effective. In 2006 and in its reformed form in 2010 the Equality Act was adopted, according to which the Equality and Human Rights Commission (EHRC) was created. Regardless of the legal frame and social counter-discourses against racism, however, the everyday experience of racist discrimination is still a reality and occurs in the form of everyday encounters and institutional discriminatory attitudes. Racism thus affects all aspects of life of minorities: on the everyday interpersonal level racist language, interpersonal discrimination and violence occurs; while on the institutional level regular discrimination is performed by the police, educational institutions, employers, and the political discourse.

The economic crisis in recent years has fuelled the rise of far-right groups such as the English Defence League and anti-EU and anti-immigration party Ukip (UK independence Party), which has acquired significant recognition in recent local elections. Groups that are most affected by racist discrimination are ethnic and religious minorities. The existence of Islamophobia affects Muslim communities, which is strengthened by persistently negative and prejudiced coverage of Muslims in the media. Muslim communities are also a special focus of many European Network against Racism reports (ENAR Shadow Reports 2011-12) as well as ENAR shadow report for UK (Schmitz 2011-12). Racism is affecting also Black or other “non-white” ethnic groups of migrants from African, Caribbean, Asian and Middle-Eastern regions. The persistence of discrimination and a lack of perspective for young members of minority

groups is also believed to be the cause of the August 2011 riots, which broke out in Tottenham after a protest following the death of Mark Duggan, who was shot dead by police on 4 August 2011. Patterns of racial inequality in conjunction with rising levels of frustration and political disenfranchisement and unemployment in certain communities are intrinsic to understanding the reasons behind the outbreak of civil unrest.

CONCLUSIONS

In all five states, the perceptions of cultural characteristics of minority and immigrant communities are perceived as an essential “problem” or threat that represents something fundamentally different from the majority population. The logic of racism operates in a neo-racist manner as cultural differences now conveniently replace conventional biological racism of the past (Bajt 2010). Race supremacy theories have been replaced with cultural differences, underlining a wide gap between different civilizations. Formerly promoted race hierarchy has been replaced by theories of cultural supremacy of Europeans.

To conclude, racism has many forms and it is therefore more fitting to speak of racisms in plural (Baskar 2004). In other words, “Islamophobia, anti-Semitism, anti-Black, anti-Roma (...) racism are distinctive phenomena, (yet) they are nonetheless varieties of racism” (Hervik 2013, 43) – which is precisely why no single one uniform definition exists. Racism can thus be understood to describe discrimination on ethnic, cultural, religious, or national basis, independent of whether these differences are described as racial in terms of a biological category of “race”. Definitions of contemporary racism thus also include discriminatory behaviours and beliefs based on cultural, national, ethnic, religious, and other stereotypes. Further, racism does not manifest itself in exactly the same way in each country but is inherently situated in a specific socio-historical, political, cultural, and economic context.

PUTTING A SPOT ON RACISM: CASE STUDIES AND QUALITATIVE ANALYSIS

The chapter reports and analyses the data collected by the five LIGHT ON NWP. The analysis focuses on visual items and verbal expressions with a racist meaning, as well as on manifestations of racism in daily life.

METHODS AND INSTRUMENTS

The LIGHT ON research aimed at investigating the contemporary expressions of racism and discrimination in EU communities, focusing on the people's perception of symbols, words, attitudes with typical or hidden racist contents. An “inventory” of racist expressions in the project countries was prepared focusing on:

- visual items with a racist meaning (i.e. symbols and images)
- verbal expressions with a racist meaning (i.e. words and statements)
- manifestations of racism in daily life (i.e. case studies regarding racist episodes, but also “virtual” online episodes of racism–hate speech in forums, blogs, web-sites, social networks etc.).

RACISM UNDER THE LOUPE: KNOWING FOR COUNTERACTING

Collecting and analysing the different expressions of contemporary racism is essential to understand the phenomenon and to design new strategies contrasting it. The analysis of such expressions (in terms of visual and language inputs, and concrete daily life manifestations) allows for the identification of the dimensions within which the phenomenon develops. Desk research revealed that in all five countries, explicit and hidden expressions of racism populate different sites and forms of daily interactions. Also, the media – whether traditional or 2.0, formal or informal – seem to represent a most popular stage for such expressions.

The following paragraphs show the methods, the instruments and the outputs of the elaboration and systematization of the collected items.

VISUAL RACISM: THE LIGHT ON VISUAL DATABASE

The collection and the systematization of the items relative to visual inputs of racism expressions in the five project countries, allowed for the drafting of a Visual Database. It is an open collection of symbols, images and pictures with racist and discriminatory meaning. Available on the project website (<http://www.lighton-project.eu/site/main/news/detail/13>), it allows for continuous contributing during

the project period thanks to the constant monitoring of NWP, project partners and spontaneous suggestions collected through the project website.

LANGUAGES OF RACISM: THE GLOSSARY OF RACIST TERMS AND THE LIGHT ON BLIKI

The collection and systematization of the items relative to language inputs of racism expressions in the five project countries, allowed for the drafting of a “Glossary of Racist Terms”. The “Glossary” represents the basis for the LIGHT ON Bliki (<http://www.lighton-project.eu/site/main/glossary/index>). A collaborative editor, created to raise awareness on the words and expressions of the contemporary racist rhetoric, both explicit and hidden⁵, the Bliki is open to public contribution.

RACISM IN EVERYDAY LIFE - A SELECTION OF CASE STUDIES

FINLAND - NEO-NAZI ATTACK TO A BOOK EVENT⁶

Description of the event

On January 30th 2013, in the public library of Jyväskylä town, a public reading of “The Finnish Far-Right” was held. Recently written by three left-wing activists and politicians, the book represents a comprehensive analysis of the ideology, activism and undertakings of the Finnish far-right as well as of its connections to the European context. In particular, it focuses on movements such as the Finnish Resistance movement.

According to a press release sent out by the organizers, during the event “(...)The atmosphere became tense when it became known that three members of the organization Finnish Resistance Movement were trying to force their way in. (...) verbally prevented from entering the auditorium, the Finnish resistance members attacked the security and stabbed a participant to the event”.

The context:

The event was part of an on-going social debate on far-right activity and movements in Finland. The book did not stir the kind of public discussion that the authors probably hoped for and it appeared that the authorities had downplayed the threat.

The attackers are believed to represent the Finnish Resistance Movement or at least have strong sympathies and inclination towards the underground level of racist, xenophobic and islamophobic activity that circulates the ideology of white supremacy,

⁵ Hidden refers to words and expressions with offensive and/or racist connotations, which entered into the lexicon and/or jargon of the mainstream society, being thus “socially or culturally accepted” in the country of origin.

⁶ <http://beforeitsnews.com/eu/2013/01/ultra-nationalist-socialists-crash-far-leftist-radicals-book-event-in-jyvaskyla-finland-one-person-stabbed-2506244.html>
http://yle.fi/uutiset/knifing_at_event_dealing_with_right-wing_extremism/6473499

racism, anti-multiculturalism and anti-Semitism. It fights “to protect Finland as a Nation free of neo-Marxist multicultural ideology”. The organizers themselves had publicly announced that they are aware of the intruders’ membership in the movement, and that the attack was a revenge for the fact that the authors of the book had exposed the ideologies and undertakings of the movement. The primary targets or victims are the people participating to the event and the authors in particular. However, it underlines the fact that potential victims could be people gathering to discuss far-right activity and movements in Finland.

The reactions:

The attack was reported quickly and widely in the traditional and social media, and follow-up reporting and debates continued for several weeks. Reactions across society have been highly condemning, although some comments were suspicious of the motivations of the victims. The day after the event, the country’s highest police commissioner commented that also in Finland fringe groups are a threat to be prepared for. The interior minister, said that the background of the attack and the perpetrators will be thoroughly investigated, but that it was important that no further conclusions are made of the event before the police investigation was complete. She also said that before the attack the Security Police had been concerned about the increase of extremist activity and confrontation between different groups. The Security Police had estimated that the activity did not yet pose a risk to the safety of the wider society. An MP, vice-chair of the Finns party posted – on Facebook - “And to the patriots: next time, don’t look like ‘patriots’ when trying to enter an event like that. Also, don’t go in a group, but negligently amongst other people.” The comment was interpreted as an advice in infiltration, but the author denied any such interpretations.

On February 4th 2013, a 27-year-old local activist of the Finnish Resistance Movement was imprisoned on suspicion of aggravated assault and attempt to violate political rights.

HUNGARY - NEONAZIS MARCH AGAINST ROMA⁷

Description of the event

On 5th August 2012, one thousand right wing extremists’ demonstrators organized a march in the Roma neighbourhood of Devecser, a small town with 5000 inhabitants.

⁷ <http://www.ajbh.hu/pt/kozlemenyek-archiv/-/content/10180/5/a-devecseri-demonstracio-rendori-kezeleserol;jsessionid=3E4F15328A3CC50065E83E3960840678;>
<http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-europe-19439679>
<http://www.athenainstitute.eu/en/map/olvas/42>
<http://mobile.reuters.com/article/topNews/idUSBRE8900AN20121025>
<http://thecontrarianhungarian.wordpress.com/2012/08/08/we-attacked-the-gypsies-and-we-are-proud-of-it-extreme-right-demonstration-gets-violent-in-devecser-hungary/>
<http://tasz.hu/politikai-szabadsagjogok/etnikai-mocskolodas-es-megkovezes-bekes-jelleggel>

"You are going to die here!" the marchers shouted, throwing their water bottles and stones at what they thought might be Roma homes. The police did not intervene. The Parliamentary party Jobbik also took place on the demonstration. The MP of the Party declared he wanted to see peace, order and safety in Devecser. This, he said, would be the reward for "normal" Hungarians who defended themselves against Roma. He urged villagers to call on the paramilitaries to help them. One representative of the far-right Sixty-four Counties group, told them there were three options: "To emigrate, to become slaves of the Gypsies, or to fight." Ironically, one thrown stone hit a right wing extremist leader; no other injuries are recorded.

The context

The local manifestation followed a nationwide pattern and also gained international publicity. The fact that 1000 far-right extremists marched in a small town caused fear in Roma inhabitants. Physical assaults happened when a group of demonstrators started to throw stones. Openly racist language was used, which is also threatening, based on well know clichés, one of the speeches even openly calling for violent actions against Roma.

The reactions

The case gained huge publicity in all kind of media with general objection of the action, except right wing extremist media. There is no record on the reaction of the overall public, there were no public reactions, but mainstream media coverage condemned the action. Demonstrations were organized against the passive attitude of the law enforcement in the case. Human Rights activists also expressed concerns and wrote a petition for the police; the Ministry of Interior stacked to the viewpoint that the demonstration "did not lose its peaceful character". The Commissioner for Fundamental Rights found in the case that "fundamental rights were injured" concerning the police activity. The Police closed investigation by stating: there were no criminal offences.

ITALY - THE SOCCER AND RACISM DEBATE⁸

Description of the events

Recently, in Italy hundreds of racist episodes occurred during soccer events. Between May and September 2013 alone, three major episodes were recorded involving supporters of three main Italian football clubs. In all instances, players of African descent were insulted with racist slogans.

⁸ http://www.repubblica.it/sport/calcio/2013/10/22/news/calcio_squalifica_per_razzismo_nelle_giovanili-69206084/?ref=search
http://www.repubblica.it/sport/calcio/2013/10/14/news/napoli_femminile_denuncia_razzismo-68603685/?ref=search
 Valeri, M. (2010). Che razza di tifo: dieci anni di razzismo nel calcio italiano. Donzelli Editore.
http://www.corriere.it/english/14_ottobre_08/uefa-hands-tavecchio-six-month-ban-for-racist-remarks-e540fbb0-4ed5-11e4-b3e6-b91ef8141370.shtml

Racist incidents generally fall within the sphere of competence of the sport judges, which could issue administrative deeds in order to inflict penalties to involved soccer teams for their supporter's behaviours. When the racist incident involves acts of violence or other crimes it may have an intervention of judges against the responsible, which could also receive a DASPO⁹ by prefecture and could be banned from any sports event. In addition, racist slur inciting to violence and hatred are considered as an aggravating circumstance in trials, according to the 1993 Law.

The context

Racism has become "a structural phenomenon of Italian football": in the decade between 2000/01 and 2009/10 championships, 530 incidents of racism in Italian soccer were reported (Valeri, 2010). The soccer supporter's environment has become a cradle for Italian racists. Booing or throwing bananas against players of African descent as well as exposing banners against minority groups have become tolerated behaviours among certain supporters groups. This appears as the beginning of a diffusion process of some racist attitudes from the soccer curves to the society at large. Moreover, even the President of the Italian Football Federation (FIGC) referred to Opti Pobà (an imaginary name) to describe African soccer players as "banana eaters" during a press-conference.

The reactions

Although racist incidents are reported by the media, news coverage of racist episodes in soccer matches is generally brief and concise. Only when famous players are insulted or when the incidents cause reaction from authorities or UEFA, news are more accurate and stimulate the general debate. However, supporters' dedicated media endorse such acts of defiance and racism. Moreover, incidents of soccer supporters threatening journalists are often reported. Reaction from the public is increasingly rare as well as public manifestations of outrage are. This may account for the "normalization" of racism (i.e. a generalized "inurement" to racism, causing no public reactions to offensive behaviours). In the case of the Italian Football Federation President, a petition against his racist comments received over 26,000 signatures. In October, 2014 he received a six months ban by UEFA.

Nevertheless, fellow players sometimes take a stand against supporters in defence of their insulted teammates. The Rioveggio team plays in the Third Category championship. Reacting to the insults targeted to Togolese Teibou Koura, fellow teammates played the following match with a black make up on their faces.

⁹ DASPO is the acronym of "Divieto di Accedere alle manifestazioni SPOrtive" ("ban to enter in sport events").

SLOVENIA - ERASURE: LEGAL AND STATE DISCRIMINATION¹⁰

Description of the events

On 26 February 1992, over 25,000 people (the majority from other republics of former Yugoslavia) were illegally and secretly removed from the register of permanent residents of the Republic of Slovenia. This was an unconstitutional administrative measure that later became known as the “erasure”. It became a public issue only in the last decade because of the self-organization of the “erased” persons in 2002 and their consequent appearances in the mass media. It took even longer than a decade for the public to start realizing the full scale of what happened to these people. The result of this administrative “erasure” left 25,671 people status-less – without documents, healthcare and social security, and they had no right to work. They were forced to resort to undeclared labour. Consequently, they were in constant fear of persecution and subjected to exploitation. Factually, the act of the “erasure” constructed these once permanent residents as illegal migrants.

The context

The event of the erasure is still a very actual theme in Slovenia. Not only because the state is reluctant to correct injustices and violations of human rights of the erased, but also because the erased, are still regarded by many people in Slovenia as villains, who deserved what happened to them.

This discourse is also part of a larger discourse against the Balkans (and the “southerners”). Since most of the “erased” or at least one of their parents were born in other republics of the former Yugoslavia, the abovementioned administrative measure hints at the “erasure” being based on ethnic origin and thus xenophobic and racist in its intent.

The reactions

The erasure has been documented on media (TV, journals, online) and personal as well as organisational/institutional online reports, comments etc. Only in late 1990s and the beginning of the 2000s their stories have begun to gain publicity.

In 1999, the constitutional court ruled that the erasure was an act against the law and as such an unlawful act of state authorities. In 2003, the Constitutional court again confirmed its conclusions, adding the decision that the state must remedy the violations. In 2004, the parliament passed a “technical law” on the erased and right wing parties called for a referendum, which happened in 2004 and where (with 31.45% voter turnout) 94.68% of the voters voted against the technical law (i.e. “against the erased”). In 2010, right wing parties (Social Democratic Party and Slove-

¹⁰ Bajt, V. (2010). More than Administratively Created “Foreigners”: The Erased People and a Reflection of the Nationalist Construction of the Other in the Symbolic Idea about “Us”. In *The Scars of the Erasure* (eds. Kogovšek Šalamon, N. & Petković, B.), pp. 195–217. Ljubljana: Peace Institute. Dedić, J., Jalušič, V. and Zorn, J. (2003). *The Erased: The Organized Innocence and the Politics of Exclusion*. Ljubljana: Mirovni inštitut. Kogovšek Šalamon, N., Petković, B. (eds.), *The Scars of the Erasure*. Ljubljana: Peace Institute.

nian National Party) lodged a request for a referendum against a law amendment, which would arrange the status of the erased. In the same year, the Constitutional Court stopped the referendum.

On 26 June 2012, the Grand Chamber of the European Court of Human Rights in its judgment in the case: Kurić and Others v. Slovenia ruled against the Republic of Slovenia, stating that Slovenia has violated the rights of the erased according to the 8, 13 and 14 article of the European Convention on Human Rights. The Court adopted a pilot judgment and ordered the state of Slovenia, within a year, to develop a specific mechanism for the recognition of compensation for the erased. Six (out of ten) of the complainants have also been recognized a compensation for non-material damages in the amount of EUR 20,000 per person and reimbursement of expenses in the amount of EUR 20,000. The judgment is final and it cannot be appealed.

Since then the state of Slovenia has been delaying an effective solution and even the implementation of the court decision. The issue is therefore on-going¹¹.

UK - ANTI SEMITIC INCIDENTS – COMMUNITY SECURITY TRUST¹²

Description of the events

The CST has been monitoring and reporting on Anti-Semitic incidents in the UK since the 1980s. The following incidents are taken from their 2012 report. The contexts were mostly interpersonal interactions with some online hate speech, and vandalism – all individual rather than organised attacks. There were a wide variety of targets including children, adults, organisations, Synagogues and even a non-Jewish person in one case. There are not many details about the perpetrators but those that were mentioned were young, white males.

February 2012 (Leeds) – *Swastikas drawn on the door of a business named after Jewish owners*

March 2012 (London) – *A) Swastikas drawn on university student’s campaign posters; B) Bacon put on synagogue door ... a lot of swastikas drawn on Jewish sites/properties; C) ‘A person living next door to a synagogue set up a Wi-Fi network with the name “Auschwitz Fan Club”.’*

April 2012 (London) – *e-mail sent to a number of Jewish organisations with the subject “Israel jock drinks Christian blood”, and including phrases such as “the Shylocks Gazette” and “the Masonic Zionist Kikester lobby.”*

May 2012 (Hertfordshire) – *Someone shouted to Jewish schoolchildren from a car: “Hitler should have gassed you all!”*

¹¹ See <http://www.mirovni-institut.si/izbrisani/en/>.

¹² Crown Prosecution Services, http://www.cps.gov.uk/legal/p_to_r/restorative_justice/, accessed 19/09/2013

Community Security Trust (2013), Antisemitic Incidents Report 2012

<http://blog.thecst.org.uk/?p=4096>

http://www.thecommentator.com/article/1722/anti_semitism_on_the_rise_in_the_uk

May 2012 (London) – A) Twitter debate on Israel-Palestine included the post: ‘Fuck off you Jew’ and ‘Keep your Jewish nose out of my business’; B) A car drove past a Jewish school and shouted ‘Heil Hitler’ and ‘fucking Jews’ while doing Nazi salutes; C) ‘Zionists control the banking system’ graffiti on the side of a bank.

July 2012 (Manchester) – Twitter ‘Jew hive’, ‘I want to be back there and laugh/gass them’ (this was settled in a restorative justice process).

July 2012 (Newcastle) – Non-Jewish student in fedora shouted at by small boys ‘smelly Jew, go back to your own country.’

July 2012 (London) – Anti-Semitic graffiti in public toilet ‘7/7 and 9/11 Zionist conspiracies’

November 2012 (London) – Tweet ‘Stamford Hill has this unbearable stench of Jews man p*sses me off almost every time. Ugly creatures.’

The themes involved in the attacks:

1. Swastikas and Holocaust references - In the list of incidents from the CST report, there were numerous references to Hitler, Auschwitz, and gassing Jewish people and so on. Whether meant or not, this is highly violent and offensive and it either diminishes the horror of the Holocaust by poking fun at it, or demonstrates support for Nazi policies.
2. Blood libel - This is a very old racist conspiracy about Jewish people killing Christian babies to use their blood in rituals. The reference to this is in the e-mail incident ‘Israel jock drinks Christian blood’.
3. Zionist conspiracies - Throughout history, conspiracy theories have been propagated to scapegoat Jewish people for a number of social problems, specifically financial. Conspiracy themes were used in Nazi propaganda to turn the German public against Jewish people and ‘justify’ Nazi persecution.
4. Smells and physical comments - There are references made to Jewish people having a distinguishable smell and to their noses – a feature commonly over exaggerated in Nazi propaganda and other racist drawings.
5. ‘Kikester’ – it is a derivative of ‘Kike’, a very offensive term for Jewish people with unclear origins. It has certainly been around since the 1800s though.

All of the incidents display an aggressive attitude towards people of the Jewish faith. There is some scapegoating in the conspiracy comment on terrorist attacks of 7/7 and 9/11, as it scapegoats Jewish people as the architects of major terror attacks that led to a number of wars in the Middle East.

The reactions

Wider public reactions are unknown, because the CST 2012 report does not include comment sections or points on other people’s reactions.

As these cases are all included in the CST 2012 report, all victims reported the incidents. The CST has a long history and good working relationships with local police forces, especially Greater Manchester.

Some cases have been settled through restorative justice processes but many of the perpetrators are hard to track down. Restorative justice is an approach that involves the attacked individual or community, and the perpetrator(s) to discuss and work through the crime and what they feel is a suitable settlement (within reason). It also involves talking with the perpetrators about the offence, why it was wrong, why they did it, and tackling their attitude towards the crime and/or victim(s).

ANALYZING RACISM MANIFESTATION IN EVERYDAY LIFE

The problem we face in contemporary Western societies including the European Union stems from the contradiction between the particularism of the social psychological need to differentiate between groups and the universalism denying any distinction made on the bases of any kind of group belonging. The clash between anthropological facts and legal norms has led to many tragedies in modern life.

Contemporary patterns of differentiation based on clustering people because of categorization, stereotyping and prejudice have come from the “Gemeinschaft” mode of existence in premodern times. Racism, chauvinistic nationalism, xenophobia, anti-Semitism, anti-Roma sentiments - just to mention a few among the manifestations of exclusion - are rooted in history of humankind. All of these manifestations presuppose the orientation of social dominance implying that “some groups of people are simply inferior to other groups.” The central element of the pattern of exclusion has always been the attribution of superiority to the ingroup and inferiority to the outgroup¹³.

The opposite of the social dominance orientation would be the belief that “all groups should be given an equal chance in life” that means “no group should dominate in society” (Sidanius, Pratto, 1999). The qualitative research we are reporting is about the “state of war” between forces of social orientations of equality and inequality between different groups in contemporary Europe with a special emphasis on Roma, Jews, Muslims and migrants in general.

GENERAL CHARACTERISTICS OF SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY OF EXCLUSION IN CONTEMPORARY EUROPE

The results of the qualitative research show, that the cognitive, affective and behavioural manifestations of discrimination against persons perceived as members of outgroups is rampant across Europe. The following section underlines the common aspects recognized in the five countries investigated.

¹³ The European era of exploration and expansion resulted in European imperial domination and colonization and in colonial racism that postulated the inferiority of colonised people, as mentioned in the previous chapter

OTHERING

The precondition of the exclusion is the creation of the other who afterwards will be differentiated and excluded. Identifying and naming the other, however, implies a negative evaluation as well. Following the legacy of ethnocentrism, *othering* in the modern society makes possible for ingroup members to make distinctions between the Good and Evil, Normal and Abnormal, True and False. As soon as the basis of intergroup comparison has been created, ingroup members compare themselves to the other. Because of comparison, they can identify themselves as Good, Normal and True as opposed to the others (migrants, foreigners, homosexuals) who are seen as Evil, Abnormal and False.

The function of *othering* is to create a sense of social distance between ingroup and outgroup members who otherwise are living in the same economic and political space (Bajt, 2005). Through the lenses of xenophobia even persons living in close vicinity seem to exist in distance.

DEINDIVIDUATION

In all instances of our research cases, we have been witnessing *deindividuation*, which makes the perpetrator insensitive to the injustice of derogation, discrimination and exclusion. *Deindividuation* denies the right to be an individual to the member of the group involved. Moreover, *dehumanization* is a relevant dimension of *deindividuation*. Once human beings are deprived of the right to be treated as humans, they are subjected to the treatment reserved for animals. Moreover, due to the nature of malignant comparison, *deindividuation* results in judgment of the others as parasites and agents of harm. The due treatment in these cases means liquidation.

CREATING THE BODY OF THE OTHER

The qualitative study of the patterns of exclusion has identified many images of the other justifying the claims of superiority and orientation to social dominance. The body of the other is represented as distorted, unclean, emanating pollution and dirt. The objective of the disgusting representation is to maintain the social distance and to reduce the motivation to get into acquaintance with him/her. The visual archetype of the other is the image of the "Ewige Jude" which was one of the most powerful psychological weapon of the Nazis in their war against the European Jewry in 1939-1944.

FEAR AND ANXIETY

No matter who is exactly the other, he/she is seen as an invader intruding and disturbing the life of the ingroup. The attribution of aggression and invasion intents of the outgroup serves as a justification of hate and aggressive emotions of the ingroup.

The accusation of intrusion makes the ingroup members to believe that hate against them is just an expression of love for us. Defence becomes the disguise of attack. This perverse logic permeates the narratives of the other constructed by visual and textual means. Scapegoating forms an organic part of this narrative, making easy to cope with the moral burden of aggression turned against the other in forms of speech act, aversion, discrimination and collective violence.

NEGATIVE IDENTITY (WHAT WE ARE NOT)

Ironically enough, the image of the collective self could not be strong enough without confrontation with the other. The mirror is more important than the model. Moreover, the self alone would be insecure and imbalanced. Helped by the negatively represented other, the self gains security. The major default of the collective self stems from its inability to develop the means of positive self-esteem. Instead, the experience of certainty of the self comes from the sense of certainty of not being the other.

ATTRIBUTION OF CRIMINALITY

Crime is a rip in the social tissue. The attribution of criminality to any subjects is a mean of degradation and justification of exclusion. The results of our study have demonstrated in all countries under investigation that the targets of hostile *othering* were identified as nests of delinquency. The involvement into the criminal justice makes the devaluation and exclusion of the targeted groups (migrants, Roma, deviants) normal and socially accepted.

SARCASM

Our results have demonstrated the sarcastic use of words and visual images in relation to the target groups. According to our observations, the ridicule or mockery was used harshly, often crudely and contemptuously, for destructive purposes. Self-esteem and identity are the targets of sarcasm aiming at destroying the reputation of the involved group.

DETERRENCE

In the course of the research we registered many instances where exclusion was realized not just by symbols, words, images but by performing behavioural patterns. Groups like the Magyar Gárda in Hungary, Golden Dawn in Greece or the English Defence League in Britain want to be seen as collective entity marching in uniform, singing military songs, shouting racist slogans and performing Nazi salutes. Parades, commemorations, meetings are used to deter the members of minority groups, sending them the message that they are not needed.

RECYCLING

Despite the fact that the corpus of the research has been emerging in 2012-2014, the results have been hardly surprising. The new extremists cannot be distinguished from the old ones. Contemporary anti-Semitism has not produced anything that can be considered as new except Holocaust denial and Israel bashing. Homophobia has been part of the conservative right wing political discourse disguising repressed MSM fantasies. Compared to the nationalist messages of the Nazi and Fascist era there is not much innovation either in contemporary manifestations of exclusive nationalism stressing the importance of being “true”, “clean” and “real” members in the nation.

NEW AUTHORITARIANISM

There is difference, however, in the political and sociological context. In Europe today the new authoritarianism does not have the support of the state and the family. Both institutions are in decline. Authoritarianism is supported by the sense of insecurity triggered by globalization. It is up to the institutions of political education in the countries of the European Union to develop the messages of the future that could compete with the messages of the past enabling the new generation to face with the challenges of living in Europe in the era of globalization. In order to fight with the pattern of exclusion, rational means of persuasion are not enough. New patterns of identity, new ways of constructing the social reality and - last but not least - new channels of social mobility should be provided.

PERCEPTIONS AND INTERPRETATIONS OF RACIST EXPRESSIONS

The chapter reports the results of the quantitative field research aiming to investigate the main perceptions and interpretations and the social value/disvalue of racist language, both verbal (words, statements) and visual (images, symbols).

MATERIALS, INSTRUMENTS AND METHOD

Choosing among the materials collected by the NWP¹⁴, in each country the respective NWP proposed one word, one statement, one image and one symbol about which to collect the perceptions and interpretations of the respondents.

For the collection of information a questionnaire was prepared, structured around:

- socio-demographic information;
- selected items (previous knowledge of and experience with each item; meanings the subject attributes to each item; meanings the users of each item are supposed to intend to convey; meanings the targets are supposed to perceive; possible future social scenarios resulting from the systematic, widespread use of each item);
- respondents' personal experience with discrimination and/or racism.

THE PROPOSED ITEMS

Images

Finland	Hungary	Italy	Slovenia	UK
				
	Wake up, Budapest! Is this what you want?		"Let's maintain Slovenia" changed into "Let's defend Slovenia"	ISLAM = EVIL

Statements

Finland	That 4% saying NO are all probably supporters of gypsies and thievery and the culture of spongers and parasites.
Hungary	A significant part of the Roma are unfit for coexistence. They are not fit to live among people. These Roma are animals, and they behave like animals. When they meet with resistance,

¹⁴ Presented on the project website, in the "Visual data base" and the "Glossary-Bliki" already mentioned before

	they commit murder. (...) They are incapable of human communication.	
Italy	Roma kidnap our children	
Slovenia	EUROARABIA? NO, THANKS! Let's stop the Islamisation of Europe and the spread of Islamic extremism. EUROPE TO EUROPEANS	
UK	That Romanians are toothless scroungers who want to steal your job, or failing that, they will steal from your country social security system.	

Symbols

Finland	Hungary	Italy	Slovenia	UK
				
Farewell, antifascist	Warning! Aggressive Gypsies 1000 ms.	Total Ethnic Self-defence	Here is Slovenia	English Defence League. No surrender

Words

Finland	Anchor child	Slovenia	Cigani raus
Hungary	Genetic trash	UK	Go home
Italy	Illegal migrant		

The totality of the collected data has been processed with Factor Analysis (Osgood, C.E., Suci, G.J., Tannenbaum, P.H. 1967; Fruchter 1968), in order to find out the “dimensions” - that is the “mental categories” - the young subjects use to process, decode and interpret the occurrence of verbal and visual racist language: each dimension “explains” the pattern of homogeneous answers to a specific group of questions. The Factor Analysis¹⁵ has been used to identify four groups of dimensions: those used in ascribing meanings to the proposed items (“meaning ascription”); those involved in interpreting the communication purposes of the users (“meaning intentions”); those used to understand the perceptions of the targets (“meaning eteroperception”), those involved in figuring out the possible future scenarios (“social value/disvalue”).

The dimensions have been interpreted and labelled: “interpretation” refers to the attempt at recognizing the common underlying “criterion” on which each pattern of

¹⁵ Extraction method: Principal component analysis; Rotation method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization; Maximum iterations for convergence: 25.

homogeneous answers is dependent; this effort is based both on the sense of the answers which “go together” and on the level of the saturation coefficients obtained from the analysis, that measure the strength of the connection between the answers to a specific question and the underlying dimension. Depending on the interpretation, to each identified dimension a “label” is assigned, which summarizes and conveys conceptually the results of the interpretation efforts.

The order in which the dimensions are presented as output of the analysis is an “order of importance”: the first obtained dimension is the one which better explains the variance of the collected answers, and so on.

Starting our analysis, we can expect to find three possible configurations of the dimensions:

1. proposed contents (i.e. discrimination, exclusion, identification of enemies, etc.) tend to cluster inside the dimensions, rather irrespective of the type of the analysed item (image, statement, symbol or word);
2. proposed contents tend to cluster in separate dimensions with reference to the specific type of item (verbal - statement and/or word - or visual- image and/or symbol);
3. proposed contents do not show a definite pattern of clustering.

The following step in the analysis is to use the identified dimensions as “variables”, to analyse to which extent the subjects have recourse to this meaning dimensions in the overall interpretation of the proposed items. To do that, for each subject and each dimension, individual scores have been calculated as the mean of the answer values to the questions which better define each dimension¹⁶.

The different levels of recognition of each dimension shown by different groups of respondents have then been scrutinized, in order to find out significant differences¹⁷ between genders, among age groups, between majority/minority memberships, among countries.

THE SAMPLE

The intended subjects were young persons, aged from 14 to 25 years, in the five project countries. This target group had been chosen on the grounds that the young population has a great relevance for the topic of the research as main users and “consumers” of the main platforms of racist discrimination occurrences (e.g. social networks, public manifestations, sport events, music concerts, etc.).

The survey was carried out online, by means of a direct link to the Survey Monkey platform; the NwPs took care of presenting the overall project and the fieldwork to

¹⁶ For calculating the individual scores, only variables with a saturation coefficient $\geq .50$ in just one dimension have been included.

¹⁷ Pearson Chi-Square sig. $\leq .05$

specific locations (high schools, university courses, etc.), disseminating the link to the questionnaire on the platform.

Due to several logistic constraints (especially different school calendars) and to the material impossibility for the NWP to control the access of the subjects to the platform and the full completion of the questionnaire, in the five countries the total number of respondents was different; moreover, some of them did not go through the full questionnaire.

The final sample whose answers were analysed is detailed in Table 1.

Table 1 – Sample composition according to age group and country

Age group	country					Total
	Hungary	Slovenia	Finland	UK	Italy	
14-16 ys	35 11,7%	0 ,0%	3 6,8%	0 ,0%	12 6,1%	50 6,3%
17-19 ys	113 37,8%	75 34,9%	17 38,6%	2 5,1%	123 62,1%	330 41,5%
20-22 ys	109 36,5%	54 25,1%	7 15,9%	12 30,8%	28 14,1%	210 26,4%
23-25 ys	33 11,0%	50 23,3%	12 27,3%	7 17,9%	20 10,1%	122 15,3%
over 25 ys	9 3,0%	36 16,7%	5 11,4%	18 46,2%	15 7,6%	83 10,4%
Total	299 100,0%	215 100,0%	44 100,0%	39 100,0%	198 100,0%	795 100,0%

PREVIOUS KNOWLEDGE AND EXPERIENCE WITH THE PROPOSED ITEMS

As shown by Table 2, not all the subjects had a previous experience with the proposed items. Generally speaking, statements and especially words were more commonly known, particularly over Italy, but in Finland none of the respondents heard the statement before answering the survey. Symbols and images tend to be “rather unknown objects”: the Slovenian respondents appear the most acquainted and the Italian ones the less acquainted with the symbol, while the proposed images were unknown to about the 90% of the subjects.

Table 2. – Previous knowledge of the items per country

		country					Total
		Hungary	Slovenia	Finland	UK	Italy	
Have You ever seen this image? (n=795)	Yes	11,4%	8,8%	2,3%	5,1%	12,1%	10,1%
	No	88,6%	91,2%	97,7%	94,9%	87,9%	89,9%
Have you ever read/ heard this statement? (n=726)	Yes	12,4%	20,4%	0,0%	52,9%	85,6%	33,9%
	No	87,6%	79,6%	100,0%	47,1%	14,4%	66,1%
Have You ever seen this symbol? (n=647)	Yes	13,7%	86,2%	22,7%	53,3%	5,7%	29,4%
	No	86,3%	13,8%	77,3%	46,7%	94,3%	70,6%

Have you ever read/ heard this word? (n=597)	Yes	28,1%	29,5%	21,1%	88,9%	98,6%	47,4%
	No	71,9%	70,5%	78,9%	11,1%	1,4%	52,6%

The NWP's had proposed the items to be included in the survey considering them "critical" among those collected during the preceding stages of the research exercise; through the survey findings, we can suppose that a part of them - particularly the visual ones - even if "critical", is not extensively known among the young people and their diffusion and sharing is probably restricted to "specialized circles".

The declared scant experience with the items gives to our survey also the "added value" of being investigating the cognitive dimensions that operate when young people are for the first time faced with language issues that can be interpreted as "hate speech", especially when these issues are unfamiliar icons.

DIMENSIONS OF MEANING ASCRIPTION

The general notion of "meaning ascription" refers to the answers to the four sets of questions "*What is the meaning you attribute to this [image/statement/symbol/word]?*".

Through Factor Analysis, 13 dimensions have been identified, interpreted and labelled. Table 2 gives a summary presentation of the dimensions, together with the variables (questions) whose sense and saturation coefficient contributed to the interpretation.

Table 3 - Dimensions of MEANING ASCRIPTION

Label	Most important defining variables ¹⁸
Symbolized Refusal	[symbol] Personal meaning: Discrimination [symbol] Personal meaning: Exclusion [symbol] Personal meaning: Superiority-Inferiority [symbol] Personal meaning: Dehumanization [symbol] Personal meaning: Identification of enemies
Exalted past	[symbol] Personal meaning: Ties to the historical past [statement] Personal meaning: Ties to the historical past [symbol] Personal meaning: Pride [word] Personal meaning: Ties to the historical past
Scientific truth	[word] Personal meaning: Scientific truth [statement] Personal meaning: Scientific truth [symbol] Personal meaning: Scientific truth [image] Personal meaning: Scientific truth
Unverified scientific position	[word] Personal meaning: Unverified scientific position [statement] Personal meaning: Unverified scientific position [symbol] Personal meaning: Unverified scientific position [image] Personal meaning: Unverified scientific position
Figurative historical conflict	[image] Personal meaning: Attribution of responsibility [image] Personal meaning: Proposal of an action plan

¹⁸ Saturation coefficients $\geq .50$

	[image] Personal meaning: Ties to the historical past [image] Personal meaning: Identification of enemies
Discursive discrimination	[statement] Personal meaning: Exclusion [statement] Personal meaning: Discrimination [statement] Personal meaning: Superiority-Inferiority
Scapegoating	[statement] Personal meaning: Attribution of responsibility [word] Personal meaning: Attribution of responsibility [statement] Personal meaning: Identification of enemies
Rejecting Labelling	[word] Personal meaning: Discrimination [word] Personal meaning: Exclusion [word] Personal meaning: Dehumanization
Figurative discrimination	[image] Personal meaning: Discrimination [image] Personal meaning: Exclusion [image] Personal meaning: Dehumanization
Helpfulness	[statement] Personal meaning: Support for the target group [image] Personal meaning: Support for the target group [word] Personal meaning: Support for the target group
Action Call	[statement] Personal meaning: Proposal of an action plan [word] Personal meaning: Proposal of an action plan [symbol] Personal meaning: Proposal of an action plan
Social conflict	[word] Personal meaning: Superiority-Inferiority [word] Personal meaning: Identification of enemies [symbol] Personal meaning: Attribution of responsibility
Pride	[statement] Personal meaning: Pride [image] Personal meaning: Pride [word] Personal meaning: Pride

With reference to our starting hypothesis, we realize that some dimensions tend to cluster around one specific type of item (e.g. the first dimension concerns the symbol, the fifth refers to the image, the eighth to the word); other dimensions tend to cluster around the ascribed meaning, rather irrespective of the type of item (e.g. the third and the fourth dimensions include all the type of items); other dimensions show a mixed pattern of clustering.

Here we have to note that, some of the items introduced as “symbols” and “images” in the questionnaire were in fact complemented by a (sometime important) verbal component; this makes difficult to ascertain whether the iconic content gets over the verbal message or vice versa.

One general remark we can present, looking at the composition of the identified dimensions, is that young people tend to **not** perceive discrimination, exclusion, dehumanization and even superiority/inferiority as distinct, analytically separated contents conveyed by the messages: all the contents tend to merge into the same dimension – symbolized, discursive, rejecting or figurative, according to the nature of the evaluated stimulus.

It is worth noting that the dimension labelled “symbolized refusal” – that is, the criterion underlining the decoding of the symbol - is the most important in explaining the variability of the answers about the meaning personally attributed to the different

items. The importance of the dimension stresses the “weight” of symbols and symbolic messages as components of “hate speech”. The second most important dimension is the “exalted past”, involved in the decoding of symbols, statements and words: in a sense, we can suppose that young people try to find the roots of the possible meaning in the past (may be mythical) history, either accepting or refusing the presence of this bond, but in any case using it as an important analytical tool.

SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES IN ASCRIBING MEANING TO THE ITEMS

Using the dimensions as variables and examining their distributions across the age groups, in general we did not find particular patterns associated to age; in any case, a few significant differences emerged.

According to our results, the young respondents up to 20 years of age tend to identify more symbolized refusal, less exalted past and more action call in decoding the message items; the age group from 17 to 22 years is more ready to identify the social conflict.

Considering the gender as the independent variable, we find six significant differences in the meaning ascriptions: compared to men, women identify slightly more the exalted past, the discursive discrimination and the social conflict; scientific truth, unverified scientific positions, historical conflict are identified slightly less. The partial emphasis on discursive discrimination and social conflict can be interpreted as a persisting effect of a “feminine” socialization pattern focused on the importance of emotional and relational feelings.

Less than 5% of our respondents declared themselves as “feeling as to belong to an ethnic/cultural/religious group and/or minority group” and a further 13,5% as feeling to belong both at the mainstream majority and to a minority group. Comparing their overall answers with those of the mainstream majority, among them we find – as a significant characteristic– a higher proportion of respondents identifying the message items as “helpful”, supportive.

Table 4 presents analytically the distributions of the ascribed meaning dimensions by country, but the significance of the differences has been evaluated only among Hungary, Slovenia and Italy, due to the limited number of valid answers for Finland and UK.

Comparing the answers across countries, we find that differences are significant¹⁹ for 12 out of the 13 identified dimensions. The only dimension which presents the same pattern over the countries is the “rejecting labelling”.

Here we have to consider that differences among countries are clearly explained by the specific presented items, that were differently but explicitly connected to history, to current events, to supposed actual behaviours, to political positions, to pseudo-scientific statements, etc.

¹⁹ Coefficients have been calculated excluding UK and Finland

Table 4 – Distribution of the dimensions of “ascribed meaning” by country (n=569)

Symbolized Refusal	country					Total
	Hungary	Slovenia	Finland	UK	Italy	
Definitely yes	58,2%	40,2%	60,0%	26,1%	40,7%	49,7%
Yes/no	31,1%	24,7%	13,3%	47,8%	25,2%	28,8%
Definitely no	10,7%	35,1%	26,7%	26,1%	34,1%	21,4%
Exalted past	country					Total
	Hungary	Slovenia	Finland	UK	Italy	
Definitely yes	3,0%	43,3%	26,7%	8,7%	23,7%	15,6%
Yes/no	34,8%	48,5%	40,0%	56,5%	56,3%	43,2%
Definitely no	62,2%	8,2%	33,3%	34,8%	20,0%	41,1%
Scientific truth	country					Total
	Hungary	Slovenia	Finland	UK	Italy	
Definitely yes	5,0%	2,1%	,0%	,0%	,0%	3,0%
Yes/no	17,1%	16,5%	13,3%	,0%	6,7%	13,7%
Definitely no	77,9%	81,4%	86,7%	100,0%	93,3%	83,3%
Unverified scientific position	country					Total
	Hungary	Slovenia	Finland	UK	Italy	
Definitely yes	6,7%	14,4%	26,7%	,0%	1,5%	7,0%
Yes/no	23,7%	28,9%	33,3%	8,7%	11,9%	21,4%
Definitely no	69,6%	56,7%	40,0%	91,3%	86,7%	71,5%
(Represented) Historical conflict	country					Total
	Hungary	Slovenia	Finland	UK	Italy	
Definitely yes	6,7%	14,4%	26,7%	,0%	1,5%	7,0%
Yes/no	23,7%	28,9%	33,3%	8,7%	11,9%	21,4%
Definitely no	69,6%	56,7%	40,0%	91,3%	86,7%	71,5%
Discursive discrimination	country					Total
	Hungary	Slovenia	Finland	UK	Italy	
Definitely yes	79,6%	87,6%	86,7%	82,6%	73,3%	79,8%
Yes/no	8,4%	6,2%	6,7%	8,7%	13,3%	9,1%
Definitely no	8,4%	6,2%	6,7%	8,7%	13,3%	9,1%
Scapegoating	country					Total
	Hungary	Slovenia	Finland	UK	Italy	
Definitely yes	27,1%	38,1%	53,3%	21,7%	23,0%	28,5%
Yes/no	25,8%	35,1%	20,0%	17,4%	34,8%	29,0%
Definitely no	47,2%	26,8%	26,7%	60,9%	42,2%	42,5%
(Represented) Refusal	country					Total
	Hungary	Slovenia	Finland	UK	Italy	
Definitely yes	38,1%	58,8%	60,0%	52,2%	54,8%	46,7%
Yes/no	35,5%	17,5%	20,0%	21,7%	33,3%	30,9%

Definitely no	26,4%	23,7%	20,0%	26,1%	11,9%	22,3%
Helpfulness	country					Total
	Hungary	Slovenia	Finland	UK	Italy	
Definitely yes	4,0%	19,6%	53,3%	4,3%	1,5%	7,4%
Yes/no	22,1%	24,7%	33,3%	4,3%	20,0%	21,6%
Definitely no	73,9%	55,7%	13,3%	91,3%	78,5%	71,0%
Action call	country					Total
	Hungary	Slovenia	Finland	UK	Italy	
Definitely yes	15,4%	44,3%	20,0%	21,7%	28,1%	23,7%
Yes/no	33,1%	41,2%	6,7%	21,7%	23,0%	30,9%
Definitely no	51,5%	14,4%	73,3%	56,5%	48,9%	45,3%
Social conflict	country					Total
	Hungary	Slovenia	Finland	UK	Italy	
Definitely yes	49,2%	61,9%	40,0%	26,1%	48,9%	50,1%
Yes/no	32,4%	24,7%	40,0%	13,0%	28,1%	29,5%
Definitely no	18,4%	13,4%	20,0%	60,9%	23,0%	20,4%
Pride	country					Total
	Hungary	Slovenia	Finland	UK	Italy	
Definitely yes	11,4%	30,9%	40,0%	4,3%	3,7%	13,4%
Yes/no	24,4%	34,0%	33,3%	13,0%	17,0%	24,1%
Definitely no	64,2%	35,1%	26,7%	82,6%	79,3%	62,6%

In Slovenia, compared to the other two countries, we find the highest tendencies to “read” the “messages” in terms of symbolized refusal, exalted past, unverified scientific position, historical conflict, discursive discrimination, scapegoating, pride, represented refusal, action call and social conflict, but also of helpfulness.

The Hungarian sample shows also a high level of identification of symbolized refusal and scientific truth, contrasted by the lower levels of exalted past, represented refusal, action call and social conflict.

In Italy, we find the lowest levels of ascribed scientific truth, unverified scientific position, historical conflict, discursive discrimination, scapegoating, helpfulness, social conflict and pride, contrasted by the highest level of represented refusal. Here, too, a glimpse to the items proposed into the questionnaire will easily help to understand the reasons for these significant differences.

Dimensions of meaning intentions

The general label “meaning intentions” refers to the answers to the four sets of questions “*What did the users of the [image/statement/symbol/word] intend to convey?*”.

Through Factor Analysis 12 dimensions have been identified, interpreted and labelled. Table 3 gives a summary presentation of the dimensions, together with the

variables (questions) whose sense and saturation coefficient contributed to the interpretation.

Table 5 – Dimensions of MEANING INTENTIONS

Label	Most important defining variables ²⁰
Historical Conflict	[word] Users meaning: Scientific truth [statement] Users meaning: Scientific truth [symbol] Users meaning: Scientific truth [word] Users meaning: Attribution of responsibility [statement] Users meaning: Ties to the historical past [word] Users meaning: Proposal of an action plan [image] Users meaning: Attribution of responsibility
Symbolized Refusal	[symbol] Users meaning: Discrimination [symbol] Users meaning: Exclusion [symbol] Users meaning: Identification of enemies [symbol] Users meaning: Superiority-Inferiority [symbol] Users meaning: Dehumanization
Rejecting Labelling	[word] Users meaning: Discrimination [word] Users meaning: Superiority-Inferiority [word] Users meaning: Exclusion [word] Users meaning: Identification of enemies
Scapegoating	[statement] Users meaning: Identification of enemies [image] Users meaning: Identification of enemies [statement] Users meaning: Superiority-Inferiority [statement] Users meaning: Attribution of responsibility
Exalted past	[symbol] Users meaning: Pride [symbol] Users meaning: Ties to the historical past [statement] Users meaning: Pride [image] Users meaning: Pride [word] Users meaning: Ties to the historical past [word] Users meaning: Pride
Figurative Refusal	[image] Users meaning: Exclusion [image] Users meaning: Discrimination [image] Users meaning: Dehumanization [image] Users meaning: Superiority-Inferiority
Helpfulness	[statement] Users meaning: Support to the target group_ [word] Users meaning: Support to the target group [image] Users meaning: Support to the target group [symbol] Users meaning: Support to the target group
Discursive Discrimination	[statement] Users meaning: Exclusion [statement] Users meaning: Discrimination
Unverified scientific position	[statement] Users meaning: Unverified scientific position [word] Users meaning: Unverified scientific position [symbol] Users meaning: Unverified scientific position
Action call	[symbol] Users meaning: Proposal of an action plan [statement] Users meaning: Proposal of an action plan
(Discursive) Dehumaniza-	[statement] Users meaning: Dehumanization

²⁰ Saturation coefficients $\geq .50$

tion	[word] Users meaning: Dehumanization
(Figurative) Historical Conflict	[image] Users meaning: Scientific truth
	[image] Users meaning: Proposal of an action plan
	[image] Users meaning: Ties to the historical past
	[image] Users meaning: Unverified scientific position

Here too, we find some dimensions that tend to cluster around one specific type of item (e.g., the second dimension concerns the symbol, the third refers to the word, the sixth and twelfth to the image, the eighth to the statement), but no dimension is a cluster of ascribed meaning irrespective of the type of item, while the mixed pattern of clustering is more frequent.

The first identified dimension, labelled as “historical conflict”, leads us to think that – when characterizing the meaning intentions of those using “hate speech” - the first attempt of the young potential audience is to try to read it as the continuation of past conflict events that tend to be reminded and perpetuated in social behaviours.

The “symbolized refusal”, that was the most important dimension used in ascribing meaning to the items, for this area is the second most important in explaining the variability of answers: this finding stresses once more the “weight” of symbols and symbolic messages as components of “hate speech”.

The **non-distinction** among discrimination, exclusion, superiority/inferiority and identification of enemies is confirmed also for this area: symbolized refusal, rejecting labelling, visualized discrimination, discursive discrimination, are dimensions where – clustered around a specific item – all this contents tend to converge. In a sense, the analytical distinction among the contents, that scholars propose and discuss in detail, is somehow blurred in everyday life and in the “normal” perception of daily occurrences.

SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES IN INTERPRETING THE MEANING INTENTIONS OF THE USERS

Considering the differences among the age groups in singling out the possible meaning intentions, we find significant differences for 7 out of the 12 dimensions.

More in detail, we find that the group aged 20-22 years is the “turning point” in identifying both the symbolic refusal and the rejecting labelling, which are growingly recognised from 14 to 22 years of age, then decrease to reach the minimum after 25 years of age.

The youngsters, the 14 to 18 years old, are more wavering in recognizing the scape-goating dimension, which is then growingly perceived as long as age grows.

The identification of an exalted past is constantly growing with age: as an explanation, we can guess that either the youngsters do not know the national history which is supposedly the basis of the message, or they are (still) immune from the ideological glorification of that history.

On the contrary, we realize that the identification of discursive discrimination declines when age grows: this could be interpreted as a signal of adjustment to discourses as long as time goes on, hence of “normalization” of hate speech.

The group aged 14-16 years is proportionally more ready to identify unverified scientific positions and figurative historical conflict, which in turn is less recognized over the 25 years of age.

Looking at gender differences, just two dimensions – exalted past and action call – show a significant differentiated cognitive behaviour: both are identified more by women than by men, as if women are more sensitive to the potentially “aggressive” hints.

Those who declared themselves as belonging to minorities identify helpfulness and figurative historical conflict more than the majority members; the remaining 10 dimensions do not reveal significant differences by gender.

Table 6 presents analytically the distributions of the dimensions of meaning intentions by country, but here too the significance of the differences has been evaluated only among Hungary, Slovenia and Italy, due to the limited number of valid answers for Finland and UK.

Comparing the answers across countries, we find that differences are significant²¹ for 9 out of the 12 identified dimensions. Those that present the same pattern over countries are the rejecting labelling, the scapegoating and the discursive dehumanization.

We have to remind – as already expounded for the Ascribed Meaning area - that differences among countries are clearly explained by the specific presented items.

Table 6 – Distribution of the dimensions of “meaning intentions” by country (n=569)

Historical conflict	country					Total
	Hungary	Slovenia	Finland	UK	Italy	
Definitely yes	25,4%	29,9%	20,0%	4,3%	4,4%	20,2%
Yes/no	40,1%	46,4%	66,7%	34,8%	29,6%	39,2%
Definitely no	34,4%	23,7%	13,3%	60,9%	65,9%	40,6%
Symbolized refusal	country					Total
	Hungary	Slovenia	Finland	UK	Italy	
Definitely yes	63,5%	36,1%	53,3%	34,8%	43,7%	52,7%
Yes/no	30,4%	36,1%	33,3%	43,5%	28,1%	31,5%
Definitely no	6,0%	27,8%	13,3%	21,7%	28,1%	15,8%
Exalted past	country					Total
	Hungary	Slovenia	Finland	UK	Italy	
Definitely yes	22,1%	82,5%	46,7%	69,6%	36,3%	38,3%
Yes/no	29,4%	11,3%	53,3%	17,4%	38,5%	28,6%
Definitely no	48,5%	6,2%	0,0%	13,0%	25,2%	33,0%
Visualized discrimina-	country					Total

²¹ Coefficient have been calculated excluding Finland and UK.

tion	Hungary	Slovenia	Finland	UK	Italy	
Definitely yes	37,1%	21,6%	26,7%	43,5%	62,2%	40,4%
Yes/no	46,5%	35,1%	26,7%	56,5%	31,9%	40,9%
Definitely no	16,4%	43,3%	46,7%	0,0%	5,9%	18,6%
Helpfulness	Country					Total
	Hungary	Slovenia	Finland	UK	Italy	
Definitely yes	4,7%	22,7%	40,0%	0,0%	1,5%	7,7%
Yes/no	21,4%	52,6%	60,0%	13,0%	23,7%	27,9%
Definitely no	73,9%	24,7%	0,0%	87,0%	74,8%	64,3%
Discursive discrimina- tion	Country					Total
	Hungary	Slovenia	Finland	UK	Italy	
Definitely yes	75,6%	53,6%	53,3%	56,5%	83,7%	72,4%
Yes/no	11,7%	22,7%	26,7%	30,4%	10,4%	14,4%
Definitely no	12,7%	23,7%	20,0%	13,0%	5,9%	13,2%
Unverified scientific position	Country					Total
	Hungary	Slovenia	Finland	UK	Italy	
Definitely yes	20,1%	17,5%	0,0%	8,7%	3,0%	14,6%
Yes/no	26,4%	27,8%	26,7%	17,4%	11,9%	22,8%
Definitely no	53,5%	54,6%	73,3%	73,9%	85,2%	62,6%
Action call	country					Total
	Hungary	Slovenia	Finland	UK	Italy	
Definitely yes	56,9%	63,9%	80,0%	65,2%	72,6%	62,7%
Definitely no	43,1%	36,1%	20,0%	34,8%	27,4%	37,3%
Figurative historical conflict	country					Total
	Hungary	Slovenia	Finland	UK	Italy	
Definitely yes	35,5%	28,9%	33,3%	17,4%	23,7%	30,8%
Definitely no	64,5%	71,1%	66,7%	82,6%	76,3%	69,2%

Significant differences through countries do not emerge for the identification of rejecting labelling, scapegoating and discursive dehumanization as intended meaning of the proposed items.

Interpretations in terms of discursive discrimination and action call show a relatively high level in all the countries, while the levels of identified helpfulness and unverified scientific position tend to be relatively low everywhere.

Despite this common trends, the Slovenian sample, more than the Italian and Hungarian ones, is ready to report the highest proportions of historical conflict, exalted past, and helpfulness; on the other side, Slovenians report the lowest levels of symbolized refusal, visualized discrimination and discursive discrimination (in any case, recognized by more than 50% of the respondents).

The Hungarian young people recognize the highest level of symbolized refusal and figurative historical conflict as users' intentions, while are the less "perceptive" in terms of exalted past and action call.

As for the Italian sample, we find that among the respondents the proportions attributing to the users the intentions of visual and discursive discrimination and action call are the highest, while those attributing to the users the conveyed meanings of

historical conflict, helpfulness, unverified scientific position and figurative historical conflict are the lowest.

DIMENSIONS OF MEANING ETEROPERCEPTIONS

The general label “meaning eteroperceptions²²” refers to the answers to the four sets of questions “*What is the meaning perceived by the targets?*”

Through Factor Analysis 13 dimensions have been identified, interpreted and labelled. Table 7 gives a summary presentation of the dimensions, together with the variables (questions) whose sense and saturation coefficient contributed to the interpretation.

Table 7 – Dimensions of MEANING ETEROPERCEPTIONS

Label	Most important defining variables ²³
Societal Refusal	[statement] Targets meaning: Identification of enemies [word] Targets meaning: Identification of enemies [statement] Targets meaning: Superiority-Inferiority [image] Targets meaning: Identification of enemies [word] Targets meaning: Dehumanization [word] Targets meaning: Superiority-Inferiority [symbol] Targets meaning: Identification of enemies [statement] Targets meaning: Dehumanization
(Scientifically motivated) Pride	[symbol] Targets meaning: Pride [word] Targets meaning: Pride [statement] Targets meaning: Pride [image] Targets meaning: Pride [word] Targets meaning: Scientific truth [image] Targets meaning: Scientific truth [symbol] Targets meaning: Scientific truth
Symbolized Hierarchy	[symbol] Targets meaning: Discrimination [symbol] Targets meaning: Exclusion [symbol] Targets meaning: Dehumanization [symbol] Targets meaning: Superiority-Inferiority
Unverified scientific position	[statement] Targets meaning: Unverified scientific position [symbol] Targets meaning: Unverified scientific position [image] Targets meaning: Unverified scientific position [word] Targets meaning: Unverified scientific position
Exalted Past	[statement] Targets meaning: Ties to the historical past [symbol] Targets meaning: Ties to the historical past [image] Targets meaning: Ties to the historical past [word] Targets meaning: Ties to the historical past
Scapegoating	[word] Targets meaning: Attribution of responsibility [statement] Targets meaning: Attribution of responsibility [symbol] Targets meaning: Attribution of responsibility [image] Targets meaning: Attribution of responsibility

²² Description of what one believes the others perceive.

²³ Saturation coefficients ≥ .50

Figurative Hierarchy	[image] Targets meaning: Discrimination [image] Targets meaning: Exclusion [image] Targets meaning: Dehumanization [image] Targets meaning: Superiority-Inferiority
Helpfulness	[statement] Targets meaning: Support to the target group [symbol] Targets meaning: Support to the target group [image] Targets meaning: Support to the target group [word] Targets meaning: Support to the target group
Labelling	[word] Targets meaning: Discrimination [word] Targets meaning: Exclusion
Discursive Discrimination	[statement] Targets meaning: Discrimination [statement] Targets meaning: Exclusion
(Figurative) Action Call	[image] Targets meaning: Proposal of an action plan
(Discursive) Action Call	[word] Targets meaning: Proposal of an action plan [statement] Targets meaning: Proposal of an action plan
(Symbolized) Action Call	[symbol] Targets meaning: Proposal of an action plan

Inside this area, too, we find all the three possible configuration patterns: two dimensions (symbolized discrimination and represented hierarchy) gather together the contents identified for a specific type of item; four dimensions (unverified scientific position, exalted past, scapegoating and helpfulness) gather the same contents identified across items; the remaining nine dimensions show a mixed pattern of clustering. Asked to envisage the meanings perceived by the targets of hate speech occurrences, our subjects have recourse to the idea of “societal refusal” as the most important concept, then to pride (maybe “scientifically” motivated) expressed by the users and, thirdly, to symbolized discrimination. The “symbolized refusal” was the most important dimension used in ascribing meaning to the items and the second most important in reading users’ intentions; for the area of eteroperceptions we find again a refusal dimension as the most important one, but here the included contents are more articulated and definitely stress the overall, “global” rejection that targets are supposed to perceive. The non-distinction among discrimination, exclusion, dehumanization and superiority/inferiority is confirmed also for this area.

SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES IN INTERPRETING THE ETEROPERCEPTIONS

Comparing age groups, we find significant differences in four factors. For the exalted past, even significant among groups, the differences do not show a clear tendency at change on varying of age. The eteroperceptions of societal refusal and symbolized discrimination tend to grow with age up to the age of 20-22, then to decrease; the eteroperception of helpfulness – even if not so high – is declared mainly after 22 years of age. These two trends allow for further consideration of the hypothesis of the progressive “normalization” of hate speech, as far as maturing subjects become accustomed to its presence. As for gender particularities, four factors show significant

differences on the “women side”: societal refusal, rejecting labelling, discursive discrimination and figurative action call; this evidence can be a confirmation of the already expressed suggestion that women are more socialized at paying attention to emotional and relational feelings. Minority’s members tend to identify, more than the mainstream majority, unverified scientific positions and helpfulness.

Table 8 presents analytically the distributions of the dimensions of eteroperceptions by country, but once more the significance of the differences has been evaluated only among Hungary, Slovenia and Italy, due to the limited number of valid answers for Finland and UK. Comparing the answers across countries, we find that differences are significant²⁴ for 11 out of the 13 identified dimensions. The two dimensions that present the same pattern over countries are the rejecting labelling and the pride. We have to remind – as already indicated for the previous areas - that differences among countries are obviously explained by the specific presented items.

Table 8 – Distribution of the dimensions of “meaning eteroperceptions” by country (n=569)

Societal refusal	country					Total
	Hungary	Slovenia	Finland	UK	Italy	
Definitely yes	53,2%	66,0%	46,7%	34,8%	40,7%	51,5%
Yes/no	33,8%	32,0%	53,3%	30,4%	48,1%	37,3%
Definitely no	13,0%	2,1%	,0%	34,8%	11,1%	11,2%
Symbolized discrimination	country					Total
	Hungary	Slovenia	Finland	UK	Italy	
Definitely yes	81,6%	68,0%	60,0%	47,8%	57,8%	71,7%
Yes/no	13,7%	16,5%	13,3%	21,7%	10,4%	13,7%
Definitely no	4,7%	15,5%	26,7%	30,4%	31,9%	14,6%
Unverified scientific position	country					Total
	Hungary	Slovenia	Finland	UK	Italy	
Definitely yes	5,7%	19,6%	20,0%	,0%	1,5%	7,2%
Yes/no	19,1%	27,8%	20,0%	8,7%	16,3%	19,5%
Definitely no	75,3%	52,6%	60,0%	91,3%	82,2%	73,3%
Exalted past	country					Total
	Hungary	Slovenia	Finland	UK	Italy	
Definitely yes	13,4%	16,5%	20,0%	4,3%	11,1%	13,2%
Yes/no	32,1%	56,7%	66,7%	30,4%	45,2%	40,2%
Definitely no	54,5%	26,8%	13,3%	65,2%	43,7%	46,6%
Scapegoating	country					Total
	Hungary	Slovenia	Finland	UK	Italy	
Definitely yes	28,4%	48,5%	60,0%	26,1%	31,1%	33,2%
Yes/no	24,7%	21,6%	13,3%	21,7%	24,4%	23,7%
Definitely no	46,8%	29,9%	26,7%	52,2%	44,4%	43,1%
Represented hierarchy	country					Total
	Hungary	Slovenia	Finland	UK	Italy	
Definitely yes	75,6%	87,6%	60,0%	91,3%	69,6%	76,4%

²⁴ Coefficients have been calculated excluding Finland and UK.

Yes/no	16,7%	5,2%	,0%	8,7%	22,2%	15,3%
Definitely no	7,7%	7,2%	40,0%	,0%	8,1%	8,3%
Helpfulness	country					Total
	Hungary	Slovenia	Finland	UK	Italy	
Definitely yes	6,0%	19,6%	53,3%	4,3%	3,7%	9,0%
Yes/no	13,7%	19,6%	20,0%	17,4%	32,6%	19,5%
Definitely no	80,3%	60,8%	26,7%	78,3%	63,7%	71,5%
Discursive discrimination	country					Total
	Hungary	Slovenia	Finland	UK	Italy	
Definitely yes	86,3%	93,8%	73,3%	87,0%	85,2%	87,0%
Yes/no	10,0%	4,1%	20,0%	13,0%	8,1%	9,0%
Definitely no	3,7%	2,1%	6,7%	,0%	6,7%	4,0%
Represented action call	country					Total
	Hungary	Slovenia	Finland	UK	Italy	
Definitely yes	41,8%	54,6%	80,0%	30,4%	28,1%	41,3%
Definitely no	58,2%	45,4%	20,0%	69,6%	71,9%	58,7%
Verbalized action call	country					Total
	Hungary	Slovenia	Finland	UK	Italy	
Definitely yes	30,4%	44,3%	40,0%	21,7%	27,4%	32,0%
Definitely no	69,6%	55,7%	60,0%	78,3%	72,6%	68,0%
Symbolized action call	country					Total
	Hungary	Slovenia	Finland	UK	Italy	
Definitely yes	34,4%	44,3%	73,3%	26,1%	51,9%	40,9%
Definitely no	65,6%	55,7%	26,7%	73,9%	48,1%	59,1%

As a general consideration, we can remark that recognition of unverified scientific position and of helpfulness is relatively low over all countries (the maximum levels are 19.6% in Slovenia for both dimensions), while eteroperceptions of represented hierarchy and discursive discriminations are relatively high over all countries (87,6% and 93,8% of the respondents, respectively, in Slovenia). Among the Slovenian sample, eteroperceptions are systematically higher than in Hungary and Italy for nine dimensions: societal refusal, unverified scientific position, exalted past, scapegoating, represented hierarchy, helpfulness, discursive discrimination, represented and symbolized action calls. Hungarian respondents seem to be more perceptive for the symbolized discrimination, while showing the lowest levels of eteroperceptions for exalted past, scapegoating and helpfulness. The Italian sample is characterized by the highest level in symbolized action call and the lowest levels in societal refusal, symbolized discrimination, unverified scientific position, represented hierarchy and represented action call.

DIMENSIONS OF SOCIAL VALUE/DISVALUE

The general label “social value/disvalue” refers to the answers to the four sets of questions “*Due to the systematic display and spreading of the [image/state-ment/symbol/word], how likely would each of the following scenarios occur?*”.

Through Factor Analysis 14 dimensions have been identified, interpreted and labelled. Table 9 gives a summary presentation of the dimensions, together with the variables (questions) whose sense and saturation coefficient contributed to the interpretation.

Table 9 – Dimensions of SOCIAL VALUE/DISVALUE

Label	Most important defining variables ²⁵
Segregation	[image] Future scenario: Self-segregation of the target-target groups [image] Future scenario: Urban segregation of target groups [word] Future scenario: Self-segregation of the target-target groups [symbol] Future scenario: Self-segregation of the target-target groups [statement] Future scenario: Self-segregation of the target-target groups [word] Future scenario: Urban segregation of target groups [symbol] Future scenario: Urban segregation of target groups [statement] Future scenario: Urban segregation of target groups
Minorities' Coalitions	[statement] Future scenario: Cohesion among different target groups [word] Future scenario: Cohesion among different target groups [symbol] Future scenario: Cohesion among different target groups [image] Future scenario: Public manif. of disapproval by target groups and supporters [image] Future scenario: Cohesion among different target groups
Mainstream Legality	[statement] Future scenario: Appeal to law enforcement by the public opinion [symbol] Future scenario: Appeal to law enforcement by the public opinion [image] Future scenario: Appeal to law enforcement by the public opinion [word] Future scenario: Appeal to law enforcement by the public opinion
Social Conflict	[word] Future scenario: General social conflict [statement] Future scenario: General social conflict [symbol] Future scenario: General social conflict [image] Future scenario: General social conflict
Hate speech "normalization"	[symbol] Future scenario: Softening of laws against discrimination and hate speech [word] Future scenario: Softening of laws against discrimination and hate speech [image] Future scenario: Softening of laws against discrimination and hate speech [statement] Future scenario: Softening of laws against discrimination and hate speech
Social exclusion	[word] Future scenario: Social exclusion of the target group [statement] Future scenario: Social exclusion of the target group [symbol] Future scenario: Social exclusion of the target group [image] Future scenario: Social exclusion of the target group
Hate speech acceptance	[statement] Future scenario: Public manifestation of approval and support [image] Future scenario: Public manifestation of approval and support [symbol] Future scenario: Public manifestation of approval and support
Hate speech outlawing	[statement] Future scenario: Stiffening of laws against discrimination and hate speech [symbol] Future scenario: Stiffening of laws against discrimination and hate speech [image] Future scenario: Stiffening of laws against discrimination and hate speech [word] Future scenario: Stiffening of laws against discrimination and hate speech
Minorities Legality	[statement] Future scenario: Appeal to law enforcement by target groups [word] Future scenario: Appeal to law enforcement by target groups [statem.] Future scenario: Pub. manif. of disapproval by target groups and supporters
General social	[symbol] Future scenario: General social cohesion

²⁵ Saturation coefficients ≥ .50

cohesion	[image] Future scenario: General social cohesion [word] Future scenario: General social cohesion [statement] Future scenario: General social cohesion
Radicalization	[word] Future scenario: Public manifestation of approval and support [word] Future scenario: Public manif. of disapproval by target groups and supporters
Targets intra-group solidarity	[image] Future scenario: Cohesion within the target group [image] Future scenario: Appeal to law enforcement by target groups
Minorities mobilization	[symbol] Future scenario: Appeal to law enforcement by target groups [symbol] Future scenario: Pub. manif. of disapproval by target groups and supporters
Targets intra-group cohesion	[statement] Future scenario: Cohesion within the target group [word] Future scenario: Cohesion within the target group [symbol] Future scenario: Cohesion within the target group

In the area of forecasting future scenarios, the pattern of clustering put first the content of hate speech, irrespective of the type of item proposed as “getting the scenarios off the ground”. As a first, general remark, we can consider that our respondents in the five countries are well aware of the “social disvalue” of widespread hate speech: the most important dimension used in envisaging future scenarios is “segregation”, which is foreseen as very or rather likely to occur by more than 50% of the young people over the five countries. In addition to that, other dimensions are present that evaluate supposed “negative outcomes”, i.e. social conflict, social exclusion, radicalization. Other dimensions, even though organized around less heavy conjectures, speculates about outcomes that in any case suppose a social confrontation, either between mainstream majority and minorities (minorities coalitions, hate speech normalisation, minorities legality, minorities mobilization, targets intra-group solidarity, targets intra-group cohesion) or among different factions of the mainstream majority (mainstream legality, hate speech acceptance, hate speech outlawing). Just one dimension evaluates the possibility of a positive outcome, i.e. general social cohesion, which is forecasted by about one third of the overall sample.

SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES IN FIGURING OUT FUTURE SCENARIOS

Comparing the distributions by age group, we find out significant differences in five expectations. Growing age seem to influence negatively the forecast of mainstream legality and minorities’ mobilization: the youngest respondents seem to be more optimistic, but the proportion of those figuring out these possibilities decreases rather regularly as far as age grows, as if scepticism substitutes confidence in the public opinion “maturity of judgment”. Three more scenarios confirm the tendency to growing scepticism, even if the age critical turning point shifts: trust in hate speech outlawing, general social cohesion and targets intra-group cohesion appears growing up to 18-22 years of age, then decreasing in the following age groups. With reference to gender, women seem more perceptive toward the “social disvalue” of hate speech, since envisage, more than men, possible future scenarios of social conflict, social exclusion and radicalization. The outcome of the significant differences be-

tween majority and minorities members inside our sample leads us to guess the existence of polarized perceptions inside both groups. The majority members express the highest proportion of beliefs in hate speech acceptance and targets intra-group cohesion but, at the same time, they are divided between the “very likely” and “very unlikely” feasibility of hate speech outlawing: outlawing is in apparent contradiction with the acceptance hypothesis and this can result from the perception that formal stiffening of the laws will continue to be contrasted by widespread approval and support of hate speech. Looking at the answers of those that feel to belong to minorities groups, we find that they express the highest levels of dichotomization (“very likely” versus “very unlikely”) both in minorities legality and general social cohesion, while showing the highest level of uncertainty (“do not know”) for targets intra-group cohesion. As possible explanations for the evidence, we can think of an “internal split” between optimist and pessimist/sceptic attitudes, between those who rely on hope and those who generalize past experiences.

Table 10 presents analytically the distribution of the dimensions of social value/disvalue by country, but once more the significance of the differences has been evaluated only among Hungary, Slovenia and Italy, due to the limited number of valid answers for Finland and UK. Comparing the answers across countries, we find that differences are significant²⁶ for all the identified dimensions. We have to remind – as already indicated for the previous areas - that differences among countries are evidently explained by the specific presented items.

Table 10 – Distribution of the dimensions of “social value/disvalue” by country (n=569)²⁷

Segregation	country					Total
	Hungary	Slovenia	Finland	UK	Italy	
1	12,7%	6,2%	,0%	8,7%	3,0%	8,8%
1,50	12,0%	8,2%	,0%	13,0%	5,2%	9,5%
2	19,1%	16,5%	13,3%	17,4%	20,7%	18,8%
2,50	15,4%	22,7%	13,3%	30,4%	18,5%	17,9%
3	16,7%	21,6%	40,0%	17,4%	31,1%	21,6%
3,50	8,0%	16,5%	13,3%	4,3%	9,6%	9,8%
4	7,7%	5,2%	13,3%	8,7%	8,9%	7,7%
4,50	4,0%	3,1%	6,7%	,0%	3,0%	3,5%
5	4,3%	,0%	,0%	,0%	,0%	2,3%
Minorities coalitions	country					Total
	Hungary	Slovenia	Finland	UK	Italy	
1	13,7%	5,2%	,0%	4,3%	6,7%	9,8%
1,50	19,4%	10,3%	13,3%	13,0%	10,4%	15,3%
2	24,4%	21,6%	20,0%	13,0%	24,4%	23,4%
2,50	11,4%	15,5%	,0%	17,4%	14,8%	12,8%

²⁶ Coefficient have been calculated excluding Finland and UK.

²⁷ Scores: 1 = very likely; 3 = do not know; 5 = very unlikely; Individual scores for every dimension have been calculated as the mean of the individual scores (from 1 to 5) in the identifying variables with a saturation coefficient $\geq .50$ in just that dimension, thus obtaining also in-between scores.

3	10,0%	26,8%	40,0%	13,0%	23,0%	16,9%
3,50	5,4%	7,2%	13,3%	26,1%	5,9%	6,9%
4	6,0%	12,4%	6,7%	13,0%	8,1%	7,9%
4,50	2,3%	1,0%	,0%	,0%	1,5%	1,8%
5	7,4%	,0%	6,7%	,0%	5,2%	5,3%
Mainstream legali- ty	country					Total
	Hungary	Slovenia	Finland	UK	Italy	
1	3,7%	,0%	,0%	,0%	2,2%	2,5%
1,50	14,4%	8,2%	26,7%	,0%	4,4%	10,7%
2	9,4%	9,3%	6,7%	13,0%	11,1%	9,8%
2,50	15,7%	32,0%	26,7%	30,4%	32,6%	23,4%
3	7,4%	20,6%	6,7%	17,4%	20,0%	13,0%
3,50	18,1%	15,5%	20,0%	17,4%	20,7%	18,3%
4	9,7%	8,2%	6,7%	8,7%	5,2%	8,3%
4,50	14,0%	5,2%	6,7%	13,0%	3,7%	9,8%
5	7,7%	1,0%	,0%	,0%	,0%	4,2%
Social conflict	country					Total
	Hungary	Slovenia	Finland	UK	Italy	
1	20,1%	12,4%	,0%	8,7%	8,1%	14,9%
1,50	21,7%	18,6%	13,3%	4,3%	5,9%	16,5%
2	23,1%	14,4%	20,0%	13,0%	26,7%	22,0%
2,50	6,7%	13,4%	20,0%	17,4%	16,3%	10,9%
3	13,0%	15,5%	26,7%	26,1%	24,4%	17,0%
3,50	5,4%	10,3%	6,7%	8,7%	6,7%	6,7%
4	3,7%	12,4%	,0%	21,7%	8,1%	6,9%
4,50	2,7%	1,0%	6,7%	,0%	2,2%	2,3%
5	3,7%	2,1%	6,7%	,0%	1,5%	2,8%
Hate speech normalization	country					Total
	Hungary	Slovenia	Finland	UK	Italy	
1	,0%	3,1%	,0%	,0%	,0%	,5%
1,50	2,7%	2,1%	,0%	4,3%	,0%	1,9%
2	6,4%	7,2%	6,7%	8,7%	1,5%	5,4%
2,50	9,0%	9,3%	6,7%	4,3%	13,3%	9,8%
3	14,7%	27,8%	6,7%	17,4%	25,2%	19,3%
3,50	20,1%	19,6%	6,7%	13,0%	19,3%	19,2%
4	15,1%	19,6%	33,3%	39,1%	18,5%	18,1%
4,50	16,4%	10,3%	20,0%	13,0%	13,3%	14,6%
5	15,7%	1,0%	20,0%	,0%	8,9%	11,1%
Social exclusion	country					Total
	Hungary	Slovenia	Finland	UK	Italy	
1	26,8%	15,5%	,0%	21,7%	31,1%	25,0%
1,50	18,7%	11,3%	,0%	26,1%	24,4%	18,6%
2	20,4%	20,6%	33,3%	21,7%	21,5%	21,1%
2,50	6,0%	10,3%	20,0%	8,7%	7,4%	7,6%
3	9,4%	23,7%	13,3%	4,3%	11,1%	12,1%
3,50	5,7%	10,3%	13,3%	8,7%	,7%	5,6%
4	8,4%	5,2%	6,7%	8,7%	1,5%	6,2%
4,50	2,3%	1,0%	,0%	,0%	1,5%	1,8%
5	2,3%	2,1%	13,3%	,0%	,7%	2,1%
Hate speech	country					Total

acceptance	Hungary	Slovenia	Finland	UK	Italy	
1	4,0%	,0%	,0%	,0%	1,5%	2,5%
1,50	14,4%	14,4%	13,3%	8,7%	8,1%	12,7%
2	15,4%	11,3%	,0%	13,0%	8,9%	12,7%
2,50	22,4%	29,9%	33,3%	13,0%	34,1%	26,4%
3	6,0%	16,5%	6,7%	8,7%	14,8%	10,0%
3,50	13,7%	15,5%	20,0%	47,8%	20,7%	17,2%
4	7,4%	10,3%	,0%	4,3%	5,2%	7,0%
4,50	11,4%	2,1%	13,3%	,0%	5,9%	8,1%
5	5,4%	,0%	13,3%	4,3%	,7%	3,5%
Hate speech outlawing	country					Total
	Hungary	Slovenia	Finland	UK	Italy	
1	7,4%	1,0%	,0%	,0%	,7%	4,2%
1,50	12,7%	3,1%	,0%	,0%	1,5%	7,6%
2	20,4%	12,4%	40,0%	4,3%	17,8%	18,3%
2,50	8,4%	10,3%	,0%	8,7%	13,3%	9,7%
3	14,4%	35,1%	40,0%	30,4%	27,4%	22,3%
3,50	10,0%	5,2%	,0%	8,7%	14,1%	9,8%
4	9,0%	24,7%	6,7%	34,8%	16,3%	14,4%
4,50	4,3%	7,2%	6,7%	8,7%	5,9%	5,4%
5	13,4%	1,0%	6,7%	4,3%	3,0%	8,3%
Minorities legality	country					Total
	Hungary	Slovenia	Finland	UK	Italy	
1	34,1%	15,5%	13,3%	4,3%	15,6%	24,8%
2	42,1%	40,2%	13,3%	30,4%	23,7%	36,2%
3	6,4%	23,7%	20,0%	30,4%	18,5%	13,5%
4	9,0%	19,6%	26,7%	34,8%	25,2%	16,2%
5	8,4%	1,0%	26,7%	,0%	17,0%	9,3%
General social cohesion	country					Total
	Hungary	Slovenia	Finland	UK	Italy	
1	2,3%	2,1%	6,7%	,0%	,0%	1,8%
1,50	6,7%	2,1%	6,7%	,0%	2,2%	4,6%
2	14,0%	19,6%	26,7%	8,7%	17,8%	16,0%
2,50	8,0%	13,4%	20,0%	8,7%	21,5%	12,5%
3	13,4%	23,7%	20,0%	34,8%	22,2%	18,3%
3,50	10,7%	15,5%	13,3%	17,4%	14,1%	12,7%
4	14,7%	18,6%	6,7%	26,1%	11,1%	14,8%
4,50	15,1%	5,2%	,0%	4,3%	5,9%	10,4%
5	15,1%	,0%	,0%	,0%	5,2%	9,1%
Radicalization	country					Total
	Hungary	Slovenia	Finland	UK	Italy	
1	17,4%	12,4%	6,7%	8,7%	11,1%	14,4%
2	37,5%	24,7%	26,7%	34,8%	31,1%	33,4%
3	14,7%	33,0%	46,7%	21,7%	31,9%	23,0%
4	16,1%	24,7%	13,3%	26,1%	14,8%	17,6%
5	14,4%	5,2%	6,7%	8,7%	11,1%	11,6%
Targets intra-group solidarity	country					Total
	Hungary	Slovenia	Finland	UK	Italy	
1	34,8%	32,0%	20,0%	60,9%	16,3%	30,6%

2	39,1%	38,1%	46,7%	17,4%	51,9%	41,3%
3	8,7%	15,5%	20,0%	13,0%	20,7%	13,2%
4	9,0%	12,4%	6,7%	8,7%	5,9%	8,8%
5	8,4%	2,1%	6,7%	,0%	5,2%	6,2%
Minorities mobilization	country					Total
	Hungary	Slovenia	Finland	UK	Italy	
1	32,8%	10,3%	20,0%	8,7%	9,6%	22,1%
2	42,8%	27,8%	6,7%	26,1%	27,4%	35,0%
3	7,0%	34,0%	40,0%	26,1%	29,6%	18,6%
4	10,7%	24,7%	20,0%	34,8%	25,9%	17,9%
5	6,7%	3,1%	13,3%	4,3%	7,4%	6,3%
Targets intra-group cohesion	country					Total
	Hungary	Slovenia	Finland	UK	Italy	
1	41,8%	29,9%	13,3%	21,7%	19,3%	32,9%
2	32,4%	46,4%	53,3%	43,5%	37,0%	36,9%
3	6,7%	15,5%	20,0%	26,1%	23,7%	13,4%
4	9,0%	6,2%	,0%	8,7%	16,3%	10,0%
5	10,0%	2,1%	13,3%	,0%	3,7%	6,9%

The Hungarian sample is characterized by the highest proportions of respondents forecasting segregation, minorities coalitions, social conflict, social exclusion, minorities legality, radicalization, targets intra-group solidarity, minorities mobilization and targets intra-group cohesion; at the same time, they show the lowest levels of reliance on mainstream legality, general social cohesion, minorities mobilization. From this evidence, we can conclude that the Hungarian young people are definitely aware of the social disvalue of hate speech, since they forecast generally negative scenarios as outcome of the widespread use of the proposed message items. In apparent contradiction with the preceding overall scenario, they also do not trust in future hate speech acceptance and hate speech normalization, but we have to consider that “acceptance” has been defined as “public manifestation of approval” and “normalization” as “softening of laws”; the result is coherent with the already presented pattern, if we consider the current socio-political situation in the country, that seems to leave little room for a legal positive approach to deal with inter-ethnic conflict. In any case, we must remind that the proposed examples of hate speech were definitely concerning two “minorities”, the Roma and Jews, thus contributing to organize future scenarios around the two suggested “targets”. The Slovenian sample is characterized by the highest levels of uncertainty (“do not know”) about minorities coalitions, hate speech acceptance, minorities legality, general social cohesion, radicalization and minorities mobilization; at the same time, results into the sample show the lowest levels of forecasted segregation, social conflict and targets intra-group cohesion. Generally speaking, the Slovenian young people seem rather uncertain about the future outcomes deriving from widespread occurrences of hate speech.

As for the Italian sample, the Italian young people are more optimistic in forecasting mainstream legality, hate speech normalization and general social cohesion, but the

most pessimistic for what refers to outcomes of social exclusion, minorities legality, minorities mobilization and targets intra-group cohesion; they also appear more uncertain about future social conflict and targets intra-group solidarity. Here too, the specific items proposed as examples of hate speech can explain the findings, since examples were rather general and in just one case a definite minority target was indicated.

SOME IMPLICATIONS FROM RESEARCH FINDINGS

The LIGHT ON project, even from its title, stresses “actions for combating the modern symbolism and languages of racism and discrimination” and among its objectives points to “challenge the normalization of racism and xenophobia and their acceptance in the dialogue and social dynamics of everyday life”. From this point of view, from our field research we can select some findings that are relevant for planning future actions. Age has been found a relevant factor in differentiating both perceptions and future forecasts, with – generally stated – scepticism and pessimism growing in parallel with age. This points to the necessity to work with the youngsters, to make them well aware and well convinced about the social disvalue of racism and xenophobia and to convince them of the need of positive actions – at the individual as well as collective and social level – to fight against hate speech. Women have been found paying more attention to emotional and social aspects and to ‘potentially aggressive’ meanings of the messages. This points to the opportunity to pay attention to interpersonal, emotional and relational aspects/consequences of hate speech, which could be blurred in the general discourses about collective, societal dimensions of the “social disvalue”. The specific differences found among countries are obviously dependent on the “local” past history and actual inter-ethnic social and legal framework; moreover, we pointed to the relevance of the specific proposed items in framing/structuring perceptions and future forecasts. In a broad sense, we found that the most “clear” is the proposed situation (clearly identified targets, clearly directed icons and statements, etc.), the most definite is the set of perceptions and forecasts. As a general suggestion drawn from these hints, we would underline the opportunity to better articulate the “actions for combating the modern symbolism and languages of racism and discrimination”, clearly identifying/analysing specific issues/incidents that involve a definite minority and proving the connections among these issues and the more general problem of racism and xenophobia, but also the need to make clear the racist/ xenophobic consequences that general issues entail for different, definite minority groups.

REFERENCES

- Athena Institute. Hate groups map. Accessed 11 June 2013, http://www.athenainstitute.eu/en/hate_groups/
- Bajt, V. (2005). Contemporary Slovenia and the "Other". In *Nation-States and Xenophobias: In the Ruins of Former Yugoslavia* (eds. Pajnik, M. & Kuzmanić, T.), pp. 43–59. Ljubljana: Peace Institute.
- Bajt, V. (2010). More than Administratively Created "Foreigners": The Erased People and a Reflection of the Nationalist Construction of the Other in the Symbolic Idea about "Us". In *The Scars of the Erasure* (eds. Kogovšek Šalamon, N. & Petković, B.), pp. 195–217. Ljubljana: Peace Institute.
- Balibar, E. (1991). Is There a "Neo-Racism"? In *Race, Nation, Class: Ambiguous Identities*. (Balibar, E. & Wallerstein, I.), pp. 17–28. London: Verso.
- Baskar, B. (2004). Rasizem, neorasizem, antirasizem. Dvojni esej o tranzitivnosti navidezno protislovnih pojmov (Racism, Neo-Racism, Anti-Racism. Double Essay on the Transitivity of Seemingly Contradictory Concepts). *ČKZ* 32 (217/218): 126–149.
- Baussano, L. F., Formicola L. (2011-12). Racism and related discriminatory practices in Italy. ENAR Shadow Report. Accessed 11 June 2013, [http://cms.horus.be/files/99935/MediaArchive/publications/shadow%20report%202011-12/Italy%20\(2\).pdf](http://cms.horus.be/files/99935/MediaArchive/publications/shadow%20report%202011-12/Italy%20(2).pdf)
- Boileau, A.M., Sussi, E. (1981), *Dominanza e minoranze. Immagini e rapporti interetnici al confine nord-orientale (Dominance and minorities. Images and interethnic relations at the north-eastern Italian border)*, Udine: Grillo.
- Boréus, K., (2006) "Discursive Discrimination of 'Immigrants' in Sweden", in Linde, Claes, Eduards, Maud and Segerberg, Alexandra (Eds.) *State of Welfare. Politics, Policies and Parties in (Post-) Welfare Society*, Stockholm: Dept. of Political Science, Stockholm University, pp. 13-45.
- Bulmer, M. and Solomos, J. (eds.) (1999). *Racism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Csepeli Gy., Murányi I. (2012) New Authoritarianism in Hungary at the beginning of the 21st century. *Central European Political Science Review*. Volume 13. Number 50. Winter 2012. p. 65-95.
- Dedič, J., Jalušič, V. and Zorn, J. (2003). *The Erased: The Organized Innocence and the Politics of Exclusion*. Ljubljana: Mirovni inštitut.
- Diamanti I. (ed, 2008), *La sicurezza in Italia. Significati, immagine e realtà (Security in Italy. Meanings, image and reality)*, Indagine Demos & Pi in collaborazione con l'Osservatorio di Pavia, Bologna: Fondazione Unipolis.
- ENAR Shadow Reports. (2011-12). Racism in Europe. Accessed 10 June 2013, <http://cms.horus.be/files/99935/MediaArchive/publications/shadow%20report%20201011/14.%20Italy.pdf>
- ENAR SLOVENIA. Responding to Racism in Slovenia. Accessed 10 June 2013, http://cms.horus.be/files/99935/MediaArchive/pdf/slovenia_en.pdf
- ENAR Suomi ry (2011-12). Racism and related discriminatory practices in Finland. ENAR Shadow Report. Accessed 10 June 2013, <http://cms.horus.be/files/99935/MediaArchive/publications/shadow%20report%202011-12/Finland.pdf>
- Fruchter, B. (1968), *Introduction to Factor Analysis*, New York: Van Nostrand.
- Gritti R., Bruno M., Laurano P. (eds, 2009), *Oltre l'Orientalismo e l'Occidentalismo. La rappresentazione dell'Altro nello spazio euro mediterraneo (Beyond Orientalism. Representation of the Other in the euro Mediterranean space)*. Roma: Guerini e Associati
- Hervik, P. (2013). *Racism, Neo-racism. Recycling Hatred: Racism(s) in Europe Today: A Dialogue between Academics, Equality Experts and Civil Society Activists*. Vol. 1 ENAR Anti-Racism in Focus. Brussels: The European Network Against Racism (ENAR), 2013. p. 43-52.
- Kogovšek, N. and Petković, B. (2007). *O diskriminaciji: Priročnik za novinarke in novinarje (Discrimination: A Guide for journalists)*. Ljubljana: Mirovni inštitut.
- Kuhar, R. (2009). *Na križiščih diskriminacije. Večplastna in interseksijska diskriminacija (At the Crossroads of discrimination. Multiple and Intersectional Discrimination)*. Ljubljana: Mirovni inštitut.

- Leskošek, V. (ed.) (2005). *Mi in oni: Nestrpnost na Slovenskem (Us and Them: Intolerance in Slovenia)*. Ljubljana: Mirovni inštitut.
- Osgood, C.E., Suci, G.J., Tannenbaum, P.H. (1967). *The measurement of meaning*. Chicago: Illinois Press
- Schmitz, K. (2011-12). Racism and related discriminatory practices in the UK. ENAR Shadow Report. Accessed 11 June 2013, <http://cms.horus.be/files/99935/MediaArchive/publications/shadow%20report%202011-12/UK.pdf>
- Sidanius, J., Pratto, F. (1999). *Social dominance: an intergroup theory of social hierarchy and oppression*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Valeri, M. (2010). *Che razza di tifo: dieci anni di razzismo nel calcio italiano (What sort of support: ten years of racism in the Italian football)*. Roma: Donzelli.
- YLE News. 13 February 2013: Unions concerned over abuse of racism researchers. Accessed 11 June 2013, http://yle.fi/uutiset/unions_concerned_over_abuse_of_racism_researchers/6493243



The LIGHT ON project (Cross-community actions for combating the modern symbolism and languages of racism and discrimination) is funded by the Fundamental Rights and Citizenship Programme of the European Union.

This report has been produced with the financial support of the Fundamental Rights and Citizenship Programme of the European Union.

The contents of this report are the sole responsibility of the authors and can in no way be taken to reflect the views of the European Union.

Contents of this publication may be quoted or reproduced, provided that the source of information is acknowledged.

LIGHT ON: CROSS-COMMUNITY ACTIONS FOR COMBATING THE MODERN SYMBOLISM AND LANGUAGES OF RACISM AND DISCRIMINATION

The LIGHT ON project (Cross-community actions for combating the modern symbolism and languages of racism and discrimination) is funded by the Fundamental Rights and Citizenship Programme of the European Commission.

LIGHT ON (January 2013 – December 2014) aims to tackle the normalization of racism and its related images and habits, providing a set of tools for the community, but also for law enforcement professionals, through a preventive and participatory approach calling everyone to put discrimination in the spotlight and combating it.

The general objective of the project is to contribute to the development of a culture that denounces racism, underlines its social disvalue, and promotes an active role of individuals in combating racism, xenophobia and related forms of intolerance.

More information on the project:
www.lighton-project.eu



ISTITUTO DI SOCIOLOGIA INTERNAZIONALE
INSTITUTE OF INTERNATIONAL SOCIOLOGY
GORIZIA

www.isig.it - isig@isig.it

ISBN: 978-88-89825-32-7



LIGHT ON is a project co-financed by the Fundamental Rights and
Citizenship Programme of the European Union