



This project is co-funded by the Fundamental Rights and Citizenship Programme of the European Union



# RADAR

Regulating Anti Discrimination and Anti Racism

JUST/2013/FRAC/AG/6271

# NEWSLETTER

FEBRUARY 2016



## Regulating AntiDiscrimination and AntiRacism JUST/2013/FRAC/AG/6271

### GENERAL RESULTS

#### 1.1 ISSUES OF LANGUAGE USE IN LAWS AND COURT JUDGMENTS<sup>1</sup>

##### Language use in anti-racism and anti-discrimination laws

A comparison of the terminology used in the Law of the European Union countries involved in the RADAR project (Finland, Greece, Italy, The Netherlands, Poland, United Kingdom) has shown that all countries have anti-racism and anti-discrimination laws, and all of them resolutely condemn any act of discrimination based on skin colour and national origin or any act which incites hatred and violence

against those who are (or are presumed or perceived) to be a member of a so-called 'racial' or ethnic group. In this respect, however, it is not clear whether there is a difference between 'racial' group and 'ethnic' group.

The European Union in 2000 instituted the Council Directive 2000/43/EC of 29 June 2000 implementing the principle of equal treatment between persons irrespective of racial or ethnic origin (Official Journal L 180, 19/07/2000 P. 0022 –



<sup>1</sup> Based on RADAR: Laws and Judgments Analysis (Project Report) by Enrico Caniglia and Gabriella B. Klein (see in: [http://lnx.radar.communicationproject.eu/web/htdocs/radar.communicationproject.eu/home/dokeos/main/document/document.php?cidReq=RAD01&curdirpath=%2FLAWS\\_and\\_JUDGMENTS](http://lnx.radar.communicationproject.eu/web/htdocs/radar.communicationproject.eu/home/dokeos/main/document/document.php?cidReq=RAD01&curdirpath=%2FLAWS_and_JUDGMENTS))



0026; Council Directive 2000/43/EC of 29 June 2000) to which all Member States have to defer when putting in place their own laws. The different social and historical context of each country means that laws may be interpreted and applied differently.

The following aspects deserve attention:

1) Greece, Poland and the United Kingdom explicitly condemn activities aimed at inciting hatred against other individuals or groups based on presumed membership to groups defined mainly by 'race'<sup>2</sup> or skin colour, but there are some differences. In some countries, the Law talks about the ways in which such practices or stirring up can be observed in written material (the Netherlands), while in other legal systems (Italy) this aspect is not explicit and any indication or prescription is generic.

2) The legal systems of Greece, Italy and Poland take for granted the existence of 'races' or other biological differences between people. UK law (as well as other national laws such as Scots Law) and especially the Finnish laws seem more attentive or at least balanced on this point. Since Italian, Polish and Greek laws mention the word "race", in our opinion it shows that these countries espouse the scientifically incorrect belief of the humanity's subdivision into different races. Their laws condemn activities and hatred towards the other 'races', however by using the term "race" they demonstrate their belief of the existence of separate, distinct human 'races'. This shows how this belief is deeply rooted in ordinary life, as well as in political and legal institutions. The Board of the Netherlands Institution for Human Rights explains the concept of race in the Equal Treatment Act in accordance with the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination broadly. It also includes colour, descent and national or ethnic origin (Papers II 1990-91 , 22 014, no. 3, p. 13).

3) The words "race" and "racial" are also present in the EU anti-discrimination Directives that have been in place since 2000. The "Race Equality Directive" mentions discrimination on the ground of "racial or ethnic origin" and, related to the workplace, also on the ground of "religion or belief"<sup>3</sup>. Nevertheless it is explicitly stated that "The European Union rejects theories which attempt to determine the existence of separate human races. The use of the term "racial origin"

in this Directive does not imply an acceptance of such theories."<sup>4</sup> This seems to be contradictory. If the European Union does not accept theories on the existence of separate human races, then it is not clear why the term "race" is being used. If the reason is the lack of a better term, this should be clarified in the Directive.

It seems that the considered Member State laws (**Finland, Greece, Italy, Netherland, Poland, United Kingdom**), do not explicitly refer to this point in their national legal texts, leaving the concept ambiguous.

4) The terms xenophobia or xenophobic are never used.

It is important to point out that the six European countries have got laws punishing the incitement of hatred against people by reference to their skin colour or their national origin. **In the UK**, for example, Criminal Law punishes violent acts and hatred acts when they are motivated by malice or ill-will against people by reference to its membership or presumed membership of a 'racial' group or national origin group. In Italy as well, an offence and a violent act can be defined as 'racially' or 'ethnically' aggravated. In Greece, laws punish the incitement of violence or hate speech: if anyone publicly incites, provokes or stirs up acts of violence against a person or a group for their **skin colour, religion, or national origin** in a manner that endangers the public order and **the life and physical integrity** of any person. In the Netherlands the Criminal Law punishes acts that incite hatred or discrimination against persons or violence against persons or property on account of their 'race', religion, national origin or skin colour.

 <sup>2</sup> To underline our critical position towards this concept, we use single quotation marks. When the term is quoted from other sources, we use the double quotation marks.

<sup>3</sup> European Commission 2014, "Equality: EU rules to tackle discrimination now in place in all 28 EU Member States", Press Release, Brussels, 17 January 2014; see also "Press pack: Report on application of the directives and annexes" [http://ec.europa.eu/justice/newsroom/discrimination/news/140117\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/justice/newsroom/discrimination/news/140117_en.htm); "European Commission – Tackling discrimination": [http://ec.europa.eu/justice/discrimination/index\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/justice/discrimination/index_en.htm)

<sup>4</sup> Footnote 6 in the Council Directive 2000/43/EC of 29 June 2000 implementing the principle of equal treatment between persons irrespective of racial or ethnic origin, Official Journal L 180 , 19/07/2000 P. 0022 – 0026

## Definition of discrimination based on racism and xenophobia in legal texts

Below we outline how legal texts define racism and discrimination<sup>5</sup> based on racism and xenophobia.

In **Poland**, the Criminal Code defines discrimination very broadly as every act of: attack on a person or group; violation of personal rights: **bodily injury or health impairment**; assault on **the dignity and physical or psychological integrity** of a person/a group of persons; violation of a person's or a group of persons' right to preserve their identity and autonomy; aggravated assault on a person or a group of persons.

**Scots law** sees racially aggravated conduct when “immediately before, during or immediately after carrying out the course of conduct or action the offender evinces towards the person affected **malice and ill-will** based on that person's membership (or presumed membership) of a **'racial' group**; or when the course of conduct or action is motivated (wholly or partly) by malice and ill-will towards members of a 'racial' group based on their membership of that group” (Criminal Law (Consolidation) (Scotland) Act 1995).

In **Finland**, “the treatment of a person less favourably than the way another person is treated, has been treated or would be treated in a comparable situation (direct discrimination)” and indirect discrimination is defined as such that “an apparently neutral provision, criterion or practice puts a person at a particular disadvantage compared with other persons, unless said provision, criterion or practice has an acceptable aim and the means used are appropriate and necessary for achieving this aim (indirect discrimination)”.

The same definition and reference to the indirect discrimination is referred to in the Greek Law where it qualifies as “discrimination” and harassment what manifests itself through an unwanted conduct related to a prohibited ground of discrimination, with the purpose or effect of insulting the dignity of a person and of creating an **intimidating, hostile, degrading, humiliating or offensive environment**.



<sup>5</sup> We do not consider here other kinds of discrimination, such as discrimination based on sexual orientation, gender, age or disability.

In **Italy** discrimination is defined as “distinction, exclusion, restriction or preference based on **race, colour, descent or national or ethnic origin, religious beliefs and practices**, and which has the purpose or effect of nullifying or undermine recognition, enjoyment or exercise, in conditions of **equality, human rights and freedoms** fundamental in the political economic, social and cultural life and in every other field of public life” (**Legislative Decree of July 25, 1998, n. 286**).

In **the Netherlands**, the term “discrimination”, according to Article 90quater of the Dutch Penal Code is defined as “any distinction, exclusion, restriction or preference, which may have as their object or effect of nullifying or impairing the recognition, enjoyment or exercise, in conditions of equality, human rights and fundamental freedoms in the political, economic or social or cultural fields or in other areas of social life.” The category of “race”, according to the legislator, with reference to the judgment of the Supreme Court under article 1 of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, also includes distinctions based on **colour, descent or national or ethnic origin**. Also the Dutch Penal Code (1991), art 137, c-g defines discrimination (a part from sex and sexual orientation) as related to “**race, religion or personal beliefs**”.

## Communicative elements defined as offensive or as a case of 'racial'/ethnic discrimination

None of the laws of the RADAR partner countries include a definition of items/words/utterances/gestures/symbols etc. that constitute discrimination or racism, except in Poland. In that case, a legal interpretation of the offence presented in the official database to the Code and the articles specifies that an insult or disrespect of a potentially offensive nature can take the form of gestural improper behaviour, e.g. refusing a handshake. Additionally, **Polish** Criminal Code punishes the incitement to hatred on the grounds of racial, national and ethnic origin and belief or lack of belief. It punishes production, selling and transferring products, which are carriers of content that promotes incitement to hatred.

According to Public Order Act (**UK Public Law**), a person who publishes or distributes written material which is threatening, abusive or insulting is guilty of an offence if: (a) he intends thereby to stir up racial hatred, or (b) having regard to all the circumstances 'racial' hatred is likely to be stirred up thereby.

It is the judge's work which defines when, where and how takes place incitement to hatred and stirring up negative attitude against other people for their different skin colour, religion or national origin.

In each country, offenders can be punished for 'racially' aggravated actions, or 'racial' aggravation can be added as an additional charge to other offences (such as murder, manslaughter, assault, etc.). If an offence has a 'racial' aggravation charge, the penalty (custodial sentence or payment, etc.) is extended, according to the severity of what is defined as 'racial abuse'.

The **Dutch** Penal Code defines as offensive and punishable "A person who publicly, either orally, or in writing, or by image, intentionally makes a defamatory statement about a group of persons on the grounds of their race, religion or personal beliefs [...]" (art 137c).

### Categories used in the legal texts from the 'racial'/ethnic collection for defining the grounds for discrimination

This section comments on the use of categories from the 'racial'/ethnic collection, such as "coloured" (in its national variations), "race", "black", "white" etc. in legal texts (laws and judgments). It has to be underlined that the categories emerging are from texts drafted by the socially dominant group (i.e. white males), who determine their meaning; in other words, one and the same term can have a quite different meaning and connotation when used in a non-dominant social group. This will be clarified below.

According to ILO, IOM, OHCHR *in International Migration, Racism, Discrimination and Xenophobia (2001)*, *racism and xenophobia are two distinct concepts. According to the above organisation's definitions, "Racism is an ideological construct that assigns a certain race and/or ethnic group to a position of power over others on the basis of physical and cultural attributes, as well as economic wealth, involving hierarchical relations where the 'superior' race exercises domination and control over others", whereas "Xenophobia describes attitudes, prejudices and behaviour that reject, exclude and often vilify persons, based on the perception that they are outsiders or foreigners to the community, society or national identity."*

The sensitive term "race/racial" is used in each **Italian** Law and in several **Greek** laws and in their respective Constitutions. Additionally, the generic term "race" is used

in The Labour Code in **Poland**.

On the contrary, **UK** Law talks about presumed (by the offender) "membership to race or other groups". This means that there can be a 'racially' defined group (a group of black people, a group of Asian people etc.), who would experience racism on the basis of their (presumed) 'race'. The **Dutch** Law talks about "race, religion or personal beliefs", where the term "race" includes the reference to colour and ethnicity. Finally, in **Finland** the legal texts do not use terms related to race but "ethnic" or "alien".

In **Italy** legal texts also use terms such as: **colour, descent, national or ethnic origin (or simply "origin"), religious beliefs and practices:"**

### Language use in judgments

As a general result from the analysis of court judgments in the six countries we can state the following:

1. race/racial: In the judgments it is implicitly stated that "races" exist.

However, it is not clear whether the term "races" refers to something that actually exists or as a mere social classification. Laws should clarify that the term "race" does not represent a "fact", but a constructed classification that doesn't describe any natural or objective reality.

What is also doubtful is the distinction between "race" and "ethnicity" in these texts: it is possible that "ethnicity" is used here to distinguish people who maintain original cultural traits (such as Senegalese ethnicity for a migrant born in Senegal and living in Europe), while the word "race" is used to identify a certain type of migrant (especially with physically marked differences) or the related descendants of migrants who have now lost the original cultural traits but are still distinguishable especially by the colour of their skin. This important distinction should also be clarified.

Dutch judgments by the Netherlands Institution for Human Rights state that the College "shall submit to the concept of race, as defined in the "International Convention on the Elimination of all forms of racial discrimination". The concept of 'race' explicitly includes colour, descent, and national or ethnic origin".

2. Persona di colore/coloured person/person of colour/black person (in Italian). In a case, the Italian judge describes the ‘victim’ of a hatred act as “persona di colore” (“coloured person/person of colour”)<sup>6</sup>. In the other Partner countries the categories used seem to be always the same to describe the motivation for discrimination and hatred: race/ethnic origin, national origin, skin colour, descent, religious practices/beliefs and, in addition in the UK and the NL, also nationality (including citizenship).

To sum up, the only description of the word “race” we have is in the aforementioned EU directive, where the concept “race” is actually defined by what it is not; it is not a biological concept: “The European Union rejects theories which attempt to determine the existence of separate human races. The use of the term ‘racial origin’ in this Directive does not imply an acceptance of such theories.” (Council Directive 2000/43/EC of 29 June 2000 implementing the principle of equal treatment between persons irrespective of racial or ethnic origin, Official Journal L 180, 19/07/2000 P. 0022 – 0026).

 <sup>6</sup> In the Italian context there is no distinction between the expression “coloured” and “of colour” as it is instead in the British context. The expression “persona di colore” is often perceived as offensive by the people concerned such as Africans; but is perceived as kind and well-educated by people using the expression instead of “black” towards Africans and generally people with a darker skin colour. But logically this expression doesn’t make sense as everybody’s skin naturally has a colour whether darker or lighter.<sup>5</sup> We do not consider here other kinds of discrimination, such as discrimination based on sexual orientation, gender, age or disability.

## 1.2 DEBATES ABOUT DISCRIMINATION, RACISM AND XENOPHOBIA RELATED TO COMMUNICATION PRACTICES<sup>7</sup>

The project collected, reviewed and analysed debates about discrimination, racism and xenophobia related to communication practices from a diverse range of sources from linguistic and sociological point of view (TV, newspaper articles, social experiments etc.). The first conclusion from the analysis is that racism and discrimination are seriously discussed in the partner countries. Secondly, there are multiple factors that have an impact on people’s opinions and reactions towards migrants, one of which is the increased number of asylum seekers in the European

## Conclusions

Three critical points emerge from observations related to legal texts:

- 1) if the “European Union rejects theories which attempt to determine the existence of separate human races” as stated above, what does the EU legislator then understand by this concept of ‘race’ and why is this still being used?
- 2) Why do “race” and “ethnic origin” (“ethnic group”) go together? Have they the same meaning?
- 3) The same has to be pointed out for the connection between belief and religious practices.

Related to the texts of judgments a further critical point can be underlined: The discriminatory evidence is detected – if it is not a physical attack or an image – mainly through words, expressions, sentences, i.e. through linguistic expressions; in a Dutch case also to the person’s accent. Even to determine whether a physical attack is mere physical violence without racist intent, or whether the physical violence is motivated by racist intent, the judge needs to base his/her decision on words expressed by the offender. Non-verbal and paraverbal messages are not taken into consideration, except in one case in a Polish judgment where also non-verbal behaviours, such as gestures, may be considered as offensive on the ground of ethnic differences.

Union over the last few years. At the same time, in countries that are relatively mono-national, e.g. Poland, it is debated whether or not to accept a greater number of migrants into the country. Finally, most of the debates do not refer to any factual data; they are based on vague examples or educated guesses in the predominant number of cases.

As to the reasons for racism or discriminatory attitudes, in all of the collected material it is clearly visible that they are primarily conditioned by general lack of knowledge

 <sup>7</sup> RADAR Debates Analysis (Project Report) by Anna Szczepaniak-Kozak (see in: <http://lnx.radar.communicationproject.eu/web/htdocs/radar.communicationproject.eu/home/dokeos/main/document/document.php?curdirpath=%2FDEBATES&cidReq=RAD01>)

or awareness, limited experience with migration, e.g. in Poland and Greece. However, the sources can also be traced in some countries, e.g. Dutch and British reports, to the colonial past and heritage; whereas in Finland some public figures attribute anti-migration sentiments to the lack of regard for history. Hate speech can also be a substitute of a physical attack, e.g. in Finland some media justify the Finns' anti-migration sentiments because this is a nation that used to be frequently invaded.

Migration and its detrimental effect on the economic situation of the particular countries has been raised as an issue in all partner reports, especially in Finland, Greece and Poland.

At the same time, the migrant circles notice that for them access to work is far more difficult than to the native inhabitants of the receiving countries (the Netherlands, the United Kingdom and Poland. In addition, the British report on debates draws our attention to the existence of structural racism which is a system of inequality that benefits white people. Structural racism is more implicit, and thus more difficult to detect and prove, than what has traditionally been considered as racism, e.g. racial segregation or acts of racially motivated violence.

In a similar vein, almost all project partners highlight the danger of latent racism, i.e. a prejudiced stance which is not visible in words or actions, but one taking place when someone rejects stereotypes on a conscious level, but subconsciously has negative associations for certain groups. This type of racism might be the result of anti-racist policy, the so-called "political correctness" that prohibited the use of certain discriminatory language in the public sphere, e.g. the words: black, Negro, race. This is so because such a policy does not lead directly to the tolerance of minority groups but makes it more invisible, not clearly expressed. The British partner highlights that: Getting rid of all 'racial' references doesn't mean racism stops, it just means it is hidden even more. Another quote from the British report is very telling: "race-neutral" ideology is problematic because: It erases people of color's cultural experiences and the reality of their lives and the oppression they face. It doesn't actually help us to approach the problem in "race-neutral" ways because the problem isn't neutral. The problem is one of racial hierarchy that privileges the lightest-skinned among us.

Latent racism or discrimination can also take the form of tokenising, which stands for involving in a project or opinion pool for example a few black / 'people of colour' to tick a box or to satisfy certain criteria, without really taking

into account a diversity of voices (British report). The same applies to the employment procedures at certain companies.

A particularly worrying fact is that, for example in the Netherlands and the UK, law enforcement officials have been involved in violent acts against migrants and that in some cases the courts postponed the passing of the sentence. Additionally, in the Netherlands, the punishment of criminal acts by non-native Dutch people appears to be far stricter and acute than those involving native Dutch offenders, only based on their origin, appearance or skin colour. At the same time, racist hate crimes are significantly under-reported.

Finally, online hate crime is widespread and difficult to persecute. The issue of legal protection against hate speech in the virtual environment demands due attention in the nearest future.

Because of the expected migration influx many debates raise the issue of the alleged dangers related to the increased number of foreigners. Migration as a reason for the rise of criminality has been mentioned in reports from Greece, Finland and Italy. Fears of terrorism and deprivation of workplaces are also commonly expressed. Muslims, and Arabs generally, are often mentioned in this context and examples from the UK and France are very often provided as a "warning".

In the UK, Poland and Greece one of the hotly debated topics is the language used to refer to foreigners and migrants, i.e. which words/phrases are anti-racist. For example, in these countries voices are heard that the native speakers should decide whether certain traditional names are to be used or not. It is reasoned that this is a matter of free speech. That means: some local inhabitants represent the view that it is the "native speakers" that should decide whether certain linguistic forms are impolite/aggressive or not. In a similar vein, some debates raise the question of what is more important: polite behaviour or emotional expression? Additionally, the Dutch report concentrates on the issue of language use and the influence of traditional feasts celebrated in the public domain as critical in promulgating stereotypes. Whereas in Poland there are numerous proverbs in which a black person, is the symbol of the uneducated, backward and lazy.

The manipulative power of language is very often highlighted together with the fact that certain terms used to describe migration and minorities are no longer adequate to describe the situation in Europe. With the new influx of migrants from Syria, who are predominantly of white skin colour, the

black-white contrast is no longer useful for talking about the 'hosts' and the incoming 'guests'. Additionally, it is postulated in all the reports that public discussions should no longer be built around the skin colour. As the British report quotes: "Non-white' should be torched. It centres whiteness as a sun around which we are condemned to orbit, forever defined by a deficit." At the same time, the role of the media in developing/changing people's attitudes and new language use in the public space is highlighted in all the project partner reports.

It is also clearly visible from the country reports that a person's identity in the contemporary world is hardly ever built around simplified categories, including nation or place of origin. Rather in today's world people define themselves around multiple identities, which resonate with their places of residence, professional experience and

languages they speak. The term intersectionality, raised by the British partner, seems to aptly catch the essence of this phenomenon. Intersectionality stands for: a combination of many aspects of someone's identity, which is a more accurate way of looking at a person, e.g. black AND woman, Asian AND gay, black AND Muslim AND gay etc. The same issue is raised by the Italian partner but without giving it a label.

Finally, in some countries there are initiatives or practices which are worth mentioning, e.g. awareness raising campaigns or TV series presenting the pitfalls of migrants and promoting the inclusion of migrants in Greece and Poland, this way inviting people to respond against racism when it takes place in front of their eyes. In Finland 10,000 Finns have signed a petition condemning how Finnish politicians have handled the issue of refugees, and reminding the value of basic human rights and the need to help those in need.

## 1.3 INTERVIEWS WITH PEOPLE WHO HAVE EXPERIENCED RACISM<sup>8</sup>

Interviews with hate crime victims and people who have experienced racism and related discrimination were carried out in Finland, Greece, Italy, The Netherlands, Poland and the United Kingdom, with the purpose to: 1) establish patterns and common themes in racist attitudes, implicit or explicit, at an interpersonal or institutional level, across the 6 countries of the RADAR project; 2) explore the impact of offensive words, gestures, looks, attitudes etc. on the survivors and 3) form a basis for the design of project training material.

### 1. INTERPERSONAL DISCRIMINATION

Three main trends were identified across partner countries: Physical & verbal abuse, overt verbal abuse and other discriminatory treatment, such as comments and actions portraying stereotypes and bias based on appearance, ethnic background, religion or nationality.

### 2. INSTITUTIONAL DISCRIMINATION

In cases of institutional discrimination, discrimination at work was reported in Finland and the Netherlands, discrimination by the police was reported in Poland, Finland and Greece and discrimination in educational settings was reported in the UK, Italy and the Netherlands. UK respondents also mentioned differences between smaller

rural and larger urban areas, albeit with contrasting opinions. Discrimination was experienced by service providers and others who abused their positions of power, such as managers, teachers, employers, healthcare professionals and police officers.

### 3. OFFENSIVE WORDS AND ACTIONS

Similarities are found across countries in the offensive words used: "Muslim, Ebola, n\*\*ger, coon, chinky, negro, monkey, baboon, dirty, terrorist, go back to the jungle".

Comments conveying discriminatory attitudes & prejudice that are often found more offensive by survivors include:

- «Your kind», being regarded as an object
- «Go home»
- «You don't belong here»

Noises, gestures and faces include:

- Monkey noises
- Nazi salutes (Polish case)
- Twerking (and the assumption that Black people should do it)
- Staring
- Breach of politeness rules: rudeness, harshness, directedness.

## 4. PERCEPTIONS OF RACISM IN THE COUNTRIES STUDIED

### Finland

Interviewees in Finland stated that “it is a rather racist society, in particular against African people». Respondents highlighted a particular hate against Somalis, other Africans and all Muslim people, and that “Somali” is sometimes used as an encompassing derogatory term for all Black Africans. Racism in Finland, however, is usually hidden and passive. Foreigners are ignored, rejected or discriminated against, but this is never exhibited in public. The use of the Internet as a platform to express racist thoughts is also mentioned by some respondents.

### Greece

Respondents pointed out that racist attacks existed way before the crisis and the rise of Golden Dawn into mainstream politics. They state that only physical abuse has decreased, but that still racist attacks by the police continue.

### Italy

Respondents stated that racism exists in everyday life because of national, religious and ethnic diversity. It is expressed openly to the point of «to say south, Black or Islam is like to say poverty, disease or danger».

### The Netherlands

Most survivors interviewed indicate discriminatory acts against them being Muslim or because of their origin / ethnicity. They attribute this to the influence of negative attitudes portrayed in the media, particularly against Moroccans.

### Poland

In Poland, institutional racism is more widely reported amongst interviewees. Tensions between migrant groups are also highlighted (Belarusians/Ukrainians, Arabs/Black Africans). One respondent also stated that Poland is “a great and safe country” but that there is “hidden racism” in companies.

### UK

UK respondents state that racism is more prominent in smaller rural communities and that discrimination is targeted “against anyone who is not British”. London is a special case, because of differences between members of minority groups born in London and migrants. Scotland and other places are portrayed as much friendlier than London – to the point that “I had forgotten I was a foreigner”. Other respondents state that, while Edinburgh is multicultural and tolerant and they are very happy living there, there is

still “hidden racism” that only becomes apparent when you start talking to people and they subconsciously unfold their views and biases.

Finally, one respondent stressed the issue of class and described the UK as a multicultural and tolerant country when it comes to ‘races’ and ethnic groups. If a person of a different ethnic origin belongs to the same class as a British person, then there are no issues among them. The problem arises when someone belongs to a lower class and is then not seen as an equal.

## 5. SOME CONCLUSIONS

The reports by the 6 countries contain examples of class allocation and differentiation. In racist abuse, there is a tendency to relate ethnicity with social class: migrants are often placed in a lower class due to their origin, religion, national identity or political status. A different skin colour usually means different status in the racist mind.

Because of this, migrants’ / ethnic minorities’ competencies, qualifications, identity, knowledge and values can be considered inferior and lower class, to the point where they receive unfair treatment at work or they do not receive the same opportunities as white people belonging to the dominant social / national group. Most importantly, bullying and racist comments at school is still prevalent today, as demonstrated in the Dutch, Finnish and UK interviews.

The notion of space and size is also important, in that racism is reported to be more prevalent in smaller places. Relations between migrant groups can sometimes also be a source of tension as we have seen in the cases of Poland, the UK and Greece. The role of the media is mentioned as crucial by many respondents in portraying racist attitudes and stereotypes, e.g. in the UK «My gypsy wedding», «The Romanians are coming», «Things we don’t say about race that are true» and in Poland, where one respondent says that “Africa is shown to Europeans as a poor country while Europe shown to Africans as a paradise”.

As regards hate crime or racist abuse, incidents go largely unreported.

Interestingly, none of the interviewees answered with a definite no to the question on whether their (host?) country was a racist country. All interviewees presented caveats,

More information about the project can be found on its website:

<http://win.radar.communicationproject.eu/web/>