



Bu proje Avrupa Birliği ve Türkiye Cumhuriyeti tarafından finanse edilmektedir.
This project is co-funded by the European Union and the Republic of Turkey.

TOWARDS A NEW DISCOURSE ONLINE TRAINING MANUAL



HRANT DINK FOUNDATION

After Hrant Dink was murdered on January 19, 2007 in front of the offices of his newspaper Agos, the Hrant Dink Foundation was established in order that such grief might never be experienced again, and in honor of his speech and courage toward the realization of his dream of a more just and free world. The demand for democracy for all, with their ethnic, religious, cultural and sexual differences, constitutes the fundamental principle of the Foundation.

The Foundation is working for a Turkey in which freedom of expression is utilized to its fullest; where all differences are encouraged, survive and multiply, and where conscience is paramount in our view of the past and the present. At the Hrant Dink Foundation, our 'struggle for which we live' is for a future dominated by dialog, peace and a culture of empathy.

TOWARDS A NEW DISCOURSE ONLINE TRAINING MANUAL



DISCOURSE
DIALOGUE
DEMOCRACY
LABORATORY

project team

Ekin alıcı Kıyak
Elin Dayanır
Ezgi Kan
Gamze Tosun
Gölşah Akın
Veli Aksoy

training consultants

Ayşe Beyazova
Cengiz Kayhan

editor

Altuğ Yılmaz

translators

Didem Sone
Saliha Rodoplu

design

Sera Dink

graphic application

Selin Hamzaođlu

Istanbul, January 2021



HDV
PUBLICATIONS

Anarad Hiđutyun Binası, Papa Roncalli Sokak, No: 128
Harbiye, 34373 ŐiŐli, Istanbul
T: 0212 240 33 61
F: 0212 240 33 94
info@hrantdink.org
www.hrantdink.org

This publication was developed with the financial support of the European Union. Hrant Dink Foundation takes full responsibility for the content herein; the publication does not necessarily reflect the views of the European Union.

According to the second paragraph of Article 5 of the Regulation on Banderole Application Procedures and Principles, the use of banderole for this publication is not compulsory.

**TOWARDS
A NEW
DISCOURSE
ONLINE
TRAINING
MANUAL**

Contents

Training methodology and approach	7
Towards a New Discourse online training	9
Asynchronous section	13
Synchronous section	17
1. Opening and introductions (25 minutes)	17
2. Discrimination and Migration (20 minutes)	18
3. Towards a New Discourse (160 minutes)	21
4. Evaluation and closing	46
Notes for the facilitator	47
Annexes	55

Training methodology and approach

Towards a New Discourse Training Manual was drafted under the project *Towards a New Discourse and Dialogue*, developed by Hrant Dink Foundation, Community Volunteers Foundation, Support to Life Association, and Sabancı University. *Towards a New Discourse and Dialogue* brings together public, media and civil society organisations who are in contact with refugees in different contexts. The project aims to question prejudice and misconceptions about refugees, contribute to the elimination of social polarisation, strengthen awareness about this issue, and build a new language all together. In this framework, we have been working towards building a platform to allow staff members of various organisations from the aforementioned three sectors to come together and share experiences, develop an alternative discourse, and create a foundation that will allow this discourse to contribute to social dialogue.

In line with these objectives, a training activity was organised for the trainers. The 24 people set to participate in this training were to receive a total of 12 one-day dissemination training sessions in teams of two. However, this activity, which was to be launched in March and April 2020, was cancelled due to the COVID-19 pandemic, taking into consideration the recommendations of the World Health Organisation and the Ministry of Health of the Republic of Turkey. Training content and materials developed prior to the pandemic were designed for non-formal education methods based on an in-person experience.¹ Research by scholars specialising in this subject, including specialists at the Council of Europe, as well as online non-formal training examples from inside and outside of Turkey, were examined to adapt the training to online media. Finally, *Towards a New Discourse Training* was adapted to online media with a rearrangement of training materials and the development of new methods.

This manual, which was drafted to facilitate the dissemination training under the project, comprises descriptions about the sessions to be held as part of the training program as well as various materials that may be needed during these sessions.

All training activities to be held throughout the project were designed with a non-formal educational approach in mind. Participants are the focal point of this approach, with special care taken to create environments that take into account their needs and enable them to learn from one another.

Training design began with the identification of learning objectives. In line with these objectives, and following the creation of the conceptual background, methods and materials suitable for the objectives were identified, and finally the program was drafted. The design process also used the information acquired from the research leg of the project.

The primary reason for the training being designed as per the principles of non-formal education is that the goal is to raise awareness about the 'alternative discourse' which is crucial for combating hate speech. Providing the participants with a training environment where they could discuss, share their experiences, express themselves and learn from one another should increase the chances of success for this effort to change attitudes among participants.

Towards a New Discourse online training

This module is a version of the Towards a New Discourse Training Module which was developed using a non-formal education methodology and adapted for online use by preserving the learning objectives and the participant-focused approach of the Training Module to the greatest extent possible. The module is designed to support mutual learning among participants just as in face-to-face training as well as help participants achieve outcomes in a number of thematic areas.

Considerations about possible barriers such as limited communication among participants in online platforms and varying levels of technology literacy were factored into the design of the training program. In line with the revised learning objectives, an asynchronous and a synchronous section were designed. The asynchronous section consists of an online form supplemented by visual materials that the participants will first implement individually before the training while the synchronous section involves an interactive online session which brings together the trainers and the participants.

Training program

- Asynchronous section (15 minutes)
- Synchronous section (4 hours 20 minutes)
 - Opening and introductions (30 minutes)
 - Discrimination and Migration (20 minutes)
 - break (10 minutes)
 - Towards a New Discourse - Part I (85 minutes)
 - break (20 minutes)
 - Towards A New Discourse - Part II (75 minutes)
 - Closing (20 minutes)

Make sure that the participants are informed about the training program. You can share information about the training program with the participants via e-mail and briefly talk about the program at the beginning of the training.

The durations of different parts of the training program were determined for groups of 12-20 participants. In cases where the number of participants is lower or higher you can adjust the durations while maintaining the existing flow.

technical requirements

Since both the asynchronous and synchronous parts of the training program will be implemented online the first and foremost technical requirement is a **computer** and an **internet** connection.

The technical infrastructure, which will be needed for the online tools and platforms that will be used during the training, will be as follows:

- 1. Online form:** The form which will be used in the asynchronous section includes questions supplemented by visual materials which will prompt participants to think about the issues of discrimination and migration before taking part in the training program. To enable the participants to implement this section, the form needs to be structured so that **YouTube videos can be embedded** into the form; **short-answer and multiple choice questions can be formulated on the form; and answers can be placed on separate pages**. The training conducted within the scope of the Towards A New Discourse and Dialogue uses Google Forms and Typeform, which are platforms that fulfil these requirements. The videos, questions and answers, which will be included in the form, are available in the section titled 'Asynchronous Section'.
- 2. Video interview tool:** To implement the synchronous section of the training, you will need a video interview platform which enables an interactive online interview session. The platforms you are going to use should enable the participants to **connect via video and audio connection** as well as **break-out sessions for group work** and have a **screen sharing feature**. Zoom was used in the training sessions conducted within the scope of the Project.
- 3. Interactive participation during presentations:** You can use tools that will help you make the training more interactive by setting up instant interactive surveys, generating word clouds and short-answer questions. These tools enable the participants to simultaneously share their thoughts on the relevant pages indicated in the presentations throughout Towards a New Discourse sessions. Mentimeter was used in the training sessions conducted within the scope of the Project.

practical guidance on how to prepare for the training

- Make sure that you test your video interview tool before the training and familiarise yourself with the technical features that you will be using during the training.
- Identify the way in which you will facilitate the sessions and explain it to the participants before the training. For instance, the participants can ask for the floor by using the chat box or the raise hand button where available. The facilitator can determine

when they will take questions and comments from the participants and inform the participants about this beforehand. For instance, the participants can ask any questions they may have while the facilitator is presenting or wait for the facilitator to conclude their presentation.

- Share the training preliminary assessment form (ANNEX 6) form and the training form you will have developed for the asynchronous section with the participants at least two days before the training. Read the responses given on these forms and take note of any response you can integrate to the training before the synchronous training.
- Identify an internal communication tool (for example a messaging group) for the facilitator and the technical team to ensure communication among team members in case of any technical problems during the synchronous section.

This exercise was a step in getting to know one another. We will have further chances to get to know each other more closely throughout the training, both during sessions and breaks. The training program we will go through today is comprised of three sessions: 'The Rules of the Game', 'Miriam' and 'A New Discourse'. During these sessions, we will talk about discrimination, migration and discourse, respectively.

Asynchronous section

The asynchronous section includes a form supplemented by visual materials which is to be filled out online and implemented individually by the participants ahead of the training. This form enables facilitators to receive information about the participants and help participants think about the issues which will be discussed at the training in advance of the training.

The synchronous section of the training will refer to the questions asked in this form, the materials and the responses given by the participants. Therefore, it is very important that you send the access link of the form to the participants four-five days before the training and give them enough time to fill out the form. Please send a reminder to the participants about this the day before the training and make sure that the form is filled out by as many participants as possible.

Towards a New Discourse online training

Welcome!

This online session aims to look at the issues of discrimination and migration. The responses that you will be providing to the questions during the session will not be used to evaluate you but rather to make an introduction to the issues that we will be discussing in the training. It takes approximately 15 minutes to answer the questions.

While you are filling out the form if you feel you need to talk further about any topic you can make a note of it and add these notes to the field provided at the end of the form.

1. Can you share your name and family name with us?

(please indicate your answer here)

2. Discrimination

This part includes three short videos which invite the viewer to think about the issue of discrimination.

- Does the narrative in this video include any generalisations or stereotypes directed to individuals based on their membership in a group? (video: <https://youtu.be/RUW3uqSpmjY>)
 - a. YES
 - b. NO

- Do you ever hear people around you make generalisations or stereotype about a group?
 - a. YES
 - b. NO
- Do you think generalisations and prejudice may lead to negative attitudes towards groups who are subjected to them? (video: <https://youtu.be/6ONgMUZb57g>)
 - a. YES
 - b. NO
- Are there any individuals or groups who are subjected to such generalisations or prejudice around you?
 - a. YES
 - b. NO
- Do you think that similar problems which affect the lives of persons with disabilities constitute discrimination? (video: <https://youtu.be/tS4bx9M-VLh4>)
 - a. YES
 - b. NO
- Do you think that similar problems experienced by various groups are sufficiently visible?
 - a. YES
 - b. NO

3. Migration and Prejudice

This part includes multiple-choice or short-answer questions which will prompt you to share your thoughts and views about migration.

- Which one of the following proverbs and idioms, which we may often hear, involve discriminatory attitudes or stereotypes?
 - a. “Yaş yetmiş, iş bitmiş.” (Once you’re seventy you’re done.)
 - b. “Her başarılı erkeğin arkasında bir kadın vardır.” (Behind every successful man is a woman.)
 - c. “Gâvur inadın tuttu.” (You’re being as stubborn as an infidel.)

d. “Bir elin nesi var, iki elin sesi var.” (One hand washes the other together they wash the face.)

e. None of them involves discriminatory attitudes or stereotypes.

answer: The proverbs and idioms in all of the options but option d involve discriminatory attitudes or stereotypes.

- Are there any idioms or proverbs which have the word ‘guest’ in them that you would like to share?

(please indicate your answer here)

answer: The concept of ‘guests’ was often used to refer to Syrians in the media, the phrase ‘our Syrian guests’ was used for a long time.

- Migration is part of life. Which of the following you believe has been among the causes of human migration throughout the history?
 - a. situations which give rise to fear for one’s life such as wars
 - b. economic concerns
 - c. adverse climatic conditions, water scarcity
 - d. uncertainty about the future
 - e. wanting to improve one’s living standards
 - f. wanting to have access to healthcare and right to education

answer: Humans have migrated for various reasons throughout the history, sometimes because they were forced to due to various factors, at other times with hopes of a better life. The number of people who migrated outside their home country in 2019 is thought have reached 272 million. This figure makes up 3.5% of the world population.²

- Which concept did Ioane Teitiota, who said “I’m the same as people who are fleeing war. Those who are afraid of dying, it’s the same as me. Sea levels are rising. When the sea gets my land that affects my life,” introduce on the agenda of the international community?
 - a. climate refugee status
 - b. economic crisis refugees
 - c. political refugees

answer: The decision of the United Nations Committee regarding Teitiota, paved the way for climate refugee status applications. It is estimated that the issue of climate refugees will come more often on the agenda in the future and 200 million people will have to migrate by 2050 due to climate-related reasons.³

- This video lasts 16 seconds. How many people you think were forced to migrate around the world while we were watching the video? (video: <https://youtu.be/wHSueKF8N1Q>)
 - a. 0
 - b. 1
 - c. 8
 - d. 16

answer: In 2019, one person every two seconds had to migrate due to natural causes such as natural disasters, draught or climate crisis or man-made causes such as wars, which means that eight people were forced to migrate while you were watching this video.⁴

- Does your family have a history of migration? Is there anyone in your family in current or past generations who moved to another city, region or country?
 - a. YES
 - b. NO
 - c. I do not know
- What three things would you take with you if you had to leave the place you are currently living?

(please indicate your answer here)

- Is there anything you would like to share with us before the training?

(please indicate your answer here)

To watch the videos included in this form in their entirety:

“Tersine göç: Avrupa’dan Suriye’ye döndü, kendini müziğe adadı” (YouTube: DW Turkish) (Reverse migration: Returning from Europe to Syria she devotes herself to music)

“Türkiye’nin siyahları: Amerika’dan çok iyi ama...” (YouTube: DW Turkish) (Turkey’s Blacks: Much Better Than the U.S. but...)”

“Türkiye’de engelli olmak: Toplumun yarattığı engeller” (YouTube: +90) (Having a disability in Turkey: The barriers created by society)

Synchronous section⁵

- Opening and introductions (30 minutes)
- Discrimination and Migration (20 minutes)
- break (10 minutes)
- Towards a New Discourse - Part 1 (85 minutes)
- break (20 minutes)
- Towards a New Discourse - Part 2 (75 minutes)
- Closing (20 minutes)

1. Opening and introductions (30 minutes)

You may wish to briefly introduce yourself as you start the training and then give the floor to your fellow team member to do the same.

instructions

Towards a New Discourse Training focuses on the participants, and thus on participation, and was developed with a non-formal education approach, which attributes equal value to the views of every participant. It would be a good idea to get to know each other before we can do the work so everyone feels at ease and can effectively engage. This is why we will now do an exercise together.

Let us imagine that I am holding a ball. I will now throw the ball to someone and say their name. That person will talk about themselves and throw the imaginary ball to someone else and say their name.

This exercise was a first step towards getting to know each other in this session we are going to conduct together. Today, we will be conducting together the online Towards A New Discourse module and discuss the issues of discrimination, migration and discourse.

If you are all set let us start with the first session.

2. Discrimination and Migration (20 minutes)

learning objectives

- Learning the relationship between the notions of stereotype, prejudice and discrimination;
- Empathising with people and groups suffering from discrimination in their daily lives.

duration: 20 minutes

technical tools:

- The presentation on 'Discrimination'
- Tool for interactive participation during the presentation (see: Technical requirements)

instructions

We asked you to fill out a form before this training. As you were filling out the form you watched three videos which included the experiences of individuals who had been subjected to discrimination. As we begin the training, we will remember these narratives and think together about discrimination and the prejudice that leads to discrimination.

Please let us know if you experience any technical issues during the session.

Identify in advance who will share their screen during the session. Remind the participants the way in which the participants are to ask for the floor, which you have identified beforehand.

ANNEX 1 - Presentation on 'Discrimination'

Slide 1: In this presentation, we are going to discuss some concepts around discrimination and remember together the videos that you watched that centred around discrimination and migration in the light of these concepts.

Slide 2: I would now like to invite you to think about some concepts that are directly related with discrimination that will help us think about discrimination. The first such concept is stereotypes. Stereotypes are generalisations about social groups that we learn through

socialisation (at home, at school, in the street). These generalisations often lead us to approach everyone with one or several common traits with the same assumptions. So much so that, the moment we hear the name of a group an image is formed in our minds and surprisingly, the name of this group mostly evokes the same or very similar things every time. Nevertheless, in reality, members of this group resemble neither the image in our minds nor each other. Stereotypes can take such a shape that when we think of a physician, we often visualise a man. For instance, idioms and expressions such as “to go Dutch” or “to turn a blind eye” contain stereotypes about the said groups. These stereotypes are so entrenched in our language that we often fail to notice at first sight that may be discriminative.

We typically know stereotypes without knowing how we know them and unconsciously rely on these stereotypes when making a judgement. Stereotypes related to gender may be given as an example. These stereotypes are the ones making us think that women are emotional and motherly and that men are not emotional. Similarly, it is the stereotypes about those groups that lead us to think that ‘every blond foreign tourist is German’, that ‘all Japanese people are hard-working’ or that ‘Arabs are not clean’. As understood from these examples, stereotypes may not always be negative. Negative stereotypes are instrumental in creating prejudices.”

Slide 3: One can see from the video that there are generalisations regarding Syrian women. The reason we may think all Syrians are Muslims and all Syrian women wear “headscarves” is the stereotypes that exist about these groups.

We hear many generalisations regarding Syrians. Such generalisations often shape our perception of refugees. Even we may have such perceptions and make such generalisations.

Slide 4: Through which intermediaries you think these perceptions and generalisations reach us? We are going to use a tool to answer this question and produce a word cloud together. [Project your online device on the screen to produce the word cloud together with the participants and inform the participants about how they are going to use the word cloud.]

As you can see the sources which feed stereotypes and stereotypes themselves are very common and present in our daily lives. So much so that all these negative generalisations become permanent and transform into attitudes and prejudice.

Slide 5: Stereotype, is a thought about one person or group while **prejudice** has to do with feelings and attitudes towards that person or group. Prejudice is about perceiving or looking down on any trait of an individual as a problem merely because of their belonging to a particular social group. Prejudices are usually based on the idea that some people

are less valuable or less capable than others. For instance, if someone believing in a stereotype that women aren't good physicians thinks that female physicians would be unsuccessful based on this judgement, then this constitutes a prejudice related to women.

As this type of prejudice becomes part of our discourse, it shapes our perception of identities such as 'migrant', 'refugee' and 'Syrian'. While it highlights negative representations it considers all individuals that belong to the same group as being exactly the same.

Slide 6: In this video, we just saw how prejudice that Black people are not clean transforms into a behaviour and a discriminatory practice. This prejudice leads to Black people not being able to find a place to rent. The fact that prejudice becomes behaviour gives rise to discrimination.

Slide 7: A tendency to keep the group against which one has prejudice at bay, socially or physically and to make this situation relatively permanent can be described as **discrimination**. For instance, if we do not employ people with disabilities thinking that disabled individuals cannot work, then we are practising discrimination. Just as in the last video you watched before the training, lack of dedicated walking routes for persons with disabilities is another example of discrimination.

Slayt 8: How do you think prejudice and discrimination based on prejudice affects individuals? [The question is put to the participants. You can use online tools for interactive participation.]

All of the answers point to significant consequences. Prejudice and discrimination leads to the violation of the rights of groups that are subjected to them, and may even cause barriers in fundamental areas such as accommodation and transport.

Slide 9: As you may have noticed, stereotypes cause prejudice which causes discrimination which in turn leads to inequality and rights violations. Inequality feeds stereotypes and creates a vicious cycle, which makes problems invisible. So much so that we sometimes do not even notice discrimination.

As a first step in our efforts to create a fairer social order, we can notice and question the rules that create inequality and the cycle that creates these rules. While doing so, it is important for us to be prepared to face discrimination and prejudice in our own behaviour and attitudes. As a matter of fact, strong stereotypes we learn during socialisation may have transformed into prejudice in our mind without us realising it. **Noticing, pointing out and transforming** these prejudices and rules that create inequality is crucial in terms of combating discrimination.

Slide 10: How do you think one can counter discrimination? Let us see various methods of struggle that come to mind in response to this question. [The question is put to the participants.]

No matter which strategy is selected to combat discrimination, we should combat discrimination so that people can live decently, humanely and equally in terms of rights. Even the slightest change is precious in this area where there is so much to do.

Today, we would like to examine together the current discriminatory discourse and the growing hate speech against Syrian refugees which is produced on various fora and think together about how we can create a pluralistic discourse.

3. Towards a New Discourse (160 minutes)

learning objectives

- Learning about hate speech
- Being able to recognise and analyse hate speech
- Learning about notions related to hate speech
- Generating an alternative discourse focused on human rights
- Disseminating an alternative discourse focused on human rights

duration: 160 minutes

- Hate Speech (92 minutes)
- break (15 minutes)
- Pluralistic Discourse (53 minutes)

technical tools:

- Presentation on 'Discourse, Discrimination and Refugees'
- Tool for interactive participation during the presentation (see. technical tools)
- Posters which will be used in hate speech analysis
- Posters which will be used to produce a pluralistic discourse

instructions

During the first session, we discussed discrimination and prejudice, then we addressed what we could do to combat them. Then we talked about the state of migration, and assumptions and prejudice about refugees. And now, we will talk about another issue which is at the junction of these two issues: we will discuss hate speech which is a part of discrimination and discriminative language. Specifically, we will take a look at the hate speech and discriminative discourse towards Syrian refugees in Turkey and work on the 'alternative discourse' which is a method of combating discriminative language.

We will start the session with a group exercise where we analyse discourse examples. We will do a small group exercise on hate speech in the first part of the session. I will give each group one example and one poster and ask you to fill in the questionnaire on it. I will ask you to examine and analyse these sample texts as a group. Do you note any problem areas in the language of these texts? If yes, what are they and why?

Facilitators who do not take part in the group work will be in the rooms to provide technical assistance. Selecting a group member who will note down the answers will facilitate the discussion and preparation of joint responses.

Identify the number of group members on the basis of the number of participants. Groups of four or five would be ideal.

You must identify the smaller groups in which the participants are going to take part in advance. You must make arrangements ahead of time about who will split into which group on the technical platform (Zoom) that you will be using.

The posters that will be used in smaller group work are available in the folder **Hate Speech Posters (ANNEX 2)**.

The facilitators should provide guidance about the use of the posters, respond to any question that the group member who writes down the answers may have, and save the posters which have been filled out. The posters that have been saved will be shared during the presentations of smaller groups. The facilitators must constantly be in touch with the rest of the team members in case there is a technical problem or an Internet connection issue.

Please remind the participants of the time during the group work.

We have talked about the language of the example texts you were given. There are things that we think are problematic; there are also things that we find disturbing but cannot exactly identify why. Here, what matters is to be able to see the impact of the language and understand its possible consequences. As the language we use is often linked to events and situations that are bigger than we think, it could create an impact that goes beyond our purpose; more importantly, it could result in unexpected harm. It could exacerbate social conflict. That is why it is crucial to understand whether a statement is discriminative or contains hate speech, and to be able to change it if it falls into one or both categories. Now we will take a 10-minute break; then we will do a more detailed exercise about hate speech.

Identify who will share their screen during the presentation beforehand. Remind the participants of the procedure for raising hand and asking for the floor before they begin to present.

ANNEX 3 - Presentation on ‘Discourse, Discrimination and Refugees’

Slide 1 While closing the first part of the session, we touched upon the possible strong impact of language, and its capacity to exacerbate social conflicts. To expand on this point a little more, I would like to deliver a short presentation on hate speech and alternative discourse as a combating mechanism.

Slide 2 Indeed, ‘hate speech’ is a notion with which we are all familiar. How would you define hate speech? What springs to mind when you here the term hate speech?

Slide 3 We all have an idea and some similar definitions of hate speech, because it has become increasingly commonplace. In this day and age, hate speech is a problem that is under discussion in the international arena and is recognised by many states. Hate speech is a body of negative and aggressive statements that are based on prejudice and target an individual or a group by discriminating against them on the basis of certain characteristics or membership in a group such as religion, language, ethnic identity, disability, age, gender, sexual orientation and the like. In 1997, the Council of Europe, of which Turkey is also a member, became the first intergovernmental organisation to recognise hate speech. [Should you so wish, you may read out the following definition.] Definition of the Council of Europe: “Hate Speech is to be understood as all forms of expressions that spread, incite, promote or justify racial hatred, xenophobia, anti-Semitism or other forms of hatred based on intolerance including religious intolerance that appear in the form of aggressive nationalism and ethnocentrism, discrimination and hostility towards minorities, migrants

and descendants of migrants.” This definition was adopted by 47 countries, including Turkey. Therefore, we may affirm that hate speech and discriminative language is recognised as a common problem in many regions and societies.

Slide 4 Even though we usually think of written and spoken words when we think about ‘hate speech’, a visual expression may also carry a discriminative, marginalising and aggressive message. We may not always see the direct result of hate speech; however, it is possible to see long term and indirect consequences. It is absolutely essential to be aware of the fact that hate speech can also be generated unwittingly. A person does not necessarily have to be ‘filled with feelings of hatred’ to use hate speech. Hate speech is born out of stereotypes and prejudices that already exist within society and which we may have already adopted. The impact of our expression may vary depending on the person or the circumstances in question. In other words, the basic element determining whether a statement constitutes hate speech is not the intention of the speaker or writer but the impact of the statement on the fundamental rights of the person that it addresses.

Slide 5 In order to identify hate speech, we ask a number of basic questions such as “Which identity is it referring to? How does it approach this identity? What could be the impact?” Directly targeting an identity, attributing negative meanings to, and vilifying that identity would be considered hate speech. As we pointed out earlier, hate speech may have been used unwittingly or our prejudice so ingrained that we do not see the discriminative mindset in an expression at first sight. That is why it may be a good idea to always do a simple check. Every time we run into a statement about any group or identity, ask “Is there a negative generalisation about an identity or a group here? Is this statement targeting the identity in question?” Such questions can raise our level of awareness about the statements we encounter as well as those we make ourselves.

Slide 6 When we refer to hate speech, we are in fact talking about discriminative language and discrimination in the broader sense. Hate speech can be thought of as a subset of discriminative discourse. If a statement is directly targeting a group or an identity, it is considered to constitute hate speech. Nevertheless, we are not always faced with an aggressive and negative language that openly targets an identity. So much so that we sometimes think that there is no problem as a seemingly positive language is used; for instance, we say “She is a cripple but an excellent piano player” or “He is blind but very social.” These statements may seem positive to us. As a matter of fact, the first statement hints that a disabled individual needs to possess high skills to be considered valuable while the second statement is based on the stereotype that disabled individuals cannot socialise. These types of statements that

relay discriminative messages in a rather implicit way also qualify as ‘discriminative discourse’. Therefore, there is no clear distinction between hate speech and discriminative discourse. What matters is to understand and reveal the discrimination in the language, and identify its impact. Even though hate speech is a more severe form of discriminative discourse, both may have grave consequences. In relation to the examples we have shared, remember the protests held by parents at a primary school in Aksaray against children with autism back in 2019. They had also collected signatures to shut down special education classes. With that incident, we witnessed a discriminative mindset transformed into both hate speech and discriminative behaviour.

Slide 7 Where do you most often encounter hate speech? [The question is put to the participants.] When we think of hate speech, the media often springs to mind. Although it is true that the media is one of the most influential instruments, statements of politicians themselves may be more influential than the media or may influence the media more strongly in societies governed by more authoritarian regimes.

Slide 8 Which groups do you think are the most vulnerable to hate speech in Turkey? [The question is put to the participants.] Implementing the Towards a New Discourse and Dialogue project, Hrant Dink Foundation regularly monitors hate speech in print media, analyses all of the national newspapers and close to 500 local newspapers for nearly ten years. Data collected under this study reveal that Syrian refugees have been referred to with a hate speech with increasingly heightened severity, especially since 2014. Indeed, as is the case in many parts of the world, refugees are often made scapegoats for many problems in Turkey and the Syrian identity is often associated with various negative incidents and situations. Turkey hosts the largest number of refugees from this country with nearly 4 million Syrians. Inevitably, this situation directly and indirectly affects social life. In addition, the current widespread discourse related to Syrian refugees makes it hard for all parties to live together harmoniously.

Slide 9 Examples from print media show that discourse on refugees are concentrated under specific themes: a designation problem stemming from the status of Syrians and a general lack of information on the legislation, creation of an ‘us and them’ contrast, the perception or depiction of Syrians as a threat, the translation of migration into a crime story (as we are all familiar with, dissemination of myths and as a lesser known problem, describing Syrians in the language of pity).

Slide 10 There are many different designations about the legal status of Syrians in Turkey stemming from false information and feeding on prejudice related to migrants and refugees. The issue of statuses is crucial, as status can grant vital rights to migrants; this is why it is important that these different types of status are known

accurately. We need to remember that these statuses are not the actual identity of individuals and that various status-indicating qualifiers have to do with rights granted or must be granted to individuals due to their circumstances. Notions such as ‘guest’, which are used to increase social acceptance may actually lead us to forget that in the long run these individuals are indeed status-holders, even if the departing point had a positive goal. Since ‘guest’ is not a legal status, it runs the risk of weakening the emphasis put on the rights of Syrians.

Slide 11 Some widespread approaches which prepare the ground for hate speech

Slide 12 The issue of designation, which generally has to do with lack of knowledge of the status of Syrians and more generally of the legislation, is one of them. There are many different designations about the legal status of Syrians in Turkey stemming from false information and feeding on prejudice related to migrants and refugees. The issue of statuses is crucial, as status can grant vital rights to migrants; this is why it is important that these different types of status are known accurately. We need to remember that these statuses are not the actual identity of individuals and that various status-indicating qualifiers have to do with rights granted or must be granted to individuals due to their circumstances. Notions such as ‘guest’, which are used to increase social acceptance may actually lead us to forget that in the long run these individuals are indeed status-holders, even if the departing point had a positive goal. Since ‘guest’ is not a legal status, it runs the risk of weakening the emphasis put on the rights of Syrians.

Slide 13 What is the heading and visuals used in this news report telling you? [The question is put to the participants.] At first glance, we see the following heading: “Syrians causing unemployment”. The heading gives the impression that clear data has been presented linking Syrians to unemployment in the country. However, looking at the text of the news report one sees that the subject is a ‘perception survey’. While the results of research which sums up citizens’ views about Syrians are presented as if they were objective data, the data included in the text of the news report tell us the opposite: “On the other hand, official figures indicate that Syrian asylum-seekers have had little impact in terms of unemployment and security. Hence, it is possible to affirm that the perception in Turkey stems from misunderstandings and prejudice.” The rapid spread of misinformation and distortion is one of the reasons prejudice against refugees is generated and disseminated. Not only are allegations often not backed with evidence from scientific studies but study results may be distorted when they are used, transforming such studies into a discourse that feeds the fear. This is a clear example of that.

Slide 14 Do you see a problem in the visuals and headlines of this news report? Is there anything that seems wrong to you? [The question is put to the participants.] Approaching

disadvantaged groups with feelings of pity is widespread in society and is mostly done with good intentions. However, this reinforces the victim role these individuals have in the eyes of society. Appealing to feelings about problems experienced by an individual or a group may ensure a response in the short run; however, what is truly needed for an egalitarian and rights-based life.

Slide 15 Social media is one of the platforms where hate speech is most prominent. In the Facebook example, we see comments posted that we might qualify as a ‘call to lynching’ under a post about an incident also involving a group of Syrians. In the Twitter example on the left, we see the comments posted following the decision to open the borders.

Slide 16 A few examples from other parts of the world will suffice to show us the commonalities. A newspaper in the UK published a news report titled: “Migrants robs young Britons of jobs”. The accusatory tone observed in many news reports about unemployment in Turkey also greets us in this one. Even though scientific studies do not support this type of claim, Donald Trump, known for his anti-immigration policies, claimed that along with immigrants “tremendous infectious disease is pouring across the border”, fuelling people’s fears, as an official who is required to support and provide services for migrant health. A newspaper in Germany carried the headline “Shut the borders to Muslims” referring to Muslim immigrants. A closer look at the news articles containing the words ‘Turkey’ and ‘Turks’ from five popular online newspapers, again from Germany, it is noted that many of these words were used in conjunction with negative notions such as terrorism, ban, headscarf, murder, integration problem, and laziness.

Slide 17 We often do not directly see the consequences of hate speech, so we might overlook the risk it creates. Discourse targeting specific groups results in discriminative attitudes towards those groups becoming justified, reinforcing the existing conflicts between groups. In many parts of the world, migrants, minorities and disadvantaged groups are under attack.

Slide 18 Then what can we do to combat this hate speech and discriminative discourse that directly impact social life? [The question is put to the participants.]

break (15 minutes)

Slide 19 The most important thing is to be able to notice hate speech and discriminative discourse, to create awareness about the fact that it can have serious consequences.

Even though it is possible to regulate hate speech through laws, as has been done in some countries, it would not be right to think that this is a direct solution. A very comprehensive regulation would be needed to prevent a law on hate speech from limiting the freedom of expression and to ensure that it is properly implemented. Of course this is a major and long-term effort. However, it is just as important to change social mindsets--i.e., hate speech being accepted as a problem by society and people feeling responsible to change the language they use--if not more important, taking precedence over changing legislation. One of the ways to ensure this is to provide positive alternatives, to develop new perspectives to transform mainstream discourse. This is why we are focusing on alternative discourse in this exercise.

Slide 20 Then what is alternative discourse? Alternative discourse is a positive, rights-focused discourse which we offer on the basis of human rights and humane values. An alternative discourse helps us to see and understand an incident that is narrated using hate speech. It is about offering a positive, well thought-out alternative, like saying “Look at it from here then” instead of trying to refute the discourse containing hate and discrimination or simply opposing it. We can concretise alternative discourse, which bases its perspective on human rights, human dignity and offers a new mindset, with a couple of examples.

Slide 21 “Looking at the matter at hand from a human rights point of view” is one of the most simple-sounding methods. Almost everyone recognises the importance of human rights and confirms respect for human rights. However, unfortunately, we do not often find situations to which this approach is applied. Where there is widespread prejudice, misinformation and conflict, incidents are often viewed one-sidedly and human rights are overlooked. For instance, in a society where the discourse that Syrians cause unemployment is widespread, very few people realise that in reality, Syrians are becoming a source of cheap labour, employers use the situation to serve their own interests, creating working and living conditions that are incompatible with human rights and human dignity. The most obvious characteristic of hate speech and discriminative discourses is that they reflect an incident one-sidedly and with a single dimension without considering social circumstances, ignoring human rights, and targeting specific groups while doing so. This is why any discourse to be proposed as an alternative to hate speech must have a multidimensional approach to the issue, offering a perspective that takes the rights of relevant parties into account. We see examples of this in the following news articles. The news article on the left delivers an alternative perspective about the root cause, pointing to the underlying rights violation and discrimination, contrary to discourses that attribute the problem to an identity or a group. We can think about the other example

similarly. Contrary to discourses accusing Syrian women in terms of ‘morals’ as in the news article entitled “Syrian bride” that we analysed earlier in the session, this highlights the overlooked conditions and human rights violations that Syrian women face. The fact that women and children, who make up the majority of Syrians forced to migrate, are faced with harassment, sexual assault and domestic violence is highlighted. The example we will analyse highlights the overlooked reality of human trafficking.

Slide 22 One of the important sources of hate speech against Syrians and other refugees is myth and falsehood. A lot of misinformation and uncorroborated news in circulation fuel both hate speech and social conflict. Many organisations and institutions are trying to combat this situation. Platforms such as teyit.org, which examine, confirm and record news that rapidly spread and provoke strong reactions, offer an alternative to hate speech founded on falsehoods.

Slide 23 Following the armed attack in New Zealand targeting two mosques and killing 50 people, Prime Minister Jacinda Ardern set an example for people across the world, including political leaders, with her inclusive attitude and discourse towards the country’s Muslim community. While Islamophobic and anti-immigrant hate speech that identifies Muslims with terrorism is on the rise across Europe and elsewhere in the world, Ardern adopted a language that prioritises the rights of the Muslim community, offering a great alternative to hate speech.

Slide 24 One of the common characteristics of discourses against Syrians and other refugees is that they do not include the voice of Syrians themselves. We often see that statements by refugees receive no coverage, not even in news reports on incidents directly involving them. Although there is a great amount of generalisation and prejudice about refugees outside of the news reports, there are too few platforms where voices of refugees can be heard. Therefore, including the voice of all parties in a news article, opening up spaces for refugees to have their say and tell their stories would offer a strong alternative to hate speech.

Slide 25 The ways to develop approaches that create alternatives to hate speech are surely not limited to the ones in these examples. Every perspective we are to offer on the basis of human rights and dignity would offer an alternative, weakening the mindset promoted by hate speech. I will conclude the presentation here, after highlighting a few points we need to remember. When creating an alternative discourse, we should avoid repeating the hate speech we intend to combat, because these types of repetitions give it further accessibility and strength. As we discussed at the outset of the presentation, hate speech may be generated both deliberately and unwittingly; we may not always see the ‘intention’

of the discourse, but we can always imagine its effects and consequences. What we need to do is to combat the discourse itself rather than the persons who generated it. Hate speech is often based on established stereotypes and prejudice; people may believe in and strongly adopt those discourses. Consequently, it is crucial to provide a thought-out explanation that is based on strong foundations while offering alternatives to hate speech. One of the errors we may commit while trying to transform hate speech against a group is establishing discourses that appeal to peoples' sense of pity, which further victimises refugees. Thrusting the binary roles of either 'perpetrator' or 'victim' onto people only paves the way for similar discourses to be perpetuated. Instead, we should see and show that the groups targeted by hate speech are indeed composed of individuals with rights, unique lives, talents, and desires.

Once the presentation has been delivered, tell the participants that you will continue with the exercise from the beginning of the session, then divide them into groups of four. At this stage, participants will work on generating alternative discourses for the hate speech examples they analysed earlier.

Return the posters used at the beginning of the session to the groups and ask them to unfold the other side of the poster and fill in the last two sections entitled 'Generate an alternative discourse' and 'Cooperate'. Provide the groups with the examples from **Alternative Discourse posters** (ANNEX 4) folder to use while filling in these two sections. These comprise extended information about news article examples the participants analysed at the outset and similar examples from other media. These cases were compiled to help participants become aware of the media outside of the print media and to work by taking various dimensions of the discourse into account. Additionally, hang the **Alternative Discourse Sample poster** (ANNEX 5) visibly in the room. Participants may examine this poster.

Once you have handed out the poster and necessary stationery items, spare 20 minutes for the group work. When the time is up, ask them to go back to their original seating arrangement. Then you may resume the session with short 5-minute group presentations.

During and after the presentations, underline the fact that it is possible to combat hate speech and how important it is to create a new discourse based on human rights. You may use the alternative discourse guide included at the end of this section while moderating the discussion during this part.

What is hate speech?

Verbal, written or visual **expressions which target an individual or group by distinguishing them based on their religion, language, ethnic identity, disability, age, gender, sexual orientation or similar traits**, which are **based on prejudice**, and which **are negative** and aggressive, **constitute** ‘hate speech’.

Even though hate speech does not always produce ‘direct’ results, it leads to the violation of the fundamental rights of the groups it targets, whether intentionally or unintentionally, **such as the right to participation in social and political life.**

Although the word ‘discourse’ suggests the verbal (the Turkish word for discourse, *söylem*, is derived from the verb *söylemek*, meaning ‘to say’), it does not merely mean ‘what we say, talk about’. This concept describes a set of thoughts that give direction to our behaviour, thoughts, and attitudes, together with what we say; in other words, an ideology.

Hate speech does not have a set, universally acknowledged definition. Its definition, detection, and the reactions it provokes vary between different societies. However, hate speech is an issue which is discussed on the international arena and recognised by many states, as it harms the democratic order and the fundamental rights of individuals in every society. Local and international organisations make efforts to detect and prevent hate speech.

The Council of Europe, of which Turkey is also a member, is the first intergovernmental organisation to define and recognise hate speech. **In 1997 the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe** adopted a Recommendation on hate speech which stated that the term “shall be understood as covering **all forms of expression which spread, incite, promote or justify racial hatred, xenophobia, anti-Semitism or other forms of hatred including: intolerance expressed by aggressive nationalism and ethnocentrism, discrimination and hostility against minorities, migrants and people of immigrant origin.**”

This definition has been adopted by **47 member countries including Turkey.**

This is a broad and inclusive definition that is designed to describe commonalities across different regions and societies. The scope of this definition may be shaped according to the spatial and historic context of the discourse. Elements such as the position of the person producing the discourse, the person about whom the statement was uttered, when and to what end it was uttered, and the audience it reached make up the context of the discourse. We can only determine whether a statement reinforces an egalitarian and fair viewpoint or a discriminative mindset by examining this context.

Statements that include hate speech do not always directly include expressions of spite, anger or contempt; they may even seem 'normal' and 'reasonable' sometimes. Therefore, it may not always be easy to identify hate speech.⁶ This may be observed in statements or well-established idioms in the language which are based on prejudice and stereotypes. For instance, set phrases such as *gâvur eziyeti*, *gâvur inadı*, and proverbs such as "*Ayıdan post, gâvurdan dost olmaz*," associate the word *gâvur* (infidel, non-Muslim) with bad, fearful, and unwanted qualities and targets non-Muslims, causing non-Muslims to be linked to concepts such as 'lack of compassion' and 'cruelty'. Widespread use and unquestioned acceptance of such statements makes it harder to realise their impact on the said group or identity.

Hate speech is distinguished from other discriminative statements **by its being negative and, directly and indirectly, targeting an individual, group or identity**. Not every statement encouraging a discriminative mindset can be considered hate speech. Some statements which are more subtle when compared to hate speech and which do not fall directly into the scope of hate speech are qualified as **discriminative discourse**. Such statements which communicate discriminative and marginalising messages in a more concealed form do not openly target an identity or a group; they may appear neutral, or even positive. For example, statements which depict disability/impairment as a misfortune or tragedy, or which describe an individual with a disability/impairment as a miracle or within a childish frame may be considered discriminative discourse. As would be seen in these examples, discriminative discourse is a category that also includes, and is broader than, hate speech.

Hate speech may be viewed as the violent and aggressive reflection of discrimination within a society as well as a subset of discriminative language.

However, the key here is to be able to discern the discrimination and violence within the language rather than the distinction between the two concepts. Identifying hate speech and discriminative discourse in Turkey, where there is no legal restriction nor regulation on the subject, is crucial in terms of countering discrimination within society and preventing the negative consequences such discourse can cause.

How to identify hate speech

Several methods adopted by both local and international studies are used to identify hate speech. One of these methods was developed under the ‘Media Watch on Hate Speech’⁷ project, which has been implemented by Hrant Dink Foundation systematically and continuously since 2009 on media and discourse in Turkey. Under the project, all national newspapers and almost 500 local newspapers are screened using a number of key words associated with ethnic, religious, and national identities.

Texts which are read as part of this screening are examined based on three main questions:

Does the statement under examination target a group or an identity?

Is the discourse targeting vulnerable persons or groups who are currently being discriminated against, have problems accessing their rights, are under pressure and/or subjected to violence?

How does the discourse approach the targeted group or identity?

- Discourse with negative generalisation, distortion, exaggeration, negative reference about an entire community/identity based on a single individual or an individual incident (e.g. “Fed up with Syrians”)
- Discourse linked with political and diplomatic relations, targeting the entire population of the relevant countries (e.g. “The Jew attacks again”)
- Discourse representing the relevant persons or groups as a social, economic, cultural or security threat (e.g. “Syrians causing unemployment”, “Muslim terrorism”, “Christian terrorism”)
- Discourse with statements evoking hostility, violence, and war about a community (e.g. “Greek atrocity”)

- Discourse with direct profanity, humiliation, insult about a community (e.g. “back-stabber”, “traitor”, “corrupt”)
- Discourse in which an identity or a trait of an identity, used as an element of hatred, humiliation, is symbolised (e.g. “Is a Jew to represent us in Eurovision?”)

What are the current political, social, and historical circumstances in the society where the discourse is generated? Given these circumstances, could the statement produce negative impact and consequences?

What is the current relevant political, historical, social conjuncture in the society in which the discourse has been generated? (e.g. history of migration, historic enmity narratives, any existing conflict/prejudice and other similar circumstances between groups) Is there a social, political, and/or historical narrative based on a conflict and/or prejudice between the audience encountering the discourse and the group(s) targeted by the discourse?

Ask the following question when you see a statement referring to any group or identity: Could this statement be hate speech and/or discriminative discourse?

What is at the root of hate speech?

Hate speech targets individuals or groups based on their belonging to a particular group. **The discourse has roots in the prejudice and stereotypes** which are built on social, political, and historical narratives about these groups.

Hate speech is the transformation of the discrimination encountered in working life, politics, textbooks, legal texts, healthcare services--in other words, in every area of life including individual relationships in everyday life--into a type of attack through discourse.⁸

Hate speech is often understood as a personal feeling and discomfort because the word ‘hate’ is included in the concept. Although hate speech draws strength from negative, biased feelings and attitudes, it does not merely consist of the expression of personal feelings or communication errors; it stems from the existing inequalities between groups that are targeted by such discourse, on the one hand, and groups that perpetrate such discourse, on the other, within the social fabric. Hate speech is part of a mindset of marginalisation, derogation, and antagonisation that reinforces the hierarchy between the groups making up the society.⁹

Where do we come across hate speech?

Hate speech is not an issue that is particular to a specific occupation or social area. We may come across hate speech in various disciplines and contexts wherever language is present, such as the press, media, social media, politics, public sector, education, science, and daily life.

However, the function of the media, which reproduces the discourse generated by public opinion leaders, politicians, businessmen and others on a daily basis, deserves special consideration. The media, in both its traditional and novel forms, creates systems that influence what and how people will learn about the world and the way it functions.¹⁰ Contrary to assumptions, the media does not always strive to ‘reflect reality as it is’; rather it builds differing definitions, identities, conceptions and images about reality, and these representations are internalised by individuals.¹¹

Public discourse is greatly influenced by the media. While having the power to promote diversity and variety, the media, which is defined as the ‘fourth power’ following legislative, executive, and judiciary, can also be influential and guiding in the heightening of social polarisation and conflict.¹² When the media acts recklessly and carelessly, it can trigger, lend power to, and even justify, racism and hatred.¹³ Therefore, the media is one of the most influential platforms in generating hate speech. However, one must also bear in mind that the influence of a platform depends on its power within the society. For instance, discourse of politicians in a society ruled by an authoritarian regime can create a stronger impact than all of the other discourse generated in various other platforms.

Why is it important to identify hate speech?

Hate speech paves the way for intolerance towards the groups and/or individuals on whom it focuses, causing hostile perceptions and attitudes such as violence, enmity, and discrimination against these individuals or groups to become mainstream. It repeatedly gives the message that “there is no place for you in this society” to the targeted groups. Members of the group who are frequently subjected to these messages grow silent and passive. This is inevitably damaging to the democratic order because not only is a fundamental right of these individuals being violated, namely the right to participate in social and political life, but often their right to life itself is put in danger.¹⁴

Hate speech

- Is a statement which is based on prejudice, and is **negative and/or aggressive**. It can be generated verbally, visually or in writing.
- Targets an individual or a group by discriminating in terms of religious or ethnic identity, disability, gender, or sexual orientation. It may be deliberate or unintentional.
- Causes harm to the individual or group, directly or indirectly, by **violating their human rights**.

FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS

Isn't the concept of 'hate speech' in conflict with the right to freedom of expression?

Freedom of expression is vital in contexts such as democracy, diversity of ideas, intellectual development of persons, and self-realisation; however, it is not an absolute right. States may limit freedom of expression under specific exceptional circumstances as per international human rights law.¹⁵

Considering the concept of 'hate speech' only through the perspective of the freedom of expression of the person generating the discourse creates the misconception that these two concepts oppose each other. In fact, the concept of 'hate speech' is used to protect the rights of persons to whom the discourse is directed. The right of the person generating the discourse to freedom of expression can only coexist with the right of the person subjected to discrimination **to protection against discrimination**¹⁶. Otherwise, inequality between those who enjoy their right to freedom of expression and those who are subjected to hate speech in the society will persist. Freedom of expression can only grow stronger in a social order in which everyone can speak up equally and certain groups are not marginalised and silenced by discriminative discourse or policies.

What is hate crime?

Since hate speech is mostly a triggering factor within the process leading to hate crime, these two concepts are often mixed up. For a crime to qualify as

a hate crime, it must have been committed with a motive involving hate, and defined as such under the penal code of the relevant country.

Any crime targeting an individual or a group and committed due to factors such as race, ethnicity, national origin, language, colour, religion, gender, age, intellectual or physical disability or sexual orientation falls under the scope of hate crime. Differing from other types of crime, the reason the victim or victims are targeted by such crimes is the prejudice felt against the group to which they belong (or are perceived as such even if they are not). This is why hate crimes are societal. They have a direct relationship with the understanding and practices related to the cohabitation of not only aggressors and victims, but of different groups within the society as well.¹⁷

Are there regulations in place on hate speech in Turkey and across the world? What does it mean to prohibit hate speech in the constitution?

Regulations regarding hate speech **vary**. For instance, as per the Dutch Penal Code, “Those who express themselves openly, verbally, in writing or graphics, in an intentionally degrading manner in the context of race, religion or philosophy of life, sexual orientation or physical, psychological or mental disability of a group shall be punishable by incarceration up to one year or third category fine.”¹⁸ On the other hand, statements within the scope of hate speech are considered to be under protection of freedom of expression in some countries. In the US, for instance, where hate speech is considered within the framework of freedom of expression, a statement including hate speech will only be taken out of the scope of freedom of expression if it poses an obvious and imminent danger.¹⁹ Under any circumstances, punitive detection of hate speech is challenging, as it needs examination based on singular incidents.

In Turkey, there is no constitutional arrangement directly prohibiting hate speech. However, Article 216 of the Penal Code of Turkey: ‘Provoking the public to hatred, hostility or degradation’ is the closest crime that could be identified in the context of countering hate speech. Some incidents against which criminal action related to hate speech has been taken on the basis of Article 216 include: A physician working at a health clinic in Erzurum in 2004 to patients: “Dirty Kurds! You should all be killed”; the campaign launched in 2007 by the Turkist Socialist Nation Society in Izmir: “Reducing the Kurdish population, sterilising Kurds”; villagers in Denizli, Çivril claiming, “Kurds keep reproducing, they will take over the village if we do not expel them” in 2008.²⁰

However, Article 216 is often interpreted in reverse: it is under criticism for being implemented not to protect disadvantaged groups in the face of hate speech but against those very groups. For instance, according to the report of the European Commission Against Racism and Intolerance (ECRI),²¹ ethnic origin, colour, language, nationality, sexual orientation and gender are not included in the bases mentioned in Article 216. Additionally, Article 216 advocates that the requirement that the crime pose a clear danger that presents a threat to the public order for it to constitute a crime should be waived.

Therefore, first and foremost, there needs to be a constitutional order allowing everyone to benefit equally from this law for hate speech to be legally recognised. Otherwise, a law prohibiting hate speech may victimise disadvantaged groups who are already at risk. It may even lead to the restriction of statements supporting the protection of the rights of these groups and to the violation of their right to freedom of expression. Hence, the legal battle for the **right to freedom of expression and the right to protection from discrimination**, which do not in fact oppose one another but indeed need to be achieved jointly, is extremely important in this sense. Yet, there is a need to develop other instruments aiming for social transformation, going above and beyond laws and regulations in countering hate speech. As Yasemin İnceoğlu says, “Going in search of another law restricting the freedom of expression while stating that Article 216, which can often boomerang, should be abolished can create a major threat to the freedom of the press, which already has a poor track record in Turkey.”²²

Alternative discourse guide

What is alternative discourse?

Alternative discourse is one of the instruments we can use to counter hate speech and discrimination. It is based on human rights and democratic values such as openness, respect for differences, freedom and equality. Alternative discourse is not merely about using new and different words; it proposes new and positive narratives which allow us to see, understand, and make sense of events from different perspectives; it brings previously unheard stories to the forefront. Alternative discourse is based on **a rights-focused language and mindset**.

Why is it important to develop an alternative discourse?

Discourse is important as it affects the way we think, our decisions and movements. What is accepted as right and normal or as wrong and abnormal in a society is determined by the dominant discourse in that society. The perspective communicated by the dominant discourse is accepted as the sole reality and truth; it is not to be questioned, with alternative narratives being rejected. Consequently, all fundamental rights and values which are necessary for a pluralist and democratic society are put in danger, starting with the freedom of thought. This is why it is crucial to transform any discriminative discourse and hate speech that may have oppressive effects. Instead, perspectives and data which invite people to see different facets of one and the same reality should be used.

How to develop an alternative discourse

An alternative discourse can be developed in four stages:

1. Analysis of discriminative discourse and hate speech,
2. Designing an effective alternative discourse to replace the discourse under consideration,
3. Cooperating to realise the discourse,
4. Following up and assessing the results

Hate speech seeps into our lives through various media with stronger or weaker influence, normalising and magnifying discrimination. Therefore, advocating an alternative discourse is crucial. An alternative discourse to be developed by workers in sectors which carry weight in social life such as the public sector and the media can produce direct results. Adopting and disseminating a rights-based language within organisations may offer an important contribution to transforming the public discourse.

Step one: Analysis of hate speech

First, the contents and potential effects of the hate speech to be opposed must be analysed in the effort to develop an effective alternative discourse:

- **Which group or identity is being referred to in the statement under consideration?** Is the discourse targeting vulnerable individuals or groups who are currently subjected to discrimination, oppression and/or violence?
- **How does it approach the targeted group or identity?** Are the targeted individuals and groups represented as a social, economic, cultural or security threat? Are there negative generalisations towards an entire community/identity based on a single person or an individual incident? Does it use direct profanity, insult and degrading statements? Does the discourse disseminate hostility, violence, or war discourse towards the targeted identities? Are all of the people living in the relevant countries targeted due to intergovernmental political and diplomatic relations?
- **On which sources of information and data is the discourse based?** Is the claimed information based on a scientific source? How was this source selected? Is there any relevant party whose opinion was not considered?
- **Under which social, political, and historical circumstances was the statement generated?** Are there conditions such as migration, historical hostility narratives, existing conflict/prejudice between groups, etc. present?
- **What is the influence/power of the instruments used to communicate and disseminate the statement?** Is the discourse being disseminated through, and frequently repeated on, powerful and influential communication channels such as social media, a popular TV channel or

radio station? Are communication media which are popular where the discourse was generated and which reach large masses being used? Is the person generating the discourse seen as a leader or an important personality by the entire or part of the society?

- **What kind of impact and consequences could this discourse generate?**

Hate speech may stem from multiple sources. It is hard to counter all of these elements simultaneously. It is more productive to focus on the aspect of the narrative which one intends to counter in an effort to develop an effective and tailor-made alternative discourse.

Step two: Designing the alternative discourse

1. Identifying the purpose

What do I want to see come to fruition by countering the hate speech which I am analysing? What is the impact I want to create in the short, mid, and long run?

2. Identifying the alternative perspective (vision)

This step constitutes the basis of the alternative discourse. The information, behaviour, and values intended to be encouraged by the alternative discourse are defined under this step. Here the alternative mindset, aka the vision to be offered in lieu of the discriminative mindset, is determined.

One of the most prominent characteristics of hate speech is that the social circumstances and rights of targeted groups are ignored. Consequently, it is crucial to answer these two questions while developing an alternative discourse:

- Is there any situation or information (a fundamental right, truth to a fallacy, a historical piece of information, event, etc.) which has been ignored and which you believe should be highlighted about the said event or situation? If yes, what is it?
- What would an alternative perspective that would change our viewpoint and mindset be like? (Human rights, cohabitation, responsibility, social cohesion, equality...)

Clearly defining the goal and the vision will make for a strong discourse. Hate speech is not merely about the words themselves: it is generated through the repetition of a certain viewpoint and message. One must become aware of this discriminative mindset underlying hate speech and offer positive alternatives in its stead to be able to counter hate speech. Hence, it is important to **try to express with a clear statement the message of the alternative discourse you would like to develop.**

For instance, perspectives which advocate multiculturalism as a source of richness, or asylum as a human right, may be brought to the forefront instead of hate speech in which refugees are referenced as a threat to social values.

Avoid directly targeting the hate speech while determining the perspective of your alternative discourse. The purpose of the alternative discourse is not to refute the hate speech but to offer and promote a well thought out, positive alternative in its stead.

3. Identifying the target audience

The target audience should be identified in line with the objective. Accurately identifying the target audience would help with the selection of platforms on which the alternative discourse is to be disseminated. While developing a discourse, your target audience may be the general public; however, this is too broad a target to establish an effective discourse. Identifying the characteristics and the needs of the audience will help to make your discourse effective. The language with which you would address a young audience would be different than the language you would use to address an adult audience or a sector where official language is predominant. Identifying the audience ensures development of a discourse in compliance with these conditions.

For instance, an alternative discourse to be developed against hate speech or discriminative discourse leading to the marginalisation of refugees in education may be addressed to students, parents or teachers.

4. Determining the content and style

In this step, the tone and content of the new discourse is determined. The content and style must be suitable to the audience being addressed.

For instance, an alternative language that carries a humorous tone may be used against hate speech founded on an official and aggressive tone about refugees. What matters is to ensure that the message reaches the target audience.

While determining the content and style:

- do not highlight the hate speech you have rejected,
- offer positive and creative alternatives,
- attract the attention of your target audience,
- open up space for your target audience to discover and consider alternative perspectives,
- it is impossible for messages that merely discredit the hate speech and the ones who generated it to be lasting and effective, so offer a positive alternative suggestion, a well thought out explanation to the hate speech and those who generated it,
- do not victimise; do not try to awaken empathy towards the persons targeted by hate speech through pity. This approach only reinforces the victim and sufferer roles of the said persons in the eyes of the society. Evoking feelings may secure you a response in the short run; however, you need to highlight human rights for a permanent transformation.

5. Selecting the instruments

How and through which instruments can I communicate my message? Which communication channels and media outlets should I use and to what extent?

In this step, the most suitable instruments are ones that ensure that the alternative discourse will reach the target audience. If the study is being conducted at an organisation, one must identify the channels and persons facilitating the communication.

All communication channels should be considered depending on the context in which the discourse is to be developed. For instance, social media is one of the media where hate speech is generated fastest and in the highest number while also providing ample ground for the dissemination of alternative discourse. However, channels through which a discourse may be disseminated are not limited to social or traditional media; alternative discourse can also be generated and disseminated through films, festivals, and workshops.

Step three: Cooperating to realise the alternative discourse

In this step, one must identify and collaborate with all the relevant and influential groups.

Which groups could help with establishing the alternative discourse? Who could help amplify the impact of the alternative discourse? Which individuals and organisations could be influential on the audience to whom I want to address my message?

At the stage of realising the alternative discourse, potentially influential individuals and organisations should be included in the alternative discourse. If there is a study on alternative discourse within an organisation, officials who may support this study should be contacted and included in this process. In the event that the study is being conducted in other contexts, it would prove important to identify and assign roles to all influential persons and organisations that may lend their support to such discourse. Influential actors may include public institutions, media outlets or civil society organisations as well as celebrities, artists, politicians and other public figures.

It is particularly important to ensure participation of the groups targeted by the hate speech **while collaborating**. Participation of targeted groups is indispensable for an empowering alternative discourse and to prevent re-establishment of unjust power relations. Encouraging different parties to collaborate in this process proves important in terms of developing an effective alternative discourse.

Step four: Following up and evaluating the impact of alternative discourse

The goal here is to have an idea about the impact of the discourse we have developed. We need to look into the relationship between the goal we originally had in mind and where we ended up. Not every discourse developed may create the desired impact. More importantly, the discourse developed may produce adverse effects or effects that are different than what was expected.

A gap in previous stages may be discovered upon evaluation of the impact and consequences of the discourse. Thus, new steps can be taken to enhance and reinforce the discourse such as the targeted audience, style, instruments to be used or replacing or adding influential actors.

Leading questions such as “Whom has the discourse reached?”, “How have they perceived the message?”, “How has their approach to the issue changed?”

While answering these questions, the evaluation may be based on concrete metrics such as the number of clicks or number of distributed posters.

Points to remember while developing alternative discourse

It is critical to protect human rights values and principles throughout the whole process of developing alternative discourse. Every step should reflect human rights, and be taken in light of promoting human rights.

A pool consisting of supportive statistics, data, information and sources should be established to reinforce the alternative discourse.

The struggle should be against hate speech, not against those who generate it. Addressing the issue at a personal level may deteriorate the situation further by triggering protectionism in the name of those generating the hate speech.

Coping strategies should be developed against such reactions in an effort to avoid harm from reactions that could be triggered by the alternative discourse.

Using language that does not reproduce the existing hierarchical power relations is crucial for the alternative discourse. With this goal in mind, having information about the social groups targeted by the hate speech, consulting with the persons who are members of these groups, and creating space to develop alternative discourse would be beneficial.

The language to be used should encourage those who usually remain silent in the face of hate speech to join the discussion and support the struggle against hate speech.

The language used is vital for the target audience to feel an affinity with the alternative discourse. Based on the desired objectives, content and tone should be readjusted as per different audiences.

useful resources

Here are some resources which were used while developing this guide and which can be referred to for further study:

- Agata de Latour, Nina Perger, Ron Salaj, Claudio Tocchi and Paloma Viejo Otero, ***WE CAN! Taking Action against Hate Speech through Counter and Alternative Narratives*** (Hungary: Council of Europe, 2017), <https://rm.coe.int/wecan-eng-final-23052017-web/168071ba08>
- Henry Tuck and Tanya Silverman, ***The Counter-Narrative Handbook*** (London: Institute for Strategic Dialogue, 2016), http://www.isdglobal.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/06/Counter-narrative-Handbook_1.pdf

- Charlie Winter and Johanna Fürst, **Challenging Hate: Counter-speech Practices in Europe** (London: Online Civil Courage Initiative, 2017), <https://icsr.info/wp-content/uploads/2018/03/ICSR-Report-Challenging-Hate-Counter-speech-Practices-in-Europe.pdf>
- Paul Iganski and Abe Sweiry, **Stopping Hate: How to Counter Hate Speech on Twitter?** (Brussels: Media Diversity Institute), <https://getthetrollsout.org/stoppinghate>

4. Evaluation and closing

Thank you for participating in and contributing to the training. We would like to give the floor to you in this final part of the training. We can use a method to make it easier for you to evaluate the experience we had throughout the training. Using all five of your fingers, you may start your evaluation answering the following questions for each finger:

- thumb: What went well?
- index finger: What could be improved?
- middle finger: What went wrong?
- ring finger: What would we like to keep?
- little finger: What did not get enough attention?

Start whenever you are ready. During this feedback session, I will hand out short evaluation forms as well and ask you to fill them in and return them to us on your way out.

Once you have described the exercise, you can place a chair in the middle and tell them that whoever feels ready to can go ahead and start. Do not force all participants to do an evaluation; those who wish to take part in this exercise may do so voluntarily. Nevertheless, you can share your own evaluation using this method in an effort to encourage participants to do so. If you have little time for the evaluation, you may opt for an exercise such as ‘three words’ instead. Contrary to the hand exercise, there are no limitations in the three words exercise; participants say three words describing their thoughts about the training activity.

Once comments have been shared, you may finalise the training by collecting the forms.

Facilitators are strongly advised to take into account the following points during the planning and implementation stages of the training activities covered by this manual.

learning objectives: You may think of learning objectives as topics to be addressed or discussed during the session you will hold. You should make the most of your learning objectives to guide discussions, and to link topics and concepts during the session.

annotations: You can make use of annotations to understand the learning objectives of sessions, establish links among them, and address them as a whole. These annotations include background information on the topic. These annotations will help you to make discussions more productive, to concretise them, and to present the topic within a framework. You should consider the learning objectives while reading through the annotations.

directive: Once learning objectives and background information have been developed, methods to be used for sharing and delivering this information will be determined. Each method will become meaningful when considered together with specific learning objectives. A directive, on the other hand, presents the framework in which the method to be adopted in the session will be shared with participants. Directives included in the manual have been written in the words of facilitators as they would address the participants.

analysis questions: Using these questions, you can create space for the participants to express themselves. Participants' sharing of their knowledge, experience, and ideas about the topic will improve the learning environment for everyone.

Who is a facilitator and what do facilitators do?²³

A facilitator's role is to help the group deliver their specific tasks towards an objective. The participants' task is to move towards the objective of the session, workshop, or training activity. A facilitator should support the joint consideration process of the group also by using the knowledge and experience of the group.

The facilitator should focus on the process that participants experience throughout the training and monitor this process. They should guide the participants along training objectives, yet bear in mind that non-formal education is participant-focused.

At this point, the facilitator should master the learning objectives of the training and listen well to participants, making sure the entire group hears the relevant knowledge and experience by asking the right questions. Active listening and asking the right questions are important skills for a facilitator.

The facilitator is responsible for supporting the participants' learning processes.

The facilitator

- implements targeted practices,
- tries to draw out the potential of participants,
- ensures that participants get to know each other better,
- helps participants understand one another,
- helps to resolve conflicts among participants,
- encourages participants to express themselves,
- organises the training environment and time schedule.

What should the facilitator avoid? The facilitator should avoid:

- correcting what participants have said, preventing them from expressing themselves,
- taking part in group work,
- resolving challenges of working groups in their stead,
- judging thoughts or viewing one thought as better or more correct than others,
- taking sides,
- trying to answer every question.

Both before and during the training

- check your preparations (hall, chairs, air, materials, etc.),
- review the program details (sessions, timing, etc.) and be sure about which objective you would like to reach in which particular section,
- encourage participation,
- encourage participants to consider different perspectives,
- support participants in their search for comprehensive solutions, and while doing so, remember that nothing is black and white,
- emphasize the objective of each session several times; if participants are doing that in your stead, repeat by referring to them.

It should be remembered that non-formal education is based on an approach that is focused on participants and partnering up/reconciling, recreating and jointly creating;

facilitators should support this approach. You can use the ‘dos’ and ‘don’ts’ given in the table below²⁴ to better understand and support this approach.

DO	DON'T
Encourage participants to express their opinions and thoughts and to talk about their experiences.	Do not invalidate any suggestion coming from participants by judging it. Do not use statements such as “useless”, “irrelevant” or “nonsense.”
Try to create a safe environment where everyone can express their views comfortably. Strive to create a culture of mutual respect.	Do not let the group marginalise, ignore, judge, or disrespect others; try to establish some of the fundamental principles at the outset.
Incentivise discussion and questioning; participants learn by expressing their doubts or hesitations.	Do not keep your presentations too long; this makes it hard for participants to focus.
Help participants to establish links between the topics addressed and what they have seen and experienced in their own environment.	Do not make generalisations that are irrelevant to the topics addressed.
Allow participants to question ‘established facts’; also do this yourself.	Do not use your position to end a discussion and do not take the high ground in your speeches.
Be honest with participants. This will ensure that participants respect you more and open up more comfortably.	Do not be afraid to say “I don’t know” in the face of a topic about which you are not well informed or a question to which you do not have the answer.
Trust the participants. Participants may have to find some of the answers on their own.	Do not speak condescendingly to the participants or try to forcibly guide them towards a point/topic.
Take participant suggestions seriously. If participants feel like they are the subject of the training, they will be more likely to engage.	Do not think that you have to stick to the planned flow and content to the letter. If participants choose to move towards another direction, do not disregard this preference.

Be natural while you address the participants. You can ask them about how they feel, whether everything is fine, whether they need anything.

If opinions of some participants seem rude and thoughtless, do not give up. Try to show them another perspective.

Treat each participant equally; position yourselves on equal standing with them.

Do not marginalise the participants. Do not make assumptions about what participants can or cannot do.

practical information

This section lists some practical information that facilitators may use while conducting the training/workshop.

- Prepare yourself well. Materials, posters, presentations, etc. you will use should be ready. The more visual you make the training, the more comfortable both you and your participants will be.
- Take care to use the expression, “Does anyone want to share their ideas?” instead of “Does anyone have any idea?” Anyone can have an idea about the topic, but some may choose not to share it at that particular moment.
- Use your presentations as a tool. Do not read the presentation, enrich it with your own sentences. Be sure to take a look at the notes prepared for your presentations and remember that these notes are an important part of the presentation.
- Make sure that all participants take the floor in equal proportions. You can start addressing some concepts and topics by giving the floor to participants. However, do not let them deviate too much from the topic at hand and use your time well. Remember that you can address more lengthy discussions during breaks or at the end of the training.
- Write on your posters in capital letters and in a legible manner. Try to put up the finalised posters visibly in the training hall. Use the blue and the black markers to write down, the green and the red ones to mark up.
- As facilitators, take care to not speak at the same time or cut in too often during sessions. This will ensure that you do not distract your participants too much. The facilitator conducting the session may ask their team mate the following question once they finished their own statement: “Is there anything you wish to add?” This

way the other facilitator may mention points that were left out or that would be good if addressed as part of the session.

- As facilitators, use the training room efficiently. To do this, it is essential to see the room beforehand. You can plan which session you would like to conduct in which part of the hall, which parts you will use for what purpose. You can ask for your participants' help about the tidiness and order of the hall.
- During the analysis part
 - Have participants reflect upon the exercise they have done with questions such as, "How did you feel?" or "What has just happened?" (Start with these questions if you have carried out an exercise).
 - You can move towards the point you would like to address, using the question, "What does this exercise compare to in real life?" Linking the exercise to real life will give you the opportunity to discuss and describe some concepts. That is why it may be important to collect comments from as many participants as possible.
 - Once you have linked the exercise to real life and revealed the key concepts of the session, you can ask your participants, "So, what can we do about this situation?" and collect their suggestions.
 - You can give a summary of the key topics and concepts addressed during the session.
- Give clear instructions before starting the exercise to make sure everyone is clear on what they need to do. Take particular care to avoid confusion. Stop by each group during group work; give feedback on their work and answer their questions.
- Do not ask questions too frequently; move on to your next question once all is said about the one you have just asked. Asking too many questions may confuse the participants.
- Refer back to the previous session as you begin a new session. Briefly touch upon what you are going to do during the current session.
- Avoid exercises that require too much physical activity. Choose exercises taking into account the characteristics of the room and your participants.
- Remember that there are at least two facilitators, including yourself. Position yourselves in the room so that you can maintain eye contact with each other.

The approach you adopt in your training is an important part of the learning environment you have designed for your participants. Your participants should feel comfortable and safe to express themselves about the topics you address, to learn from one another, and to share their experiences. To achieve this, you should make sure that the learning environment is participant-focused both by the preliminary work you did and by your attitude during the training activities.

- 1 Towards A New Discourse Training Manual is available at bit.ly/TowardsANewDiscourseOnlineTrainingManual
- 2 United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs Population Division, "International Migrant Stock 2019", https://www.un.org/en/development/desa/population/migration/publications/migrationreport/docs/MigrationStock2019_TenKeyFindings.pdf
- 3 "Projections show that 200 million people will likely become 'climate refugees'", *Hürriyet*, 18.12.2019, <https://www.hurriyet.com.tr/teknoloji/200-milyon-insanin-iklim-multecisi-olacagi-tahmin-ediliyor-41400321>
- 4 United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, "Trends At a Glance", <https://www.unhcr.org/tr/en/figures-at-a-glance>
- 5 The 'instructions' and presentations included in the manual were developed to give the facilitators some ideas about how they can relay the content to the participants. The facilitators do not have to use the method proposed in these sections or use every sentence verbatim. The role of the facilitator is described in detail in the section titled 'Notes for the Facilitator' along with some significant practical information.
- 6 Yasemin İnceoğlu, "Tartışmalı Bir Kavram: Nefret Söylemi," in *Medya ve Nefret Söylemi: Kavramlar, Mecralar, Tartışmalar*, ed. Mahmut Çınar (Istanbul: Hrant Dink Foundation Publications, 2013), pp. 75-95.
- 7 <http://hrantdink.org/tr/asulis/faaliyetler/projeler/medyada-nefret-soylemi>
- 8 Tırşe Erbaysal Filibeli, *Asulis Dil, Diyalog, Demokrasi Laboratuvarı Raporu* (Istanbul: Hrant Dink Foundation Publications, 2016), p. 9.
- 9 Melek Göregenli, "Nefret Söylemi ve Nefret Suçları," in *Medya ve Nefret Söylemi: Kavramlar, Mecralar, Tartışmalar*, ed. Mahmut Çınar (Istanbul: Hrant Dink Foundation Publications, 2013), p. 57.
- 10 *Ibid.*, p. 58.
- 11 *Ibid.*, p. 59.
- 12 Tırşe Erbaysal Filibeli, *ibid.*, p. 9.
- 13 *Ibid.*
- 14 Yasemin İnceoğlu, *ibid.*, p. 76.
- 15 *Hate Speech 'Explained': A Toolkit* (London: Article 19, 2015), <https://www.article19.org/data/files/medialibrary/38231/'Hate-Speech'-Explained---A-Toolkit-%282015-Edition%29.pdf>
- 16 Prohibition of discrimination was introduced by the European Convention on Human Rights and covers Article 14 of the convention as well as the protocol no. 12 to the convention.
- 17 Ulaş Karan, "Nefret Söylemi ve Yakından İlişkili Diğer Kavramlar: Ayrımcılık, Nefret Suçu ve Hakaret," in *Medya ve Nefret Söylemi: Kavramlar, Mecralar, Tartışmalar*, ed. Mahmut Çınar (Istanbul: Hrant Dink Foundation Publications, 2013), p. 70.
- 18 Dutch Penal Code, Article 137 c, cited by Yasemin İnceoğlu, *ibid.*, p. 82.
- 19 Ulaş Karan, *ibid.*, p. 64.
- 20 Yasemin İnceoğlu, *ibid.*, pp. 79-80.
- 21 European Commission Against Racism and Intolerance (ECRI) Turkey Report (Strasbourg, 2016).
- 22 Yasemin İnceoğlu, *ibid.*, p. 91.
- 23 Sabine Klocker, *Manual for facilitators in non-formal education* (Strasbourg: Council of Europe, 2009), <https://rm.coe.int/16807023d1>
- 24 Ellie Keen and Mara Georgescu, *Bookmarks: A Manual for Combating Hate Speech Online Through Human Rights Education* (Ukraine: Council of Europe, 2016), <https://rm.coe.int/168065dac7>

All annexes are available at bit.ly/TowardsANewDiscourseOnlineTrainingManual

ANNEX 1 - Presentation ('Discrimination')

ANNEX 2 - Hate speech posters

ANNEX 3 - Presentation ('Discourse, Discrimination and Refugees')

ANNEX 4 - Alternative Discourse posters

ANNEX 5 - Alternative Discourse sample poster

ANNEX 6 - Preliminary assessment form

© HRANT DINK FOUNDATION PUBLICATIONS, 2021

This manual was designed to help promote a new, alternative, pluralistic language to replace discriminatory discourse and hate speech which is a threat to co-existence. The manual, as the implementation manual of the Towards a New Discourse Training, which was developed using non-formal education methodologies, presents the objectives, program, methods and materials of the training. Consisting of three main sections which focus on 'Discrimination', 'migration' and 'discourse' the Towards a New Discourse Training Program aims to question prejudice and misconceptions about refugees, help address polarisation within society, raise awareness of this issue and build a new language together.

*This publication was developed with the financial support of the European Union.
Hrant Dink Foundation takes full responsibility for the content herein;
the publication does not necessarily reflect the views of the European Union.*