



53rd EPRA meeting (online)

Thematic Meeting:

Living with hate speech: from apprehending to combatting
21 May 2021

Background paper¹ by the EPRA Secretariat (Post-meeting version of 13 July 2021)

1. EPRA and Hate Speech

Over the years, the topic of hate speech has regularly featured on the agenda of EPRA meetings and members have discussed this complex issue through various angles including the question of jurisdiction and typology of content ([Istanbul 2004](#); [Sarajevo 2005](#)) and best regulatory practices and case-law ([Budva 2014](#)). In [2016](#)², the focus shifted to tackling hateful content in times of crisis, both from the media providers and regulators' perspective, and to addressing the particular topics likely to fuel hate speech, such as terrorism and migrant crises. More recently, at the [49th EPRA meeting in Sarajevo](#) in 2019, a working group on "[the prevention of Hate Speech in the media in countries with multicultural communities](#)" was an opportunity to resume this long-lasting discussion among EPRA members, to share updates on recent cases and legislative initiatives and for an excursion into neuroscience and the psychological perspective of incitement to hatred. Further to a consultation with member authorities, hate speech was identified as a priority topic on [EPRA's Work Programme for 2021](#).

The past exchanges have highlighted the **difficulty to define hate speech** and the enduring challenge for broadcasting regulators to **weigh freedom of expression against the level and nature of alleged hate speech cases that they encounter**.

Rather recently, the focus of the discussions in the EPRA forum has **shifted from hate speech on broadcast media to the online sphere** reflecting the lively public debates on the multiplier effect of online media regarding hateful content and the role of social networks, and the ongoing legal initiatives on the national and the European level to deal with online harms and regulate online platforms.

Parallel strands of work in successive EPRA work programmes have also emphasised the **relevance of a wide range of legal and non-legal potential remedies and tools** to fight hateful content, such as media pluralism, self/co-regulation, artificial intelligence and media literacy.

Considering all of the above, the EPRA thematic meeting aims to provide a **comprehensive picture of hate speech** by unravelling its complexity and exploring the means to address it effectively.

¹ **Disclaimer:** this document has been produced for an internal meeting by EPRA, an informal network of 55 regulatory authorities in the field of audiovisual media services. It is not a fully comprehensive overview of the issues, nor does it represent the views or the official position of EPRA or of any member within the EPRA network.

² A bi-annual working group in Barcelona ([43rd EPRA meeting](#)) and Yerevan ([44th EPRA meeting](#))

2. The new faces of Hate Speech

What is hate? What is an opinion? Cyber-harassment, incitement of violence against a group of persons, terrorism propaganda... Defining hate speech has always been a challenge and can generate passionate debates. Indeed, hate speech can take many forms and originate from various issues. But behind this elusive notion, there are also victims and crucial concerns among our societies that need to be addressed. As it was pointed out in the introductory paper for the meeting in Sarajevo, hate speech is not illegal because it is hateful, but because it is dangerous and can lead directly or indirectly to discrimination and violence.

Several legal initiatives have gradually emerged on the national, European and global level, ranging from criminal law to audiovisual law, thus contributing to a complex, fragmented and constantly evolving legal framework and definitions. Within this dispersed structure, how can we identify hate speech? How can we respond to its various forms?

The online environment has disrupted the traditional schemes by facilitating the spread of hate speech and bringing up new type of players in the field. With the emergence of online media services such as social media, perpetrators are more difficult to identify and hateful content now has the capacity to reach wider audiences faster through services the providers of which are not under any editorial control. Mechanisms are changing, actors are changing but hate speech remains. With this thematic meeting, we intend to bring some insight into the various faces of hate speech and discuss how remedies should evolve to tackle the new challenges.

During this session organised in two parts, high level experts from academia and media regulators will explore the issue of hate speech by examining its roots, its key features and assessing its impact on our societies. Providing a global and consistent approach, the speakers will address both the mechanisms behind the scenes and the ways to tackle hate speech effectively.

3. Structure of the session

- Firstly, an interactive, interview-style **experts' panel** representing the legal, technological and societal perspectives will shed light on the complex underlying issues and analyse the range of adequate responses.
- Secondly, a **panel of audiovisual regulators'** representatives will share their approach towards hate speech as well as the recent initiatives put in place by their respective authorities to tackle hate speech.

Experts' Panel



Susan Benesch, [Dangerous Speech Project](#): Trained as a Human Rights lawyer at Yale, Susan is an American journalist and scholar of speech. In 2010, she founded the Dangerous Speech Project “to study any form of human expression that inspires violence between groups of people – and to find ways to mitigate this while protecting freedom of expression”. Within the Dangerous Speech Project, she also advises social media on their policies, and provides training and workshops to help people such as educators, lawyers, activists, researchers or tech companies staff understand and counter dangerous speech. She studies the use of counterspeech to delegitimise harmful speech.



Dr. Tarlach McGonagle, [University of Amsterdam](#): Tarlach is a university lecturer at the Institute for Information Law (IViR), at the University of Amsterdam and a coordinator of the [Netherlands Network for Human Rights Research](#). He is specialised in a broad range of topics relating to international and European human rights law, and especially the rights to freedom of expression, “hate speech” having a central place in his research. In addition to a Ph.D. awarded by the University of Amsterdam (2008) on freedom of expression and minority rights, he also holds an LL.M. degree in International Human Rights Law (University of Essex, 2001). He regularly advises and writes expert studies for various branches of the Council of Europe, the OSCE and other IGOs and NGOs and is a member of the [Council of Europe’s Expert Committee on Combating Hate Speech](#) (ADI/MSI-DIS).



Bertie Vidgen, the [Alan Turing Institute](#): Bertie holds a BA from the University of Warwick in History and Politics and an MA from the University of Essex in Ideology and Discourse Analysis and studied “Islamophobic hate speech among followers of UK political parties on Twitter” for a DPhil at the Oxford Internet Institute. He is now a Research Fellow in Online Harms at the Alan Turing Institute where he uses computational social science methods such as machine learning, natural language processing and statistical modelling, to detect, analyse, and counter online hate speech, in the context of both news and social media, as well as extremism and misinformation. He is Research Lead on “[Hate speech: measures and counter measures](#)” and co-Investigator of the Detecting Online Harms project, both Alan Turing Institute’s projects. He is one of the authors of the report “[Understanding Online hate](#)” commissioned by Ofcom.

Audiovisual Regulators panel

A media literacy approach – focus on minors: The Swedish Media Council’s initiatives



Anette Novak, Director general of the [Swedish Media Council](https://www.statensmedierad.se/) (SE): The Swedish Media Council has run the national campaign No Hate Speech since 2013 and is the Swedish Safer Internet Centre since 2020. The Council has recently compiled an international research overview of net hate/net bullying among minors, underlying the cognitive mechanisms at play. <https://www.statensmedierad.se/rapporter-och-analyser/material-rapporter-och-analyser/utsatt-pa-internet> (SE)

- ➔ Watch Anette’s presentation: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=F4Rr6G_SuqM
- ➔ Anette’s slides: <https://www.epra.org/attachments/53rd-epra-meeting-living-with-hate-speech-presentation-of-the-swedish-media-council>

A 360° approach - focus on enforcement, training and media literacy: The media authority of North Rhine-Westphalia’s initiatives



Tobias Schmid, Director of the [Media Authority of North Rhine-Westphalia](https://www.mediainfo.nrw.de/) (DE) (and also ERGA Chairperson): LfM-NRW is encouraging legal enforcement and sanctions against perpetrators as a deterrent (“prosecuting instead of only deleting”). LfM-NRW is also conducting training and issuing guidelines for journalists to deal with hate speech or to learn how to moderate hate speech, a yearly survey on hate speech and other initiatives around media literacy (Zebra, Klicksafe, Medienbox).

- ➔ Watch Tobias’ presentation: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=NyEqr5SAZ5s>
- ➔ Tobias’ slides: <https://www.epra.org/attachments/53rd-epra-meeting-living-with-hate-speech-presentation-by-lfm-nrw-de>

Focus on guidance, monitoring and enforcement: Ofcom’s initiatives



Murtaza Shaikh, Policy Lead - Online Hate, Terrorism & Incitement at [Ofcom](https://www.ofcom.gov.uk/) (UK) and former UN Special Rapporteur on Minority issues: The UK adopted The Audiovisual Media Services Regulations 2020 on 30 September 2020 to transpose the AVMS Directive. On 15 December 2020, the UK Government also confirmed its intention to appoint Ofcom as the regulator of the UK’s future online harms regime. Against this background, Ofcom is currently consulting on [“Guidance for VSPs on measures to protect users from harmful material”](https://www.ofcom.gov.uk/consult/condocs/vsp/vsp_guidance/vsp_guidance.pdf) (including hate speech) and has commissioned the [Alan Turing report on hate speech online](https://www.ofcom.gov.uk/consult/condocs/turing/turing_report/turing_report.pdf).

- ➔ Watch Murtaza’s presentation: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=KiN43l8r33g>

4. Summary of the session

4.1. Understanding Hate Speech

4.1.1. What is Hate Speech?

- **Defining hate speech is a challenge:** While we tend to share an approximate definition of hate speech, this approach is difficult for regulatory purposes. Yet agreeing on a common definition is a challenge. There is generally agreement on the extreme; the challenge is the grey area based on individual perception. The conundrum is to ensure a balance between all the rights protected while building enough safeguards to prevent against harmful impact.
- **Hate speech is complex and multifaceted:** hate speech is a deep-rooted, complex and multi-dimensional phenomenon, which takes many pernicious forms and has far-reaching consequences in contemporary democratic societies. Hate is an emotion and as such is subjective.
- **Protected characteristics evolve over time:** In [the Council of Europe's Recommendation of 1997](#) the concept of hate speech was mostly based on ethnicity and race. In the meantime, the understanding has grown and deepened to include a variety of grounds such as sex, gender or disability. The case law of the European Court of Human Rights has evolved in the same direction. While there is still no set definition by the ECHR, there is a clearer understanding of the concept and a better sense of predictability.
- **An open-ended definition which evolves with society:** The United Nations attempted to define hate speech in 2019 in their [Strategy and Plan of action on hate speech](#) based on some shared identity. They solved the definitional problem by referring to one list of identities and adding an open-ended phrase ("or other identity factor")³. The current [draft Council of Europe Recommendation on combating hate speech](#) has taken a similar approach based on an indicative list of "*personal characteristics or status including (...)*"⁴.
- **Open questions:** Can a definition be too broad? Is "pejorative language" hate speech? There is also a discussion among scholars about power balance and whether hate speech can only be targeted against a minority group. Can there be hate speech against the majority?
- **Context matters:** Analysing the context is extremely important to get a deeper understanding of hate speech: this can include the influence and standing of speakers and

³ "Any kind of communication in speech, writing or behaviour, that attacks or uses pejorative or discriminatory language with reference to a person or a group on the basis of who they are, in other words, based on their religion, ethnicity, nationality, race, colour, descent, gender or other identity factor":

<https://www.un.org/en/genocideprevention/documents/UN%20Strategy%20and%20Plan%20of%20Action%20on%20Hate%20Speech%2018%20June%20SYNOPSIS.pdf>

⁴ The current draft Council of Europe Recommendation on combating hate speech refers to "*all kinds of expressions, which spread, incite to, promote or justify violence, hatred, discrimination or prejudice against a person, or a group of persons, that is based on presumed or real personal characteristics or status including ["race"/race], colour, language, religion, citizenship, national or ethnic origin, age, disability, sex, gender, gender identity and sexual orientation*":

<https://www.coe.int/en/web/committee-on-combatting-hate-speech/adi-msi-dis-working-documents>

the impact, the technology used, the content of the speech and how it is perceived. This is a huge challenge for the technology (“how to encode context?”).

- **Implementation matters:** While we may never agree on a definition, what really matters is how to implement an approach in practice. In this regard, it is important not to conflate hate speech with illegal hate speech: the majority of hate speech will not be illegal. Rather than a list of protecting characteristics, identifying a spectrum of severity is helpful.

4.1.2. *What is the impact of online media on hate speech?*

- **The paradox of technology:** Technology has increased freedom of expression. The interactive nature of the Internet makes it easier to reach large audiences for better or for worse; it is thus particularly important to make society more resilient. Online also allows research that would not be possible offline, for instance on how information travels.
- **Old enemy, new norms:** hate speech is not a new phenomenon; we are taught to hate. At the same time, new societal norms have emerged. Authors suddenly became socially accountable for what they are sharing on social media. These new "norms" can be heavy to handle for both the victim and the author.
- **No clear evidence of increasing hate online:** Clear evidence of increasing online hate is missing according to experts. Rather, research shows that surges and spurts of hate speech appear in response to offline events. There is certainly an improvement in the figures for reporting and take-down of hate speech, but this can be based on the changing policies of online platforms or the use of AI tools looking for hate.

4.2. Combatting hate speech

4.2.1. *General considerations*

- **Need for further research:** on the mechanisms of hate speech online:
 - Research can help understand how platform design can positively and negatively impact the prevalence of hate speech online
 - More research into the impact of interventions is required (what does “combatting” hate speech really mean, and what works in this context, e.g. downranking vs. removing content, impact of counterspeech on the audience vs. perpetrators).
 - Greater transparency by platforms can help feed into designing interventions better.
- **Artificial Intelligence:** benefits and limitations
 - AI tools are helpful and really important for intelligence-gathering: they can help monitor hate speech and are scalable and cost-effective.
 - AI is however not a silver bullet to fight hate speech; hate speech represents less than 1% of the online content and it is difficult for artificial intelligence tools to properly detect such content: it will pick counterspeech that quotes hate speech; it will not pick hate mentioned in a subtle way.

- Even though technology appears neutral and objective, the design and development of AI tools are always based on humans and thus, include bias and various social perceptions. If we do not agree on what is hate speech, we will not be able to have effective AI tools or to monitor efficiently hate speech.
- AI always needs to be complemented by human supervision and this should go along with better engagement with communities of users.
- **Implementing platform policies:** Internet intermediaries may have clear and relevant policies and terms of use, but problems arise regarding enforcement (time pressure on moderators, psychological impact, a lack of support and means).
- **External oversight of platforms is key:** Platforms have become so dominant and powerful by now that content moderation cannot be left at their sole discretion and only rely on their good will, as their first objective will be to keep the users on their services.
- **Transparency by platforms is paramount:** It has become urgent to understand how platforms implement their policies and how they make decisions regarding content. However, there is a clear lack of data and transparency regarding enforcement. Access to moderation data is crucial. For instance, today, it is not possible to know the impact of making content less visible rather than deleting it, the "deleting" rate of content depending on its author's gender or the impact of the country of origin of the content posted.
- **Different forms require different responses:** Hate speech covers various aspects and types of speech: from hateful/mean/distressing/offensive speech to more formally defined discrimination or incitement in relation to protected characteristics. Depending on the type of speech and what we really want to fight, some responses might be more relevant than others (prosecution, content moderation, counterspeech...).
- **Role and limits of media literacy:** There is general agreement that MIL cannot be the silver bullet to eradicate hate speech but that a wide range of societal responses are required. MIL however clearly has a role to play in countering the impact and effects of hate speech on individuals. Counterspeech also overlaps with MIL quite a bit. In addition, societal norms around hate speech can be significantly supported by MIL, through the development of such norms and investment in education relevant to both MIL and norm setting.
- **Benefits of proactive, joined-up approaches:** Combatting hate speech involves a range of responses. It requires to look at the roots of hatred, to invest in education and to find remedies and ways to mitigate the impact on society and the victims. A comprehensive action plan at national level bringing all the different players could help address these issues in a coordinated way combining civic, legal and technological approaches and tools. The [national action plan recently put in place in the UK for the safety of journalists](#) could serve as a blueprint.

4.2.2. *The role of Media Regulators: What can NRAs do?*

- **Develop internal understanding/knowledge of hate speech and online platforms:**
 - In-depth understanding of the complexity of hate speech is required.
 - A better understanding of the intermediaries' limits: In order to regulate platforms, it is important to keep in mind that not everything can be achieved with technology and to also take into account smaller platforms with limited resources. A better understanding of technology could help foster a fruitful dialogue with Internet players to understand what is feasible or not and at what cost.
- **Focus on key achievable things:** Developing guidance notes or similar documents addressed to state and industry actors and gathering stakeholders and regulators from other areas are helpful measures. EPRA could also help share best practice and guidance notes among its members.
- **Be proactive:** While joined-up approaches are indispensable, media regulators should be proactive and recommend and/or launch initiatives such as national action plans.
- **Be specific:** As mentioned earlier, different forms require different responses. When drawing the line, it is useful to decide explicitly which harms media regulators want to protect as there are different policies depending on different types of harm.

4.3. Further points raised by the audience:

- **Traditional broadcasters:** As traditional broadcasters increasingly engage in online activities but have little experience regarding the moderation of users' comments, they should also be a focus for media regulatory authorities. Developing specific guidelines could be helpful.
- **Timing of regulatory responses:** When is it the "right time" to act against hate speech at the regulatory level? An evidence-based approach is important but should not preclude intervention at an early stage. This question should also be included in the due diligence exercise done by the relevant actors. In any case, platforms should not take moderation decisions without taking into account the specific social context and the guidance from "local" actors such as media regulators.
- **The regulation of small platforms:** While current regulatory proposals focus on very large platforms, small platforms can also be sources of harm and thus have an impact on society. However, they may not have the same means to deal with hate speech as the large platforms.

Annex: A short selection of recent resources on hate speech of particular relevance for media regulators

As mentioned above, the various initiatives to tackle hate speech have resulted in a complex legal framework, with several layers of national, European and international standards, from specific criminal law to international Human Rights conventions for instance. Against this background, providing exhaustive references to the legal framework would be a particularly arduous challenge and may duplicate existing work by specialised organisations. With the following list, we highlight some key resources that might be relevant for audiovisual regulatory authorities.

See also the [dedicated list of resources on Hate Speech and Media Literacy](#) compiled by EMIL, EPRA's Media and information Literacy Taskforce.

Self-regulation at European Union level:

- The **EU Code of conduct on countering illegal hate speech online**, May 2016: Signed between the European Commission and major IT companies, the Code requires the signatories to put in place various conditions, mechanisms and initiatives to help tackle online hate speech (*flag and removal system, staff training, media literacy...*). This code is regularly monitored by the Commission.
https://ec.europa.eu/info/policies/justice-and-fundamental-rights/combating-discrimination/racism-and-xenophobia/eu-code-conduct-countering-illegal-hate-speech-online_en

The European Court of Human Rights and hate speech:

- The **European Court of Human Rights' Factsheet on hate speech**, September 2020: A summary of key ECHR's decisions illustrating the two approaches of the Court regarding to hate speech (*excluding from the protection of the Convention (Article 17 of the Convention) / setting restrictions on freedom of expression (Article 10 of the Convention)*):
https://www.echr.coe.int/documents/fs_hate_speech_eng.pdf

Policy recommendations:

- The **Council of Europe draft Committee of Ministers to member States Recommendation on combatting hate speech**, July 2021: The draft Recommendation aims at providing non-binding guidance for member States and key stakeholders based on a comprehensive approach within a Human Rights framework. The public consultation is open until 8 August:
<https://rm.coe.int/draft-recommendation-on-combating-hate-speech-public-consultation-v-18/native/1680a2ef25>
- The **United Nations Strategy and Plan of Action on Hate Speech**, May 2019: In this plan of action, the UN define hate speech and list its key commitments to tackle it, from the roots to the victims' support notably through cooperation, research, education and technology:
https://www.un.org/en/genocideprevention/documents/advising-and-mobilizing/Action_plan_on_hate_speech_EN.pdf

- The **European Commission against Racism and intolerance's General Policy Recommendation n°15**, December 2015: Ten concrete recommendations and an explanatory memorandum addressed to members States to guide them in their fight against hate speech: <https://www.coe.int/en/web/european-commission-against-racism-and-intolerance/recommendation-no.15>

Comprehensive and global reports on hate speech:

- **Understanding online hate – VSP regulation and the broader context** by Bertie Vidgen, Emily Burden and Helen Margetts from the Alan Turing Institute, February 2021: a comprehensive report to understand the characteristics and forms of online hate speech, the ways it inflicts harm and the key elements for an effective content moderation system: https://www.ofcom.org.uk/_data/assets/pdf_file/0022/216490/alan-turing-institute-report-understanding-online-hate.pdf
- **Models of governance of online hate speech**, by Alexander Brown for the Council of Europe, May 2020: this six-month study analyses the various innovations recently undertaken to combat hate speech and, identifying three main levels of governance (the moderation level, the oversight level, and the regulatory level), provides a large number of practical recommendations to govern hate speech: <https://rm.coe.int/models-of-governance-of-online-hate-speech/16809e671d>
- **Defining and diminishing hate speech**, by Susan Benesch for Minority Rights Group International, 2014: As the second Chapter of the State of the World's Minorities and Indigenous Peoples, this paper provides an analysis and overview of existing law and alternatives to criminal law such as counterspeech around the world: <https://minorityrights.org/wp-content/uploads/old-site-downloads/mrg-state-of-the-worlds-minorities-2014-chapter02.pdf>
- **Hate speech and hate crime in the EU and the evaluation of online content regulation approaches**, by Judit Bayer and Petra Bárd for the European Parliament's Committee on Civil Liberties, Justice and Home Affairs, July 2020: Addressing both hate speech and hate crimes and the impact of the Covid-19 crisis, this detailed study analyses the current international legal framework and the legal responses in place in five selected jurisdictions (DE, HU, IT, MT and PL) to conclude with recommendations towards the European Union legislator: [https://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/STUD/2020/655135/IPOL_STU\(2020\)655135_EN.pdf](https://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/STUD/2020/655135/IPOL_STU(2020)655135_EN.pdf)
- The **Council of Europe against online hate speech: Conundrums and challenges**, by Dr. Tarlach McGonagle, November 2013: An expert paper analysing the Council of Europe approach to hate speech and the new challenges raised by online hate speech, at the Council of Europe's level: <https://cdn.epra.org/attachments/files/2342/original/McGonagle%20-%20The%20Council%20of%20Europe%20against%20online%20hate%20speech.pdf>

- The [Unboxing hate speech conference](#), 18 February 2021: Politicians, experts, stakeholders and civil society discuss what European political institutions and civil society must do to actively combat online hate speech while also defending freedom of speech.

-> **Measures and strategies for combating hate speech at the European level – an overview**, Briefing paper by *Hanna Gleiß & Sina Laubenstein*, February 2021: An overview of recent studies on hate speech, current initiatives undertaken by the Council of Europe and actions that remain to be done from the standpoint of civil society:

<https://www.fes.de/index.php?elD=dumpFile&t=f&f=61932&token=911f44ea2f89bd28527110c8a6e957e2d87cb2dc>

-> **The Conference's conclusions:** <https://rm.coe.int/unboxing-hate-speech-17-18-feb-2021-conference-conclusions/1680a1cd96>

Practical guidance on hate speech:

- **Content Moderation: Best practices towards effective legal and procedural frameworks for self-regulatory and co-regulatory mechanisms of content moderation**, adopted by the *Council of Europe Steering Committee for Media and Information Society (CDMSI)* at its 19th plenary meeting, 19-21 May 2021. This practical guide provides recommendations and best practices for member States and Internet intermediaries (*not limited to hate speech*): <https://rm.coe.int/content-moderation-en/1680a2cc18>
- **Dangerous speech: A practical guide**, by the *Dangerous Speech Project*, April 2021: A practical guide on the definition of dangerous speech, its characteristics and effects, with concrete examples and addressing the issue both offline and online: <https://dangerousspeech.org/guide/>
- A practical guide "**Combatting hate speech in the audiovisual media: standards, case law, good practices and case studies**", by the *Organisation Internationale de la Francophonie* [FR], September 2018: <https://www.refram.org/Media/Files/Etudes-et-presentations/Guide-contre-les-discours-de-haine>

Hate speech and regulatory authorities:

- **Video-sharing platforms: Draft guidance for providers on measures to protect users from harmful material** by *Ofcom (UK)*, March 2021: Currently under consultation, this guidance is intended to support VSP providers in understanding their statutory obligations under the new regime which came in force last November and include requirements to take measures to protect users from harmful material in videos: https://www.ofcom.org.uk/_data/assets/pdf_file/0028/216487/vsp-harms-draft-guidance.pdf

- **Guidance notes on the fight against illegal online content, and especially hate speech by the Conseil supérieur de l’audiovisuel (CSA - BE)**, February 2020: This guidance note encourages the legislator of the French-speaking Community of Belgium to take concrete measures against online hate speech and recommends extended scope of competence for the regulator and increased accountability of online platforms and social networks: https://www.csa.be/wp-content/uploads/2020/02/Note-dorientation-contenus-illicites_f%C3%A9vrier-2020.pdf (FR)
- Activity report of the international conference “**Addressing hate speech in the media: the role of regulatory authorities and the judiciary**”, organised by the Council of Europe in partnership with the Croatian Agency for Electronic Media, November 2018: <https://rm.coe.int/zagreb-2018-hate-speech-conference-brochure/16808eacea>
- **Media regulatory authorities and hate speech**, by Asja Roška Zubčević, Stanislas Bender & Jadranka Vojvodić, in the framework of the European Union Joint Programme on “Reinforcing Judicial Expertise on Freedom of Expression and the Media in South-East Europe (JUFREX)”, in 2017: <https://rm.coe.int/media-regulatory-authorities-and-hate-speech/16807338f5>
- **Section three of the Ofcom Broadcasting Code on Crime, disorder, hatred and abuse (UK)**: This section provides definitions of material likely to incite crime or disorder and the rules and principles applying to such content for broadcasters: <https://www.ofcom.org.uk/tv-radio-and-on-demand/broadcast-codes/broadcast-code/section-three-crime-disorder-hatred-abuse>

Podcasts:

- **Decoding hate**: Six-episode podcast series launched in February 2021 and exploring the interplay between freedom of expression, hate speech and artificial intelligence (AI), funded by the OSCE Representative on Freedom of the Media, through the framework of the Spotlight on Artificial Intelligence and Freedom of Expression ([#SAIFE](https://twitter.com/SAIFE)): decodinghatepod.com

Webinar:

- **Webinar Media Talks #1 organised by the CSA (BE) on “hateful content online”**, with Dr Mark David Cole (University of Luxembourg), Peter Matzneller (DLM-DE) and Frédéric Bokobza (CSA – FR): <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=E0VSyHdpmWY&t=20s>

Articles/Blogs:

- **The Insidious Creep of Violent Rhetoric**, by Susan Benesch for the Noema magazine, March 2021: <https://www.noemamag.com/the-insidious-creep-of-violent-rhetoric/>
- **Four ways how platforms could improve moderation**, by Bertie Vidgen, March 2019: <https://theconversation.com/four-ways-social-media-platforms-could-stop-the-spread-of-hateful-content-in-aftermath-of-terror-attacks-113785>

Campaigns, civil society initiatives:

- **STOP FUNDING HATE**, a community-driven human rights campaign, based on a philosophy of open, inclusive and participatory campaigning: <https://stopfundinghate.info/>
- **#IAmHere**: A civil society initiative, based on a network of volunteers with more than 150,000 members in 14 countries, who intends to change the overall tone of online debates by counteracting hate speech and misinformation on social media, supporting the targeted and victimised and protect freedom of speech and democracy:
<https://iamhereinternational.com/#1595258675289-49ca9606-7077>
<https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/blogs-trending-48462190> **#IchBinHier**
- **The CCDH - Center for Countering Digital Hate**: an international not-for-profit NGO located in the UK and the USA that seeks to disrupt the architecture of online hate and misinformation and publishes reports, open letters and campaigns.
<https://www.counterhate.com/about-us>
- **Glitch! #fixtheglitch**: Glitch is a UK charity working to end online abuse – particularly against women and marginalised people through research, awareness campaign, workshops and educational training: <https://fixtheglitch.org/about/>

EPRA resources:

- Keynote speech by Dr. Tarlach McGonagle, IviR, University of Amsterdam for the Plenary session 2: "**Hate Speech – Old Enemy, New Battles**", on the occasion of the 39th EPRA meeting in Budva: <https://www.epra.org/attachments/budva-plenary-2-hate-speech-keynote-by-tarlach-mcgonagle>
- 44th EPRA meeting: Working group on "**Media in times of crisis: The role of regulatory authorities**", October 2016: [Comparative background document](#) & [Summary of the session](#) by Asja Roška Zubčević
- 49th EPRA meeting: Working group on "**The prevention of Hate Speech in the media in countries with multicultural communities**", May 2019: [Introductory paper](#) & [Summary of the session and debates](#) by Asja Roška Zubčević
- Outputs from the second meeting of EMIL (EPRA's Media and Information Literacy Taskforce) focusing on **media literacy and hate speech**: Key points of the discussion about the role of MIL in the fight against hate speech and examples of initiatives mentioned in the discussion, May 2021: <https://www.epra.org/attachments/media-literacy-and-hate-speech-outputs-of-emil-s-second-meeting>