Welcome to this Community Forum co-sponsored by FVRL / Circle of Peace

SPEAKER NOTES: Kelly Lamm introduces forum and format

6:00-6:05: Welcome, introductions, our purpose, agenda
6:05-7:00: “Hate Speech: How We Can Respond” (55 min.)
7:00-7:40: Small Group Discussion (40 min.)
7:40-8:00: Q&A / What have we learned? / Wrapping up / What’s next? (20 min.)
MICHAEL
Welcome to the third session of our three-part series on Hate Speech. All of us from Circle of Peace and the FVRL would like to thank you for coming out tonight. Our aim in this series has been to foster dialogue and learning together about a topic that many observers of our democracy have described as deeply disturbing and the latest test of our fundamental rights of expression guaranteed by the First Amendment of the U.S. Constitution.
Who Are We?

Michael Andersen
Angela Vahsholtz-Andersen

Circle of Peace is:
- a non-sectarian, nonprofit, grassroots, worldwide initiative of individuals representing a diversity of beliefs
- a unifying platform for people of faiths and non-faiths, who aspire to a more peaceful world
- brings together people across religious, ethnic, and cultural divides to strengthen the common bond of humanity

My name is…

Michael Andersen: Third-generation native of Vancouver; former high school philosophy and language arts teacher in the Vancouver School District for 21 years; currently studying Sustainability Ethics and volunteering as a coach of the Ethics Bowl team at VSAA.

Angela Vahsholtz-Andersen: Native of Vancouver; family has been here for roughly 100 years. Have worked as a high school English teacher, and currently serve as a teacher-librarian at VSAA.

[ANGELA CONTINUES…] Circle of Peace is… [READ SLIDE BULLETS]

...PLEASE NOTE: We are not presenting tonight as experts on this topic nor as trained specialists for counseling victims of hate speech. Rather, our experience is as educators and researchers who have spent considerable time investigating this topic over the last eight months. As educators and citizens, we are deeply committed to presenting this information in a manner that is as unbiased as possible. Our hope is to leave you with some helpful insights and resources to guide your own learning after this evening.
Our agenda tonight

6:00-6:05: Welcome, introductions, our purpose, agenda
6:05-7:00: “Hate Speech: How We Can Respond” (55 min.)
7:00-7:40: Small Group Discussion (40 min.)
7:40-8:00: Q&A / What have we learned? / Wrapping up / What’s next? (20 min.)

ANGELA
As we mentioned earlier in this series, this is a very complex topic--which is why we have worked the FVRL to break it up into three parts. Tonight, we will start with a brief recap of the past two sessions, then address the heart of tonight’s topic, which is to dig deeper into how we can respond to so-called “hate speech” with strategies both for the long term and for in-the-moment circumstances. We will follow the timeline you see written on this slide, leaving time for us all to gather in small groups and share our own experiences so we can learn from each other, as well as to have a brief Q&A session at the end.

NOTE THAT we have provided you with some note cards to write down your questions. Since we have limited time to give you these basic details, we ask that you jot down your questions and we will try to answer them as best we can during the discussion period starting at about 7:00 or during the wrap up section at 7:40.
MICHAEL
In 1995, a group of everyday citizens in Billings, Montana, following an incident in which a Native American family’s home was defaced with racist graffiti, organized their concern under the name *Not In Our Town*. Later incidents that year in Billings included the hostile disruption of church services at a local black church by skinheads, the toppling of Jewish gravestones at the local cemetery, and a brick thrown through the window of child’s bedroom in which a menorah had been displayed.

If you attended our first session on Oct. 21st, you will have learned that these incidents are not protected by the First Amendment of the U.S. Constitution—and in a few minutes, we will briefly recap the line that separates constitutionally-protected hate speech from punishable crimes. **One of the key takeaways from our research for this series was that hate crimes, like vandalism, arson, malicious harassment, and incitement of violence against vulnerable or marginalized groups, are usually preceded and enabled by so-called “hate speech.”** So, understanding how we might effectively respond to hate speech incidents when they occur here in our area is in our collective interest.
MICHAEL
The first 4 minutes of the PBS film that documented the community’s struggle together to combat hateful messages in Billings captures some the spirit of why we decided to convene this discussion.  [ PLAY UNTIL 4:29, then STOP ]
Our Main Purpose Tonight

A. To present a brief overview of effective strategies for overcoming impulsive judgments that eliminate the possibility for real communication

B. To share some ways to respond to hate speech incidents in public, as well as ways to effectively support targets of hate speech.

ANGELA
Tonight, our presentation will address the two main points expressed in the library’s advertising material: READ SLIDE
ANGELA
And--to echo a reminder from our first session--our presentation tonight and the discussion following are NOT intended as:
...a defense of any group's political agenda  [CLICK image #1 & #2]
...an excuse to grandstand by us or an invitation to do so  [CLICK image #3 & #4]
...expert psychological counsel on conflict resolution or emotional support of hate speech targets
...an exhaustive survey of “hate speech” response strategies  [CLICK image #5 & #6]
ANGELA
Since several weeks have passed since we last met, we’d like to recap the main ideas from the first two sessions. This will remind us of the context in which we’re working. It’s important to know that this audience--like the people of Billings, Montana--is full of people who care deeply about Vancouver and who desire to foster a strong sense of community and inclusiveness here. At minimum, we assume that you are here because you want to learn about some effective responses to “hate speech” incidents when they occur.

...So, as briefly as possible, here is what we have covered so far:
Recap of Session 1: “A User’s Guide to the First Amendment”

ANGELA
For session 1, we examined the key parameters set by U.S. Supreme Court rulings considering hate speech regulation; we learned the two principles that are used to interpret the First Amendment’s right of free expression; we examined a couple of Supreme Court cases that illustrate the principles; and we learned about a counter-perspective to the status quo view that the Supreme Court’s rulings to date are sufficient for limiting expression deemed as “hate speech.”
ANGELA:
Although we cited a lot of divergent sources about this debate, we relied significantly on Nadine Strossen’s 2018 book *Hate: why we should resist it with free speech, not censorship*. This text—which we encourage you to read—gives a thorough overview of the generally accepted, current understanding of how the Supreme Court interprets the First Amendment parameters for regulating “hate speech”.
What is “Constitutionally Protected ‘Hate Speech’”?

“...Although the Supreme Court has never recognized a special category of ‘hate speech’ that is excluded from FA protection based on its message alone, government may restrict some speech with a hateful, discriminatory message...if, in context, it directly causes specific imminent serious harm...” (i.e., the Emergency Test).

--p. xxi, Hate: why we should resist it with free speech, not censorship, by Nadine Strossen

MICHAEL
We learned that, unlike other developed democratic countries, the U.S. currently does not have laws specifically recognizing “hate speech” as a prohibited category of expression. We also learned about a crucial distinction for us to make when considering any proposed regulation of so-called “hate speech”--i.e., between “hate speech” that is presently protected by the First Amendment, separate from “hate speech” that is not constitutionally protected.

[READ SLIDE] “... if, in context, it directly causes specific imminent serious harm...” (i.e., the Emergency Test) --which we will recap in a minute.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SPEECH “Hate Speech” Protected by the FA</th>
<th>SPEECH “Hate Speech” NOT Protected by the FA</th>
<th>CRIMINAL ACTIONS NOT Protected by the FA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>● Cross burning in general</td>
<td>● Cross burning on a particular family’s lawn</td>
<td>● Bribery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Peaceful NSPA march through Skokie, Illinois</td>
<td>● Targeted harassing phone calls</td>
<td>● Fraud</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Offensive political rhetoric</td>
<td>● Nooses in the break room</td>
<td>● Libel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● Perjury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● True Threats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● Vandalism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● Inciting a Riot</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Michael**

We shared some examples of how the spectrum of language and action works to illustrate this distinction. [Reads slide]

NOTE that when words cause specific harm to a specific person, they are NOT protected by the First Amendment. HOWEVER, when the expression is offensive but unfocused on a specific target, or is clearly political speech, then the Supreme Court has ruled that the FA protects such expression.
Two Crucial Tests for Regulating “Hate Speech”

1. Does the incident of perceived “hate speech” constitute an “emergency?”

2. In choosing to regulate speech, any government entity must not punish “hate speech” (or speech conveying any particular point of view) merely because some of us—even the vast majority of us—consider its views or ideas objectionable or even abhorrent. This is called the “viewpoint neutrality test.”

(Strossen, p. 3-4)

MICHAEL
We learned about the two constitutional tests for regulations that aim to limit expression identified as “hate speech”, which are...

[READ SLIDE]
Principle 1: The Emergency Test

The Emergency Test

MICHAEL

So, to refresh your memory about Principle 1: The Emergency Test… [TRANSITION]
“Under this test, the government may punish speech about public issues only when, in context, it poses an emergency:
...only when it **directly, demonstrably, and imminently causes a certain specific, objectively ascertainable serious harm** that cannot be averted by non-censorial measures, the most important of which are counter speech and law enforcement.”

(Strossen, p. xx)

MICHAEL

[READS SLIDE]

Recall that this definition entails that IF an individual's specific words directly lead to specific harmful actions (as limited by the words of this test), THEN the person's speech can be curtailed in some way, or face other legal consequences. Currently, expression using “hateful" words in and of themselves is protected by the First Amendment.
To refresh your memory about Principle #2: The Viewpoint Neutrality Test…

[TRANSITION]
“Sometimes referred to as ‘content neutrality,’ this principle bars government [entities] from regulating speech solely because the speech’s message, idea, or viewpoint is disfavored, or feared to be dangerous, by government officials or community members.”

(Strossen, p. xxiv)

ANGELA:

[FIRST READ THE SLIDE QUOTE]

As the Court has explained in its rulings, any such ‘viewpoint-based’ or ‘viewpoint-discriminatory’ regulation would subvert not only individual liberty, but also our democratic self-government, because of the danger that officials would enforce it to ‘suppress unpopular ideas or information or manipulate public debate.’
“Once the government is authorized to suppress speech because of a feared harmful tendency or because of a disturbing viewpoint, the government has largely unfettered censorial power.”

(Strossen, p. 13)

ANGELA
When thinking about what to expect from government agencies in responding to “hate speech,” it is important to remember that the Viewpoint Neutrality Test safeguards Americans’ free speech rights from government regulation based on the content of the speech.

Or, as Nadine Strossen puts it… [READ SLIDE]

In other words, if the government is given the power to decide to shut down speech because an idea seems harmful or distressing to some people, then ANY idea could be shut down.
Andrew Marantz is a staff writer at The New Yorker, where he has worked since 2011. His work has also appeared in Harper’s, New York, Mother Jones, the New York Times, and many other publications. A contributor to Radiolab and The New Yorker Radio Hour, he has spoken at TED and has been interviewed on CNN, MSNBC, NPR, and many other outlets.

ANGELA:
To understand how the debate is playing out, we also learned in our first session about a counter view. A new body of scholarship, including writers like Andrew Marantz, are now challenging us to think more rigorously about those on the margins who typically end up being targets of hate speech, and how an overly-narrow focus on free speech rights devalues the rights of those who are systematic targets of “hate speech.”
“Free speech is a bedrock value in this country. But it isn’t the only one. Like all values, it must be held in tension with others, such as equality, safety and robust democratic participation.”

--Andrew Marantz, “Free Speech Is Killing Us” NY Times, Oct. 4, 2019
ANGELA:
We learned from Shannon Gilreath, Professor of Law at Wake Forest University, who argues that we should officially recognize in the law a narrower sub-class of “hate speech” called “Anti-Equality Speech.” Anti-Equality Speech reinforces systematic inequality for targeted groups and often precedes physical harm of those groups. It sows fear, and that can lead to silencing marginalized people in our country.
**Anti-Equality Speech**

Speech that aims to create inequality for targeted groups.

It often precedes physical harm and/or destruction of targeted groups, and it also contributes to the silencing of those groups.

--Shannon Gilreath

**ANGELA:**
A lax and uncritical tolerance of Anti-Equality Speech, Gilreath argues, contributes to maintaining a de facto two-tier society, because it can help to prevent its targets from participating fully in the workplace or in public life.

For example, when an influential or dominant set of people are bombarded with the false claim that homosexuality causes gay men to rape children, they might be less apt to hire a qualified gay man for a teaching position. The issue here, according to scholars like Gilreath, is that targets of Anti-Equality Speech need protection under the law so they are not penalized for someone else’s demonstrably false beliefs about them.
MICHAEL:
Following our small group discussions about some of these questions, we reconvened here the next Monday to learn about who usually benefits from the climate of “hate speech” as it currently plays out in America.
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MICHAEL:
Our speaker on Monday, Oct. 28th, was Circle of Peace member Shirin Elkoshairi, who works in IT here locally and, as you can see, has been an active member in our community.
MICHAEL:
Shirin’s talk focused on the way that previously marginalized hate groups who fostered hate speech language through “old school” methods are (currently) mainstreaming their message via new technology platforms like YouTube, Facebook, Instagram, Twitter and other social media.

As a result, susceptible people are more easily absorbed into these movements and radicalized. So, if we are to respond effectively to hate speech, we must develop a media literacy which demonstrates awareness of the impact this new technology.

[READ SLIDE]
A Quick Note About Those Who Get Pulled into Hate

- The disadvantaged are susceptible
- Channel their anger to the wrong place
- Many that hate are “saving the country”
- Hiding the truth through scapegoating

MICHAEL:
Shirin pointed out that the followers in these hate groups are usually motivated by grievances that, in and of themselves, might deserve our sympathy—or at least better understanding. Some of the followers truly believe there is a real threat coming, and it nurtures their animosity and rage.

If we're to place blame on anyone, it's the leaders who start these movements and harness this animosity from their followers to target scapegoats.
Who Benefits From Hate Speech?

- Irresponsible Politicians, Dictators, Political Parties
- Religious Leaders
- Racists / Bigots
- Terrorists
- These lead to movements

MICHAEL:
Shirin clarified how all kinds of people benefit from hate speech, which feeds off of a polarized society, as well as our inherent tribal instincts and flight or flight responses. EXAMPLES:

- Politicians - votes, leverage but distance when necessary.
- Religious leaders - societal homogeny, ethnic cleansing. Muslims in Saudi, Hindu BJJ in India, Buddhists terrorizing Rohingya Muslims in Myanmar, Uyghur Muslims by Communist Chinese
- Racists - The create movements, create lifestyles around their beliefs.
- Terrorists - Justify and promote violence (they were able to kill us), militias and armed group
MICHAEL:
Next, to help us understand the changing nature of how people benefit from hate speech, Shirin illustrated the difference starting with “Old School methods”--where there was little or no financial reward involved.

Unlike today’s internet where hate mongers can remain anonymous, hate group meetings in the past had to be face to face, and risked ridicule when they decided to go public. It took a real labor of “love” to maintain these movements.
MICHAEL:

Now, however, technology has made it easy to spread a spectacle of hate for money. Various platforms make it easy to spread real time tweets and photos, self-publish manifestos, and create widely-distributed videos. Viewers can easily share these ideas and images with a simple click. When producers use these platforms, they can instantly receive data about viewership statistics and revenue generated.

Shirin shared this slide with us. We couldn’t darken the slide, unfortunately, but the takeaway here is that for 397,000 minutes of watch time you can make $200 per month consistently through ad revenue—which may seem like a lot of viewer time, but this breaks down (worldwide) to a mere 1000 viewers @ 14 minutes a day of engagement over a period of 1 month.
MICHAEL:
Shirin helped us see how YouTube is now the fulcrum. Before explaining this graphic, it is important to know that YouTube has recently tried to address this problem more proactively. (If you are curious, we included on our Resources handout a brief video link from YouTube explaining their new hate speech policy.)

...THE GRAPHIC:
- The items above YouTube push traffic towards Youtube. Youtube in turn generates ad revenue.
- The items below YouTube are things that can be done to increase revenue outside of YouTube

As some of you may already know, algorithms in FaceBook and Youtube can push a viewer down a rabbit hole of hate by suggesting similar content that the viewer previously consumed. This has contributed to the “echo chamber” effect that often keeps people in a state of groupthink, shielding them from counterviews that might otherwise moderate their opinions.
ANGELA:
So, brings us to tonight’s focus: How we can effectively respond to this climate of hate.
Our Primary Sources

- Represent a variety of views
- Are experts in the field who write for, or are quoted by, reputable publishers and news outlets
- We have avoided representing extreme positions on either side due to questionable reliability of sources

ANGELA

We have drawn from a variety of sources for our presentation this evening. In choosing them, we have made sure they… [READS SLIDE]
ANGELA:
There is a growing library about how to respond to hate speech. We have listed many of the better resources on the handout we gave you. For tonight’s presentation, though, we have drawn from three main sources:

*Why We Hate*, currently showing on the Discovery Channel, is a 6-part TV series, co-produced by Steven Spielberg and Alex Gibney, that delves deeply into the psychology and phenomenon of hate and its public expression.
ANGELA:
Another source we have drawn from is *The Codding of the American Mind* by Jonathan Haidt and his colleague George Lukianoff. Together, they examine the current climate on U.S. college campuses, where calls for stricter “hate speech” policies, dis-invitation of controversial speakers, and an intolerance for views that might challenge one’s own beliefs have increased dramatically since 2012. We will share some of their examples with you this evening.
ANGELA:
Our third main resource we will draw from is the Southern Poverty Law Center, an organization that has been monitoring, litigating, and responding to hate groups since 1971. They have a commitment to educating people about ways to respond to hate and inoculate their communities, so we draw tonight from their expertise. Their *Ten Ways to Fight Hate Community Resource Guide* is linked in the Resources handout we gave you.
ANGELA:
As we consider successful strategies for overcoming impulsive judgments that eliminate the possibility of real communication, let’s use this graphic illustration as our model. [ CLICK ]

Moral actions stem from the habits of mind we cultivate on a regular, daily basis. If we think in terms of gardening, we know that good harvests can only come from carefully prepared, rich soil. [ CLICK ] In other words, we best prepare ourselves for public action by cultivating our minds through education and mindfulness.

This evening, we will further our understanding of hate speech by looking at how the topic is playing out in the realm of youth culture in schools and universities, [ CLICK ] online culture, [ CLICK ] and interactions in the public sphere. If we prepare ourselves by understanding these particular scenarios, we’ll know better how to respond.
Our education challenge:
To find the right balance between sensitivity to hurtful language and freedom of inquiry

A. Explicitly reject the Untruth of Fragility: What doesn’t kill you makes you weaker.

B. Explicitly reject the Untruth of Emotional Reasoning: Always trust your feelings.

C. Explicitly reject the Untruth of Us vs. Them: Life is a battle between good people and evil people.

Jonathan Haidt, NYU
Social psychologist and author

MICHAEL:
If we think of colleges and universities as training grounds for the country’s future leaders, then the current campus debates around hate speech and free speech should concern us all. A strong democracy relies on a robust exchange of ideas, but if citizens are afraid of causing offense or of being labeled as bigoted or insensitive, they are more likely to hold their opinions to themselves.

One author that we have cited before who is intimately familiar with this debate is Jonathan Haidt, Professor of Sociology and Ethical leadership at NYU.

To combat an unhelpful climate of political correctness on campuses or in our public discussions about “hate speech”, Haidt and his colleague George Lukianoff recommend that we counteract what they call “the Culture of Safetyism” by finding the right balance between sensitivity to hurtful language, on the one hand, and freedom of inquiry, on the other.

To accomplish this, they argue that in our learning communities and in our public debates, we should actively challenge the three pillars of this Culture of Safetyism, or what they call “The Tree Great Untruths.“
MICHAEL:
On the YouTube channel Big Think, Haidt outlines these Three Great Untruths:

3 great untruths to stop telling kids—and ourselves | Jonathan Haidt
<https://youtu.be/VzGH97DQzA4> (5:44)
The right balance between sensitivity to hurtful language and freedom of inquiry

RACIAL MICROAGGRESSIONS

Explicitly reject the Untruth of Us vs. Them: Life is a battle between good people and evil people.

MICHAEL:
C. Haidt and Lukianoff’s third piece of advice helps us appreciate the diversity of our communities, avoid being intentionally hurtful with our words, and yet also preserve space for confronting difficult truths that may put us in a defensive state of mind. In the learning communities of public schools and universities, they caution community leaders to: “Explicitly reject the Untruth of Us vs. Them: Life is a battle between good people and evil people.

- For example, they suggest modeling this at the beginning of every school year: “Look closely at how identity politics is introduced to first-year students.... Given the diversity of the incoming class, including international students, it is a good idea to talk about the many ways that students unwittingly offend or exclude one another, especially in this technologically supercharged age.” (260)

However, they says we need to...

- “Encourage politeness and empathy without framing issues as micro-aggressions [which can reinforce a groupthink state of mind and unnecessarily foster in young people an unconscious habit of defensiveness, conditioning them for hypervigilance against the next perceived slight.] ...Try instead to use a more charitable frame [they suggest], such as members of a [functional] family giving one another the benefit of the doubt; [and] when problems arise, ...try to resolve
them privately and informally” --rather than publically on social media. (260)
MICHAEL:

*Why We Hate* Episode 2: “Understanding Tribalism” echoes the insights about groupthink from Haidt and Lukianoff:

**Takeaway:** “Love for our group and its members, also known as ‘tribalism,’ can sometimes lead to distrust and hate of other groups. This group-based thinking shapes our behavior in many ways, one of which is preventing us from seeing or being open to other perspectives. One way to change is to determine opportunities to step outside the boundaries of your own ideas or beliefs.”
The right balance between sensitivity to hurtful language and freedom of inquiry

Should young people be encouraged to disrupt expression of views in a public forum that “trigger” them or which represent a “hateful agenda” in their minds?

Should “de-platforming” be encouraged?

MICHAEL:
Our society’s attempt to find the right balance between sensitivity to hurtful language and freedom of inquiry is, admittedly, a messy project, with lots of trial and error.

Our first session on Oct. 21st reviewed how the U.S. Supreme Court preferred the approach of practicing counter speech over censorship of views seen (by even the vast majority of citizens) as “hateful” or abhorrent.

*But what are the proper boundaries of counterspeech?* Should counterspeech be devoid of outrage--what some might call righteous anger? [READ QS ON SLIDE]
“Carpe datum! ...Evidence really is an ethical issue, the most important issue in a modern democracy. If you want justice, you must work for truth. And if you want to work for truth, you must do a little more than wish for justice.”

--Alice Dreger, Northwestern University professor and author of *Galileo’s Middle Finger* (Penguin 2015)

MICHAEL:
We were inspired by **historian, bioethicist, author Alice Dreger**'s emphasis on the necessary connection between truth and justice: [READ SLIDE].

Our brains have been organized by evolutionary pressures to prioritize survival functioning over an accurate grasp of reality. Understanding this can help us moderate our impulsive reactions in our experience.

This doesn’t mean that all of our initial intuitions about injustice are always flawed; but knowing that we are susceptible to groupthink, to impulsive judgments about our environments, and to biases about out-groups should steer us toward more caution and rigor concerning our first perceptions of injustice.
MICHAEL:

Why We Hate Episode 1: “Origins of Hate” offers this Takeaway: “Humans have evolved to perceive threats as a survival mechanism. However, without accurate information, we may form misconceptions that lead to feeling fear or hate. Having the opportunity for new experiences can impact and challenge our beliefs. By taking a mindful approach to how hate originates, we can help each other turn hate into hope.”
ANGELA:
If we return to our evening’s graphic model, we see that we are rooting ourselves in education in order to better understand how to operate in the world.

We have just examined some of the issues present on university campuses and how they might spill over into democratic life. In our last session, Shirin spoke to the way that hate can and does flourish online. Next, we will take a look at what the Southern Poverty Law Center says about how to effectively respond to hate when we encounter it in the public sphere.
Proven strategies for supporting targets of hate speech

ANGELA:
So here we present to you: *Ten Ways to Fight Hate*
Do something.
In the face of hatred, apathy will be interpreted as acceptance by the perpetrators, the public and — worse — the victims. Community members must take action; if we don’t, hate persists.

ANGELA:
Our first responsibility as citizens is to act. As people from Billings said repeatedly, they wanted and needed to show a united front against white supremacists, because they were each other’s neighbors. They all hoped that the community would stand in solidarity with them if they were targeted. And, as the SPLC says, READ SLIDE
Reach out to allies from churches, schools, clubs, and other civic groups. Create a diverse coalition. Include children, police, and the media. Gather ideas from everyone, and get everyone involved.

**ANGELA:**
Secondly, Join Forces

If a community is to inoculate itself against hate, then we must join forces. Again, Billings serves as an excellent model for us.

SPLC says: [READ SLIDE]
Hate crime victims are especially vulnerable.

If you learn about a hate crime victim in your community, show support.

Let victims know you care. Surround them with comfort and protection.

ANGELA:
Tip #3 Support the Victims [ READ SLIDE ]
Sometimes, humor can be especially effective at countering hateful expression in public. Here's an example. Several years ago, Barcelona defender Dani Alves was on the pitch when an opposition fan threw a banana down on him. He responded by picking it up and eating it.

His decision inadvertently sparked a social media campaign against racism in European football as support flooded in from fellow professionals.

Luis Suarez posted a picture on Twitter of himself and Liverpool team-mate Philippe Coutinho taking bites out of bananas, along with the words: "#SayNoToRacism #WeAreAllMonkeys."

Even Italian Prime Minister Matteo Renzi and Italy coach Cesare Prandelli joined the campaign.
Hate must be exposed and denounced.

Help news organizations achieve balance and depth.

Do not debate hate group members in conflict-driven forums.

Instead, speak up in ways that draw attention away from hate, toward unity.

Goodness has a First Amendment right, too.

ANGELA:
The 4th principle in responding to hate speech is to speak up. Goodness has a First Amendment right, too. [ READ SLIDE ]
Here is an example from Dayton, Ohio.

A KKK-affiliated white supremacist group based in Dayton, Ohio planned a rally in the city’s courthouse square on May 25, 2019. Only 9 people showed up. Hundreds of local residents, including members of the local NAACP came out to counter their message.

**NOTE: Please note that a few of the counter-protest signs a little rough around the edges. Following the Supreme Court’s example, we’ll leave it up to you to decide if such strategies are effective.**

“Dayton Shows Up to Counter a KKK March” <https://youtu.be/qySkJReFMQ8> (1:57)
An informed campaign improves its effectiveness.

Determine if a hate group is involved, and research its symbols and agenda.

Understand the difference between a hate crime and a bias incident.

**ANGELA:**
Tip #5 Educate Yourself  [ READ SLIDE ]

As we have been saying--and as you all clearly know since you’re here tonight--educating yourself is crucial.

If you witness an incident, how should you respond? Have you witnessed a hate crime? It’s best to call 911. Have you witnessed a bias incident? Maybe the appropriate response is to get organized.
Do not attend a hate rally.

Find another outlet for anger and frustration and for people's desire to do something.

Hold a unity rally or parade to draw media attention away from hate.

**MICHAEL:**

Tip #6 Create an Alternative  [ READ SLIDE ]
Elected officials and other community leaders can be important allies. But some must overcome reluctance — and others, their own biases — before they’re able to take a stand.

MICHAEL: Tip #7 Pressure Leaders  [ READ SLIDE ]
Promote acceptance and address bias before another hate crime can occur.

Expand your comfort zone by reaching out to people outside your own groups.

MICHAEL:
Tip #8 Stay Engaged [ READ SLIDE ]

Every year in September, Vancouver hosts a Peace and Justice fair in Esther Short Park. We have so many groups in town that are working on fostering peace in our community. If you are part of religious community or non-profit agency, how might your group reach out to another group to form a connection?
MICHAEL:
One excellent way to stay engaged locally is to attend a Better Angels workshop. Launched in 2016, Better Angels is a national citizens’ movement to bring liberals and conservatives together at the grassroots level — not to find centrist compromise, but to find one another as citizens. Through workshops, debates, and campus engagement, Better Angels helps Americans understand each other beyond stereotypes, form community alliances, and reduce the vitriol that poisons our civic culture.

Circle of Peace’s own Dan Sockle has led Better Angels trainings here at the FVRL and around the region. If you are interested, be sure to grab a handout before you leave.
Bias is learned early, often at home. Schools can offer lessons of tolerance and acceptance. Reach out to young people who may be susceptible to hate group propaganda and prejudice.

9 TEACH ACCEPTANCE

MICHAEL:
Tip #9 Teach Acceptance  [ READ SLIDE ]

We know quite well that fear and ignorance foster hate. Consider what it might feel like to be a child in the country right now. Schools in our community with high Latino populations are noticing enrollment declines this year. Teachers speculate that parents are keeping their children home because they are afraid of what might happen to their family if the kids leave the home.
Commit to disrupting hate and intolerance at home, at school, in the workplace, and in faith communities. Acceptance, fundamentally, is a personal decision. It comes from an attitude that is learnable and embraceable: a belief that every voice matters, that all people are valuable, that no one is “less than.”

MIchael: Finally, here is our great personal challenge:

Look inside yourself for biases and stereotypes.

READ SLIDE
MICHAEL:
Clearly, we have examined some challenging topics and ideas through this series. We have plenty of work to do to maintain our relationships and continue to create a world where democracy can flourish. Sometimes, the best way to act, though, is to slow down and quiet our minds first.

We return to our model, where we see that Practicing Mindfulness is one of the habits of mind we can use to ground all of our public interactions.
Mindfulness Meditation

Regular practice of mindfulness meditation appears to change people’s brains to better regulate strong emotions.

Even simple forms of mindfulness meditation strengthen the connectivity between the ventromedial prefrontal cortex (which is involved in emotion regulation) and the amygdala (an area strongly susceptible to fear).

MICHAEL:
Which brings us to one practice that we can do as individuals that good scientific research increasingly shows can yield positive results. [CLICK TEXT BLOCK #1]

*Why We Hate* Episode 6 “Turning Hate Into Hope” offers this *Takeaway*: “Even though the foundations of hate may be biological, we can use science to help understand it and move past it. Individuals have the power to change others’ way of thinking, as our brains were made to adapt and change. A first step is having an open perspective in the way we think about the world around us, identifying what can be changed, and then setting the example for others.”

[CLICK TEXT BLOCK #2] Also from episode 6, we hear from Dr. Richard Davidson, Director of the Center for Healthy Minds, University of Wisconsin-Madison, who explains, “We can say with a fair amount of confidence [that] there are two major circuits in the brain that are impacted by meditation. One are circuits that are important for regulating attention, and the other are circuits that are important for regulating emotion. ...These are called the ventromedial prefrontal cortex (which is involved in emotion regulation) and the amygdala (an area strongly regulated by fear); and the connectivity of these regions is significantly strengthened in the long-term meditators compared to [those who are] just learning to meditate. *This is one of the key changes that are produced by simple forms of mindfulness training.*” (@ minute 41:25-42:40)
The human brain is pliable and made to learn and change. Hate can be unlearned, and often, acts of kindness are the dislodging elements.

Creating peace relies on the structural responses of leaders and the psychological responses of citizens. There is an interplay between the two.

MICHAEL:
So, we like to leave you tonight with some hopeful thoughts from Why We Hate: [READ SLIDE]
MICHAEL
We just shared a lot of background information with you, and so it is important to take time to talk with each other and think it over. We’ll be getting into small groups for the next (40 MINUTES?), but in order for that time to be productive, let’s review some guidelines [SEE HANDOUT]. We have all been in discussions that haven’t worked, so let’s make a commitment this evening to take turns and TO listen to each other.

[READ SLIDE]  [ORGANIZE AUDIENCE INTO SMALL GROUPS FOR 40-MIN. DISCUSSION]
Small Group Discussion Questions

1. A. Briefly share a moment when you made *an impulsive judgment* about someone during a contentious discussion and *how the communication went awry as a result*. How did you come to recognize your impulsive judgment and its effects?

   ...OR...

   B. Briefly share a time *when you overcame an impulsive judgment* about someone, and how that significantly improved the quality of your conversation about a contentious topic.

   C. *What did you learn from either experience?*

MICHAEL: Read questions
2. A. Consider your observations of people caught in the throes of hateful emotions. Briefly share an experience when you witnessed *how this distorted their ability to understand the reality of the situation or the facts on the issue*. What, if anything, enabled you (or someone else) to help them back to a more charitable perspective or truthful understanding?

...OR...

B. Briefly share an experience when you witnessed a person undergo a transformation away from hate as a default emotion, and *what exactly enabled them to do so*. 
3. Briefly recount an experience where an individual, or group of individuals, were publically made to be the target(s) of hateful language.

*What effects* did this experience appear to have on them, and what did you do (or could have done) *to make them feel supported*?
Wrapping it up

- Resources
- Questions
- What’s next?

MICHAEL & ANGELA
The texts highlighted below are those we relied on the most and that we found most helpful and/or representative of the key arguments about “hate speech”:

ANGELA:
As we mentioned earlier, we wanted to share with you the sources we drew from in creating this evening’s presentation. If you're interested in doing some background reading for the next two forums, check these out at the library or at your favorite bookseller’s.
Why We Should Resist It with Free Speech, Not Censorship

Nadine Strossen
John Marshall Harlan II Professor of Law at New York Law School; Former President, American Civil Liberties Union, 1991-2008
Andrew Marantz is a staff writer at The New Yorker, where he has worked since 2011. His work has also appeared in Harper’s, New York, Mother Jones, the New York Times, and many other publications. A contributor to Radiolab and The New Yorker Radio Hour, he has spoken at TED and has been interviewed on CNN, MSNBC, NPR, and many other outlets.
Jonathan Haidt
American social psychologist and author, Professor of Ethical Leadership at NYU's Stern School of Business. His main areas of study are the psychology of morality and the moral emotions.
Shannon Gilreath Professor of Law and Women's, Gender and Sexuality Studies at Wake Forest University. He is nationally recognized as an expert on issues of equality, sexual minorities, and constitutional interpretation. His books include Sexual Politics: The Gay Person in America Today (2006) and The End of Straight Supremacy: Realizing Gay Liberation (2011), and Sexual Identity Law in Context: Cases and Materials (2011).
Questions?

Rights of Free Speech

Responsibilities of Free Speech
What’s Next?

Possibly, a Circle of Peace-hosted viewing together of the 6-part Discovery Channel series *Why We Hate*, with group discussions following each episode?

Michael + Angela
Thank you for joining us tonight
Resources Distributed to Audience
Hate Speech: How We Can Respond  Nov. 18, 2019  6:00-8:00 pm @ Vancouver Community Library

NOTE: For each session in this series, all handouts with embedded links are available at www.circleofpeaceonline.org/

Helpful Resources -- Archives & Overviews:
1. Organized by Oxford professor Timothy Garton Ash and Oxford graduate students, Free Speech Debate is a clearinghouse of articles and resources capturing the latest fronts in free speech controversies from around the world.
   <https://freespeechdebate.com/tag/hate-speech/>

2. AllSides -- Balanced Search -- "Hate Speech":
   <https://www.allsides.com/allsides-search-results?search_api_views_fulltext=hate+speech&created=2&submit.x=23&submit.y=35>

Helpful Resources -- Articles of Interest:
1. Southern Poverty Law Center’s Ten Ways to Fight Hate: A Community Response Guide

2. Why We Hate Discussion Guide:
   <https://discovery.sndimg.com/content/dam/documents/Discovery/2019/10/WhyWeHateDiscussionGuide.pdf>

3. Not In Our Town: Community Response To Hate A Quick Guide For Action: This Action Kit provides advice and resources to assist community leaders, members and local government leaders with effective ways to respond to and prevent hate crimes and bias incidents. <https://www.niot.org/stop-hate-action-kits/community-response-to-hate>

4. Anti-Defamation League’s “No Place for Hate” Coordinator Handbook & Resource Guide
   <https://www.adl.org/media/11295/download>

5. A Guide for Administrators, Counselors and Teachers: Responding to Hate and Bias at School - Teaching Tolerance
   <http://www.tolerance.org/sites/default/files/general/Responding%20to%Hate%20at%20School%20ONLINE_3.pdf>

SEE YOUR HANDOUT p. 2
6. Article 19 ‘Hate Speech’ Explained: A Toolkit

7. “How to help kids recognize, and handle, online hate speech”


Helpful Resources -- Videos of Interest:
1. Why We Hate six-part series (2019) on Discovery Go: <https://www.discovery.com/shows/why-we-hate>

2. Common Sense Media: “5 Ways to Deal with Hate Speech Online” (1:00):
   <https://www.commonsensemedia.org/videos/5-ways-to-deal-with-hate-speech-online>


4. “Social Media and Hate Speech: Who Gets to Decide?” Nadine Strossen, former president of the ACLU, argues that censorship does more harm than good—especially when it comes to social media. <https://youtu.be/bghTL5gU6fs>

5. “Free Speech in an Age of Social Media” Panel discussion moderated by John Samples, VP, Cato Institute, with speakers Corynne McSherry, Legal Director, Electronic Frontier Foundation; Thomas Kadri, Resident Fellow, Yale Information Society Project; Jonathan Rauch, Senior Fellow at the Brookings Institution; Lori Moylan, Public Policy Manager at Facebook. <https://youtu.be/agdZCzbweqo>

SEE YOUR HANDOUT p. 2
Slides or Speaker Notes Omitted for 11/19
"I think that free speech is free speech only if the presentation of opinions is respectful and nonviolent. If opinions are not presented in a respectful manner — such as heckling a speaker because of opposing political views — then it doesn’t constitute free speech, because in a way, by disrespecting the speaker, you deny their right to free speech.

In the same way, violence to state a point is not free speech, because you are not only denying the free speech of whom the violence is against, but you also possess a mindset that only your opinion is right, and people who disagree should be attacked.”

— Ben S., Sunnyvale

MICHAEL:
We were encouraged by the words of a student who responded to a NYTimes special Student Opinion question and related lesson plan on the problem of hate speech and the proper protections and limits of the First Amendment. Co-sponsored by The National Constitution Center, the question posed to students was, “Why Is Freedom of Speech an Important Right? When, if Ever, Can It Be Limited?” Student Ben S. from Sunnyvale, California wrote:

“I think that free speech is free speech only if the presentation of opinions is respectful and nonviolent. If opinions are not presented in a respectful manner — such as heckling a speaker because of opposing political views — then it doesn’t constitute free speech, because in a way, by disrespecting the speaker, you deny their right to free speech. In the same way, violence to state a point is not free speech, because you are not only denying the free speech of whom the violence is against, but you also possess a mindset that only your opinion is right, and people who disagree should be attacked.”

A bright spot in the cloudy atmosphere surrounding this debate is that people ARE talking about this issue today, just as we are tonight. Occasionally, young people — like Ben S. from Sunnyvale — will share articulate solutions that we need to have ears for.
Our education challenge:  
To find the right balance between sensitivity to hurtful language and freedom of inquiry

A. Explicitly reject the Untruth of Fragility:  
\textit{What doesn't kill you makes you weaker.}

B. Explicitly reject the Untruth of Emotional Reasoning:  
\textit{Always trust your feelings.}

C. Explicitly reject the Untruth of Us vs. Them:  
\textit{Life is a battle between good people and evil people.}

\begin{figure}[h]
\begin{center}
Jonathan Haidt, NYU  
Social psychologist and author
\end{center}
\end{figure}

\textbf{MICHAEL for Q&A:}

A. Explicitly reject the Untruth of Fragility:  \textit{What doesn’t kill you makes you weaker.}
\begin{itemize}
\item “[Our learning communities, such as a university] which are devoted to the pursuit of truth must prepare students for conflict, controversy, and argument. Many students will experience their most cherished beliefs being challenged, and they must learn that this is not harassment or a personal attack; it is part of the process which people do each other the favor of counteracting each other’s confirmation bias. Students must also learn to make well-reasoned arguments while avoiding ad hominem arguments, which criticize people rather than ideas.” (258-59)
\end{itemize}

B. Explicitly reject the Untruth of Emotional Reasoning:  \textit{Always trust your feelings.}
\begin{itemize}
\item Much of Haidt’s and his colleague George Lukianoff’s argument rests on good scientific data showing how susceptible we are, as a species, to confirmation biases and cognitive distortions. “It is a challenge to think well; we are easily led astray by feelings and by group loyalties. In the age of social media, cyber trolls and fake news, it is a national and global crisis that people so readily follow their feelings to embrace outlandish stories about their enemies. A community in which members hold one another accountable for using evidence to
substantiate their assertions is a community that can, collectively, pursue truth in the age of outrage.” (259)