Co-funded by the European Union

Butterfly Effect

Project 101084546

BUTTERFLY EFFECT

Guidelines containing research instruments and tools for the implementation of the research activity in WP2

cospe

TOGETHER FOR CHANGE

Introduction

1. Theoretical background

First of all, it is important to define the theoretical framework of this research work, providing a common understanding and definition of the key concepts underlying the scheduled fieldwork.

1.2. Race and racism: theoretical and historical basis.

In this frame, we assume racism as a *historically determined* phenomenon, intertwined with the stratified history of the notion of *human*. Since modernity, that notion was historically articulated via the opposition to the notion of *non-human* as *sub-human*, that is by imposing an ideological and social hierarchy of the human (Lugones 2010). The conceptual production of this differentiation is inscribed in the long history of slavery and colonialism, as long as they were elevated to forms of structural, social and political organization. In other words, racism is an outcome of the process of globalization and rationalization of a radical appropriation of lands and bodies, by exploiting them to the point of complete exhaustion of their vital capacity. If the expropriation of land were historically justified on the basis of the notion of *terra nullius* (no one's land) underlying the idea of an appropriable land (C. W. Mills 1997), the way millions of human lives were reduced to a condition of "social death" (Patterson 1982) stems from the practice of enslavement.

The colonial plantation system was based on the production of socially death existences, that is slavery as an existential condition by birth. The modern notion of 'slave' shaped the matrix for the production of the modern, and specifically racial, notion of *sub-human*. In fact, the modern notion of slave incorporates the following principles which, even after the formal abolition of slavery, have been rearticulated in the modern processes of racialisation, both on a material and symbolic level. The principles are as following: principle of instrumentality, markability, dispensability, native alienation (Patterson 1982)

-

- Principle of instrumentality. The slave's body is not considered as featuring autonomous faculties, but it is reduced to an instrument of the master's agency, that is, an extension of his own body. In the slave's body, in this sense, the master alienates his own corporeity, namely the experience of physical wear and tear, by claiming for himself to be the mind that instructs the body and enjoins it to action.
- Principle of markability. The instrumentality of the slave body is in direct correlation with its conceptualisation as a *tabula rasa*, whose meaning is determined from the outside, through an operation of *marking*. In other words, the sub-humanity of the slave body is the distinctive trait of a body which has been reduced to a system of bodily marks (skin, hair, hands, mouth, etc.). The system of marks bind together a biological and a moral meaning. The principle of marking is accompanied by a rationalization of the violence which is inherent in the act.
- Principle of dispensability of bodies. The figure of the slave is associated with the idea of a body that can be worn out until its vital, physical and psychological forces are completely exhausted, no needing to provide for their regeneration. The constitutively dispensable body is always replaceable by a body of equal value, that equally destined to exhaustion. In this sense, inferiorized bodies within the hierarchy of the human are exposed by design to a premature death.
- Principle of natal alienation. The sub-human conditions of existence is based on the principle of a constitutive denial of human ties, at the level of all temporalities - past, present and future. In other words, it is impossible for the sub-human (ideologically transformed into a constitutive incapacity) to hold genealogy, or a kinship in the present time or even the possibility of generating lineage. This principle, however, is inscribed in a paradox: the sub-humanity of the slave, precisely because it is determined by birth, is a hereditary trait transferred from mother to child: the slave mother gives birth to slave children, but at the same time cannot be legally recognised as a mother, but reduced to a 'reproductive machine' (Davis 1981, Vergès 2017).

The genealogy of race as a modern category is deeply intertwined with the history of colonialism and the colonial system of slave exploitation, as far as it doesn't end in such entanglement. With the globalization of the transatlantic slave trade at the end of 1600 plantation colonies became an actual laboratory of experimentation and production of modernity's social structures and system of thinking. As a matter of fact, the creation of a class

society of European free masters and African enslaved people laid the groundwork for production of modern racial conceptualisation. Effectively, under this circumstances the association between African origin and a status of inferiority progressively led to the production of the modern notion of Blackness as marked by a racial meaning, so becoming an implicit referent for other historical trajectories of racialisation.

If the slave plantation system rests on a differentiation on a legal basis (the hierarchy of the human that distinguishes between free and slaves is upheld by law), the abolition of slavery progressively leads to a transposition on a biological basis of the hierarchical difference, that is, an inferiority sanctioned no longer by law but by nature (Benthouami 2016).

As a metter of fact, it was only after the abolition of slavery (1830-1848) that the modern notion of race was constructed (Arthur de Gobineau's Essay on the Inequality of human Races is dated 1852). Since the second half of XIX century the presumed biological an physical inferiority has started to be claimed once the juridical inferiority (that is slavery) was no more admitted. Thus, sub-human conditions of existence formerly granted by slavery were renewed, through a process of naturalization.

The pre-modern roots of race and the multiple racisms

The hierarchical notion of humanity is rooted in the hierarchical construction of differences on an ethnic and religious basis in Europe during the centuries preceding American colonization. What is more, those hierarchical differenciations pre-existed the transatlantic slave trade and shaped it. In this regard, it is important to point out that the word 'slave' itself derives etymologically from the word 'Slavic', and can be traced back to the massive enslavement of populations of Slavic origin in pre-modern Europe, which contributed to their ethnically-based inferiorization process. Similarly, one of the oldest marks of blackness can be traced back to the term 'Moor', which for a long time was employed in Catholic Europe in order to define and inferiorize Mediterranean peoples of the North African and Middle Eastern on the basis of their Muslim religious confession. Similarly, Jewish people has been inferiorized on the basis of their religion since pre-modernity.

The authoritarian regimes of the Nazi-fascist era also affected the racial stigmatization, not only of Jewish people, but also of Roma and Sinti populations. The colonization of the Asian continent contributed to further produce racial bodily marks, such as the shape of eyes or the voice verbalizing idioms not belonging to the Indo-European language family.

Anti-Semitism, Islamophobia, anti-Gypsyism, and Sinophobia are therefore to be considered as further expressions of racist ideology alongside what is more typically to be identified as anti-Black racism. Race in its manifold historical and geographical trajectories is thus to be understood, in Stuart Hall's words, as a "floating signifier" (Hall 1997), a notion whose meaning is never static, but perennially articulated according to historical conditions. In light of its historical roots, therefore, it is important to recognize a multiple and interconnected genealogy of race, from which multiple forms of racism have historically emerged.

Race, ethnicity and nation. The rise of xeno-racism.

Such an interconnected genealogy of race as a signifier allows us to read its thickly problematized nexus with the concept of ethnicity, the use of which is often accepted, insofar as the nexus with race is not read critically. As Bentouhami (2016) observes, in fact, the concept of ethnicity is a precursor to modern racisms, since it is constructed on the basis of a culturally-based identity implicitly supported by a racial hierarchical differentiation. In fact, the concept of ethnicity is the basis for the construction of national identity, which reinforces the very boundaries of ethnic identity as they come to correspond with the boundaries of the nation-state (Balibar and Wallerstein 1988) In the contemporary era, in which race on biological grounds is a no longer accepted idea, ethnic-cultural difference allows for the surreptitious reproduction of the racial matrix, since it is an implicit hierarchical and binary order that establishes ethnic difference: a difference between cultures is presupposed, as between a Self (namely Western Europe), and an Other than Self (the Non Western Europe), in which the boundaries of the Self are established by the construction of the the Other as different (Said 1978). The ethnicized other, as constructed in these terms, constitutes the object of a specific feeling of "fear" whose existence is legitimized and normalized as the difference that sustains this feeling is, in turn, naturalized. In this relationship of mutual co-construction between nation and ethnicity, racism emerges in the terms of xenophobia.
To subtract the reading of this process from any sort of naturalization and to claim on a theoretical level, the racial matrix od the process, Sivanandan (2001), introduces the key term of *xeno-racism*: «It is a racism that is not just directed at those with darker skins, from the former colonial territories, but at the newer categories of the displaced, the dispossessed and the uprooted, who are beating at western Europe’s doors, the Europe that helped to displace

them in the first place. It is a racism, that is, that cannot be colour-coded, directed as it is at poor whites as well, and is therefore passed off as xenophobia, a "natural" fear of strangers. But in the way it denigrates and reifies people before segregating and/or expelling them, it is a xenophobia that bears all the marks of the old racism. It is racism in substance, but "xeno" in form. It is a racism that is meted out to impoverished strangers even if they are white. It is xeno-racism».

Race as a social relationship. Systemic racism.

The deep history of slavery reverberates in contemporary social structures (James 1938). Contemporary principles of social and international division of labour are informed by implicit racial criteria, resulting in a segregation of racialised subjects into specific work sector. The so-called DDD jobs (dirty, dangerous and demanding) and CCC jobs (caring, cooking, cleaning) are the 'unskilled' occupations to which racialised subjects are structurally assigned in western societies (Farris 2019) and they are imbued with what Grada Kilomba refers to as 'plantation memories', that is, the acting out in the present of the colonial past of racial oppression, humiliation, dehumanisation. In the devalorisation of these occupational sectors, and in the conditions of exploitation that characterize them, it is possible to read against the light the re-actualisation of the principles of instrumentality, dispensability, marking of bodies, and native alienation of plantocratic memory, which oriented the historical transition from slavery to wage labour (Moulier-Boutang 1998).

Within this framework, the collective historical trauma of slavery, colonisation and persecution is 're-enacted' through episodes of *everyday racism*. In the relationship between a present that re-enacts the past and vice versa, a past that re-enacts in the present the racial and colonial order, the distinction between past and present temporality collapses (Kilomba 2021).

The rearticulation of the hierarchical relationship between freedom and slavery in terms of superior and inferior races permeates the written and unwritten norms of contemporary Western societies. Moreover, the shift from a XIX and XX century biologically-based racism to a contemporary culturally-based racism allows racism today to perpetrate itself through its own negation on the discursive level, fueling a normalisation of ethno-cultural hierarchical differentiations. Those differenciations implicitly inform much of the social (and therefore racial) organization of labour, as well as the legal framework regulating border regimes, citizenship and a more general racially based differential access to rights.

The naturalization of racial perception

Race was progressively rationalised and legitimised through the production of a scientific discourse. Race and racial superiority/inferiority was fixed as an objective and incontrovertible datum. In this way racial difference, and the system of bodily marks that underpins it (the so-called "skin colour difference", is produced as a self-evident given). Race in this sense, and the perceptual system that race informs and shapes, loses its understanding as a historically determined category and acts precisely through its naturalisation by de-radicalisation.

Colette Guillaumin speaks of racist ideology as a discursive system produced through a process of 'bio-social syncretism' in which 'the unfolding of the process is not investigated, the law is not sought. [Race] proceeds by juxtaposition and justification. The real is endowed with meaning before it is described, and every description is subordinated to this meaning. Clothed with the character of evidence, it eludes demonstration, since it presents itself as an illustration of a fact that is already certain' (Guillaumin, p.25). In this sense, the use of expressions such as 'skin colour difference', presented as a self-evident fact, is normalised at the expense of its understanding as a historically determined process, i.e. as the 'construction of skin colour difference'.

The notion of *racialisation*

Introduced by Frantz Fanon (1952) in the critical debate on race, this term is intended to delineate the historical, social and perceptual process that produces race and the system of bodily marks that reverse it. In this sense, Blackness is not to be understood as an objective datum of perception, but as a datum historically determined by racialisation, in the misucra in which the very perception of Blackness is inscribed in the system of symbolic singifications associated with it by the racial hierarchy: bestiality, malignity, violence, eroticism, incivility, moral and intellectual inferiority.

The sociologist Du Bois (2007, 2010) introduces the term «color line», precisely to attribute to color the character of a socially and culturally constructed category, whose boundaries are not fixed and stable, but historically subject to constant re-signification.

Racism as a discursive regime

As Grada Kilomba (2021) notes, racism has to be understood as a discursive regime. Its functioning is based on the production of what the author calls 'chains of meanings': words and images that by association become equivalent through a psychic and cognitive process of *displacement* of meanings one onto the other, producing what Hill Collins (1991) calls «controlling images» and Fanon (1952) describes in terms of an imposed «livery» woven «with a thousand details, anecdotes, stories». Sewn onto bodies, the chains of equivalents produce what Fanon calls the *epidermalization of inferiority* (*ibid.*). The Fanonian and Black feminist categories converge in understanding racialisation as an *erotic* process, namely an ambivalent process of hyper-sexualisation or de-sexualisation of the sub-human, as opposed to the normative (white) categories of virility and femininity. Kilomba exemplifies this by unravelling the process of displacement that produces Black femininity, as an erotic and animal dimension, articulated through a chain of associations: «Black woman – Black Venus – savage Black – human savage – savage animal – animal».

More specifically, Kilomba distinguishes five dynamics underlying the process of racialisation by articulating what Guillaumin identifies as the process of naturalization of race. These are: 1) Infantilisation (the construction of the racialised subject as the personification of the dependent) 2) Primitivization (personification of the incivilized) 3) Decivilisation (personification of violence and menace) 4) Animalization (personification of bestiality, as the primary element of the non-human dimension) 5) Eroticization (personification of hypertrophic sexuality)

In synthesis, racism is to be understood as a historically determined phenomenon, discursively produced, as well as an economic and ideological system subjected to rationalization. It has also to be understood as a not homogeneous but multifaceted category, that is a floating significier, affecting perceptive and cognitive capacities. If scientific racism characterized the production of racist ideology between the mid-nineteenth and mid-twentieth centuries, the historical-contemporary framework from the post-World War II period onwards in which contemporary understanding of racism is inscribed, is what Goldberg theorises in terms of «racial evaporation», i.e. the reality of a discursively produced regime, which continues to be discursively produced, but without the need to explicitly summon a racial lexicon, all the more so of a biological nature. With the end of the Second World War and the political distancing

of Europe from 20th century openly racist authoritarian regimes, theories of scientific racism and their linguistic apparatus were dismissed. This did not, however, lead to the end of racist ideology but rather to its rearticulation in less explicit terms anchored in a culturally based production of racial difference (Bentouhami 2016, Farris 2019). The repercussions of this shift are also to be found in an institutionalization of what Hawthorne and Piccolo (2016) refer to as «anti-racism without race»: it consists of a critique of racism by sacrificing the mobilization of a critical conceptual apparatus based on the notion of race. What results is a "race-ignorant" intervention to racism based on the impossibility of naming race as a social and structural relationship, thus reducing antiracist critique to an ethical-moral and voluntarist-individual approach.

Structural, institutional and everyday racism

On the basis of this historical and philosophical framework, Grada Kilomba distinguishes three dimensions of contemporary racism: a) structural racism, b) institutional racism and c) everyday racism.

a) Structural racism. It indicates the forms of systemic exclusion of racialised people from economic, social and political structures, and the related generalized condition of disadvantage.
b) Institutional racism. It indicates the spill-over of racism to a functioning principle of political, social and cultural institutions, which establishes unequal treatment as a model for structuring and regulating educational systems, the labour market, criminal justice, services, etc. Citizenship, migratory status and the relative residence permit are today the main devices of institutional racialisation, whose combined action spills over into the production of differential access to the welfare state and entitlement, into horizontal educational segregation (students without citizenship, or with a migratory background are structurally segregated in technical-professional training courses, and they are oriented towards less qualified professions) and vertical segregation (in Italy, for example, the school drop-out rate in the population of students without citizenship is 35.4% against a national average of 13.1%).[1] Concerning school, it is also worthy of

[1] https://www.miur.gov.it/documents/20182/0/NOTIZIARIO_Stranieri_2021+%281%29.pdf/150d451a-45d2-e26f-9512-338a98c7bb1e?t=1659103036663

c) note the *eurocentrism* of school curricula, which contributes to the construction of the social identity of the subjects undergoing training, by renewing the principle of natal alienation, and neglecting or invisibilising the legacies of students with racialised backgrounds.

d) Everyday racism. It indicates the racial matrix that permeates everyday social behaviour, particularly within inter-individual relations at the level of language, speech, images, gestures and looks.

Structural and institutional racism are fundamental premises for understanding everyday racism and avoiding its reduction:

1) to the mere most striking and visible forms, based on high degrees of physical violence. If the actions of hatred, most classically recognised as such, belong to such a definition, it is important, in this research framework, to grasp the links between visible and submerged elements of the process of racialisation.

2) to a mere individual moral disposition, which only the individual has the power to admit or not ('I am racist'/ 'I am not racist'). Subtracting racism from a moral reading also becomes crucial from the perspective of a non-moralising intervention in the reading of its embodied expressions. Indeed, by branding the perpetrator of racist behavior as the perpetrator of a morally reprehensible behavior, one runs the risk of individualizing the dynamic (endorsing the so-called “rotten apple” paradigm. Thus it would invisibilize all the factors of social, cultural and institutional co-responsibility, as well as the elements of historical determination of such behavior.

The experience of racism

The experience of racism, referring to the quadripartition proposed by Paul Mecheril 2003, can take the form of an act referred directly to 1) a person, 2) to persons close to him, or 3) to persons perceived as his/her representatives, or 4) members of his/her own group (real or perceived as such according to the belief of the aggressor). With particular reference to linguistic experiences, Mecheril also distinguishes between primary and secondary experiences. The first group includes the transmission of explicitly racist messages, whose damaging character is clear both in intentions and effects. The second group includes those experiences in which the thematisation of primary experiences is posed as a problem and thus effectively denied. *The experience of the disavowal of experience* reinforces the consequences

of the act, and its premises, in a structure of action, as Mecheril observes echoing Ferreira (2003), whose difficult identification is a constitutive and integral part of the phenomenon itself and its reproduction.

In the dynamics of the everyday racist episode Kilomba identifies three elements that define the experience as traumatic: 1) the violent shock 2) the separation 3) the timelessness

1) Violent shock is peculiar to an unexpected experience that due to its violence, intrusiveness and intensity, despite the structural nature of racism as a phenomenon, cannot be integrated into mental structures, insofar as it interrupts one's sense of security.
2) Exposure to daily racism deprives the individual of his/her connection to society, damaging the exposed subject's sense of belonging to a community dimension and thus reiterating the dehumanizing constitutive principle of social death by natal alienation.
3) The re-actualisation of a past order of subjugation in the present defines the foundational timelessness of racism, which determines a coexistence of the past in the present and vice versa, bringing into the single episode not only the accumulation of experiences in the course of the individual biographical trajectory, but the legacy of a centuries-old memory that, in often unconscious forms, has been transmitted for centuries, from one generation of racialized subjects to the next.

Everyday racist episodes, as Kilomba emphasizes, do not only involve those who act and suffer the racist act. In fact, the episode always takes place in front of what the scholar calls the '*white* audience', which tends to assume a static behaviour of passive and silent observers. According to Kilmba, this represents common sense from a white racial perspective. The triangular constellation that is thus created is at the origin of the isolation of the person made the object of the racist act. The perpetrator of the racial aggression, in fact, acts on the basis of a sense of belonging to the same social group as the audience, namely whiteness. The relationship of the aggressor to the white audience, in this sense, is to be understood as an immanent material relationship, but also as a symbolic and transcendent one. What in fact underscores its function in the scene is that the racist action is triggered by the conscious or unconscious certainty that the aggressor's group membership, i.e. the white audience, will give consent to the action itself. The episode’s scene therefore becomes a scene precisely because it takes place under the eyes

of an interested observer (Kilomba 2021, p.129-130). The *white* audience, as Kilomba observes, is created together with the racialized group, even before the direct triangulation with the racialized subject and the aggressor. This triangulation in fact takes shape precedently, in symbolic forms, in situations in which, in the absence of the direct object of aggression, the racialized victim is linguistically evoked in the form of the object of aggression, mockery, denigrating acts.

Racism: prejudice + power.

As Kilomba points out, racism cannot be reduced to a mere synonym for prejudice or an expression of prejudice. If prejudice is in fact a fundamental component of racist ideology - which works on the construction of difference and its hierarchical articulation - racism is the result of the combination of prejudice and power, i.e. the application of hierarchical difference to a power (historical, political, social, economic) relationship: «In this sense, *racism is white supremacy*. Other racialized groups cannot be racist or practice racism, because they do not have the power to do so». (p.71).

Race ignorance. Race as a matrix of intelligibility.

As Frantz Fanon's work demonstrates, race shapes the relation of the self to its own perceptive capacity. Race, in this sense, is to be understood, in Judith Butler's words (1982), as a *matrix of intelligibility*, which demarcates the boundary line between what can and cannot be perceived. It also provides the code for the interpretation of perception itself. Elsa Dorlin speaks in this regard of a *racial schematisation of perceptions* (2017), to point out how race not only acts as a perceptions' matrix of intelligibility, but goes even deeper into what it means to perceive, understanding this human capacity as historically and racially determined. On these theoretical premises, it is then possible to understand the concept of *race ignorance*. The term defines an epistemological attitude of neutrality, whether intentional or unconscious, with regard to the impact of race in a given reading of reality, on a macro or micro-systemic level. This presumed neutrality, in fact, translates into a selective inability to 'see' race, that is, to explicitly problematise the power relations that race sustains and brings into play. Often this ignorance coincides with a gaze that is incapable of self-reflexivity, and thus cannot read the epistemic source of discourse as racially situated. In these terms, the alleged coincidence of whiteness with the epistemic norm, and its presumed universality, is ratified.

Privilege

The term privilege is used to define the position of power within a structural relationship of gender, race and class oppression. Privilege consists in economic, political power, historically accumulated by the social subjects, which is reflected in the power to speak, to be heard and to see one's own speech validated, as well as the contents conveyed by it. Specularly, privilege also includes the power to validate subaltern speech and the discourse conveyed.

Race, gender and class: the intersectionality of oppression systems.

The term "intersectionality" refers to the reading of structural domination in terms of a multiplicity and simultaneity of interconnected systems of oppression, gender/sexuality, race and class. Coined by feminist Nera Kimberle Crenshaw in 1989, this interpretive model is opposed as much to monist options (the reading of only one fundamental type of domination relationship from which the others would derive) as it is to additive options (the identification of oppressed subjects on the basis of the sum of the oppressions they suffer). In contrast, in Combahee's proposal, the intertwined and reciprocal action of oppressions makes their disjointed, let alone hierarchical, analysis impossible. The successful theoretical debate around intersectionality has expanded the reading of simultaneous interconnections to include other forms of oppression such as ableism, ageism, and fatphobia.

In this context it seems to us of particular relevance to read in international terms the common genealogy, and the co-construction of gender and race relations.

Historically, in fact, racialization is accomplished through a hypersexualization or de-sexualization of the colonized-racialized other. Alleged racial inferiority is corroborated by the construction of an alleged sexuality that is deviant by excess or defect (Stuart Hall 1996) from a sexual norm that thus comes to be constructed as implicitly white. On this basis the hierarchical differentiation between human and subhuman is a sexualized and gendered differentiation. In Maria Lugones' words: «From this point of view, colonized people became males and females. Males became nothuman-as-not-men, and colonized females became not-human-as-not-women» (Lugones 2010).

Gendered Racism

If Maria Lugones defines it in terms of *coloniality of gender* (Lugones 2010), Philomena Essed proposes the concept of *gendered racism* (Essed 1991) to understand racism structurally constructed by gender roles and vice versa.

The construction of white women as good wives and mothers, whose natural predisposition to domestic and care work is presumed to be synonymous with white femininity, is historically produced as in Angela Davis' words, the embodied reproduction of the presumed "superior race" (Davis 1981).

Specularly, non-white femininity comes to coincide with the idea of a sub-womanhood incapable of assuming the maternal task and therefore assigned to the dirtiest and most wearisome tasks of care work, under conditions of slavery in the past and overexploitation in the present.

Reading racism as a gendered notion allows one to read the functioning of interlocking systems of oppression (Combahee River Collective 1977). Sara Farris conceptualizes it in social and economic terms of *sexualization of the labor market* to read the structural assignment of non-Western women in the West to the most exploited and least economically and symbolically valued care work (Farris 2018).

Definition of hate crimes

Hate crimes are violent or discriminatory actions committed against an individual or group on the basis of their membership of a specific social category, such as race, ethnicity, religion, sexual orientation or gender identity.

Thus, hate crimes are considered in Europe as crimes that aim to attack not only the victim, but also the group to which the victim belongs. Therefore, these crimes are not only harmful to the direct victim, but also represent an attack on cultural diversity and social cohesion.

From a legal perspective, the European Union adopted the Council Framework Decision 2008/913/JHA of 28 November 2008 on combating certain forms and manifestations of racism and xenophobia by means of criminal law. This Framework Decision states that EU Member States must take measures to prevent and suppress hate crimes, including those based on race, ethnicity, religion, sexual orientation or gender identity.

In addition, European legislation requires member states to ensure that these crimes are punished appropriately and that victims of such crimes are protected and assisted. This means that EU courts must take hate crimes into account as an aggravating circumstance when determining sentences, and that the competent authorities must take measures to prevent and suppress hate crimes and to protect victims.

The concept of hatred and indicators of prejudice

The use of the term 'hate' can create a misunderstanding, leading one to believe that the perpetrator must have a strong feeling of hatred towards the victim or the group he or she belongs to in order to be held responsible for a hate crime. This, however, as the OSCE reminds us in its guide to prosecuting hate crimes, does not correspond to reality: the element that determines the discriminatory nature of a crime is not so much the hatred, but the process of victim selection, which must be based on discrimination or prejudice against the group to which the victim belongs. In other words, the discriminating factor lies not so much in the emotion of the offender, but in his choice to target a particular person because of his membership of a socially determined group.

In order to facilitate understanding of the selection process behind hate crimes, indicators known as 'bias indicators' are often used. These consist of facts and circumstances that may suggest the presence of a hate crime, i.e. a crime committed because of the perpetrator's prejudice against the victim, resulting from one or more protected characteristics (real or presumed by the perpetrator) that identify the victim. The Odihr, Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights of the OSCE, defines them as: 'Objective facts, circumstances, patterns relating to a crime which, alone or in conjunction with other facts or circumstances, suggest that the perpetrator's actions are motivated, in whole or in part, by some form of prejudice'.

The main injury indicators are:

- victim/witness perception: the victim's (or possible witnesses') perception of what happened is an important indicator that should give further impetus in the search for objective elements to determine the possible discriminatory motivation of the crime;
- disparaging remarks, gestures, written statements, drawings, symbols and graffiti: often the perpetrator of a hate crime intends to highlight the motivation of prejudice, non-

acceptance or even outright hatred behind the crime (it is no coincidence that *hate crimes* are also referred to as message crimes);

- differences between perpetrator and victim on ethnic, religious or other grounds (e.g. sexual orientation): these are a significant indicator, especially - but not necessarily - if the victim belongs (or is perceived to belong) to a so-called *minority group;*
- involvement of so-called *organised hate groups* (i.e. dedicated to hate crimes or incitement to hate) or their members**:** the perpetrator may not even be structurally affiliated to any such group, but share its ideology and violent methods;
- location: the offence was committed near a place of worship (synagogue, mosque, Christian church) or an establishment predominantly attended by persons at *risk of discrimination* (LGBT persons, migrants);
- *timing*; the offence took place on the occasion of a particular festivity, religious festival or other event of special significance for a community;
- patterns/frequency of previous crimes or incidents**:** the incident is similar to others of a similar nature that have occurred in a given period; a certain crime pattern, a seriality, recurs;
- nature of the violence: in hate crimes, the level of violence may be particularly high and is often accompanied by serious physical insults or humiliation, often made public, by the perpetrator himself, via the Web;
- lack of other motivations: sometimes there are no obvious reasons that could justify the commission of the crime: the victim and the suspect do not know each other, any quarrel that may have triggered the attack appears clearly pretextual, there is no economic motive, in such cases, discrimination may be the only plausible motivation

The same objectivity reserved in investigating the meaning of 'hatred'', that is, the subsistence of the matrix of hatred in the act regardless of the meaning that the author subjectively attributes to it in an explicit form, must also be maintained when investigating the racial matrix that animates the conduct, not seeing racism as a purely emotional predisposition towards the other, driven by ignorance and/or fear, but as a system invented, implemented and perpetrated to serve a purpose. And it is precisely this systematic dimension that allows hatred, not the other way around.

The Role of Public Institutions In Anti-Racist Premises

What has been said so far can also lead us to another argument. in fact, critical race theory argues that the fight against racism and hate crimes must necessarily be accompanied by a critical reflection on the social, political and economic structures that contribute to perpetuating inequality and discrimination (see: Reference to paragraph Marie). Only through a deep social and cultural transformation it will be possible to create a society that is truly inclusive and just for all, where the principle of equality does not refer to a neutral and formal normative framework that is immune to the racial dimension, but to a framework in which instead a norm is legitimate as it is able to understand the existing relations of force and power, with the aim of acting on systemic imbalances.

To make this happen, it is crucial for the state institution to intervene, but it is also necessary for them to question the effectiveness of the premises on which they currently rely to legitimize their legal action. Among these, the first is the social contract that underlies the rule of law.
A contract is a pact made between free people to escape violence, uncontrollable aggression, which characterises the state of nature, i.e. social relations in the absence of such a contract.
However, the question must be asked: who are the people considered in this social contract? Does it involve all citizens? Does the state of nature from which those who sign the contract escape remain completely uninhabited?
In particular, what becomes law arises from the conflict between subjects in the state of nature. The signing of the social contract expresses in this sense an attempt at peaceful recomposition of the parties. But if we assume that the social contract has not actually been signed by all the subjects in the state of nature, since one party is excluded from it, the social contract implies the assumption of a specific and arbitrary point of view from which to read and interpret society, and, on balance, silences others. These are the points of view of those who, in practice, are left to live in a state of nature and thus exposed to discrimination and systemic violence.

A state that neglects its duty to give effective relevance also to the racialised component of its citizenry (whether recognised as such or not) is a state that, in the face of racist violence, stands as an 'implicit public'. The Portuguese-Angolan writer, theorist and psychoanalyst Grada Kilomba introduced the concept of the 'implicit public' in her analysis of the dynamics of racism

and discrimination. According to Kilomba, the implicit audience refers to all the subjects who, directly or indirectly, participate in a situation in which racial discrimination is present, since the actor, by assimilating himself and the audience to the same group, acts on the basis of an implicit consent that the group to which he belongs, real or imagined, confers on him. In this framework, a public authority that fails to adopt effective policies against racism and to ensure respect for the rights of persons belonging to minoritised groups is an implicit public by its own omissive conduct.

This attitude can have serious consequences for racialised people not only because it puts them in a position to suffer discrimination and violence without access to adequate protection mechanisms, but also because the lack of effective action by public institutions can contribute to perpetuating racism and discrimination at a society-wide level, creating an environment in which these phenomena become normalised.

This process of normalisation makes racism a phenomenon that is difficult to appreciate in the social and legal spheres, degrading the manifestations to incidental episodes, and silenced when not actually accepted.

Tracing Hate Crimes

What has just been stated is evident if we take a look at the numbers of the phenomenon, which are incomplete and unreliable not only due to the lack of a common legal definition and an adequate monitoring system in many European countries, but also and especially due to a fundamental miscommunication between those who suffer racist crimes and those who should provide tools to protect against such hateful conduct.

For instance, the 2021 report of the European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights (FRA) "Encouraging hate crime reporting - The role of law enforcement and other authorities" points out that data on racial discrimination suffer from the limitations of under-reporting and under-recording.

Under-reporting is the tendency of victims and witnesses of hate crimes not to report them for individual reasons (unawareness or denial that the attack is motivated by prejudice; fear of compromising one's privacy or of retaliation) or structural reasons (lack of trust in the police and, in general, in the reception that will be given to one's petition and one's person, combined with language and/or information barriers on the legislation on the subject). Under-recording,

on the other hand, refers to the phenomenon where institutions do not recognise the discriminatory matrix of the reported crime and, consequently, do not record or investigate it

as such. This may happen for various reasons, from the failure to recognise indicators of prejudice to the lack of sensitivity or training of operators. The reports also point out that, even when data are available, definitions of 'hate crime' may vary between countries, making it difficult to compare data and assess the extent of the problem at European level.

The European network against racism (Enar), in an article titled “How can rule of law commit to tackle racism across europe?”, adds an important remark with regard to the resulting infringement of the principle of representativeness:

“The existence of institutional racism within justice and law enforcement systems is not acknowledged by public authorities which decreases the opportunity to provide an effective policy response to this long-standing issue. Accordingly, it breaks the trust between racialised groups and public authorities; the victims rarely report racial and state violence which remains under-documented”.

Structural Violence And Systemic Racism

In such a context, there is the establishment of a system in which the weight and relevance of bodies and their experiences is not the same for everyone and in which, at the same time, racial imbalance is realised by using only certain types of these bodies to shape the pattern of perceptibility of the structural violence that is unleashed.

Structural violence, theorised by sociologist Johan Galtung, is a complex and pervasive phenomenon that affects multiple aspects of society. It is a form of violence that does not necessarily act through the use of physical force, but through the structures and institutions that rule social life. In this framework, systemic racism is a form of structural violence that creates racial inequalities in laws, public policies and institutions.

Indeed, we can say that systemic racism is the sum of policies, practices, representations and interactions that produce and reproduce inequalities between racial groups and, if we read this in a framework of structural violence, we come to understand its power to influence the perception of threat and the response to it.

Being aware of what and how much is able to act on the ways of perceiving and opposing a racist action is particularly relevant for the purposes of this investigation, especially with the intention of dealing with potentially unresolved young people, questioned on the issue in a context that is not to be considered pacified even in the absence of evident clashes.

Towards A New Definition Of The Concept Of Victim: Between The Importance Of Personal Experience And Social Co-Responsibility

Structural violence and its influence on the perception of and response to a threat may therefore have implications in the definition and identification of victims in hate crimes. In a context of structural violence, the concept of victim can be much more complex than one might think.
In fact, in such a context, witnesses and aggressors could also be considered victims, as structural violence itself can be considered the main 'aggressor' and true perpetrator of hate crimes.
This wider definition of victim, however, could be controversial and problematic, since it could imply that the personal responsibility of the aggressors is minimized or denied, but it is useful to us as much as it does not alienate us from the care and consideration to be reserved for those who have suffered violence, centralising their experience but maintaining an approach of social co-responsibility (between perpetrator, institutions and the socio-cultural substratum in which the action manifests itself. In other words, the implicit audience Kilomba spoke of) in which those who 'do wrong' should not be exclusively pointed at as rotten apples. If it were only a matter of rotten apples, it would be enough to throw them out of the basket, but years of securitarian and justicialist policies have shown us that retributive theories of punishment have never brought the expected results in terms of recidivism and social justice.

Not Just Hate Crimes, But Hate Actions: The Microaggressions

Starting from these premises, an indication that can be followed in carrying out the research is to refer, in more general terms, to 'hate actions'. In fact, maintaining the given reading of the concept of hatred, talking about actions and not only crimes allows us to extend our perspective on the multiplicity of forms that human behaviour can possibly take.

In fact, hate crimes are crimes characterised by the aggravating circumstance of racial hatred, but the space of discrmination is not only occupied by criminal conduct. In fact, both in terms of intentionality and level of seriousness, there are other conducts that are equally damaging but do not represent a criminal offence: this may be the case of racist actions carried out without

the conscious intention of carrying out an act of violence or racist discrimination, but also of racist actions that are not considered criminal offences due to their slightness.

Among these various forms of discrimination, microaggressions, for example, are actions characterised by subtle actions manifested through comments, behaviour or attitudes that may seem harmless but in reality communicate a message of inferiority or dehumanisation towards a group or person.

Microaggressions are not considered crimes under European hate crime legislation, but are still a form of discrimination that can have negative consequences on the mental and physical health of victims.

The fact that they are not prosecuted, however, rather than immediately suggesting the failure of institutions, should make us reflect on the fact that it is neither possible nor desirable for the criminal prosecution to focus on every possible human action. The risk is, firstly, that of a penal norm losing its characteristics of generality and abstractness that make it applicable to several specific cases, but also the risk of believing that only the threat of a sanction can shape human behaviour and relations.

For this reason, as fundamental as it remains to educate legal and judicial practitioners to detect microaggressions, it is also crucial to get unaccustomed to justicialist and legalitarian demands due to the urgency of the instances and to recognise the role of the other social factors involved: among these, the educational one.

Beyond The Retributive Justice Approach: Restorative Justice As A Social Instrument

Acknowledging the role of the educational context does not mean, as has often been the case, relegating racism to an eclipse of reason that can be overcome through the rhetoric of anti-racist pedagogies as set up by institutions incapable of naming the concept of race, but rather giving oneself the opportunity to promote a view that is not afraid to address the premises of racism and to take positions that do not necessarily refer to the guilt of a few, but necessarily to the responsibility of all parties involved.

It is in this way that, according to the theoretical premises, restorative justice should also work, i.e. that form of conflict resolution that focuses on repairing the harm caused by the offence, rather than only punishing the offender. Restorative justice is applied to hate crimes in order to

provide a more adequate response to the needs of the victims and the communities involved by bringing the parties together. The result, on society, is cultural and based on co-responsibility and not, solely, that of deterrence typical of punitive justice.

Read more:

1. Galtung, J. (1969). Violence, peace, and peace research. Journal of Peace Research, Vol. 6, No. 3 (1969), pp. 167-191
2. Kilomba G. (2021). Memorie della piantagione - Episodi di razzismo quotidiano. Capovolte.
3. How can rule of law commit to tackle racism across europe? - European Network Against Racism https://www.enar-eu.org/how-can-rule-of-law-commit-to-tackleracism-across-europe/
4. Know Your Rights: Toolkit di Autodifesa legale per persone razzializzate: https://stop-afrofobia.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/11/CHAMPS_LEGALE.pdf
5. Hate crime recording and data collection practice across the EU: https://fra.europa.eu/en/publication/2018/hate-crime-recording-and-data-collection-practice-across-eu
6. Encouraging hate crime reporting - The role of law enforcement and other authorities: https://fra.europa.eu/en/publication/2021/hate-crime-reporting
7. Decisione quadro del Consiglio 2008/913/GAI del 28 novembre 2008 sulla lotta contro alcune forme e manifestazioni di razzismo e xenofobia mediante il diritto penale: https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/IT/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:32008F0913&from=EN

Methodological premises:

On the basis of the theoretical premises articulated so far, some methodological indications are needed in order to conduct the field research.

Positioning

As defined in the previous part, racism has to be understood as a power relationship affecting all individuals and social groups. As a matter of fact, individuals and social groups are to be read in the framework of structural social relationships, namely in a position of power (whiteness) or in a subordinate position (Blackness or other forms of racialisation). The politics of positioning (Rich 1984) plays a fundamental role in framing the subjective lived experience of power relations, assuming subjects of power relations as *epistemic subjects*, whose capacity to produce knowledge is always anchored in the social position they embody. We refer to this paradigm in terms of *standpoint epistemology* and of *situated knowledge* (Collins 1991, Haraway 1988). Under these epistemological premises, racialized subjects are to be understood as key figures for the conceptualization of racialization itself (Hill Collins 1991).
Research figures, that is the subjects of scientific production, are also implicated in structural power relationship. More specifically, they hold a strategic position of power within structural race relationships, since producing knowledge is a power condition and race requires no knowledge be produced about its functioning, in order to function and reproduce itself. Therefore, positioning research subjects in terms of gender, race and class is a fundamental theoretical and methodological action because it allows power asymmetries traversing all the setting components relations to become visible - not only power asymmetries relating targeted research subjects, but also the relationships between researchers and the targeted subjects themselves. Thus it is crucial to clearly express whether all the involved subjects belong to the same or to antagonistic social groups in terms of gender, race and class. That is at stake both in collecting and in interpreting research data.

In the frame of this research, structural power relations cross relationships between victimized subjects, witnesses and authors of hate actions and their specific standpoint, in epistemic terms, is at stake.

In fact, when we face with the presence of a subject that could be define as the 'victim' of a hate action, a twofold effort of analysis is required. First, it is crucial to focus on the individual who experienced victimization, granting him/her the power to define the epistemological limits of his/her own experience. Second, it is very important to avoid a *secondary victimization* dynamic, in which the researcher or other subjects involved in the research setting intervene in the elaboration of the "victim"'s lived experience, subordinating it to their own power to validate or invalidate it. Similarly, a great attention must be paid to the way in which the personal and experiential elements are formulated by the victimized subject, in order no to silence and reduce her/him to a mere instrumental role subordinated to the cognitive and perceptive capacity of the researcher, which is inevitably situated, and therefore conditioned, by his/her own positioning with respect to the phenomenon. Instead, focusing the research on the epistemic value of the subject who has faced the hate action, by anchoring the research frame to his/her own experience and standpooint, means to ground the research in a best practice orienting the identification of all subsequent ones. In other words, giving centrality to the lived experience of the victimized subject, that is in the harm that has been suffered, means acknowledging its strategic importance in defining an horizon for its *reparation*. If the victimized subject becomes the protagonist of a reparation process, that permits to effectively transform the victimization experience and to eliminate the risks of a secondary victimization. The epistemological gesture by which centrality is accorded to the lived experience of being harmed, is in fact the first necessary gesture of support in response to acts of hatred and episodes of everyday racism (Kilomba 2021).

Positions of subalternity within relationships of structural oppression do not correspond to conditions of inaction and passivity. On the contrary, reading racism in terms of a structural relationship allows one to read social subjects actions on the basis of counterposing interests placed in direct antagonism. Secondly, it permits to frame every social action within the asymmetrical distribution of power at the two poles of the social relationship. The conceptualisation of subalternity as a static condition of inability to act is not a neutral construction, but it results from the application of *the racial matrix of intelligibility*, which impacts racialized subjects' agency by making it unintelligible (Butler 2004). Simultaneously,

the racial matrix of intelligibility reduces racialized subjects' agency to a sub-human notion of act, namely to a violent, aggressive, hyper-erotic, uncivilized, or submissive inclination. Therefore, a critical reading of the racial matrix of intelligibility implies a critical understanding of the category of "victim", and the passivity and staticy substantiating its meaning. On the contrary, beyond those assumptions, it is crucial to grasp the "victim"'s experience starting from her/his very capacity to act and therefore to resist, that is to strategically oppose the relationship of domination conveyed by the action of racial hatred. In order to account for a subject that, by virtue of his/her own subaltern structural condition, who is anything but passive and inactive, we propose to go beyond the definition of "victim" by adopting instead the term "victimised subject". In fact, the term "subject" immediately refers to the subject's nature as agent, while the term "victimised" goes beyond the static crystallization of the the victim and focuses on the process of subjection underlying it, which the victimized subject always confronts with his or her own strategic agency.

Research structure

1) **Focus groups** will be performed as preparatory activities in cooperation with stakeholders (diaspora organizations, youth organizations, women organizations)
2 Focus groups per country. The primary purpose is to outline the characteristics and impact of intolerance, racism, discrimination among young people and to understand how to prevent and respond to hate incidents and crimes and to support victims. Specific attention must therefore be paid to the immanent context of the focus group itself, mapping the positions of all the actors involved, with a particular focus on educational, school and extra-school contexts - sports contexts, after-school activities, aggregative spaces, student collectives/committees, associations, etc. - trying to retrace from outside the school the experience within the school context.

2) Individuals, selected from the focus groups, will be interviewed in a second phase through face-to-face **semi-structured interviews**. Interviewees can also be activists, members of associations ecc.
40 semi-structured interviews (**10 per country**, on the other hand, are aimed at mapping best practices understood as preventive, contextual and subsequent actions identified by centralising the needs expressed by the parties involved, especially those of victimised persons. The goal is also to gather insights in how to prevent and respond to hate incidents and how to support the victims.

3) **20 questionnaries** per country will be administered to young people to explore their knowledge on discrimination, racism and the impact of intolerance. The questionnaires can be submitted to school and extra-school contexts - sports contexts, after-school activities, aggregative spaces, student collectives/committees, associations.

4) A **Desk Research (6-8 pages)** in all target countries will be conducted. It will provide **data on racism, discrimination, hate incidents numbers on the national level**; **national legislative and social frame of reference for the different countries** (anti-discrimination law, tracking of hate crimes, presence or absence of the concepts of race and racism in legal texts

and possible declinations, rates of proceedings, particular legal difficulties, framing on: citizenship, immigration; structural discrimination in welfare and labor law); **an overview of the good practices** implemented by civil society organizations and public authorities in all the countries involved and in other selected countries of the European Union.

5) A **European Report** will be drafted starting from the findings collected at national level and using a comparative approach among the involved countries. The report will include recommendations addressed to key stakeholders at European, national and local level.

❖ Methodological indications for the researcher:

1) Modulate the action according to the gender, class factors involved and ethnic background, particularly those affecting racialised people.
2) Consider the role that belonging to a community with a racialised background can play at the intersection with the class conditions of the community in question. Such membership may in fact condition the emergence of research data, as racialised people, by virtue of their subaltern position, may be less likely to be exposed in racially mixed contexts.
3) Take into consideration the documental situation of racialised persons (does he/she have citizenship?) as these factors can also impact on the degree of awareness of rights and the practical possibility of exposure.
4) Ask and detect whether racialised people are comfortable speaking in a racially mixed context, i.e. exposing incidents of racialisation in front of people who are not necessarily racialised
5) Detect how gender dynamics are involved in the relationship between participants, bearing in mind that the presence of men could inhibit or overpower or condition the speech of women. Find out how gender dynamics intervene in relation to the hate action analysed (n.b. even if the hate incident occurs between two men, gender factors should also be analysed there too)
6) Pay attention to the circumstance that people who are subjected to hate actions might have the perpetrators or witnesses of the hate actions in front of them during the focus group

7) Formulate the questions taking care not to imply any form of trauma resolution: persons subjected to hate actions may still be in a 'processing' phase.
8) Clarify that each person is free to share what he or she feels, knowing that what emerges will be protected by being anonymous, and that there is no obligation to share anything, while also guaranteeing the possibility of temporarily stepping away from the discussion space if needed.
9) Build the preconditions for a relationship of mutual trust: also ensure that each person's experience will be recognised and cannot be invalidated (this is not a public process aimed at settling guilt in an absolute and definitive manner, so keep a relativist approach).
10) Build relationships of trust: propose a context of confrontation based on active listening and absence of judgement.
11) Build a sense of group (see below: team building). Observe the behaviour of individual participants during the activity to intercept possible tensions, be careful not to subordinate individual needs to the performance of the group activity.

Criteria for focus group composition:

Focus groups can be set up in two typologies:

A. Focus groups composed by young people, attending school or university, and possibly included in socio-educational projects or contexts (associations, sporting contexts, institutional or informal gathering environments)
B. Focus groups composed by adults with educational and/or organizational responsibility in school and extra-school settings (hereinafter, Aeor)

The separation of the two typologies of participants is advised because of the power relationship that exists between young people who are targeted by educational activities/projects and those who exercise responsibility, management - and in fact, power - in those socio-educational contexts. This power relationship is reinforced by the generational asymmetries between the adult and youth population, which also conditions the likelihood of emulation behaviors by the young people in relation to adults who refer to them.

For this reason, the experience of Aeor figures is in itself relevant and deserves specific treatment as it is liable to shape the omissive or commissive behavioral patterns and the related social contexts in which they are expressed.

For both the two typologies of settings, it is recommended what follows:

- At least two racialised participants or people who have suffered discrimination or hate speech for each group (with the aim, among others, of observing supportive relationships)
- A minimum gender diversity to be guaranteed. In other words, for each group it is important to ensure a minimum presence of people who do not identify as heterosexual cisgender men.
- In type B groups (Aeor focus groups), it is important to cover the various roles involved in the investigated socio-educational context and the different contractual status (structured, precarious, volunteers) framing the responsibility roles.
- Each group can have between 7-8 participants
- Lastly, it is recommended to also structure focus groups made up of women only, belonging to association/educational/aggregative contexts The goal is identify how gender relations intervene in determining the dynamics of the hate actions, by isolating that specific structural variable.

Focus group structure

***The focus groups can be organised following the typical methodology or dividing the activity in the following steps. In both cases the questions to be asked are the ones below.**

1. Icebreaker activity:[2] an activity aimed at introducing focus group participants and creating a minimum sense of group cohesiveness. 15"

2. Presentation of the research work, focusing on the methodological premises (see) and declaring the researchers positioning, if applicable (see above) 15"

3. Distribute three post-it notes and a pen to each participant. In the first card, ask them to answer the question: "What do *hate crimes* mean for you? Can you give an example?". The answers are then attached to the blackboard, trying to group them by type. 15"

4. Open a discussion starting from the answers given under point 3 and ask to answer the further question:

- what does the term *hate* mean in the concept of *hate crime*? 15"

[2] The following is a proposal for the icebreaker activity. It is suggested that focus group participants be arranged in a circle and that they take it in turns to say their name and name something they are good at.
As far as icebreaking is concerned, however, the following is suggested:
Arrange the chairs in a circle, leaving one more than the number of participants. Read out a list of statements and ask those who agree with what has been said to change their seat to another chair. Those who disagree remain in their seats while those who want to abstain get up, turn around and sit down again. Here is a possible list of statements that can be used:

- all people are of equal value;
- talking about feelings is not something men do;
- a husband must not earn less than his wife;
- immigrants work hard because they have to;
- whoever arrives in this country must adapt to the regulations in force;
- racism is a matter of ignorance
- it is only fair that those born in this country should have more opportunities than those from outside;
- Already in childhood, girls are better at cooking and boys are better at mechanics;
- the school calendar should respect all religious holidays.

- how are the targets of hate crimes identified? 5"
- have you ever heard of bias indicators?

  → the researcher collects an initial round of answers, then provides the correct definition by writing the main bias indicators on the blackboard. 5"

5. The researcher hands each person a post-it note, asking them to write their name on it and place it, on the board, under the question "Do you feel racialised?" Near the three possible answers: "yes"/"no"/"I don't know what that means".
   Disclamer: some non-racialised people may define themselves as racialised. Leave people free to answer according to their own feelings without intervening to correct the answer, and without providing any prior definition of racialisation. 5"

6. From the answers given in the previous point, divide the participants into 3 corresponding subgroups of discussion: 20"
   - <u>for young people:</u> give each subgroup participant three A4 sheets of paper on which are illustrated the following questions:
     a. What do you think racialisation is?
     b. At school or in other contexts, have you ever participated in discussions on what racism is? (lectures, trainings, workshops, discussions with peers, student collectives, other educational activities)
     c. Tell what you think is a possible racialisation incident you witnessed, possibly at school.

Ask the subgroups to collect the answers on the back of the sheets.

- <u>for the Aeor:</u> give each subgroup participant three A4 sheets of paper on which are illustrated the following questions:
  a. What do you think racialisation is?
  b. In the exercise of your role of socio-educational responsibility, how do you, if at all, transmit knowledge about the phenomenon of racism to the recipients of your activity?

c. Tell what you think is a possible racialisation incident you witnessed while in yourrole

7. Report of sub-group discussions (10") and definition of the concept of racialisation. Explain why we talk about racialisation when addressing the topic of hate crimes (5"). Introduce the distinction between hate crimes and hate actions (see above), recalling that racialisation relates to the first as much as to the second (5").

8. Discussion around an episode of racialisation chosen from among those raised in point 6:
    - Detection of bias indicators framing the victimised subject 10"
    - Who were the witnesses? 10"
    - Following the hate action, were there any reactions or any form of intervention? Yes, no? Who? Was there any intervention in defence or offence? By whom? By the victim, the perpetrator, other witnesses or authority figures (e.g. ffoo, manager, etc.)? in what way and why? 10"
    - who was the aggressor? in what relation of power is he positioned to the victim 10"
    - do you think more could have been done? (what could the victim or witnesses have done?) 10"

9. Distribute three post-it notes:
   Two to be placed in a box for anonymous answers:
    a) one to provide an opportunity to write down and communicate to the researcher other episodes that one does not wish to tell in person, useful for the investigation
    b) a post it in response to the question "what do you expect from your socio-educational reality now?".

   One to be sticked to a poster of conclusions:
    c) “What did you discover today/what was most useful?"

Participant observation during focus groups:

- Keeping track of the key words that emerged from the different racial, gender and role groups.
- Keeping track of how often people identified by racialisation/gender/subordinate role are silenced, interrupted and/or invalidated in their narrative
- Do any gaps emerge between theoretical reasoning and the experience of people, victims or witnesses? If so, keep track of which
- Mapping victims, witnesses and aggressors of real incidents in the focus group for the selection of subjects to be included in the semi-structured interviews

Semi-structured interviews

Criteria for identifying participants in semi-structured interviews:

Among focus groups participants, it will be necessary to recruit the subjects to interview.

- Both in the focus groups composed of young people and Aeor it will be necessary to identify those who have narrated themselves as victimised subjects, witnesses and possibly perpetrators of racial hatred actions, or participants the researcher identifies as such, on the basis of the reported accounts. To select perpetrators of hate actions, take into account that these subjects are more unlikely than witnesses and victimized subjects to name themselves as such.

- The salient reported accounts are episodes that occurred preferably in a school context but also outside school. With respect to Aeor figures, identify incidents in a school or extra-school contexts in which they have had (as victimed subjects, witnesses or aggressors) a role of educational responsibility.

- With respect to school contexts, identify hate actions pertaining to several types of socio-racial school contexts (technical-professional institutes and high schools), in order to cover a variety of social class conditions.

- It is not necessary for the recruited subjects to have experienced or witnessed the same incidents.

- The interviews should cover, for each category of young people and Aeor (respectively distinguished as victimised subjects, witnesses, and aggressors) at least:

    - two racialized people;
    - two non-racialized people

Disclaimer: With reference to *non-racialized* interview subjects who belong to the category of victimized subjects, the intention is to target people who *improperly* adhere to the category of victimized subject, i.e. who feel they have been victims of racially motivated hate behaviors - even though they are not racialized subjects - on the basis of their own personal interpretation of the concept of racialization. It is important for the researcher to probe the reasons for this self-perception, related to the subjective reading of phenomenon in general terms, while adhering to the methodological premises, outlined above, on the non-existence of so-called 'reverse racism'.

Interviews with young people

Young victimized subjects

> How long have you been part of this organization/association/reality and when did you get there?
> What led you to join or attend this organization/association/reality?
> Retrace the episode you experienced (already recounted during the focus group or a new one), relating to the organization you belong to, or to another school/extra-school context.
> How did you feel? [investigating the subject's personal perception].

> While the incident took place, did you realize that the matrix of the action was racial?

> Who was the aggressor? [investigating the power relationship in which the aggressor is positioned in relation to the victimized subject and witnesses].

> Who were the witnesses? How did they behave, what did you think and how did it make you feel?

> Was there intervention by other authority figures? (e.g. police, school director/organization president, etc.)? How did they intervene and why?

> How do you wish the people in that situation to behave at that time and in retrospect?

> Who did you talk to about the incident? [investigate secondary relationships of complicity or support].

> Were you aware of what the law provides to defend yourself in these situations? [investigate the victim's degree of awareness of the legal instruments available].

> Did anyone take measures? Were they effective? [inquire whether pedagogical or sanctioning measures were taken].

> Afterwards, was there any intervention by the families?

> How do you feel afterwards?

> In the socio-educational context in which this incident took place, were there before or after the event any didactic or extra-educational initiatives on the subject of racial hate actions? If so, did you participate?

>Are you aware of services which offer support to hate victims in your city/area ecc. ?

>Are you aware of projects, ideas, campaigns that you consider good practises to combat hate speech and hate crime?

Young witnesses

> How long have you been part of this organization/association/reality and when did you get there?

> What led you to join or attend this organization/association/reality?

> Retrace the episode you experienced (already recounted during the focus group or a new one), relating to the organization you belong to, or to another school/extra-school context.

> How did it feel? [Investigating the subject's personal perception].

> As the event took place did you realise that the matrix of the action was racial?

> Who was the aggressor? [investigating the power relationship in which the aggressor is positioned in relation to the victimized subject and witnesses].
> Who were the witnesses? How did they behave, what did you think and how did it make you feel?
> Was there intervention by other authority figures? (e.g. police, school director/organization president, etc.)? How did they intervene and why?
> How do you wish the people in that situation to behave at that time and in retrospect?
> Who did you talk to about the incident? [investigate secondary relationships of complicity or support].
> Were you aware of what the law provides for those who witness such incidents? [investigate the witness's degree of awareness of the legal instruments available].
> Has anyone taken measures? Have they been effective?[investigate whether pedagogical or sanctioning measures have been taken].
> Afterwards, was there any intervention by the families?
> How do you feel afterwards?
> In the socio-educational context in which this incident took place, were there before or after the event any didactic or extra-educational initiatives on the subject of racial hate actions? If so, did you participate?

Young aggressors

> How long have you been part of this organization/association/reality and when did you get there?
> What led you to join or attend this organization/association/reality?
> Retrace the episode you experienced (already recounted during the focus group or a new one), relating to the organization you belong to, or to another school/extra-school context.
> Who were the people involved in this action? [Investigate in what power relationship they stand in relation to the victimized person and the witnesses].
> How did you feel? [Investigating the subject's personal perception].
> How did the people involved react to your gesture? What did you think and how did it make you feel?

> Was there intervention by other authority figures? (e.g. police, school director/organization president, etc.)? How did they intervene and why?

> Would you call that racism?

> What did you expect to happen after you act?

> Who did you talk to about the incident? [investigate secondary relationships of complicity or support].

> Were you aware of what the law provides for these situations? [Investigating the degree of the author's awareness of legal instruments to sanction hate actions].

> Has anyone taken action? Were they effective? [investigate whether pedagogical or sanctioning measures were taken].

> Afterwards, was there any intervention by the families?

> How do you feel afterwards?

> In the socio-educational context in which this incident took place, were there before or after the event any didactic or extra-educational initiatives on the subject of racial hate actions? If so, did you participate?

Interviews with Aeor figures

Aeor victimized subjects

> How long have you been part of this organization/association/reality and when did you get there?

> What led you to join or attend this organization/association/reality?

> Retrace the episode you experienced (already recounted during the focus group or a new one), relating to the reality itself, or to a school or extracurricular context in which it played a role of responsibility.

> How did you feel? [investigating the subject's personal perception].

> While the event took place did you realize that the matrix of the action was racial?

> Who was the aggressor? [investigating the power relationship in which the aggressor is positioned in relation to the victimized subject and witnesses].

> Who were the witnesses? How did they behave, what did you think and how did it make you feel?

> Was there intervention by other authority figures? (e.g. police, school director/organization president, etc.)? How did they intervene and why?
> How do you wish the people in that situation to behave at that time and in retrospect?

> Who did you talk to about the incident? [investigate secondary relationships of complicity or support].
> Were you aware of what the law provides to defend yourself in these situations? [investigate the victim's degree of awareness of the legal instruments available].
> Have you approached any authority or structure? (manager, trade union, police, other)
>Did anyone take measures? Were they effective? [inquire whether pedagogical or sanctioning measures were taken].
> Afterwards, has there been any intervention on the side of the families of the young people to whom you address your educational activities? Or has there been any confrontation with them?
> How do you feel afterwards?
> What role did your contractual position (or role in general) play?
> What knowledge do you articulate in your pedagogical work in order to combat racism?
> In the socio-educational context in which this incident took place, were there before or after the event any days, didactic or extra-educational initiatives on the subject? If so, did you participate?

Aeor Witnesses

> How long have you been part of this organization/association/reality and when did you get there?
> What led you to join or attend this organization/association/reality?
> Retrace the episode you experienced (already recounted during the focus group or a new one), relating to the reality itself, or to a school or extracurricular context in which it played a role of responsibility.
> How did it feel? [Investigating the subject's personal perception].
> As the event took place did you realize that the matrix of the action was racial?

> Was there intervention by other authority figures? (e.g. police, school director/organization president, etc.)? How did they intervene and why?

> Who was the aggressor? [investigating the power relationship in which the aggressor is positioned in relation to the victimized subject and witnesses].

> Who were the witnesses? How did they behave, what did you think and how did it make you feel?

> How do you wish the people in that situation to behave at that time and in retrospect?

> Who did you talk to about the incident? [investigate secondary relationships of complicity or support].

> Have you approached any authority or structure? (manager, trade union, police, other)

> Were you aware of what the law provides for those who witness such incidents? [investigate the witness's degree of awareness of the legal instruments available].

> Has anyone taken action? Were they effective? [investigate whether pedagogical or sanctioning measures were taken].

> Afterwards, has there been any intervention on the side of the families of the young people to whom you address your educational activities? Or has there been any confrontation with them?

> How do you feel afterwards?

> What role did your contractual position (or role in general) play?

> What knowledge do you articulate in your pedagogical work in order to combat racism?

> In the socio-educational context in which the incident took place, were there before or after the event any days, didactic or extra educational initiatives on the subject? If so, did you participate?

Aeor aggressors

> How long have you been part of this organization/association/reality and when did you get there?

> What led you to join or attend this organization/association/reality?

> Retrace the episode you experienced (already recounted during the focus group or a new one), relating to the reality itself, or to a school or extracurricular context in which it played a role of responsibility.

> Who were the people involved in this episode? [Investigate the power relationship interrelating the aggressor, the victimized subject and the witnesses].

> How do you feel? [Investigating the subject's personal perception].

> Did anyone take any measures? Were they effective? (investigate whether pedagogical or sanctioning measures were taken)

> How did the people involved react to your gesture? What did you think and how did it make you feel?

> Was there intervention by other authority figures? (e.g. police, manager, etc.)? How did they intervene and why?

> Would you call that racism?

> What did you expect to happen after the gesture?

> Who did you talk to about the episode? [Investigate secondary relationships of complicity or support].

> Were you aware of what the law provides for these situations? [Investigating the degree of the author's awareness of legal instruments to sanction hate actions].

> Have you approached any authority or structure? (manager, trade union, police, other)

> Has anyone taken action? Were they effective? [investigate whether pedagogical or sanctioning measures were taken].

> Afterwards, has there been any intervention from the families of the young people you work with? Or has there been any confrontation with them?

> How do you feel afterwards?

> What role did your contractual position or your role in general play?

> What knowledge do you articulate in your pedagogical work in order to combat racism?

> In the socio-educational context in which the incident took place, were there before or after the event any days, didactic or extra educational initiatives on the subject? If so, did you participate?

EUROPEAN REPORT INDEX

1. Introduction (premises and objectives) 1-2 pp
2. Summary of work 1 pp
3. Desk Research on good practices 6-8 pp
4. Framework of the research:

4.1. Focus Group 5 PG

draft an overview sheet containing the following information for each focus group:

1. General background information

- Number of sessions, session dates, number of participants
- Composition. How the group was composed
- Description of the Reality(ies)
- Territorial social context in which they operate
- Any basic criticalities that emerged at the beginning of the work

2. Overview of responses from activity n.4 or the methodology applied

- Report prevailing responses and any factors not mentioned
- Indicate whether hatred emerges as a subjective or objective element
- Indicate the main participants in the discussion and their positioning
- Report if invalidation dynamics or specific points of disagreement emerge

3. Overview of responses from activity or question n.5

- Briefly describe salient elements of the self-identification process and any critical issues

4. Overview of responses from activity or question n.6

Report specifics on the following elements regarding different typologies of participants as mentioned in the paragraphs above (ex. young people, aeor)

a. What is racialisation?

- Report prevailing responses and any factors not mentioned
- Indicate the subjects that provide more feedback and their positioning
- How feedback from groups is received by racialised and non-racialised people

- Report if invalidation dynamics or specific points of disagreement emerge

b. Have you ever participated in training sessions on racism and when?

- Identify whether best practices emerge among them

c. Experiences of racism in school or extra-educational contexts

- Report who among victims, aggressors or witnesses report experiences
- Brief description of group dynamics
- Report if invalidation dynamics or specific points of disagreement emerge

5. **Overview of the case(s) that emerged from activity n. 8, with specific attention to the context of the incident, indicators of hatred and social actors involved.**

- Report the dynamics of intervention or non-intervention and the reasons claimed.

6. **Overview of answers on post-its or in general**
7. **Report best practices (both in terms of prevention and ex-post reaction) that emerged in the different focus group phases**
8. **Conclusions: researcher's comment on the perception and level of awareness that emerged in relation to the phenomenon**

4.2 Semi-structured interviews 5 PG

Draft an overview sheet containing the following information for each category of victimized subjects, witnesses and aggressors:

1. **Introduction:**

- Objectives, Interview subject and context of provenance
- How the selection was made, on what grounds.
- Report on the questions asked, possible citations of the interviewees

2. **For different categories Young victimized subjects, aggressors, witnesses, aeor victimized subjects, aeor witnesses, when reporting the answers when applicable report the following elements**

- Draw the typical profile(s) of the victim of hate actions in school and out-of-school contexts. Indicate the most recurrent type of power relationship that runs through the victimized subject-aggressor and victimized subject-witness relationship in terms of gender, race, class, social role.
- Emotional profile in relation to the accident.

- Awareness of the facts: there is awareness that this is a hate action and of the legal/regulatory instruments available? In what terms does the interviewee define the phenomenon and the incident? What kind of correlation does the interviewee draw between the hate incident and its racial matrix ("bias indicator")?

- During the interview, what representation does the social actor propose of themself in relation to the episode, and what representation does they propose of the other social actors involved (from the point of view of the personal relationship and the structural social relations that run through and characterise it)

- problems that emerged in the management of the incident

- what could have been done differently and, vice versa, what effective practices have been put in place? identify the best practices put in place and those suggested

3. **Conclusions:**

- Keywords that return most frequently to mark the perception of the phenomenon
- Social profiles and Emotional spectrum of experience
- Recurring approaches (sanctioning posture, cultural, other)
- Who are the social actors who most often appear as aggressors

4.3 Questionnaires 2PP

Report an overview of the answers received and short analysis.

5. Recommendations 1-2 PP

Every national report based on the conclusions elaborates 1-2 pages of recommendations for the EU.

TOTAL PAGES NATIONAL RESEARCH: MAX 20-25 PP

TOTAL PAGES EU REPORT: 50 PP

DEADLINE FOR NATIONAL REPORT: 31 JANUARY 2024