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Foreword

Since increasing numbers of refugees* have been seeking protection from war and persecution in the German-speaking nations, the social networks have exploded. All and sundry have opinions of their own, warnings, worries, abundant hate and even more fury. In many forms, users encounter explicitly racist and anti-refugee statements and comments, or are actively involved in these. For a long time now, right-wing extremists and neo-Nazi free comradeships have been agitating on social networks, purposefully setting out their position on issues such as protecting the German way of life, recruiting followers, and disseminating right-wing ideology and propaganda. In the context of the public debate concerning the refugee crisis, the strategy is now beginning to take effect: right-wing extremist language and images have within a relatively short time re-established themselves in the societal mainstream through social media, and have become the normality in daily conversations regarding refugees and migration. Young and less-well-informed people, in particular, can be influenced by hate speech against refugees in the social media. Often, it would appear that those disseminating hatred of refugees are in the majority. They are more vociferous, more dominant, and thus quite deliberately intimidate others as well. Social media facilitate mutual feedback and networking, which means they can also be utilized for disseminating racist hate speech and recruiting converts. In worst case, this may even lead to actual violence – not online, but offline. Clausnitz, Freital and other places bear eloquent witness to this. And it’s precisely because hate speech ineluctably translates into real violence against human beings that many users are simply overwhelmed by the vehemence of misanthropic hate speech directed against refugees. They want to oppose this right-wing vituperation, take appropriate action, refute it, but don’t know exactly how to go about it.

This brochure explores the options for confronting racist hate speech. How do I report racist posts? How can I file a criminal complaint? What do I have to bear in mind here? And what do I have to do when I find myself in the line of fire? The brochure is aimed at anyone interested and at the many committed refugee helpers, who want to confront racist hate speech online, who need to get to grips with the paramount question: what can we do? There are in fact many different options for opposing hatred: delete it, block it, ignore it, discuss it, refute it, complain to the authorities.

The brochure accordingly provides an overview of how racist hate speech can be recognized, reported and referred to the public prosecutors. It also covers self-protection and the publication of racist hate speech. The brochure has been created by the no-nazi-net team. The project is sincerely grateful to the Freudenberg Foundation for the financing provided.

*Note: the term “refugees” is a contentious one, and for a variety of reasons problematic. For reasons of accessibility, we have in this brochure nonetheless decided to use this term.
But first of all: how to actually recognize racist hate speech against refugees

In order to actively oppose racist hate speech, it is necessary to create an awareness for racist statements, so as to identify these as such. Basically, refugees are collectively disparaged in hate speech, invariably conjoined with social discrimination. Abuse of refugees, in most cases combined with racist (and quite often sexist or anti-semitic) prejudices, is a relatively obvious feature of hate speech. In most cases, emotional hatred is packaged as rational argumentation. Hate speech instrumentalizes incorrect information, such as “refugees exploit welfare systems”. Indirect hate speech often appears harmless at first glance, but ultimately legitimates racism and violence against refugees, e.g. “The right to asylum needs abolishing” (Article 16a of the German constitution guarantees asylum as a basic right: “Victims of political persecution shall have the right to asylum.”)

Frequent forms of racist hate speech against refugees are:

- Contrasting “us” and “them”
- Generalizations (“all refugees …”) and blanket attributions (e.g. refugee = Muslim)
- Normalization of discriminatory attitudes: “It’s no wonder that …”
- Projecting onto “refugees” problems involving all of society like sexism, criminality or housing shortage
- Pejorative designations like “economic migrant” suggest that the fundamental right to asylum here is being exploited by people who are coming to Germany solely for financial reasons, not because they are seeking refuge from persecution.
- Dehumanization: equating refugees with insects, parasites, animals, etc.
- Lies about refugees and alleged criminality, violence, rapes, forged official papers – often disguised as an alleged personal experience.
- Cultural racism (“They simply don’t fit in here”)
- (Nationalistic) relativizations: what about “our” children / homeless, etc.?
- Soon we’ll feel like strangers in our own country / “our way of life is doomed”
- The establishment / the mendacious press – never tell us the truth anyway
- Anyone who helps refugees is a do-gooder, or quite probably a left-wing extremist.
- So am I to be labeled a Nazi just because I …/ where is my own freedom of speech if you delete my comments?

Often, racist hate speech is also disguised as satire or humor, or subsequently the excuse is proffered that it was only meant as a joke. What’s more, racism is directed not only against refugees, but also against non-white Germans, who are equally affected by hate speech and assaults.
Hatred of refugees in social networks

- can currently be found in all comment columns and fields, but particularly on all sites that address the refugee issue, or in media covering the refugee crisis.

- It is being strategically fomented by right-wing extremists and right-wing populists, but is also being vigorously disseminated by everyday racists.

- According to our qualitative observations, the people involved are from all age-groups and educational qualifications, of both genders, even with a migrant background – with a slight preponderance of elderly white men.

- This fits in with attitudinal research, which for years has been showing that around 25 percent of people in Germany espouse right-wing populist attitudes, while 44 percent agree with the disparagement of refugees.

A. Reporting, and filing a criminal complaint

A1. Reporting

The guidelines of many social networks lay down that users must not release or publish any materials that incite hatred towards groups by reason of their ethnic origins, nationality, religion, disabilities, age, gender or their sexual orientation. This also includes racist hate speech against refugees, which can be reported. A report will usually be processed within two days, and frequently within a few hours.

Reports are always treated as confidential. The person being reported will never find out who reported him/her.

The reporting function on Facebook will differ, depending on what kind of content you wish to report. The basic principle involved, however, is that next to the list of contents you will find an “Option” button, under which the reporting function is located.

Information:
https://www.facebook.com/help

Experience has shown that it is more successful to directly report the specific contents concerned, rather than the entire profile or pages.

You can check the status of your report in the support mailbox, where you also have an option for rating the handling of your report. If deletion of the content concerned is rejected, you can give a negative rating to the way your report has been handled, and then write your feedback. For example, you can describe the facts of the case once again in more detail, and thus trigger a renewed investigation of the case.
Please note: all networks provide an option for reporting a post. In most cases, the buttons for reporting will be located in the post concerned itself. Sometimes, one or two more clicks have to be performed. Since the reporting procedure on the platforms changes regularly, only the basic principles involved are covered here. You will find the current, detailed status on our website: http://www.amadeu-antonio-stiftung.de/onlinehetze/

A2. Filing a criminal complaint

The basic principle involved here is this: what is a criminal offense offline is also a criminal offense online, and can be the subject of a criminal complaint. It must be remembered in this context that a criminal prosecution is often a slow process, which is ill-matched to the dynamic nature of the internet, and does not offer immediate assistance. In Germany, freedom of speech enjoys particular protection under Article 5 of the country’s constitution. This also means that opinions which you do not share and definitively reject have to be tolerated from a legal standpoint. So filing a criminal complaint is a viable option only when the post concerned is an offense under criminal law. But even if you’re not quite sure: it’s better to file one complaint too many than one too few.

Sedition (§ 130 of the German Criminal Code)
Anyone who incites people to hatred of refugees or other sections of the populace, who calls for violent measures against them or maliciously disparages them may be committing sedition, which is a criminal offense. Not every ostracizing insult or discrimination, such as “Refugees not wanted”, is a criminal offense. A relatively clear case of sedition will presumptively be involved if National Socialist violence is trivialized or approved.

Symbols of unconstitutional organizations (§ 86a of the German Criminal Code)
Nor is it permissible to use symbols of unconstitutional organizations. These include not only the swastika and various runes, plus greetings like “Heil Hitler” and “Sieg Heil”, but also the lyrics and tune of the Horst Wessel Song.

Rewarding and endorsing criminal acts (§ 140 of the German Criminal Code)
It is also an offense under criminal law to endorse criminal acts, insofar as this is done publicly, in an assembly, or by disseminating documents – this also subsumes internet comments. The relevant criminal offenses include: murder and manslaughter, arson, but also the formation of terrorist organizations. For example, anyone publicly supporting the violence of neo-Nazi underground movements or endorsing arson attacks on refugee accommodation may be committing a criminal offense.

Incitement to criminal offenses (§ 111 of the German Criminal Code)
Public incitement to commit criminal offenses is in itself a criminal offense. Here, the incitement concerned has to be sufficiently specific. Provocations and expressions of displeasure, such as simply advocating criminal offenses, do not suffice.
Defamation (§185 ff of the German Criminal Code)

Often, the hate-filled tirades of the internet comments are also studded with insults and libels. A defamatory comment will be investigated by the police only if the party defamed so requests. But you can also use the services of an attorney to fight back under civil law.

“Slandering the memory of the deceased” (§189 of the German Criminal Code)

This paragraph presupposes a particularly serious and coarse disparagement. The slander can also be posted under a collective designation, e.g. when derisively gloating comments are posted about refugees who have drowned or suffocated.

How do I file a criminal complaint?

The notification of a criminal offense can be submitted orally or in writing to the public prosecutors’ office or the police. There is also an option for filing your complaint online. Many countries have set up what are called “internet precincts”:

https://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/internetwache

Formulating a criminal complaint

A criminal complaint can be filed without any special requirements as to form. The important thing is to describe what you are complaining about and to include all salient data. The following formulation, however, may prove helpful:

Dear Sir or Madam,

I hereby file a criminal complaint against

- the user of the Facebook internet platform who operates under the name of XYZ
- unknown
- Mr/Ms XYZ [+ link to profile XYZ]

and notify you of the following circumstances:

On xxxxxxx at xx.xx h, Mr/Ms ...... on the Facebook internet platform posted a contribution with the following content: “Rhubarb rhubarb rhubarb ...”.

- See the relevant screenshot.
- I request that the appropriate investigations be initiated and that I be informed of the result.

In addition, I am lodging a criminal complaint regarding all relevant offenses. (Please note: criminal offenses like defamation are investigated only if the defamed party so requests. If no request is on file, the offense concerned will not be investigated. Lodging a criminal complaint is necessary only if you are personally affected).

Yours sincerely,

XYZ

On the net: secure the evidence

The internet can be very volatile. Comments and tweets are sometimes deleted as quickly as they’re written, or the page is simply nowhere to be found. Also, the law enforcement authorities will not see it as within their remit to investigate something they regard as a vague piece of evidence. For this reason, always make screenshots with a time-stamp. The screenshot should also show the URL involved.
B. Counter-speech: confronting hate speech and getting organized

Counter-speech can be an option for actively engaging with the dissemination of anti-refugee and racist prejudices and hate speech in social networks, and for supporting people in their endeavors to get involved in the online debate from a human-rights-based standpoint. Counter-speech is above all important because it constitutes a visible and public objection to racism and hate speech, which creates a counterweight to the perceived dominance of hate speech in discussions, thus exerting a beneficial effect on the course of the conversation. This is because counter-speech is based upon the assumption that an online debate involves not only the discriminators and their victims, but also those who silently read the posts and will make a contribution if they are invited or motivated to do so.

B1. Argumentation strategies

Questioning

Simply asking questions may be helpful, and sometimes brings about a swift solution. Questions as to interpretation, about examples and facts, and about intentions will sometimes swiftly reveal misunderstandings and give the users concerned an opportunity to check the post themselves and reflect upon it. Often, the alleged knowledge is merely copy & paste, without the source involved having really been read. Asking questions may quite easily inspire counter-argumentation. If after such questioning major issues and discriminatory statements still recur, it is particularly important to consider whether the discriminatory or prejudiced stance is possibly being used to
occupy the virtual territory concerned and to create the illusion that the racist mindset is the universally valid one.

**Naming and shaming**

It is important to name discrimination and dehumanizing statements on the net as such, primarily so as not to allow them to be left as something presumptively “normal”, and mistakenly permit them to appear legitimate. Identify a racist post for what it is: “Do you realize that that was racist?” or rather more confrontationally “That is racist, don’t bother me with it”. It’s helpful in this context to cite the community standards involved.

**Fight back with counter-arguments**

Encouraging free and frank discussions is more illuminating than mere stigmatization. Try to remain calm and objective in the discussion, and do not be provoked into insulting formulations. What is the thesis that your interlocutor is propounding without its emotional trappings? Demand hard facts instead of sweeping generalizations and emotive language. Point out omissions and errors in the argumentation involved, and check the sources used. Right-wing extremist and other dubious sources should be named.

**Recognizing right-wing extremists in discussions on the net**

Right-wing extremist movements and protagonists have this in common: they believe in an ideology of inequality, and also disseminate this proactively in the social networks. For them, social networks are a place for dissemination, propaganda, and also recruitment from the socio-political center, which they achieve by projecting an image of “concerned citizenry”. Right-wing extremists collect potential followers in the context of emotionalized issues, e.g. in order to mobilize opposition to a home for refugees in the neighborhood. Very often, the strategically organized right-wing extremist authorship of such sites and discussions is obfuscated. For highly strategic reasons, right-wing extremists like to assume the trappings of middle-class respectability. A special role is played here by right-wing extremist female users, who talk about issues like bringing up children, family and concepts of sexuality, and thus lure other women into right-wing and extremist structures. This is why it is important to discern whether organized Nazis are behind a discussion on the internet. Often this is easier to recognize than you would initially expect. The people involved in the discussion: whom else are they liking?

**Facts against the rumor mill**

For six months now, the voluntary web project Hoaxmap.org has been collecting rumors of alleged criminal acts committed by refugees. Since it began, there have been 345 (status 1 April 2016) reports on the internet of putative criminal offenses, each of which is specifically refuted with facts and a link to reputable sources. Using a map of Germany, the hoaxes have been assigned to their geographical locations. These rumors are principally disseminated via the social networks like Twitter, Tumblr and Facebook. The map mainly documents alleged sexual offenses, invented thefts and unsubstantiated reports of cruelty to animals. In particular, profiles of protagonists from the right-wing extremist and right-wing populist scenes purposefully disseminate these hoaxes in order to foment hatred of all asylum-seekers and refugees.
Hatred of refugees – “No to Homes” websites

# Currently 300 “No to Homes” sites with (alleged) local links on Facebook alone
# Attempt to pass themselves off as “concerned citizens”
# Often controlled by right-wing extremists
# Places of cheap polemics, misinformation, lies, but also of threats to refugees and their helpers
# There are also calls to take action; several violent protests against the arrival of refugees were organized in these groups (e.g. Heidenau, Freital)
# Latest development: vigilante groups

Important note: right-wing extremists are usually reluctant to enter into discussions – they want to ensure their own opinions prevail. The aim of debating with them is to convince (silent) third parties of the opposite. Should you nonetheless seek to confront organized Nazis, use caution. Organized right-wing extremists mostly mean their threats very seriously. It is accordingly imperative to protect your own data, and to network and get organized with other people.

Who strategically foments hatred of refugees in social networks?

# First NPD campaign as from 2012
# First anti-refugee “No to Homes” groups as from 2013
# Then discovered as a campaign issue with chances of connecting with the “social majority”
# Hatred of refugees is disseminated by
  ● right-wing extremist parties (Der III. Weg, Die Rechte / “The Third Way”, “The Right”)
  ● right-wing populist parties and media (“Junge Freiheit” / “Young Freedom”)
  ● right-wing extremist FB pages (e.g. Identitäre Bewegung (“Identitary Movement”), “Mädelbund Henriette Reker” (“Henriette Reker Girls’ Union”), Zuerst-Magazin (FIRST! Magazine))
  ● Pegida and all its offshoots; plus FB pages of individual protagonists: Lutz Bachmann, Tatjana Festerling, Akif Pirincci
  ● “No to Homes” groups with local links (currently: 300)
  ● extreme right-wing “media” like PI-News (“Politically Incorrect”), the publishers Kopp-Verlag, Compact Magazine
  ● new-right “media” like “Eigentümlich frei” (“Distinctively free”), “Sezession im Netz” (“Secession on the Net”), “Blaue Narzisse” (“Blue Narcissus”)
  ● extremist right-wing Facebook pages like Anonymous-Kollektiv, ostensible “patriot” pages, conspiracy-theory pages
If you encounter topic-hopping (many different topics are being addressed all at once) by your interlocutor, you should guide the participants in the conversation onto a single issue, and also communicate this (“You’ve addressed many issues now, but I’d like to discuss just this particular one with you here, e.g. the racist aspect”). It may also prove helpful in regard to debates concerning migration to remain substantively focused on the topics of human rights and equality, instead of beginning utilitarian discourses about “good” and “bad” migrants. Other attempts at distraction aimed at disrupting the discussion should be addressed and exposed. Demand rules of discussion, since anyone wishing for a serious debate will accede to this.

Counter-speech can also subsume arguing by citing positive examples of social values like tolerance, diversity, freedom, democracy instead of racism, hate, and violence, and possibly explaining how democracy and politics function. Affirm the values you sign up to, and map out how the world can be made a better place.

**B2. Deploy facts against prejudices – debunking**

One mode of counter-speech is offered by what is called “debunking”. This is a method for exposing and refuting incorrect information or lies in prejudices, myths and convictions by means of facts. Debunking is addressed not only to persons who espouse and disseminate incorrect information, but also to anyone reading who do not yet have a fixed perspective on the issues involved.

Debunking focuses on facts, and therefore requires a certain amount of preparation in order to achieve its full effect. For this purpose, it may prove helpful to network with academic communities, to study reliable academic sources, or to gather information at debunking sites. The aim here is less to provide people with even more information than to expose incorrect information and interpretations, rumors and myths as such, and to replace them by objectively substantiated facts. Useful facts and arguments in the context of refugees can be found, for example, in a brochure entitled “pro menschenrechte. contra vorurteile”, which can be downloaded free of charge as a PDF file: [http://www.amadeu-antonio-stiftung.de/hetze](http://www.amadeu-antonio-stiftung.de/hetze)

Quite generally, it must be noted that debunking is not a method that is able to magically make all dehumanizing incorrect information disappear. If an impasse has been reached, it
may be better to break off the conversation. Debunking can, however, prove successful if it is aimed at third parties who have not yet formed a coherent worldview. Sometimes objective arguments result in a readiness to engage in meaningful debate. It may prove helpful to request other democratic users to get involved, and to provide argumentational support for users already engaged in a debate.

For debunking, there are certain points that need to be borne in mind if this method is to be successfully deployed:

- **Provide the salient facts instead of repeating incorrect information**
- **Too much information, too many facts tend to overtax the people you are addressing.** That’s why for debunking you should concentrate on the most important facts, so that these will be remembered. You should also realize that repeating incorrect information to people may cause them to remember it more clearly than the corrective facts. For this reason, it is best to avoid as far as possible mentioning the incorrect information in your refutation. In the case of texts, the corrective information should be provided in the heading and in the first paragraph.
- **If you intend to address incorrect information, this should be preceded by a warning that the information involved is not correct.**
- **It has to be clearly discernible that the conspiracy-theory-based statements quoted for purposes of debunking them constitute a false perception of the world.** Without an unambiguous warning, there is a risk that only the familiar, easily comprehensible incorrect information will be remembered.
- **Debunking should not only refute racist and anti-refugee prejudices, myths and convictions, but also offer an alternative explanation, plus a counter-narrative for the events concerned.**

Incorrect information serves not only for underpinning anti-refugee stances. It also reinforces corresponding dehumanizing prejudices and worldviews. To prevent these narratives from being the only ones to circulate in society, they need to be opposed by alternative narratives. For democratic societies, it is important that opposition be expressed in visible form.

**Avoid pitfalls**

As the above three comments on debunking already indicate, if inappropriately deployed, debunking may also achieve the opposite of what was originally planned. The problem is exacerbated by the existence of closed worldviews. People whose worldview is crucially determined by dehumanizing ideologies may be reinforced in their convictions by attempts at debunking. The refutations of their incorrect convictions do not simply invalidate the incorrect information, they also threaten their self-image. In order to render these people receptive to debunking, the obvious course is to provide the debunking post with a framework that makes it appear less threatening to the entire dehumanizing worldview of the person being addressed. In this way, the facts contained in your debunking post have a better chance of not being rejected wholesale, and of persuading the person concerned to do some long-term thinking about his/her positions.
C. Self-protection and empowerment

C1. Self-protection

Engaging with anti-refugee hate speech and discriminatory statements in the social media can very quickly become stressful – particularly if you are exposed to personal insults and attacks. So taking care of yourself and ensuring appropriate self-protection should not be neglected.

1. Block, block, block
In the social media, there is an option for blocking particular users. Freedom of speech does not mean that you have to listen to racist utterances and attacks. Don’t let anyone tell you that blocking is not ok.

All platforms provide you with an option for blocking. To do this, you have to go to the profile page of the person you want to block and then to the settings there. In most cases, the platforms will also provide a list of the accounts you have blocked.

There is likewise an option for muting accounts or forcing them to unfollow you by blocking the people concerned and unblocking them again.

2. Protect yourself
Showing moral courage is not entirely risk-free, even online. Right-wing extremists keep lists, in some cases in the public domain, and recurrent threats are a real possibility. So it’s important in cases of doubt to remain anonymous and not to make public any private data, and most certainly not your address.

3. Don’t take insults too personally
Very many attacks have nothing at all to do with you as a person. Instead, what’s involved is a projection. In arguments on social networks, particularly, insults and hate speech are more quickly typed than spoken in the usual way. This does not, of course, change anything about the dehumanizing statements involved, but perhaps it will help to put them more in perspective.

4. Take care of yourself
Engagement in opposing right-wing hate speech is important, but also uses up a lot of energy. So it’s very important to take due care of your own health and in cases of doubt to consider refraining from engaging in a debate. Moral courage is important, but it helps nobody at all if moral courage means your own health suffers.

5. Not too many justifications
When you post statements in the social networks opposing Nazis or in favor of refugees, it is very probable that you will be attacked. Do not allow yourself to be cornered, or start to justify your statements. You do not have to apologize for refuting racist hate speech.

In exchanges with incurably bigoted right-wingers particularly, it is often better to break off a discussion. If it becomes too much for you, just withdraw, and perhaps refrain from using social networks for a bit. Meeting up with friends, reading a book or going to the cinema will help you to take your mind off hate speech and rediscover the realization that the world is not an entirely evil place.

6. Seek professional help
There are moments when professional help is necessary. Whether it’s psychological therapy or also contact facilities that offer counseling and assistance when right-wing violence is involved. This is particularly true when people from your direct social environment are af-
fected. Important: there are counseling services that will help you when family and friends drift into the right-wing extremist milieu. Like the “Mobile Beratung gegen Rechts” (Mobile Counseling against Right-Wing Extremism).

7. Try to support victims in discussions
Provide them with argumentation support and let them know that they are not alone. Solidarity is an important instrument!

8. Publish the most outrageous things
Putting something in the public domain signifies in this case protection and solidarity, while privacy may even mean that you are left alone with the fallout. Feel free to publish it anonymously or also under your own name. At any rate, please remember: anonymity is not necessarily an indicator for hatred. The most intemperate statements often come from people who sign their full names underneath.

9. Seek allies
Encourage other users as well to take up a stance against hate speech, and join forces with them. Lots of things are much simpler when tackled together. When users are infuriating you with racist hate speech against refugees, it helps when several participants in the forum take up an opposing stance – simply request this if it is not happening!

10. Networking
Networks of like-minded people that exchange news and views and can be appropriately mobilized are very important, not least online. Events, publications and campaigns can be referenced, for example. Together, a major campaign can be launched on the internet: such as a hashtag campaign or a witty Facebook page, so as to overshadow right-wing hate speech with humor.

C2. Empowerment
Opposing right-wing hate speech in the social media is very important, but there is one point you should never lose sight of: to see and disseminate the stories and viewpoints of the refugees themselves. Refugees have a voice of their own; hearing and amplifying it can help to proactively counter right-wing hate speech. There are many projects ongoing for this purpose. Here is a small list with no claim to completeness:

- http://www.fluchtnachvorn.org/
- https://www.facebook.com/sharehausrefugio/
- http://www.the caravan.org/
- http://www.refugeesemancipation.com/
- https://twitter.com/REmancipation
- http://www.refugeeradionet work.net/projekt.html und https://www.facebook.com/refugeeradionetwork/?fref=ts (Radio made by refugees for refugees, nationwide, several broadcasting locations)
- https://arriving-in-berlin.de/ (Map made by refugees, Berlin)
- https://asyl-in.de/ (In order to provide the refugees with an opportunity to tell and to safely communicate their own stories, the project provides a diverse infrastructure that is subsequently described. The input from the project is here restricted solely to structural measures. All contents are taken from the multifaceted stories of the refugees themselves.)

Overview of the projects from the Refugee Hackathon
Literature:


The Amadeu Antonio Foundation campaigns for a democratic civil society, one that resolutely opposes right-wing extremism, racism and other forms of group-focused antagonism. For this purpose, the foundation sponsors and supports initiatives throughout Germany, which are involved in youth work and schools, in victim protection and victim support, in municipal networks and many other areas. The more than 1,000 projects already supported include:

- the glossary of the New German Media-Makers on discriminatory language,
- the “Recognize, don’t Ostracize” educational weeks in Halle on asylum policies, right-wing extremism, sexual identity and inclusion,
- and the “Asylum-Seeker in Wonderland” theater tour of the Mecklenburg-Western Pomerania Refugee Council.

The foundation is named after Amadeu Antonio, who in 1990 was beaten to death by right-wing extremist youths in Eberswalde, Brandenburg, because his skin was black. He was one of the first of what today are almost 200 fatalities caused by right-wing extremist violence since the fall of the Berlin Wall.

The Amadeu Antonio Foundation is supported not least by the Freudenberg Foundation, and works closely together with it. It is a member of the Association of German Foundations, and has signed up to the voluntary commitment defined in the Transparent Civil Society Initiative.

Contact
Amadeu Antonio Stiftung
Novalisstraße 12
10115 Berlin
Telephone: 030. 240 886 10
Fax: 030. 240 886 22

- info@amadeu-antonio-stiftung.de
- amadeu-antonio-stiftung.de
- facebook/AmadeuAntonioStiftung
- twitter.com/AmadeuAntonio

Donation account
GLS Gemeinschaftsbank eG
IBAN: DE32 4306 0967 6005 0000 00
SWIFT-BIC: GENODEM1GLS

Please state an address with the remittance, so we can send you a donation receipt.
Racist hate speech against refugees is a daily occurrence in the social networks. This hate speech needs to be opposed. Only how?
This brochure provides an overview of what can specifically be done if once again racist hate speech is encountered on the internet.