



Racism & Discrimination Resource

Sustainable Scouting Team

June 2020



Introduction

This resource is suitable for mature Scouts, Ventures, and Rovers. We are working to create similar resources for Beavers and Cubs.

In solidarity with the Black Lives Matter Movement and Pride, the Sustainable Scouting Team is this month publishing a resource on racism & discrimination. Recent events have highlighted the profound inequalities that exist within our society, and the absence of meaningful conversation around these topics previously.

Inequality has been compounded by the COVID crisis, which at its heart stems from man's problematic relationship with nature. Our relationships to each other, to justice, equality, and to the planet are inextricably linked, something which we hope comes across in our resources. As the climate crisis deepens, the rates of climate refugees will soar and we will require a new skillset to help us navigate this in a just, peaceful and constructive way that helps bring about the best outcomes for the planet and its people.

The mission of Scouting, adopted at the 35th World Scout Conference in South Africa in 1999, is "to help build a better world". We cannot do this if we remain silent. We must stand up against injustice and promote a culture of peace and inclusion in our communities as "Messengers of Peace" and develop the skills we require to do so. There can be no justice for the planet without justice for its people.

Some resources in this pack have been adapted from those published by the Council of Europe and the Guides and Scouts of Sweden, to be suitable for and map to the One Programme in Scouting Ireland.



Activity 1: Step Forward

Aim: To explore equality in Irish society in 2016 and gain insight into the lives of other people who may be less privileged than us.

Time: 40 minutes

Sustainable Development Goals: 4. Quality 5. Gender Equality 10. Reduced Inequalities

Materials: Shoeprint cut-out with Scout's name on (optional), character cut-outs, statement list.

Step 1: Cut out the individual character cards and place them in a container.

Step 2: Invite the Scouts to pick a card, but not to show anyone else.

Step 3: Get the Scouts to form a straight line.

Step 4: Tell the Scouts that you will read a number of statements. For each statement they feel the answer is 'Yes' to, in relation to their character, they must take a step forward. If they feel that the answer is 'No', then they should not move.

Step 5: After all of the statements have been called out, ask everyone to lay their shoeprint down where they are standing. They may then walk around and take a look at the area (If you aren't using shoeprints just ask everyone to remain standing). Ask the group if they felt their characters were realistic, or if they know anyone like those characters (ask them not to give specific names, just a 'Yes' or 'No').

Step 6: Starting from the furthest back, invite the Scouts to describe who their character was.

Step 7: Explain to the group that in a way, this represents one picture of Ireland right now...

- Ask the Scouts at the back how it felt when they were not taking steps forward.

- Ask the group if they are surprised by where they are or where others are (You may have used the same character twice, this can help to illustrate that experiences can be different even with the same label).

- How do the people at the back feel about those in front?

You might ask how connected those at the front might be to those at the back, and whether this is a barrier itself to equal opportunities. You might notice that the single white male is at the top, but, a homeless person could fit this description. The group may also reflect on how these basic labels can frame a whole person's life for us and the challenges that brings.

Statements

- You have never had any serious financial difficulty
- You feel that your language, culture and religion are respected in this society
- You feel that your opinion on social and political issues is valued
- You are not afraid of being stopped by the police
- You know where to go for help or advice if you need it
- You have never felt discriminated against because of your origin
- You have adequate social and medical protection for your needs
- You can invite friends home for dinner
- You feel that you can follow the profession of your choice
- You are not afraid of being harassed or attacked on the streets
- You are presented positively in the media
- You can vote in national or local elections
- You are not afraid for the future of your children
- You can fall in love with the person of your choice
- You can celebrate the most important religious festivals with your relatives and close friends
- You have decent housing
- You can move freely in this society and to any other country
- You feel represented in national politics

CHARACTERS

Wheelchair User

Teenage son of a drug addict

Asylum seeker

Single white male

Teenager in care (taken out of family home)

Black teenager born in Ireland

Young person with depression

Unemployed builder

Romanian Immigrant

Pregnant Teenager

Teenager with a brother who is a convicted drug dealer

Daughter of a bank manager

University student from Iran

Unemployed college graduate

Young person in Direct Provision

Young carer (cares for a sick person)

Early school leaver

Young single parent

Young traveller

Single white female

Gay teenager

Teenager from 'council estate'

CHARACTERS

Young person with anorexia

Homeless young person

Muslim girl

Teenager who has been in prison

Young person with a mental disability

Reformed drug addict

Daughter of a gangland boss

Young victim of domestic violence

Young person with ADHD

Activity 2: First Impressions



Aim: A game about how our prejudices show themselves the first time we meet others.

Time: 30 mins

SPICES: Social, Intellectual, Emotional

Sustainable Development Goals: 4. Quality Education

Materials: Printed photographs of individuals provided. Bios of individuals.

Definitions:

- **Prejudice:** The word in itself means “judgment in advance”. Prejudices are ideas and notions that somebody or something should be or act in a certain way. We often have prejudices with regard to whole groups of people, prejudices founded on incorrect information. Most of our prejudices are subconscious.

Steps:

Step 1: Pass around the printed photographs of the individuals one-by-one.

Step 2: Ask the Scouts what their first impressions of the people in the photographs were. If the group is quiet, refer to the prompt questions.

Step 2: Read the bio of the individuals to the group and watch the accompanying videos.

Step 3: Ask the following: Does learning more about this individual change our impression of them? In what way?

Step 4: Read the definition of ‘Prejudice’ to the group. Ask the group if they think prejudice had anything to do with their first impressions of the individuals. Was that effect positive, negative, or neutral?



Steps (cont'd):

Step 5: Ask the group if their first impressions were similar to one another. Did they all think/assume the same thing about this person?

Step 6: Ask them how they arrived at their first impression.

Step 7: Ask the Scouts what they think others' first impressions are when they meet them.

Step 8: Ask the Scouts how they think our first impressions of people affect how we treat them.

Prompt Questions

- What nationality do you think they are?
- What do you think they do for a living?
- What do you think their personality is like?
- What do you think they like to do on the weekends?
- Do they look like anyone you know?

Image 1:



Image 2:



Image 3:



Image 4:



Image 5:





Bios:

Image 1 - Emma Dabiri

Nationality: Irish

Occupation: Model, Presenter, Academic, Activist, Author.

Description: Emma was born in Atlanta in the United States to a white Irish-Trinidadian mother and a black Nigerian father. When Emma was 5 years old, the family moved to Rialto in Dublin. She currently lives in London with her husband and son, and is pursuing a PhD at the University of London while working as an Academic and a Presenter. She published her first book '*Don't Touch My Hair*' in 2019.

Video: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=MrSw9a9gqMU>

Image 2 – Rory O’Neill

Nationality: Irish

Occupation: Author, Activist, Drag Queen.

Description: Rory O’Neill, more commonly known by his drag name, *Panti Bliss*, grew up in the small town of Ballinrobe, Co. Mayo. He began performing in drag during his early 20’s while living in Japan. Panti Bliss has become a “national treasure” and was instrumental in the 2015 referendum on marriage equality in Ireland.

Video: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Db2857BR7GM>



Bios (cont'd):

Image 3 – Sonia O’Sullivan

Nationality: Irish

Occupation: Retired track and field athlete.

Activist, Author.

Description: Sonia was born in Cobh in Co. Cork in 1969. She won a silver medal for Ireland in the 5000 metres at the 2000 Olympic Games in Sydney, and held a world record for the fastest 2000m run for 23 years. She also won gold at the 5000m World Championships in Sweden in 1995.

Video: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Xvs0ngVeSpU>

Image 4 – George Takei

Nationality: American

Occupation: Actor, Author, Activist.

Description: George was born in Los Angeles in the United States to Japanese-American parents. His mother was born in California, his father, in Japan. During WW2, when George was very young, he and his family were interned at a concentration camp in Arkansas. His aunt and cousin were killed in the bombing of Hiroshima. After the war was over, George and his family were set free from the concentration camp and returned to California. George is a staunch campaigner for human rights, including for the LGBT+ community. He currently lives with his husband in Los Angeles.

Video: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=AqfGE9r5h5s>



Bios (cont'd):

Image 5 – Sinéad Burke

Nationality: Irish

Occupation: Writer, academic, influencer, activist and broadcaster

Description: Sinéad is 29 years old and was born in Dublin. She graduated top of her class in Marino Institute of Education where she trained as a primary school teacher. A passionate advocate for inclusive design, she has spoken at the White House on the topic of inclusivity in fashion design, has a TED talk on the subject with over 1 million views, spoke at the World Economic Forum in 2018, and was the first ever little person to appear on the front cover of VOGUE magazine. She is responsible for the introduction of the term for little person, “duine beag”, into the Irish language.

Video: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=avy0K_zNLU8



Activity 3: Green Dot

Aim: A quick exercise on the theme of belonging.

Time: 15 mins

SPICES: Social, Emotional

Sustainable Development Goals: 4. Quality Education, 10. Reduced Inequalities, 16. Peace, Justice & Strong Institutions.

Materials: Different coloured sticky dots.

Definitions:

- **Segregation:** Implies making a distinction between people and primarily depicts differences in groups of population. Segregation can be of a voluntary nature (seeking the company of others like oneself) or mandatory (only being allowed to live or work in special areas).
- **Integration:** Is a process in which a feature which previously didn't belong to a certain element, now begins to become a part of it. We most often speak of integration in describing an ethnic minority becoming a part of a majority culture. This is a voluntary process which requires that both the majority and minority groups desire integration and that a practical possibility exists for such a cultural exchange. It's a matter of surrounding oneself with the new culture and in various degrees accepting it and contributing to it.
- **Discrimination:** Means to treat people according to the stereotyped image of a certain group they belong to.
- **Inclusion:** To comprise, include, embrace, involve, take into account. To be allowed in.
- **Exclusion:** To shut out.
- **Diversity:** Diversity is any dimension that can be used to differentiate groups and people from one another. Diversity allows for the exploration of these differences in a safe, positive, and nurturing environment.

Definitions (cont'd):

- **Ethnic Minority:** An ethnic minority is a group of people who are in the minority in society. This term is used to identify people who share language, culture, religion, physical distinctions, origin, etc. The Travelling community is Ireland's only significant indigenous ethnic minority. There are around 22,000 Travellers in Ireland, making up about 4,000 families. Another 15,000 Irish Travellers live in the UK, and there are 10,000 people of Traveller descent in the USA. Travellers account for 0.5% of the entire population of Ireland. They are a tight-knit community with a strong tradition and culture built around a nomadic existence. Though they are not related to the Roma peoples of Europe, Irish Travellers share with Romanies the sense of being excluded and marginalised in society.

Steps:

Step 1: Get the Scouts to close their eyes.

Step 2: Stick a coloured dot on each of the Scouts' foreheads. There should be roughly an even number of all colours except for green. There should only be one Scout with a green dot on their forehead.

Step 3: Ask the Scouts to group themselves by colour.

Step 4: Once they have formed their groups, bring the group back together and discuss the following:

- How did it feel to meet someone who had the same colour as you?
- (to the Scout with the green dot) How did it feel to be alone?
- What groups do you belong to? (e.g. Scouting, school, family, sports club, etc.)
- Can anyone be a member of those groups?
- Who are carrying "green dots" in our society?

Activity 12: Island Clash

Aim: To explore issues relating to diversity, pluralism and hate speech. To consider how freedom of expression contributes to the functioning of a democratic society. To discuss the advantages and disadvantages of having no limits on freedom of expression. To practise skills of negotiation

Time: 2 hours

SPICES: Social, Intellectual, Character, Emotional.

Sustainable Development Goals: 1. No Poverty, 2. Zero Hunger, 4. Quality Education, 8. Decent Work & Economic Growth, 10. Reduced Inequalities, 16. Peace, Justice and Strong Institutions

Materials: Paper and pens.

Steps:

Step 1: Explain to the group that this is going to be a role-play game.

Step 2: Divide the group into thirds.

Step 3: Tell one third of the group that they will be the 'Pastiks'. The other two thirds will be the 'Ixprats'.

Step 4: Separate the Pastiks from the Ixprats and read out their associated scenarios.

Step 5: With the groups still separated, ask them the following questions:

- What are your thoughts about life on the island?
- Would you like to live on the island?
- (to Pastiks only) What are your concerns about moving to the new island?
- (to Ixprats only) What are your concerns about receiving a large number of immigrants with no knowledge of your culture or traditions?

Step 6: Bring the groups back together and get them to introduce themselves to each other as if they are islanders meeting for the first time on Ixprat.

Step 7: Once the group has settled, read out the following statement:

A year has passed, and a number of problems have arisen. Tensions between the communities have become increasingly acute and many people are worried about severe social unrest. The President has invited you to form a working group to try to find solutions to these problems.

Step 8: Divide the group into at least three smaller groups. The groups should have around twice as many Ixprats as Pastiks. Present each group with one problem statement.

Step 9: Tell the groups that they have 20 minutes to reach a decision about how to resolve the problem. Explain that any proposal must be put to the vote and needs to be approved by a majority of participants (in the working group) in order to be accepted. Remind them that if they cannot approve a new decision, the status quo will continue! Encourage the groups to stay in-character as much as possible.

Step 10: After 20 minutes, bring everyone together to present their decisions. Give each working group 2-3 minutes to feed back and outline their solution, and ask for any brief responses. Remind participants to stay in-character. Once all responses are dealt with, move on to the debriefing.

Step 11: Tell the group that they can stop pretending to be Ixprats and Pastiks now. Tell them that they are now going to discuss the activity as a whole. They should try not to return to previous debates. Ask the group the following:

- How did you feel about the activity? What did you like or not like?
- How easy was it to play your role – and stay in it – when the islanders came together?
- What did you think about the negotiation process, and the process of decision making at the end? What were the most important things for you when trying to find a solution?

Step 11 (cont'd):

- Was it fair that the Ixprat community effectively had a veto on any proposal, because they were the majority? How can we make sure that the opinions and rights of minorities are fairly represented in 'real' life?
- Did the activity change any of your views? If so, which in particular, and why?
- Do you think the activity was close to reality: did it recall any problems in society today?
- How do you think we should deal with the problem of people saying things which are hurtful, intolerant and sometimes dangerous?

The Pastiks: You live on a small island whose borders are closed and which has seen no immigration and very few tourists for as long as anyone can remember. Your society is calm and peaceful: peace and the absence of conflict have a strong tradition and are regarded as a 'national priority'. There is even an article in the Constitution which states that: No-one should say or do anything which might be painful or upsetting to others. This article is carefully monitored and infringements are severely punished. It is very rarely broken; it is much easier to agree with other people. Disagreement has become painful for the Pastiks as it troubles the mind.

Your country calls itself a democracy. Elections are held every year and nearly everyone votes. However, the same people tend to be elected, as there is little discussion of alternative policies.

In general, conversations, public pronouncements and even the media don't stray beyond the opinions that are generally accepted by society, and people mostly don't mind this as they have forgotten or are unable to imagine a different way of doing things. There is little news about other places on the globe, no literature from other cultures, and very little change, because change has been found to be upsetting.

People have noticed over the years that the coastline has altered: sea levels have risen and many parts of the country which used to be habitable are now under water. This did not matter to begin with: there was enough land for everyone and communities living near the coastline were simply moved further inland. However, in recent years the problem became more acute. A few people began discussing it among themselves but this was found to be upsetting, so the government introduced a ban.

The Pastiks (cont'd): Life continued, mostly calm, predictable and free from conflict and disagreement, until one terrible windy day a severe hurricane hit the island. Buildings were destroyed, many people died, and most of the land was flooded. When the waves subsided, few crops had survived and those that had survived were now dying from the salt water. Nearly all the infrastructure had been destroyed. Food became scarce, infection and disease began to spread and medical supplies were inadequate. The island fell into chaos. People even started disagreeing about what the best thing to do was!

Just when it seemed that all hope was lost, a message was received from a neighbouring island, the Island of Ixprat. The message expressed sincere concern for all Pastiks and contained an offer to accommodate anyone who wished to move to Ixprat. You are among those who have decided to move.

The Ixprats: You live on the Island of Ixprat, located in the Pacific Ocean and in the path of one of the ancient shipping routes across the ocean. Your island has traditionally relied on trade and communication with other countries and you have had an open borders policy for hundreds of years. That has meant that travellers and immigrants from many different cultures have been a strong feature of life on the island. The result is a very diverse population, with a wide range of opinions, beliefs and cultural practices.

Your national culture embraces such diversity: people have a keen interest in other ways of doing things, different beliefs and ideologies. Of course, with such diversity, not every idea or ideology can be embraced by everyone. Disagreement and conflict are a way of life on Ixprat. Almost every meeting of two human minds contains a thrashing out of thoughts, beliefs and ideas. Furthermore, almost every meeting passes through or ends in disagreement. Disagreement is almost a national hobby.

For that reason, there are no laws which limit what one person or one group can say to another, or which limit what one person or one group can say about another. Some people do say terrible things. Sometimes this leads to people doing terrible things. The 'doing' is punishable by law; the saying is not.

Life on Ixprat is interesting, challenging, and constantly changing. You value the richness of the culture and the fact that you can say anything you like. You know that endless argument and disagreement does not always lead to happiness. In fact, you often find disagreement very tiring, and very painful: it is not always easy to hear people saying things you think are wrong, let alone things you think are cruel. You have also seen how some groups in society tend to be more frequent victims of cruel and intolerant language than others.

The Ixprats (cont'd): Even so, it seems to you important that no-one should ever be stopped from expressing their beliefs.

One windy day, your island received news that a very strong hurricane had hit one of the other islands in the Pacific. You know very little about that island: they have always kept themselves to themselves. You have heard tales that the people living on the island are very stupid and very backward, but you have never met anyone from there. You know it is almost impossible to visit.

The government has announced that the Island of Pastik suffered so badly as a result of the hurricane that most of the residents who have survived will be relocating to Ixprat. They can probably be squeezed in but it will mean that current residents will have to do a lot of re-adjusting. Jobs will have to be shared out and there may not be enough housing for everyone.

Problem 1: A campaign has been set up to ‘Find a Pastik tongue’ and it has taken the Internet by storm. The campaign site includes such slogans as – “Poke a Pastik dummy: see if he squeaks!” – “No tongue, no brain!” – “Find a tongue, win a smartphone!” People are invited to submit photos of Pastik tongues. There is a ‘Tongue Gallery’ with photos and videos of people forcing open the mouths of Pastiks, shining a torch into their mouths, posing with telescopes or pointing to the tongue. The campaign is gathering momentum and there have been a large number of incidents where Pastiks have been attacked in the streets. Pastiks have responded by saying they refuse to be drawn into an insulting conversation with people they don’t respect.

Problem 2: A young girl from the Pastik community was shouted at in the street by a group of boys from the Ixprats. They called her a “fat slob”, a “filthy slag” and told her she had no tongue in her head and no mind of her own. The girl has been miserable and has not left the house or talked to anyone for two weeks. For three days she has eaten nothing. Her parents are desperately worried.

Problem 3: A report has been released which shows that the rate of unemployment among Pastiks is far higher than in the population as a whole, there are no Pastik representatives in Parliament and few in positions of power in any organisation. The report has also monitored other social factors, for example, levels of stress and mental illness, educational qualifications, and levels of crime. On all indicators, the Pastiks appear to do worse than any other sector of society. Attitudes towards Pastiks among the rest of society are also overwhelmingly negative.

Activity 11: A Day in Court



Aim: To consider how freedom of expression rights should be balanced against the need to protect victims of racist abuse or hate speech. To explore the protections – and limitations – of the right to freedom of expression (Article 10) in the European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR). To understand the role of the European Court

Time: 2 hours

SPICES: Social, Intellectual, Character, Emotional.

Sustainable Development Goals: 4. Quality Education, 16. Peace, Justice and Strong Institutions

Materials: Case and role cards, pen, paper.

Definitions:

- European Court of Human Rights: The European Court of Human Rights was established in 1959 to oversee Council of Europe member states' observance of the European Convention on Human Rights.
- European Convention on Human Rights: The Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, better known as the European Convention on Human Rights, was opened for signature in Rome on 4 November 1950 and came into force in 1953. It was the first instrument to give effect to certain of the rights stated in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and make them binding.
- The UN Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR): The UDHR was drawn up in 1948, immediately after the Second World War. It has been accepted by every government around the world and sets out the basic rights and fundamental principles to be found in every successive human rights treaty.



Steps:

Step 1: Ensure the group is comfortable with the definitions for this activity.

Step 2: Ask participants what they understand by 'freedom of expression'. Once a few ideas have been thrown around read out the following:

Free speech, or the right to free expression, is a fundamental human right. People should be allowed to 'express' their opinions or thoughts because thoughts, opinions, and beliefs are an important part of our identity. Freedom of expression should also be protected because it plays a key role in a democratic society. However, sometimes the right to freedom of expression can be limited if it may harm individuals or be dangerous for society.

Step 3: Explain to the group that they'll be playing a role-play game. The game is based on a real life case brought before the European Courts of Human Rights against the Danish Government. Some Scouts will play the Danish Government, others will play the Court, and the remainder will play the applicant, a journalist named Mr. Jersild.

Step 4: Read the case out to the Scouts.

Step 5: Divide participants into 3 roughly equal groups.

- Group A represents Mr Jersild
- Group B represents the Danish Government
- Group C represents the judges in the European Court

Step 6: Hand each group a copy of the relevant role card and a copy of the information about the case.

Step 7: Explain to the groups that they will have 30 minutes to discuss and prepare their arguments (or in the case of the judges, to prepare questions to both sides) before the trial begins!

Step 8: Ask participants to find the member of each of the other groups with the same number as them and form a new group with these two people, a mini-court!



Steps:

Step 9: The mini-courts have 20 minutes to listen to the arguments of both sides and for the judges to put forward questions.

Step 10: After this time, ask each judge to come to an individual judgement on whether Article 10 has been violated.

Step 11: Ask the judges to group together and arrive at a collective judgement. This may take up to 10 minutes.

Step 12: Bring the whole group back together and ask the judges to announce their decision and give their reasons.

Step 13: Offer the representatives of the other two groups the opportunity to respond to the judgements made. This may take up to 5 minutes.

Step 14: Tell the group how the European Court in fact ruled in this case & ask them for their reaction to the decision:

The case was heard by the European Court in 1994. The Court disagreed with the judgement of the Danish court and decided that Mr Jersild should not have been punished for making and showing the film. They felt that the film made it sufficiently clear that the racist comments were not acceptable or approved by the filmmaker and that there was no danger of the message being misunderstood by the public. They commented: “ [the film] clearly sought by means of an interview to expose, analyse and explain this particular group of youths, limited and frustrated by their social situation, with criminal records and violent attitudes, thus dealing with specific aspects of a matter that already then was of great public concern.” The Court also made the point that news reporting is essential in a democratic society and allows the press to play the role of ‘public watchdog’. They said there would need to be very strong reasons for punishing a journalist who publicised statements made by someone else. It is one of the important functions of a free press that it allows and encourages public discussion of issues which are of general importance to society.

Materials (cont'd):

The Case: The applicant in the case is Mr Jens Olaf Jersild, a Danish national who works for Denmark's Radio (which also broadcasts television programmes). The news channel is regarded as a serious one and has an audience of well-informed people. Mr Jersild wanted to broadcast a documentary on an extreme racist group called the Green jackets. He contacted members of the group and conducted a long interview with them; then he cut the film down to a few minutes and added some commentary of his own. The final result was shown as part of a news programme and was broadcast on national television. In the broadcast, members of the Green jackets were shown making abusive and derogatory remarks about immigrants and ethnic groups in Denmark, comparing black men to gorillas and saying they are "not human". A Danish court found the Green jackets members guilty of making racist comments and also found Mr Jersild guilty because he had 'encouraged' them, and had broadcast the remarks to a wider audience. Mr Jersild appealed his conviction at the European Court of Human Rights because he thought his conviction by a Danish court was a violation of his right to freedom of expression (Article 10 of the ECHR). The European Court needed to decide whether restricting his right to broadcast the remarks was 'legitimate'. This meant looking at whether the right balance was struck between protecting the rights of the people who were the targets of the racist comments, and the need for the public to know about the existence of such groups.

Article 10 from the European Convention (simplified): Everyone has the right to freedom of expression. This right includes the freedom to hold opinions and to receive and communicate information and ideas without interference. Freedom of expression can be restricted if the restriction is 'necessary in a democratic society' – in particular, in order to protect the rights of others.

Materials (cont'd):

Mr. Jersild: You are a serious journalist and you wanted to make a film about racism and xenophobia which did 2 things: 1. Illustrated the extent of the problem – including the extreme nature of views held by the Green jackets 2. Showed that the Green jackets are a criminalised group with many emotionally immature and socially disadvantaged members. You believe that both these points are important ones for society to understand and you think that your programme managed to address both, partly by directly broadcasting some of the worst opinions, and partly by describing the poor level of education, the background and social difficulties experienced by the young people you interviewed. You do not think that any of your viewers would have understood your programme to be supporting the racist opinions expressed. As a journalist, you value freedom of expression very highly: too much restriction would make it impossible for journalists to inform the public about real – and unpleasant – issues. You believe that journalists have a responsibility to bring such issues to the public's attention so that they can be recognised and addressed.

Materials (cont'd):

The Danish Government: You believe it was right that Mr Jersild was convicted by the Danish court. His programme contained very extreme and racist views which should not be heard by a wide audience. The programme was sensationalist and did not contain enough commentary to say that the views expressed were unacceptable and dangerous. You believe that journalists have a responsibility to ensure that viewers are not upset or misled. You think that people watching his programme would not have understood that the journalist was shocked by the racist statements and that he did not approve of them. They would not have understood that such statements are ignorant, harmful and illegal. Mr Jersild edited the film to show the worst comments expressed by the Green jackets. You think he should not have interviewed the members and encouraged them to express such views, and certainly should not have given the views wide publicity by including them in his programme. You do not think the programme should have been made and Mr Jersild should be held responsible for having given wide publicity to such dangerous opinions.

Materials (cont'd):

The Judges: It is your task to manage the trial and then to decide whether you think the Danish courts acted rightly and Mr Jersild was indeed guilty or whether his rights were violated.

- The trial process: Begin by reminding Mr Jersild and the representative of the Danish Government that each side will be given a few minutes to present their side of the case; then you will put questions and they can respond to each other. Tell them that they must behave in an orderly manner and follow any instructions from you!
- The decision you need to make: You need to consider whether Mr Jersild should have allowed his film to be broadcast to the public. His right to freedom of expression would seem to allow him to do that, but freedom of expression is not an absolute right – it needs to be balanced against other social concerns and other human rights. It is your task to decide if the balance has been correctly struck in this case. These are the key questions you will need to decide and weigh up when you hear the evidence of both sides:
 - Do you think that the film might have been understood by the public to be supporting the racist opinions?
 - Was it important that the public knew about the racist beliefs and the background of the Green jackets, or was it more important that such opinions do not reach a wide audience?



Activity 14: Group X

Aim: To consider how victims of hate speech are often deprived of numerous other human rights. To raise awareness of Roma rights and the human rights abuses they commonly experience. To relate the rights contained in the European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR) to real examples of abuse

Time: 60 minutes

SPICES: Social, Intellectual, Emotional.

Sustainable Development Goals: 4. Quality Education, 16. Peace, Justice, and Strong Institutions

Materials: Flipchart paper & pens

Definitions:

- Human Rights: Human rights are rights inherent to all human beings, regardless of race, sex, nationality, ethnicity, language, religion, or any other status. Human rights include the right to life and liberty, freedom from slavery and torture, freedom of opinion and expression, the right to work and education, and many more. Everyone is entitled to these rights, without discrimination.
- European Convention on Human Rights: The Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, better known as the European Convention on Human Rights, was opened for signature in Rome on 4 November 1950 and came into force in 1953. It was the first instrument to give effect to certain of the rights stated in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and make them binding.
- The UN Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR): The UDHR was drawn up in 1948, immediately after the Second World War. It has been accepted by every government around the world and sets out the basic rights and fundamental principles to be found in every successive human rights treaty.

Steps:

Step 1: Read out the story about Group X. Explain that all the examples in the narrative are typical experiences for people from a particular minority, a minority which does not have its own country, but which exists in many countries of the world. Give participants the chance to guess the minority, and then confirm that the examples are all typical of Roma experiences in countries throughout Europe. Explain that the character of Esmeralda in Disney's *'The Hunchback of Notre Dame'* is, for example, a member of the Roma community. Ask for brief reactions to the text.

Step 2: Explain that most of the examples are illegal under human rights law and illegal in every country in Europe. Refresh participants' memory on human rights concepts under 'Definitions'.

Step 3: Ask the group to break into their patrols. Hand out copies of the UDHR to each patrol, and read through it together if participants need reminding. Each group should also receive a copy of the story about Group X.

Step 4: Ask patrols to mark on the story, near the text, any connections between parts of the child's story and specific human rights. They may use a highlighter or coloured pens to do this, and should indicate the number of the right in the ECHR on the highlighted section of the story.

Step 5: After 20 minutes or so, invite the patrol leaders to stand side by side and present their sheets. Discuss how the sheets have been marked, and note any similarities or differences.

Step 6: Have a debrief with the group using the following questions:

- Were you surprised by the number of different abuses which members of the Roma community commonly experience? Do you think any / all of these examples happen in this country?
- Have you ever heard or witnessed any examples of abusive speech against traveller communities? Have you seen anything online?

Steps:

Step 6 (cont'd):

- Those who drew up the Universal Declaration on Human Rights (and the ECHR) thought that we should never make judgements about someone based on which 'group' they belong to. Do you agree?
- What do you think about the child's comment that there are criminals in every community, but yet we don't use that to say that everyone in that community must be a criminal? Why do we say that about 'all Roma' if we don't know 'all Roma'?
- Those who drew up the UDHR also thought that there were certain things we shouldn't do to anyone, however they may have behaved. Do you agree?
- How do you think you would feel if you were constantly abused by others in the community? How might you behave?
- What do you now know about the life of Roma communities? What about the problems they face?

Group X Story: I'm a child from Group X. At school, I've been put in a special class for children with learning disabilities. We're not allowed to be in 'normal' classes. I'm often bullied by other children because I'm Group X – so are my friends. The teachers don't do anything about it. Some teachers even pick on us. They never get punished. In one country, I know that all the children from Group X were sent to schools for children with learning disabilities.

People don't want us around. They don't even know us, they just shout at us or beat us up because of who we are – or who they think we are. Well, we're children, just like them. And how are we meant to behave if someone shouts at us or beats us up? Should we like them for it?

If we go to the police, they often don't listen. They tell us it must have been our fault because we're all trouble-makers. How do they know? I thought the courts were meant to decide that. The police stop us in the streets all the time for no reason. They tell us they think we've stolen something and they need to search us. Sometimes I get stopped 6 times a week but I've never stolen anything.

I've heard of people from my community who've been in prison and have been beaten up by prison officers. Why should someone who beats up someone else not be punished? Even prison officers are meant to obey the law.

Last summer, groups of people dressed in the same way and singing songs against us marched in our village. We were all scared and locked ourselves in our homes. They threw stones at our homes and beat some of the young people who tried to send them away. The police did not do anything ...

Group X Story (cont'd): Members of the government often insult us, as if everyone from Group X is the same, and everyone in Group X is a criminal. Well, we're not. Every community has some people who commit crimes. The government doesn't insult everyone in another community, just because a few of them commit crimes. Why can't they tell some good stories about Group X people who are just like everyone else?

On the television and on the Internet, people just say whatever they want about us. I'm sick of seeing online groups telling us we're dirty or stupid or much worse things. They tell us we should get out of the country, go home, and get a job like everyone else. My Dad would love to have a job. No-one will employ him because he's Group X.

How are we supposed to live? How are we meant to feel when everyone says nasty things about us, even when they don't know us? It's hard: sometimes I don't want to go out into the street because I'm afraid I might get shouted at or beaten up.

THE UNIVERSAL DECLARATION OF HUMAN RIGHTS 1948 (Simplified by Amnesty International UK)

1. We are all born free. We all have our own thoughts and ideas. We should all be treated in the same way.
2. These rights belong to everybody
3. We all have the right to life, and to live in freedom and safety
4. Nobody has any right to make us a slave. We cannot make anyone else our slave.
5. Nobody has any right to hurt or torture us.
6. We all have the same right to use the law.
7. The law is the same for everyone. It must treat us all fairly.
8. We can all ask for the law to help us when we are not treated fairly.
9. Nobody has the right to put us in prison without good reason, to keep us there, or to send us away from our country.
10. If someone is accused of breaking the law they have the right to a fair and public trial.
11. Nobody should be blamed for doing something until it has been proven that they did it. If people say we did something bad, we have the right to show this was not true.
12. Nobody should try to harm our good name. Nobody has the right to come into our home, open our letters, or bother us or our family without a very good reason.
13. We all have the right to go where we want to in our own country and to travel abroad as we wish.
14. If we are frightened of being badly treated in our own country, we all have the right to run away to another country to be safe.
15. We all have the right to belong to a country.
16. Every grown up has the right to marry and have a family.
17. Everyone has the right to own things or share them. Nobody should take our things from us without good reason.
18. We all have the right to believe in what we want to – to have a religion, or to change it if we want.

THE UNIVERSAL DECLARATION OF HUMAN RIGHTS 1948 (Simplified by Amnesty International UK)

19. We all have the right to make up our own minds, think freely, speak freely, and share our ideas with people.

20. We all have the right to meet our friends and to work together in peace to defend our rights. Nobody can make us join a group if we don't want to.

21. We all have the right to take part in the government of our country.

22. We all have the right to a home, to have enough money to live on and medical help if we are ill. We should all be allowed to enjoy music, art, craft, sport and to make use of our skills.

23. Every grown up has the right to a job, to get a fair wage, and to join a trade union.

24. We all have the right to rest from work and relax.

25. We all have the right to a good life, with enough food, clothing, housing and healthcare. Mothers and children, people without work, old and disabled people all have the right to help.

26. We all have the right to an education, and to finish primary school, which should be free. We should be able to have a career. We should learn about the United Nations and about how to get on with other people and respect their rights. Our parents have the right to choose how and what we will learn.

27. We all have the right to our own way of life, and to enjoy the good things that science and learning bring.

28. We have a right to peace and order so we can all enjoy rights and freedoms in our own country and all over the world.

29. We have a duty to other people, and we should protect their rights and freedoms.

30. Nobody can take these rights and freedoms from us.

Activity 15: Play It Again

Aim: To understand how bullying works. To develop solidarity and empathy for victims of bullying. To encourage participants to take action against bullying and hate speech online

Time: 60 minutes

SPICES: Social, Intellectual, Emotional.

Sustainable Development Goals: 4. Quality Education, 16. Peace, Justice, and Strong Institutions

Steps

Step 1: Explain to the group that this is a role play game. Volunteers will be needed to play the different characters. The volunteers must act out the scenes as they are read aloud by the Scouter.

Step 2: Start with 5 volunteers for the following characters: Alan, Dylan, James, Ahmed, and the Teacher (this role should be played by a Scouter).

Step 3: The volunteers must act out the following:

Albert is quiet and is seen as a bit 'different'. He doesn't have many friends and often worries that others in the class don't like him. Sometimes he plays the fool to make the other children laugh, and he is very good at that (even if the teacher doesn't always approve!). After one lesson when he had made all the class laugh a lot, he was approached as he was leaving school by Derek and Jared, two of the most popular boys in the class. The three of them laughed together about his behaviour, and then walked home together. Albert felt very proud, as if he'd at last been accepted...

Step 3 (cont'd):

As Derek, Jared and Albert are walking home, they see Ahmed ahead of them, walking alone. Ahmed has recently joined the class and is from another country. He is teased by some of the children for speaking the language used in school badly, for being smaller than most people in the class, and for his shabby clothes.

Derek and Jared walk a bit faster so as to catch up with Ahmed. Then they start shouting insults at him, pulling his bag and asking whether everyone in Ethiopia wears clothes like him, and whether he should be in the baby class if he can't speak the language used in the school.

Albert feels very uncomfortable. Derek and Jared keep looking at him, encouraging him to join in and asking what he thinks. In the end, Albert makes what he thinks is a witty comment about people in Ethiopia living in trees and speaking monkey language. Derek and Jared laugh a lot but Albert can see that Ahmed is very upset and frightened of the three boys.

When Albert gets home, he feels bad. He knows what it's like to be teased by other children, and what he'd said to Ahmed had been far worse than anything people had said to him. But it had been good to laugh with Derek and Jared, and their friendship was worth a lot. He logged onto the Internet and 'friended' Derek and Jared. Then he posted his comment about Ethiopians onto his profile.

Step 4: After the role play, ask participants for their reactions. Prompt with a few questions if necessary, for example:

- Do you think the scenario is realistic?
- What do you think about Albert's behaviour?
- How do you think Ahmed must have felt?
- What might you have done in Albert's position?

Step 5: Explain to the group that the role play will be run again, but this time you would like to invite others to step in and see if they can produce a better outcome for Ahmed (and Albert).

Step 6: Begin the second run of the role play.

Step 7: After the role play, invite everyone to come up with something else that Albert could have posted online at the end of the original scenario – something which might have helped to repair the damage. This could be a tweet, a personal message, a comment, or anything else.

Step 8: Bring the group back together for a debrief. Ask them to come out of their characters and return to their normal selves. Run through the following questions with the group, emphasising that they should be answered from their own point of view, not from the point of view of characters that featured in the role play:

- What did you think about this activity?
- What were the things that made Albert join in with the bullying?
- How easy do you find it to resist these pressures in your own life?
- What if this happened online? What would be similar? What would be different?
- Have you ever seen posts on someone's personal profile, or elsewhere on the Internet, which target people in the way Albert did in this scenario?
- Is there anything you can do to stop things like this being posted, or lessen their impact?
- Did you learn anything from the activity, or did it make you think about bullying in a different way?



Get Involved!

Below is a list of organisations/charities where you can donate either your time or money to help fight racism and discrimination and connect communities with the outdoors.

In Ireland:

- Movement of Asylum Seekers Ireland: <http://www.masi.ie/>
- Migrants and Ethnic Minorities for Reproductive Justice: <http://merjireland.org/>
- Cooking for Freedom: <http://www.cookingforfreedom.ie/>
- Our Table: <http://www.ourtable.ie/>
- Pavee Point - Traveller & Roma Centre: <https://www.paveepoint.ie/>

In the US:

- Outdoor Journal Tour: <https://linktr.ee/outdoorjournaltour>
- Black Outside Inc.: <https://www.blackoutside.org/>
- Soul Trak Outdoors: <https://soultrak.com/>
- Greening Youth Foundation: <https://gyfoundation.org/>
- Outdoor Afro: <https://outdoorafro.networkforgood.com/>