

ACCEPT
PLURALISM

2013/22
5. New Knowledge.
Applying Tolerance Indicators

**APPLYING TOLERANCE
INDICATORS:**

**ASSESSING TOLERANT
AND INTOLERANT
DISCOURSES AND
PRACTICES IN
POLITICAL LIFE**

Flora Burchianti and
Ricard Zapata-Barrero,
Universitat Pompeu Fabra



EUROPEAN COMMISSION
European Research Area



SEVENTH FRAMEWORK
PROGRAMME

Funded under Socio-economic Sciences & Humanities

© 2013 Flora Burchianti and Ricard Zapata-Barrero

This text may be downloaded only for personal research purposes. Additional reproduction for other purposes, whether in hard copies or electronically, requires the consent of the author(s), editor(s). If cited or quoted, reference should be made to the full name of the author(s), editor(s), the title, the research project, the year and the publisher.

ACCEPT PLURALISM Research Project,
Tolerance, Pluralism and Social Cohesion: Responding to the Challenges of the 21st Century in Europe
European Commission, DG Research
Seventh Framework Programme Social Sciences and Humanities
Grant agreement no. 243837
www.accept-pluralism.eu
www.eui.eu/RSCAS
email: anna.triandafyllidou@eui.eu

Available from the EUI institutional repository CADMUS
<http://cadmus.eui.eu>
Published by the European University Institute
Robert Schuman Centre for Advanced Studies
Via dei Roccettini, 9
50014 San Domenico di Fiesole - Italy

Disclaimer: The information and views set out in this publication are those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect the official opinion of the European Commission. Neither the European Commission nor any person acting on behalf of the European Commission is responsible for the use which might be made of the following information. A great deal of additional information on the European Union is available on the Internet. It can be accessed through the Europa server (<http://europa.eu>).

Table of Contents

ASSESSING TOLERANT AND INTOLERANT DISCOURSES AND PRACTICES IN POLITICAL LIFE	4
PART 1. THE INDICATORS	6
What the indicators can and cannot show	7
Indicator 4.1 Ethnic and religious tolerance. Existence of legislation that punishes racist discourse	8
Indicator 4.2 Ethnic or religious tolerance. Application of such legislation in recent times..	10
Indicator 4.3 Electoral share of far right / anti-immigrant and anti-minority parties	13
Indicator 4.4 Ethnic tolerance. Racist violence in public life	16
Indicator 4.5 Religious tolerance. Racist violence in public life	20
Indicator 4.6 Influence of radical far right or anti-immigrant parties.....	23
Indicator 4.7 Media mainstreaming of anti-immigrant or anti-minority positions	26
PART 2. ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION	30
About ACCEPT PLURALISM – project identity	34

ASSESSING TOLERANT AND INTOLERANT DISCOURSES AND PRACTICES IN POLITICAL LIFE

INTRODUCTION

The electoral success of the far-right and the manifestation of racist attitudes and opinions is undoubtedly one of the main challenges in European politics at present. While policies explicitly based on racial inequalities have been condemned since the Second World War and in the wake of the Civil rights movements in the United States, racism has not disappeared from political life. Radical-right groups still endorse racist opinions and claims for white supremacy. Even if they have generally few members, they are responsible for a good share of the racist violence exerted against immigrants and ethnic minorities that has been steadily increasing in recent years. In some European countries, such paramilitary violent groups are connected to formal radical-right political parties with parliamentary representation or not.

This type of 'classic' racism based on race inequality nowadays goes hand in hand with another type of racism, which has been defined as 'neo-racism' (Balibar, 1991), 'new racism' (Barker, 1981; Gordon, King, 1986), differentialist racism (Taguieff, 1991), and cultural racism (Modood, 1997). The appearance of new political actors at the far-right, or so called 'neo-populist' political parties who professed anti-immigrant claims but without a racial motivation justified the analysis of this new 'racism without races' (Balibar, 1991). This differentialist or cultural racism claims to be colour-blind, and does not postulate the superiority of certain groups over others (like white supremacy). However, it underlines the problems of opening borders and the incompatibility between certain cultures. In the words of Etienne Balibar, for neo-racists "culture can also function like a nature" (1991: 22).

In the research conducted for ACCEPT PLURALISM, both types of racism have been investigated as extreme but widespread forms of intolerance to cultural diversity.

Teun Van Dijk (1993) has researched how elites are responsible for using and reproducing this kind of new racism and cultural prejudices in the political life and the media. Politics and, more generally, the public space, is a fundamental ambit to study the production and reproduction of intolerance through practices and discourses. Politics is decisive to determine whether opinions, practices, qualities, groups or individuals, may be tolerated or not, accepted or rejected by the national community or the citizenry. Protagonists of public debates such as politicians, media representatives but also civil society representatives have an important responsibility in shaping the boundaries of tolerance.

In this report, we cover eight European countries **Bulgaria, Denmark, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Italy** and **Spain**.

ACCEPT PLURALISM

Our analysis is based on the research conducted for **ACCEPT PLURALISM**, funded by the European Commission under the Seventh Framework Program. The project investigates the responses to diversity and the role of tolerance in 15 European states.

In each country, we explored the meaning and scope of 'intolerance' or of 'tolerance to intolerance' in practices and discourses in the political life.

In its extreme form, racist intolerance refers to practices of domination and oppression, practices of exclusion, and/or to physical violence. This is the most direct expression of racist intolerance and the first target of anti-racist resistance. In our research, we also covered discourses of racist intolerance, which also refers to a language of oppression. It is important to examine these categories in terms of which intolerance represents the non-tolerated. Racist intolerance is still justified in biological terms sometimes, but it is widely justified by cultural difference and/or religious difference.

The core of our assessment and research focused on legislation and institutional practices towards racism and hate speech. We also devoted attention to the permeability of mainstream political actors and media to racist prejudices and cultural intolerance. Rather than attributing scores on political intolerance towards cultural and religious diversity *per se*, the scores we have accorded to the different countries reflect whether the political and public space of each country is **more or less tolerant to intolerant discourses and practices**.

PART 1. THE INDICATORS

Seven indicators have been selected to assess tolerance and intolerance in political discourses and practices :

Indicator 4.1 Ethnic and religious tolerance. Existence of legislation that punishes racist discourse

Indicator 4.2 Ethnic or religious tolerance. Application of such legislation in recent times.

Indicator 4.3 Electoral share of far right / anti-immigrant and anti-minority parties

Indicator 4.4 Ethnic tolerance. Racist violence in public life

Indicator 4.5 Religious tolerance. Racist violence in public life

Indicator 4.6 Influence of radical far right or anti-immigrant parties

Indicator 4.7 Media mainstreaming of anti-immigrant or anti-minority positions

These indicators principally address the political dimension of intolerance. Their objective is to use these indicators to evaluate to what extent intolerance and racism towards immigrants and native minorities is tolerated within a country. These indicators shed light on different dimensions of political life, which, if taken together, offer a clearer picture of tolerance to intolerance in the country. Some indicators aim at capturing structural dimensions such as the possibility for social actors to fight legally racist discourses and racist violence (4.1 and 4.2). Some assess the presence of anti-immigrant parties and their influence on politics (4.3 and 4.6). Others aim at assessing the situation in the country as regards to racist violence, with racial or religious motivations (4.4 and 4.5). Finally, one indicator assesses media discourse and presentation of anti-immigrant and anti-minorities positions.

The assessment is made primarily at the national level. If national data is not available, or if a regional or local assessment makes more sense for the specific indicator (due to important variations among regions or because of an important devolution of power), the level of assessment is noted.

In a context which changes greatly over time, it is important to consider that the assessment is made for the period noted and should not be used without this context. It is especially important for the presence of the far-right and anti-immigrant parties. Wherever time it was possible, the assessments have considered an evolution of the phenomenon (the last 10 years in general) and not only the current situation. This aims at providing context for the assessment and thereby avoiding focusing only on very contemporary and burning issues.

For each indicator, we rely on self-assessments. Country teams within the ACCEPT PLURALISM project not only have the contextual knowledge required for these evaluations, their evaluations occur (necessarily) on the basis of definitions of acceptance that are contextually appropriate and may not be completely shared. The comparative picture that emerges from evaluations provided by eight teams of experts may thus highlight interesting trends, parallels or discontinuities. Readers are therefore invited to critically follow the justifications provided by country teams for each score and to consult the extended assessments and evaluations provided in the Annex.

What the indicators can and cannot show

Country scores on individual indicators should be interpreted as very condensed statements on the situation in a particular country (for a given time period) on this aspect.

Scores represent contextual judgements by experts based on an interpretation of qualitative research and the available knowledge about the respective society in this respect.

The “scores” cannot be understood and should not be presented without the explanations provided by the researchers.

Scores cannot be aggregated, scores on individual indicators may help to analyse the situation in countries in a comparative perspective, but from the fact that countries score higher or lower across a number of indicators we cannot infer that ipso facto a particular country as a whole is “more or less tolerant”.

Scores on individual indicators are not necessarily comparable; because different factors and reasons may have resulted in a particular score for a country (e.g. it may be that the score in one country only refers to a particular region). This means that scores cannot necessarily be compared and they can only be interpreted in a comparative way in relation to the explications and reasons provided.

For more information about each national case study please refer to the individual reports listed in the Annex. For the Toolkit of the ACCEPT PLURALISM Tolerance Indicators please see here: www.accept-pluralism.eu

Indicator 4.1 Ethnic and religious tolerance. Existence of legislation that punishes racist discourse

LOW – non tolerance	Legislation punishing racist discourse and actions, or incitement to ethnic or religious hatred does not exist or is inadequate for current challenges of cultural, ethnic and religious diversity in the given country.
MEDIUM – minimal tolerance	Legislation exists but includes clauses that make it difficult to apply (e.g.: it requires for proofs that are very difficult to obtain; or it requires that racism must have been the only motivation of an action or speech, etc.)
HIGH – acceptance	Legislation exists, is up to standard and is applied without important legal or procedural problems.

This indicator seeks to assess the legal framework that exist in the different countries as regards racist discourse and hate speech. Supranational texts (UN, EU) have encouraged the strengthening of national legislation and the development of appropriate instruments in order for countries to effectively fight hate speech.

Many countries have a relatively long tradition of legislation condemning racist violence. Denmark and Germany have a longer tradition than most other European states due to historical reasons. In Denmark, the law was intended to protect Jews during World War II; while legislation on hate speech specifically addressed anti-Semitism and holocaust negation after World War II in Germany. These laws have been later applied to other types of hate speech (including against sexual orientation, religion or skin colour).

As for the Southern and Eastern European countries (Bulgaria, Hungary, Greece, Italy and Spain), their legislation against public expressions of racism and hate speech has been influenced by the Directive on Racial Equality and other European recommendations from 2000 onwards. All criminal codes define and condemn racism and hate speech and treat it as an aggravating circumstance in criminal cases. Nevertheless, some countries have been constantly reluctant in integrating these norms in their national criminal code (Greece, Hungary) and include clauses which lead in practice to severe problems in applying the law.

In some countries such as Denmark, Germany, Spain or Hungary, there is a conflict between the application of the law against hate speech and the norms which guarantee freedom of speech. This leads to contradictory Court decisions which, in practice, drastically reduce the chances of success of procedures that invoke laws against hate speech. It is particularly true in the case of politicians as underlined by the German assessment. In the case of Hungary, this simply blocks attempts to pass a law against racist discourse. This question is frequently debated in the public space of some countries, such as Denmark.

As this indicator focuses on the existence of a legislation punishing racist discourse, the majority of countries which have a robust legislation and/or have integrated EU recommendations, score High (Denmark, Germany, Bulgaria, Italy and Spain). However, one must bear in mind that this does not mean that the legislation is effectively and adequately applied (see indicator 4.2). Greece has been reluctant to establish standards against hate speech which are in fact still not applied. Hungary does not have anti-hate speech legislation but its existing legal framework, as for example human rights activists argue, could be used to effectively punish racist discourses. However, its current legislative

ACCEPT PLURALISM

framework is inadequate to effectively fight racism, especially when it targets groups (such as Roma). Both countries thus score Medium.

Table 1. Applying Indicator 4.1 Ethnic and religious tolerance. Existence of legislation that punishes racist discourse to eight European countries

Country	Score	Notes
Bulgaria	High	Legislation that punishes racist discourses exists (Protection Against Discrimination Act, Penal Code). It is up to the EU standard, and there are no legal or procedural problems impeding its application.
Denmark	High	In Denmark racist discourse is prohibited according to §266b of the Danish penal code. Anybody can file a case building on §266b, not only the offended part, but it is only the <i>Director of Public Prosecutions (Rigsadvokaten)</i> who can press charges.
Germany	High	The law against incitement of the people (§ 130 criminal law) is an important tool against racist discourse. It has however to be balanced against the right to freedom of expression and especially in cases, that are not explicitly neo-Nazi or otherwise from extreme-right-wing background, the proof of the violation of human dignity has often been difficult in court.
Greece	Medium	Anti-racist legislation exists, however, it needs to be amended so as to face challenges posed by ethnic, religious and cultural diversity and most importantly by the recent rise of extreme right-wing mobilization across the country and allegations about discriminatory practices conducted by public servants.
Hungary	Medium	Hungary receives a medium score on this indicator for 1) its emphasis on free speech (over a more robust hate crime legislation) and 2) its failure to consistently and stringently apply existing hate crime legislation.
Ireland	Medium	The Prohibition of Incitement to Hatred Act 1989, proscribes threatening, abusive or insulting words or behaviours or those likely to stir up hatred against 'a group of persons on account of their race, colour, nationality, religion, ethnic or national origins, membership of the travelling community or sexual orientation'. Except for incitement to hatred, racist behaviour is not expressly criminalised.
Italy	High	In Italy protection against discrimination has been ratified by the Italian Constitution (art.3). Italy also adheres to the international laws (e.g. the Universal Declaration of Human Rights) and enforced the EU directive 2000/43/CE. Based on this directive in 2003 the UNAR (National Office against racial discrimination) has been built. Besides UNAR anti-discrimination actions are also promoted by the judicial system, civil society organisations or private citizens.
Spain	High	The legal framework is globally adequate to EU recommendations on discrimination and hate speech. Some improvement in the transposition of the recommendations and independence of anti-discrimination authorities has to be done though.

INDICATOR 4.2 ETHNIC OR RELIGIOUS TOLERANCE. APPLICATION OF SUCH LEGISLATION IN RECENT TIMES

LOW – non tolerance	The legislation exists but has never been applied
MEDIUM – minimal tolerance	The legislation exists but so far cases brought to court have shown that (a) the law is problematic (e.g. see case of Greece where the court can condemn only if the ‘sole’ motivation of the racist action or speech was racism); or (b) there is tacit reluctance to apply the law and convict the perpetrators; or both.
HIGH – acceptance	The legislation exists and is consistently applied.

Note: Period of assessment: 2002-2012

The gap between an adequate legislation and the effective implementation of rights is well documented in a number of domains. In the case of the criminalization of racist discourse and hate speech, the gap is wide in all the countries assessed.

The reasons that block the effective application of the law are located at all stages of the procedure. In some countries (Greece, Hungary, Spain), there are many problems in filling complaints for racist discrimination or racist violence. The structures are not adequate, or the country does not have an independent authority in charge of this issue (Greece). When this authority exists, it does not have the power to pursue directly the perpetrators (Italy, Spain). In some countries, the fact that police forces are often involved in racist violence or racist discourse is also a problem (Greece). In Bulgaria, the problems that affect the prosecution of hate crimes are affecting the legal system as a whole: very slow procedures, lack of efficiency and resources, etc. This problem affects also other countries, especially as regards the duration of procedures.

Several assessments identify the reluctance of judges to apply the law as an important problem. The reluctance is obvious when we consider the difference between the number of complaints and the number of prosecutions (Denmark). Judges also invoke frequently other justifications for not using the criminal code on racist motivations, hate speech and incitement to violence, such as data protection for the victim (Hungary), the impossible identification of perpetrators or victims in the case of groups (Hungary), the conflict with freedom of speech (Spain and as underlined in 4.1 for Denmark and Germany). As a consequence, racist violence is often qualified by other names such as “hooliganism” (Bulgaria).

We face in practice a very narrow interpretation of the laws on racist violence and discourses. In some countries, it is only applied so far to right-wing extremism and groups inspired by a neo-Nazi ideology (Germany, Spain). In Ireland, only incitement to hatred is recognised as a special offence. Judges have discretionary power in treating racist motivations in the prosecutions processes and few cases have been successfully pursued. Courts of several countries consider that the harm caused by racism has to be physical or demonstrated with material proofs by the victim.

For all these reasons, the countries score Medium except Hungary and Greece which score Low due to the fact that the reluctance to apply the law is jeopardizing all attempt to fight racism.

ACCEPT PLURALISM

Despite these problems, it is worth noting that civil society and anti-racist organisations have a very active role in filling complaints and creating jurisprudence to extend the possibilities to fight racist and hate speech. They also pressure the governments to develop the legislation and its application with the help of international networks.

Table 2. Applying Indicator 4.2 Ethnic or religious tolerance. Application of such legislation in recent times to eight European countries

Country	Score	Notes
Bulgaria	Medium	The application of the legislation suffers from chronic illnesses characteristic for the entire Bulgarian legal and judicial system –exceptionally slow and flawed legal proceedings. Even when the cases are well documented, the prosecution often starts a procedure against “unknown perpetrators” and the assaults are often prosecuted as “hooliganism” rather than acts of discriminatory violence. To date, very few cases have finished with a verdict.
Denmark	Medium	Despite relatively high numbers of complaints filed over the last decade building on §266b, the juridical practice in the area suggests considerable limitations to the application of the paragraph. The position of the <i>Director of Public Prosecutions</i> is that the right to freedom of speech calls for a narrow interpretation of §266b. In practice, the paragraph has only been applied in a few rather grave cases. This has led to international criticism by among others the <i>UN Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination</i> (CERD).
Germany	Medium	The application of the law against incitement of the people seems to be especially difficult, if perpetrators do not express right-wing extremist worldviews. The cases, where the law is applied are most often members of extreme right parties or groups. Some other cases of insulting social groups are not prosecuted because of the importance given to the freedom of opinion.
Greece	Low	Failure to effectively apply existing legal provisions. There are no independent mechanisms to assess its application, no official data on racist crimes, no unified official system for recording racist crimes in cooperation with the police and NGOs, while no perpetrator of a violent racist attack has been sentenced until today. No provisions encourage victims of racist violence to report attacks against them.
Hungary	Low	Courts have been reluctant to invoke the laws that could be used to punish hate speech and prosecutors and judges have been reluctant to examine the racial or other hate motivations behind the crimes in question. For these and related reasons, laws against hate speech or acts are rarely applied and Hungary receives the score of ‘low’.
Ireland	Medium	The Prohibition of Incitement to Hatred Act 1989 identified a number of offences, but there are weaknesses in the Act and its application. Except for incitement to hatred, racist behaviour is not expressly criminalised. There is discretion for the Director of Public Prosecutions to prosecute, and for judges in treating racist motives as an aggravating factor when sentencing. Few cases have been successfully pursued
Italy	Medium	Despite the anti-discrimination legislation and UNAR, the application of legislation is medium. UNAR, for example, can give an opinion but it cannot

		engage in legal action in defence of people who have been discriminated against. It does not have the power to intervene legally or to apply sanctions directly. Some interventions to enforce legislation are done by civil society actors, such as the Association Avvocati per Niente (transl.: Association of Pro-Bono Lawyers).
Spain	Medium	Contradictory/ different interpretations of the law by the Courts makes it difficult to effectively fight racist violence and hate speech. Improvements have been made since 2009 in the effective prosecution of hate groups.

INDICATOR 4.3 ELECTORAL SHARE OF FAR RIGHT / ANTI-IMMIGRANT AND ANTI-MINORITY PARTIES

Note: The short term 'far right parties' is used below to refer to parties that are extreme right and engage into anti-immigrant or anti-minority discourse and actions. They may qualify even for just one of those issues i.e. being of far right and/or being anti-immigrant and/or being anti-minority, e.g. anti-Roma.

LOW – non tolerance	Far right parties exist and have gained more than the minimal threshold for entering Parliament in the last national election
MEDIUM – minimal tolerance	Far right parties exist and have gained between 1% and the minimum threshold for entering Parliament in the last national election
HIGH – acceptance	Far right parties if they exist at all gained less than 1% of the national vote in the last national election.

The situation of the countries under assessment is diverse as regards the electoral presence of anti-immigrant and far-right parties. Nevertheless, the vast majority count powerful far-right parties which engage in anti-immigrant or anti-minority discourses and have a chauvinist or xenophobic and racist discourse. Far-right parties have seats in the National parliament of five countries: Bulgaria, Denmark, Greece, Hungary and Italy. Their score ranges from 6.9 per cent (Golden Dawn in Greece) to 17 per cent (Jobbik in Hungary).

The assessments highlight the difference in nature between parties as regards to immigration or minorities, or as regards to their qualification as 'far-right' parties. While the Danish People's Party can be considered an anti-immigrant political party because of its very restrictive propositions and policies on migration and its instrumentalization of Islam, it is not considered as part of the far-right. On the other hand, the Greek Golden Dawn relies at the same time on xenophobic discourses and actions and is inspired by neo-Nazi ideology and symbols. Hungarian Jobbik and Golden Dawn are also frequently associated with street activism against immigrants and other minorities, and with paramilitary and violent racist groups. Depending on the country situation, these parties target primarily immigrants (Denmark, Germany, Greece, Italy and Spain) or the Roma minority (Bulgaria and Hungary). In general, these parties deny racism and claim instead to be nationalists or simply claim to be putting nationals 'first'.

Spain, Ireland and Germany do not have representatives of anti-immigrant parties in their national parliaments. In Germany, the National Democratic party was voted by 1.8% voters in the last federal elections and, in local elections, far-right parties are voted by more than 5% of voters in the former Eastern federal states, and by more than 3% in the former Western federal states. In Spain, all far-right parties are voted by less than 1% of voters at the national level. However, Plataforma per Catalunya and España 2000 have local councillors in the Catalonia, Valencia and Madrid regions. Ireland presents the most favourable situation as it has not witnessed so far the emergence of far-right or anti-immigrant parties. A short-lived platform failed to attract voters on the basis of anti-immigrant discourse.

Concerning the dynamic of far-right parties' electoral scores over the last years, they are rising in Greece, Bulgaria, Hungary and in some regions of Germany. However, in Denmark and Italy, the

DNP and the Lega Nord faced a decrease in votes during the last elections and do not participate in national governments any more. Nevertheless, the Lega Nord is still governing two important regions of Northern Italy, i.e. Piedmont and Lombardy. In Spain, the scores of Plataforma per Catalunya and other parties are stable since 2007 or are growing only slowly.

The political representation of the far-right, its integration in governments and its influence on the political system is certainly one of the most pressing issue at the moment for European countries. Countries like Greece and Hungary face the growing presence of violent and overtly xenophobic parties with a direct influence on the political system and government.

Table 3. Applying Indicator 4.3 Electoral share of far right / anti-immigrant and anti-minority parties to eight European countries

Country	Score	Notes
Bulgaria	Low	A far-right nationalist party “Attack” was founded in 2005 and has been represented in the Parliament since (8.14% on 2005 elections and 9.36% in 2009; threshold for entering Parliament is 4%).
Denmark	Low	In the September 2011 national elections, the <i>Danish People’s Party</i> , often considered an anti-immigration party, gained 12.3% of the total vote, making it the third biggest party in Denmark. This electoral share has been more or less stable since 2001.
Germany	Medium	Rightwing extremist or anti-immigrant parties are not present in the Federal Parliament at the national level. The right-wing extremist party NPD gained 1.8% in the last national elections, which was not enough for entering parliament. However, certain regions of Germany, especially in the Eastern federal states (but not only), witness relatively high electoral shares of rightwing extremist parties, who also send delegates to some of the local parliaments. Anti-Muslim parties are relatively new, but are gaining importance.
Greece	Low	The far-right party Golden Dawn, with a clear racist position, entered the Hellenic Parliament in June 2012 gaining a 6,97% of the national vote (electing 18 MPs).
Hungary	Low	Jobbik (Movement for a Better Hungary), a radical right party, received 17 % of the vote in 2010, the third largest share of the votes after the governing party and the socialists (former governing party). Their share of the vote translated into 44 seats in parliament (out of 386).

ACCEPT PLURALISM

Ireland	High	Ireland has not seen the emergence of a right-wing, anti-immigrant party, or any significant political campaign or protest against immigrants. One anti-immigration voice has been the Immigration Control Platform (ICP), a single-issue political grouping, which ran candidates in the 2007 Irish general election and received less than 0.1% of the votes. No candidates ran on this platform in the 2011 election.
Italy	Low	<p>The Northern League party appeared on the political scene at the beginning of the 1990s and among the themes proposed in its political agenda was hostility towards immigrants and nomads. Anti-immigrant discourses and actions have characterised its identity and programme since its creation.</p> <p>In 2008 the party obtained about the 8% of the national vote</p> <p>It had significant responsibilities in the national governments (2001-2006, 2008-2011), and a leading role in immigration policies. It governs important regions of Northern Italy (Piedmont and Lombardy).</p>
Spain	High	There is no presence of far-right parties in national or local parliaments.

INDICATOR 4.4 ETHNIC TOLERANCE. RACIST VIOLENCE IN PUBLIC LIFE

LOW – non tolerance	Public life is characterised by frequent incidents of racist violence against ethnic minority or immigrant individuals (or groups of people) because of their ethnic affiliation. According to NGOs, state authorities and other sources there have been more than 3 incidents of ethnically motivated racist violence per 1 million people in the country during the last year.
MEDIUM – minimal tolerance	Racist violence against individuals or groups of people of ethnic minority or immigrant origin is a rare incident. There has been between 1 and 3 such incidents per 1 million people monitored during the last year. There are campaigns against such ethnically motivated racist violence but they are small campaigns of left wing or pro-immigrant organisations without a massive appeal.
HIGH – acceptance	There have been between 0 and 1 incident per 1 million people of racist violence against ethnic minority or immigrant individuals (or groups of people) because of their ethnic affiliation during the last year and there are massive initiatives against racism involving several stakeholders (both state and civil society)

Although this indicator is of a tremendous importance to assess the level of racist violence in the European countries under survey, the lack of reliable statistics has complicated greatly the possibilities to provide a balanced and informed assessment.

In all countries, there is a general problem with statistics and reports of hate crimes. When comparing the statistics provided by the different countries, Ireland seems to have the most reliable statistics as they are national and public and record different motivations for racist crimes. The Fundamental Rights Agency's annual report for 2011 ranked European countries according to their system of data collection on racist crimes and offences. Bulgaria, Italy, Spain and Hungary provide limited statistics in terms of collection and publication. Germany, Ireland and Denmark were considered to have a good collection system, recording different bias motivations for racist crimes and publishing statistics. Greece established a data collection system only in September 2011 on the initiative of the National Commission for Human Rights and the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR). In 2010 and 2011, Italy and Spain improved their collecting system.

The scores given to the different countries have to be considered with caution, in the light of the unequal reliability of official data collection. Comparison should not be made between assessed countries. Reluctance to make visible the actual racist violence in the country is one of the main impediments to data collection systems' improvement. Our intention is therefore not to put the blame on countries which have better collecting system. For instance, even if Ireland has a lower score than other countries such as Spain or Hungary it does not necessarily mean that the last ones experience comparatively less racist violence as their collection system are deficient.

Several problems have been identified in the countries' data collection system.

ACCEPT PLURALISM

Official data is sometimes simply inexistent. In these cases, the assessment has had to rely only on non-exhaustive records from NGOs, anti-racist and human rights organizations. In others, there are some official data provided by different national or regional agencies such as the Ministry of Justice; public prosecutor's offices at the regional level; police records; intelligence services or independent anti-discrimination authorities. Yet all evidences point to the fact that these official statistics only record "the tip of the iceberg" of hate crimes. For example, in Ireland, the Irish Network Against Racism consider that only one in six people report racist incidents to the police. There are many problems which distort the statistics. Incidents are not systematically recorded and there are many problems in determining if an incident has to be included or excluded from the category hate crime or incident with a racist motivation, which is in general an aggravating motivation.

In some countries, the authorities only consider the crimes which have very obvious racist motivations and exclude much of them, even when they were accompanied with racist expressions. On the other hand, official statistics often put together in a same category hate crimes and other incidents such as political violence of the far-left (Denmark), or complaints on the grounds of discrimination (Italy). In addition, the countries which monitor hate crimes have experienced changes over time in the counting method and categories used, which complicate even more all attempts to assess the evolution of racist violence.

When the official data are contrasted with victimization surveys, data estimations change completely. In Denmark for example, 10% of victims considered that there was maybe or surely a racist motivation behind the incident they suffered. In Spain, 9% North African, 7% Latin-Americans and 6% Romanians who had suffered incidents in the previous year think that it was related to their immigrant or minority background.

Sometimes, the countries' authorities only consider and prosecute crimes with very obvious racist motivations and leave apart many other crimes for which the racist motivation is in doubt or hard to prove. Yet, in some countries like Germany, there were reports on the growing importance of "everyday" racist violence which is not expressed directly by hate groups or individuals with a blatant racist ideology. Some countries have nevertheless witnessed also a growing racist violence of radical right-wing groups and paramilitary groups (Hungary, Greece) and individuals, with neo-Nazi or fascist ideology. While some countries target principally those groups (Spain, Germany), others such as Hungary and Greece do not effectively try to prevent and punish street racist violence despite national and international alerts on the growing importance of the phenomenon.

In all countries surveyed in this report, NGOs, human rights and anti-racist organizations have taken initiatives to supply the lack of reliable official data. These organizations started to monitor racist violence through observatories (press coverage, reports from networks of local organizations) but also in encouraging people to self-report incidents to their offices. The lack of resources of these organizations and their unequal territorial presence makes it difficult to give a correct view of racist violence nationally. Nevertheless, the statistics provided by these organizations are in general much higher than the official statistics (when they exist). Those challenging estimations change the score we would give to the different countries on the basis of the Indicator's description. Thus, the country assessments have been made taking into account a wider range of criteria such as the different statistics available, accounts on the reliability of official data, civil society and official initiatives to improve racist violence reports.

Table 4. Applying Indicator 4.4 Ethnic tolerance. Racist violence in public life to eight European countries

Country	Score	Notes
Bulgaria	Low	According to an OSCE Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights report, in 2011, the Bulgarian police recorded 29 incidents of racist violence against ethnic minorities or immigrants. As the population of Bulgaria is 7.5 million, this amounts to more than 3 incidents per 1 million people.
Denmark	Medium	Reliable, systematic and continuous statistics on hate crimes against ethnic minorities in Denmark are scarce. But, available data suggests that in 2010, 62 of the recorded cases of hate crimes (amounting to 18.6%) had a clear racist motive. Both nationally and locally much has been done to combat hate crimes and to make the reporting of such crimes easier and more effective.
Germany	Medium / Low	The number of racist attacks in public life has been about 3 incidents per 1 million inhabitants in 2011. However, in certain regions, like Berlin or Saxony the concentration of such attacks is far higher. Therefore, the tendency of the scoring is towards the level of low tolerance.
Greece	Low	No official data, results are drawn from international and national NGOs reports which refer to numerous racist incidents recorded daily. According to a pilot study (January-September 2012) conducted by the Racist Violence Recording Network formed by UNHCR and Human Rights Committee 87 incidents of racist violence against refugees and migrants were documented, while it was noted that these were 'only the tip of the iceberg'.
Hungary	Medium	The score of 'medium' reflects the official number of racist attacks in Hungary for 2011. Civil rights organisations would put this number considerably higher, which, if substantiated, could result in an overall score of 'low'.
Ireland	Low	In proportion to the population of just under 4.6 million, the 114 racist incidents reported in 2011 indicate that social/public life has been characterised by frequent incidents of racist violence against ethnic minority or immigrant individuals on the scale adopted here.
Italy	Medium	It is very difficult to evaluate Italy on this indicator because of the lack of data on racist violence. We can score it by looking at the data on

ACCEPT PLURALISM

		complaints made by people and collected by UNAR. In 2011, the relevant complaints were 799. A limit of this scoring is that discriminatory actions are collected, which not necessarily become incidents of racist violence.
Spain	Medium	Few cases of racist violence are reported in Spain each year and evidences of hate crimes or hate speech remain low in the country. Several improvements have been detected in the last year, with a more effective prosecution of such crimes. However, there is a severe lack of public data and all evidence points toward the fact that few cases are effectively reported and denounced as compared to the real cases in the country.

INDICATOR 4.5 RELIGIOUS TOLERANCE. RACIST VIOLENCE IN PUBLIC LIFE

LOW – non tolerance	Public life is characterised by frequent incidents of racist violence against religious minority individuals (or groups of people) because of their faith. According to NGOs, state authorities and other sources there have been more than 3 incidents of religiously motivated racist violence per 1 million people in the country during the last year.
MEDIUM – minimal tolerance	Racist violence against individuals or groups of people of a minority religion is a rare incident. There has been between 1 and 3 such incidents per 1 million people monitored during the last year. There are campaigns against such racist violence but they are small campaigns of left wing or pro-immigrant organisations without a massive appeal.
HIGH – acceptance	There have been between 0 and 1 incidents of racist violence per 1 million people against religious minority individuals (or groups of people) because of their different faith during the last year and there are massive initiatives against racism involving several stakeholders (both state and civil society).

Most of the remarks on the difficulty to assess the indicator on racist violence (4.4) also apply for indicator 4.5 on religious tolerance. It is even less possible to have reliable data or at least a precise picture of racist violence against religious minorities because of their faith. Several assessments made for this indicators stress the fact that there is no data on religious minorities and religious motivation for crime is not recorded or mixed with racist motivation (Ireland, Hungary, Italy...). When there are data, religious motivation account for a small part of all hate crimes: 3% in the Danish intelligence service statistics on hate crimes, 15.4% of those who report discrimination to the independent anti-discrimination authority think it is because of their religion in Italy. In Spain, out of the cases of discrimination and racist violence received by the Public prosecutor for hate crimes of Barcelona, 11% had a religious motivation and 7% a specifically anti-Semitic motivation.

In several countries, NGOs give evidences of resurgence or continuity of anti-Semitic violence: street harassment in Copenhagen and Hungary; 16 violent incidents in Germany in 2011 (where crimes against Jews are the only religious category counted separately by the security agencies); rise of offences in 2011 in Ireland and persistence of anti-Semitic stereotypes in Spain.

Many countries face also the increase of anti-Muslim violence. As for violence against Jews, many incidents also concern places of worship which suffer damages or racist paintings. There are also many grassroots movements against the construction of Mosques, as in Catalonia for example. Mosques are regularly attacked in Germany and serious incidents targeting Mosques occurred in Sofia and Athens in 2011. However, several assessments acknowledge that current measures fail to target the specific violence against Muslims or Islamophobia (e.g. Ireland).

Apart from evidences given by public incidents, it is then often hard to make a difference between racist crimes targeting ethnic or religious minorities. It seems that in most countries, religiously-motivated crimes are part of the same dynamic of recrudescence of hate crimes and racist violence.

Table 5. Applying Indicator 4.5 Religious tolerance. Racist violence in public life to eight European countries

Country	Score	Notes
Bulgaria	Medium	Several incidents involving physical assaults on religious minorities occurred in 2011. Most often, the victims were Muslims, but other minorities like Jews and Jehovah Witnesses were also attacked. These events provoked massive condemnation by a wide range of actors – NGOs, civil society, media and political and state institutions. However, to date, judiciary has been exceptionally slow in punishing the perpetrators.
Denmark	Medium	Distinguishing between hate crimes based on race and religion is very difficult building on available Danish data. However, in 2010, 10 cases of hate crimes with a religious motive were reported, including cases where the victim has been Muslim, Jewish and Christian. As a way of furthering religious tolerance, a number of interfaith activities and campaigns have been launched, primarily by NGOs.
Germany	Medium / Low	Cases of violence on the basis of the victim's religion are not officially documented in Germany. Therefore, the score "low" cannot be documented. However, looking at the high number of mosque attacks in the last ten years and surveys about the negative opinion of large parts of the population towards Muslims, the score tends rather towards "low" than "medium".
Greece	Medium	NGOs and news in the media refer to attacks against places of worship across the country. However, cases of racist attacks as documented by NGOs reports are not reported as being directed against religious minority individuals (or groups of people) because of their faith, rather, they form part of the general rise of racist violence in the country.
Hungary	Medium	Recently there have been incidents of individuals and groups with radical right affiliations and/or sympathies attacking Jewish people in the street.
Ireland	Medium	There is no disaggregation of data under 'racist' incidents in relation to 'religion' and therefore no accurate 'numbers' for the total of 'religiously-motivated crimes/violence' in Ireland. However, in July 2011, information from the CSO revealed that offences against the Jewish community had risen to 13 in 2010 from 5 in 2009 before declining to 2 in 2011.

Italy	Medium	As in 4.4, it is very difficult to evaluate Italy on this indicator because of the lack of data. We can score it by looking at the data on discrimination events on religion collected by UNAR's associations, and not on racist violence. Among 174 associations, 69.2% said that discrimination occurs because of race/colour, 46.2% said it occurs because of ethnicity/nationality and only 15.4% because of religion.
Spain	High	<p>Despite a growing climate of intolerance toward Islam and Muslims and persisting prejudices towards Jews, there are very few documented cases of direct violence in reason of the victim's religion.</p> <p>[Caution: reliable data is not available at the national level for this indicator]</p>

INDICATOR 4.6 INFLUENCE OF RADICAL FAR RIGHT OR ANTI-IMMIGRANT PARTIES

LOW – non tolerance	The current government either subscribes to radical far-right and/or anti-immigrant views, or relies to a significant extent on the support of parties representing such views.
MEDIUM – minimal tolerance	Radical far-right or anti-immigrant parties have no direct impact on government, but ruling parties may offer concessions to such parties in order to gain their support.
HIGH – acceptance	Radical far right parties are marginalized and/or contained. There is no collaboration or mutual support between them and the parties in government.

Currently, no far-right or anti-immigrant party is in the ruling coalition or government of the countries assessed. As such, the influence of anti-immigrant parties is exerted mainly indirectly in the political life of these countries, with a graduation. This graduation in the influence of these parties has mainly to do with their political representation and the share of the electorate they represent.

Ireland presents a somewhat different context regarding anti-immigrant discourses in political life. There is no real anti-immigrant or far-right party, and mainstream parties have signed up to an anti-racist protocol in election campaigning established in 2001 by the National Consultative Committee on Racism and Interculturalism (NCCRI). Thus there is some level of political commitment against intolerant political discourses, although this does not prevent all expressions of racist discourse in national and local political life.

In two countries, Germany and Spain, the far-right has only a very indirect influence on political debates and governmental policies. In Germany as in Spain, the far-right has no representation at the national level. Germany on its part, witnesses the presence of far-right parties in a variety of local and even some federal state parliaments. The absence of right-wing parties on the national level in both countries however does not mean that parties in government and mainstream political representatives are not instrumentalizing migration issues. Some officials in both countries have heated debates on migration by endorsing anti-immigrant and xenophobic statements. Even if this does not come from the pressure exerted by the far-right, it has given credibility and legitimacy to the intolerant discourse expressed by its representatives. Assessments show that the marginalization of the far-right in the political system and in party politics does not hinder the use of intolerant discourses.

A second range of countries have witnessed important changes over time regarding the influence of the far-right on government and migration policies. They generally experienced alliances between parties-in-government and anti-immigrant parties (Bulgaria, Denmark), or even the participation of anti-immigrant parties to the ruling coalition (Italy) but these last ones no longer participate to the government. While they have been marginalized in Denmark and Bulgaria (since 2011), the Northern League in Italy continues to have an impact on migration politics. In Bulgaria, the current government counted with the support of a far-right party from 2009 to 2011, which stopped with the attack to the Mosque of Sofia. The far-right party Attack withdrew its support to the party-in-government. In Denmark, the Danish People's Party has had a direct influence on the restrictive migration and integration policies of the country between 2001 and 2011. But since the socialist

government took office in September 2011, the DPP is marginalised. In Italy, in turn, even if the Northern League is no longer in the ruling coalition, officials of this party have held positions in former governments and designed restrictive migration policies. In addition, representatives of this party still govern two regions. The country scores low because the discourse and long-lasting influence of the Northern League still manages to influence migration and immigrant policies in the country and the public debate on migration.

Finally, two countries count an important share of anti-immigrant parties' representatives in their national parliaments: Hungary and Greece. In both countries, the ruling party does not need the support of the far-right to rule. As for Hungary, although there is no need for its support, the current government is cautious in opposing Jobbik because their electorate is overlapping. In addition, some of the government's policies have received the support of Jobbik. It cannot, however be argued that the party has a direct influence on government. In Greece, the far-right has undoubtedly an impact on governmental policies. On the one hand, the government does not blame anti-immigrant and racist speech and violence rising in the country and kindled by far-right organisations. On the other hand, the government has toughened its discourse and policies on migration and several officials of the government take ownership of anti-immigrant intolerant statements.

There is mostly no direct impact of the far-right on the governments in the countries under examination in this report. It is frequent however that parties-in-government give concessions in exchange of support, or lower the contention from anti-immigrant parties when they have a seat in the parliament. Governments and dominant political parties may toughen their discourse and policies on migration if they fear that the far right would attract a larger share of the (and especially their) electorate.

Table 6. Applying Indicator 4.6 Influence of radical far right or anti-immigrant parties to eight European countries

Country	Score	Notes
Bulgaria	Low / Medium	The current government (GERB) has openly relied on the parliamentary support of the extreme far right party Attack during the first two years of its rule. The partnership ended after May 2011, after the Attack supporters assaulted believers at the Sofia mosque. Since then, the GERB government relies on the support of another populist-nationalist party (Order, Lawfulness, Justice).
Denmark	High	After the Centre-left government took office in September 2011 the <i>Danish People's Party</i> has been marginalized in the opposition without much influence on policy-making. The current government has declared that it will collaborate with any party that is willing to back the Government's political program, including the <i>Danish People's Party</i> , but it has so far

ACCEPT PLURALISM

		closed political deals without giving any concessions to the party.
Germany	Medium	The direct influence of rightwing extremist parties on the government can hardly be found in Germany. However, anti-immigrant discourses by individual public officials can be seen to have some influence on decision makers.
Greece	Low	The current coalition government (June 2012) subscribes to radical far-right propaganda, as national authorities do not respond to the alarming rise of hate speech and racist violence, but adopt themselves anti-immigrant stance. The cancellation (February 2013) of the recently reformed citizenship law testifies to that.
Hungary	Medium	The far right has no direct influence on the government, however, Fidesz has been cautious about alienating potential voters who sit on the fence between Jobbik and Fidesz and reluctant to publicly condemn some of Jobbik's more intolerant excesses. The current government has also pursued and strengthened a 'welfare for work' policy that had the support of Jobbik.
Ireland	High	Ireland has no real right-wing, anti-immigrant party. The one anti-immigration voice - the Immigration Control Platform (ICP) – is a political grouping, not a registered political party and can be seen as uninfluential and marginalised.
Italy	Low	The most extraordinary example of the influence of the Northern League party is the fact that the Ministry of Interior in the last Berlusconi-led government was Roberto Maroni, a leader of this party. The Northern League has actually managed the immigration policies in this coalition government, promoting several restrictive measures (the Security Packages in 2008 and 2009) and spreading governmental discourses which were hostile to immigration
Spain	Medium	There is only an indirect influence of the far-right through street activism. But anti-immigrant statements have been reclaimed by mainstream politicians, especially during electoral campaigns.

INDICATOR 4.7 MEDIA MAINSTREAMING OF ANTI-IMMIGRANT OR ANTI-MINORITY POSITIONS

LOW – non tolerance	The understanding that there has been ‘too much tolerance’ of migrants/minorities and/or that there is ‘too much diversity’ dominates mainstream public debate and mainstream media. Such understandings are prominently rehearsed by mainstream politicians and inform governmental agendas.
MEDIUM – minimal tolerance	There is a mixed picture of pro- and anti-migrant/minority rhetoric and both positions, in public debate, the media and on governmental agendas, have supporters and defenders of relatively similar size. While notions such as ‘too much tolerance’ and ‘too much diversity’ have some traction, their political impact is limited.
HIGH – acceptance	Anti-migrant or anti-minority views are relatively marginalized in mainstream political debate.

Note: the assessment is principally based on existing studies and media surveys.

In general, the media coverage of migration presents a mixed picture. On the one hand, media have actively contributed to constructing and spreading negative stereotypes about migration and migrants. They give space for intolerant opinions on migration. On the other hand, the media also offers space for alternative ideas and pro-immigrant advocates.

Especially in the most recent countries of immigration (Greece, Ireland, Italy and Spain), media have had a significant role on the construction and dissemination of stereotyped image of migrants. The terminology used by the media often present migration as a security issue, relating to images and accounts of crime and even invasion. Immigrants are presented as ‘others’ through the figure of the criminal or of the victim. In Hungary, the racist terminology ‘Gypsy crime’ has been gradually “normalized” in the debates about the Roma integration, even in mainstream media. In Germany, a rise in anti-Muslims views in the media has been noticed. In Germany, in Hungary and other countries, the idea that it is necessary to “break taboos” about migration has flourished in the public space. This has given more space in the media to actors expressing intolerant views on migration. In several countries (Hungary, Bulgaria, Germany), ideologically ‘conservative’ mainstream media (newspapers, TV channels) have played an important role in shaping those debates.

Several country assessments raise concerns about the influence of media run by radical-right activists, especially online. There is an increasing porosity and exchange between online media and the mainstream media, so information presented by radical-right media are frequently retaken (even with a critical view) by mainstream media. In addition, easy access to online information has also given a wider audience to radical-right groups' online publications and their anti-migrants and anti-minorities statements.

Independent and public authorities in charge of regulating the media and in guaranteeing media ethics often fail to condemn or process enquiry infringements to ethics or the expression of stereotyped and anti-immigrant views. Media subscribe in general to a code of ethics which include not harming minority groups and not spreading hate speech. When they fail to respect this code of ethics, media are rarely censured publicly.

Another source of concern lies also in the diversification of the media themselves. In Greece, studies have shown that the media were far from representing the diversity that currently exists within Greek society. Studies in Germany show that 90% of Muslims do not feel adequately represented by the news and information given by the media.

Nevertheless, the media landscape also offers space for human rights organisations and pro-immigrant organisations to express their views as it has been accounted for in Bulgaria, Denmark, Germany or Italy. In all these countries, and in Ireland, the assessment is that despite a growing presence of actors expressing intolerant views on migration, the mediatised public debate is still balanced. The voice of pro-immigrant actors is heard and intolerant views are generally opposed directly by other actors in the media. In that view, mainstream media generally allow the expression of contentious point of views.

Finally, positive initiatives also exist in some countries like Spain, emanating from media professionals or public authorities, aiming at ensure an ethical coverage of migration.

Table 7. Applying Indicator 4.7 Media mainstreaming of anti-immigrant or anti-minority positions to eight European countries

Country	Score	Notes
Bulgaria	Medium	Since 2010, intolerant media reporting and incidents of hate-speech have been on the rise. The ethic commissions of the print media and the Council of Electronic Media regularly fail to protest and sanction hate speech in the media. On the other hand, pro-minority views and positions of human and minority rights activists are also well represented in the media and in the public debates.

Denmark	Medium	Public opinion and public mediatised debates on issues of immigration and integration in Denmark has over the last decade been highly polarized. Thus, the media debate features many immigrant sceptics, who worry about the challenges of 'too much diversity', but they are counter-weighted by many active tolerant voices, who argue that increasing diversity is either enriching or not a problem.
Germany	Medium	Both anti-immigrant and counter positions are present in the media landscape, this is why the scoring tends more towards "medium". Looking at Muslims in particular however, the scoring would rather tend towards low, as most of the media reports connected to this issue are negative and stereotypical.
Greece	Low	Media in the country is mainstreaming anti-immigrant positions by representing negative stereotypes regarding non-nationals and fostering a xenophobic and ethnocentric public attitude.
Hungary	Low	Very significant change towards a negative direction in media discourse has taken place in the last couple of years.
Ireland	Medium	A mixed picture of pro- and anti-migrant/minority rhetoric has emerged. While immigrants have been portrayed as adding a valuable diversity, concerns have been expressed that there might be 'too much' diversity with potentially negative implications for Irish society. Anti-immigrant rhetoric in the media crystallised in particular around asylum seekers and non-EU mothers coming to Ireland to give birth.
Italy	Medium	Mainstream public debates and media are dominated by both the anti-immigrant and pro-immigrant discourses and they inform the agendas of political parties. Research shows that the area in which most discrimination occurred is in the media. Immigration to Italy is usually described by mass media in crisis terms, as an emergency situation.
Spain	Medium	Spanish media coverage of migration presents a mixed picture: The media have helped constructing and disseminating stereotyped images of immigrants and often presented migration as a threat for the country. But in recent years, there is an increasing awareness among media professionals on this issue and positive initiatives are flourishing.

Table 8. Comparative country overview

COUNTRY	4.1	4.2	4.3	4.4	4.5	4.6	4.7
BULGARIA	High	Medium	Low	Low	Medium	Medium / Low	Medium
DENMARK	High	Medium	Low	Medium	Medium	High	Medium
GERMANY	High	Medium	Medium	Medium / Low	Medium / Low	Medium	Medium
GREECE	Medium	Low	Low	Low	Medium	Low	Low
HUNGARY	Medium	Low	Low	Medium	Medium	Medium	Low
IRELAND	Medium	Medium	High	Low	Medium	High	Medium
ITALY	High	Medium	Low	Medium	Medium	Low	Medium
SPAIN	High	Medium	High	Medium	High	Medium	Medium

Notes:

Indicator 4.1 Ethnic and religious tolerance. Existence of legislation that punishes racist discourse

Indicator 4.2 Ethnic or religious tolerance. Application of such legislation in recent times.

Indicator 4.3 Electoral share of far right / anti-immigrant and anti-minority parties

Indicator 4.4 Ethnic tolerance. Racist violence in public life

Indicator 4.5 Religious tolerance. Racist violence in public life

Indicator 4.6 Influence of radical far right or anti-immigrant parties

Indicator 4.7 Media mainstreaming of anti-immigrant or anti-minority positions

PART 2. ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

In general terms, the scores on intolerant discourses and practices indicators in all countries surveyed in this report are low. Apart from the more formal part on legislation where most countries score high, there are very few high assessments for other indicators. We think that the situation of the countries under assessment reflects to some extent the current European context. Although undeniable formal efforts have been made to fight against discrimination and to ensure equal opportunities for minorities, these measures have trouble being applied or effectively improving the lives of immigrants and minorities. In addition, there is a specific problem in fighting new forms of racism that are more subtle, that deny to be racist, and that exclude or spread prejudices on the grounds of cultural difference and not on the grounds of racial inequality. The role of political and media elites in this process deserves special attention.

Among all the countries assessed, two countries score particularly low on the indicators, and the assessments report disconcertingly high levels of tolerance towards racist intolerance: Greece and Hungary. In both countries, radical-right and racist political parties are represented in parliament and influence the way national governments manage migration, minority and more generally diversity issues in the country.

They are also particularly influential in ‘street’ movements. Paramilitary groups in both countries - responsible for daily violent racist acts against immigrants – are connected to these formal far-right political parties. The levels of racist violence in these countries, the impunity of hate speech and racist attitudes in reason of the inapplicability of the law, and the lenience of the media and mainstream political actors, paint an alarming picture of the situation of these countries regarding intolerant discourses and practices in political life.

On the contrary, in general terms, Spain scores a bit higher than the other countries, in particular because there is no far-right / anti-immigrant party formally represented in the country’s political institutions.

As regards the overall assessment of the different indicators, several results can be highlighted:

- 1) There is an obvious **difference between the legislation and its application**: even if this is not a surprising conclusion, all countries witness a difference between the standards of their legislation on hate speech and racism, which is generally adequate, and the effective application of this legislation which face a lot of problems. These problems must be contextualised though as they differ from one country to another. In some countries, the legal culture and public debate place the freedom of speech above the harm that hate speech and racism can cause to a person or group. In others, the problem might come from recognizing harm to a group, from reluctance to apply the law and the lack of legal culture on racism, or from general problems affecting the whole legal system.
- 2) There is an **alarming presence and/or influence of anti-immigrant / far-right parties in the political system of most countries**: These parties have representatives in the national parliaments

of 5 out of 8 of the countries assessed, and representatives in several regional parliaments in Germany. Ireland and Spain do not have any far-right representative at national or regional level. Evidences suggest that these parties are also directly influencing the way in which migration, minority and diversity issues are dealt with by mainstream politicians and governments, either through restrictive migration policies, segregation or exclusion policies, or through intolerant speech.

- 3) All countries share problems in **measuring racist violence and hate speech in an effective manner**: Although there has been some improvement in several countries, mainly in reason of the pressure exerted by civil society and NGOs recommendations, no country has an efficient, reliable and national system to monitor racist incidents and violence. Here again, there is a variety of situations: some countries have no official system and have to rely only on NGOs monitoring, others have partial or local systems to monitor the complaints. In addition to this statistical problem, all countries face problems in encouraging victims to declare incidents they have experienced, whether because they know that it will not lead to prosecution or sometimes because the police force is not perceived as a reliable interlocutor and may even be involved in violent acts.

Following from the above, the following recommendations are put forward:

Political Parties: Refrain from legitimizing intolerant discourses

By not taking a clear stance, mainstream parties facilitate the spread of intolerance and the rise of anti-immigrant parties.

We recommend that political parties:

- Sign a formal commitment to reject instrumental use of migration and form a 'cordon sanitaire' around political groups and leaders who promote racism and intolerance.
- Clearly and collectively condemn acts of racism and overt intolerance.
- Integrate clearly into internal rules and procedures sanctions against party members who use racist and intolerant speech.

Legal authorities: Strengthen and enforce codes against hate speech and racist offences.

In several countries, the legal means to sanction racism and hate speech are clearly insufficient or ineffective.

We recommend that countries:

ACCEPT PLURALISM

- Create specialized institutions to fight racism, xenophobia and intolerance (appoint special prosecutors, ombudsman and labour inspectors).
- Raise awareness about the legal means to fight racism and hate speech.
- Create training and awareness campaigns for judges, law enforcement officials and prosecutors.
- Create independent authorities to monitor and sanction discriminatory attitudes, racial profiling, violence and racist speech of law enforcement officials.
- Monitor and provide reliable statistics on racist incidents and hate crimes.

National policy makers: Immediately ban racist violence by far-right paramilitary groups, especially in Greece and Hungary.

- Disband political organisations and groups whose members are repeatedly involved in racially motivated violence.
- Establish means to ensure that racist violence and hate speech are reported and prosecuted.
- Introduce procedures to file complaints and ensure the protection of victims.
- Support civil society organizations in their attempt to legally fight racism and support victims of discrimination.

The Media: Adopt a code of ethics rejecting racism and stereotypes regarding immigrants and native-minorities.

The media not only reflect current debates, they also contribute to constructing an understanding of current events and to organizing public debate. In some countries, the media have contributed to spreading intolerance by reinforcing stereotypes and prejudices against immigrants and native minorities.

We recommend that:

- National media authorities ensure fair and balanced news coverage and penalize those who spread racist views and stereotypes.
- Media corporations and journalist associations adopt a formal code of ethics applying to all their activities and design ways of gathering feedback on their practises.
- Media support campaigns against racism and intolerance.

FURTHER READINGS AND COUNTRY REPORTS

[Discourses of intolerance in political life](#)

By Flora Burchianti and Ricard Zapara-Barrero, Universitat Pompeu Fabra (2013)

Download your copy from: <http://cadmus.eui.eu/handle/1814/25836>

[ACCEPT PLURALISM Tolerance Indicators Toolkit](#)

By Anna Triandafyllidou, European University Institute (2013)

Download your copy from: <http://www.accept-pluralism.eu/Research/ProjectReports/ToleranceIndicatorsToolkit/ToleranceIndicators.aspx>

[Tolerance and Cultural Diversity Discourses in Bulgaria](#)

By Marko Hajdinjak and Maya Kosseva with Antonina Zhelyazkova, IMIR (2012)

Download your copy from: <http://cadmus.eui.eu/handle/1814/23257>

[Conceptions of Tolerance and Intolerance in Denmark: From Liberality to Liberal Intolerance?](#)

By Tore Vincents Olsen and Lasse Lindekilde, Aarhus University (2012)

Download your copy from: <http://cadmus.eui.eu/handle/1814/23255>

[Tolerance Discourses in Germany: How Muslims are Constructed as National Others](#)

By Nina Mühe, Europe – University Viadrina (2012)

Download your copy from: <http://cadmus.eui.eu/handle/1814/23404>

[Tolerance and Cultural Diversity Discourses and Practices in Greece](#)

By Anna Triandafyllidou and Hara Kouki, European University Institute (2012)

Download your copy from: <http://cadmus.eui.eu/handle/1814/23261>

[Tolerance and Cultural Diversity Concepts and Practices in Hungary](#)

By Zsuzsanna Vidra, Jon Fox, Anikó Horváth, Central European University and University of Bristol (2012)

Download your copy from: <http://cadmus.eui.eu/handle/1814/23402>

[Tolerance and Cultural diversity in Ireland, Concepts and Practices](#)

By Iseult Honohan and Nathalie Rougier, University College Dublin (2012)

Download your copy from: <http://cadmus.eui.eu/handle/1814/23258>

[Overview Report on Tolerance and Cultural Diversity Concepts and Practices in Italy](#)

By Maurizio Ambrosini and Elena Caneva, University of Milan (2012)

Download your copy from: <http://cadmus.eui.eu/handle/1814/23259>

[Tolerance and Cultural Diversity Concepts and Practices in Spain](#)

By Ricard Zapata-Barrero, Flora Burchianti, Blanca Garcés-Mascareñas, GRITIM – Universitat Pompeu Fabra (2012)

Download your copy from: <http://cadmus.eui.eu/handle/1814/24378>

References

- Balibar, E. (1991). "Is there a neo-racism?" in Balibar E., Wallerstein I. , *Race, Nation, Class: Ambiguous Identities*, London: Verso, p.17-28.
- Barker, M. (1981). *The new racism*. London: Junction Books
- Gordon, P., King, F. (1986). *New right, new racism*. London: Searchlight Publications
- Modood, T. (1997). "Difference', Cultural Racism and Anti-Racism". In Werbner P., Modood T. (eds.), *Debating Cultural Hybridity: Multicultural Identities and the Politics of Anti-Racism*, London: Zed Books.
- Taguieff, P.-A. (1990). *La force du préjugé: essai sur le racisme et ses doubles*, Paris: La Découverte.
- van Dijk, T. A. (1993). *Elite discourse and racism*. Newbury Park: Sage.

About ACCEPT PLURALISM – project identity

Acronym

ACCEPT PLURALISM

Title

Tolerance, Pluralism and Social Cohesion: Responding to the Challenges of the 21st Century in Europe

Short Description

ACCEPT PLURALISM questions how much cultural diversity can be accommodated within liberal and secular democracies in Europe. The notions of tolerance, acceptance, respect and recognition are central to the project. ACCEPT PLURALISM looks at both native and immigrant minority groups.

Through comparative, theoretical and empirical analysis the project studies individuals, groups or practices for whom tolerance is sought but which we should not tolerate; of which we disapprove but which should be tolerated; and for which we ask to go beyond tolerance and achieve respect and recognition.

In particular, we investigate when, what and who is being not tolerated / tolerated / respected in 15 European countries; why this is happening in each case; the reasons that different social actors put forward for not tolerating / tolerating / respecting specific minority groups/individuals and specific practices. The project analyses practices, policies and institutions, and produces key messages for policy makers with a view to making European societies more respectful towards diversity.

Website

www.accept-pluralism.eu

Duration

March 2010-May 2013 (39 months)

Funding Scheme

Small and medium-scale collaborative project

EU contribution

2,600,230 Euro

Consortium

17 partners (15 countries)

Coordinator

European University Institute

Robert Schuman Centre for Advanced Studies

Person Responsible

Prof. Anna Triandafyllidou

EC officer

Ms. Louisa Anastopoulou, Project Officer,

Directorate General for Research and Innovation, European Commission