

Danuta KAŻMIERCZAK

Uniwersytet Pedagogiczny im. Komisji Edukacji Narodowej w Krakowie

Paweł Rafał OSTOLSKI

Akademia Sztuki Wojennej w Warszawie

HATE CRIME AS A THREAT TO SOCIAL COHESION

Abstract: Timeline of human history is marked with glorious as well as destructive deeds we witnessed in the past and are still witnessing at present: wars, ethnic cleansing, genocide, politicide, domesticide or hate crime which undermine the social cohesion and security. The paper presents the authors' attempt to define and discuss the reasons and effect of hate crime to give a deeper insight into the relation of a human to another human in the social, economic and political contexts. The conclusions of this theoretical analysis should foster estimating and developing preventive measures to be incorporated into educational curricula.

Key words: hate crime, genocide, social cohesion, preventive model.

Introduction

"There is perhaps no phenomenon which contains so much destructive feeling as 'moral indignation,' which permits envy or hate to be acted out under the guise of virtue." — Erich Fromm¹.

Timeline of human history is marked with glorious as well as destructive deeds which reminds about the generally known concept of human nature with good and evil elements. The weaknesses of human nature are demonstrated by atrocities we witnessed in the past and are still witnessing at present: wars, ethnic cleansing, genocide, politicide, domesticide or hate crime. Defining them, discussing reasons and their effect on an individuals and nations should give deeper insight into the relation of a human to another human in the social, economic and political contexts and foster estimating and developing preventive measures currently employed.

Hatred expresses disapproval of vice or behavior, which actually can be only a pretext. Generally, hatred is recognized as a matter of mental inclination the consequences of which are destructive to an individual, community or nation. It is a trigger for the morally lowest reasons as malevolence, malignity and injury toward another human. However, the term "hate" can be misleading. In a hate crime law, the word "hate" does not mean rage, anger,

¹E. Fromm, *Man for Himself: An Inquiry into the Psychology of Ethics*. Open Road. Integrated Media. New York 2013, Rozdz. 5c.

or general dislike. In legal terms “hate” means bias against people or groups with specific characteristics that are defined by the law. The USA Federal hate crime law lists crimes “committed on the basis of the victim’s perceived or actual race, color, religion, national origin, sexual orientation, gender, gender identity, or disability”². These acts can be considered as manifestations of the lack of social cohesion and trust, which can take extreme forms of genocide or hate crime.

“Social cohesion refers to the extent of connectedness and solidarity among groups in society. It identifies two main dimensions: the sense of belonging of a community and the relationships among members within the community itself”³.

It can be measured by such variables as: social balance, economic dynamism, and national identity. Social cohesion is a social process which aims to consolidate plurality of citizenship by reducing inequality and socioeconomic disparities and fractures in the society.

Social cohesion is also defined “as the belief held by citizens of a given nation-state that they share a moral community, which enables them to trust each other”⁴. The lack of it means “social erosion”, and consequently lack of trust, sense of belonging, will to cooperate and resolve disputes and conflicts, and “overcome the basic problems of collective action”⁵. Lack of trust can then be a reason for unleashing and escalating negative emotions and aggressive actions, on one hand and on another a hinder for preventive actions of state institutions responsible for supporting victims. Therefore, the hate crime can be discussed in the relation to social cohesion aspects.

Manifestations of hatred

Hate crimes reflects a condition of the society as such rather than a political regime as the oldest democracies face them, too. There are governments which believe their country is free from hate crime occurrences and, so there is no need to take action. However, the evidence shows that all countries without exception face this problem to a greater or lesser extent⁶.

Hate crimes are defined as criminal acts motivated by bias or prejudice towards particular groups of people. Bias motivations are preconceived negative opinions, stereotypical assumptions, intolerance or hatred directed to a particular group that shares a common characteristic, such as race, ethnicity, language, religion, nationality, sexual orientation, gender or any other fundamental characteristic. People with disabilities may also be victims of hate crimes.

Hate crimes don't only affect individuals from specific groups. People or property merely associated with – or even perceived to be a member of – a group that shares a protected characteristic,

² <https://www.justice.gov/hatecrimes/learn-about-hate-crimes> [accessed: 30.12.2021].

³ A.R. Manca, Social Cohesion, in: A.C. Michalos (eds) *Encyclopedia of Quality of Life and Well-Being Research*. Springer, Dordrecht 2014, https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-007-0753-5_2739 [accessed:30.12.2021].

⁴ C.A. Larsen, *The Rise and Fall of Social Cohesion. The Construction and De-construction of Social Trust in the USA, UK, Sweden and Denmark*, Oxford University Press, Oxford 2013, za: C. A. Larsen, *Social cohesion: Definition, measurement and developments*, Centre for Comparative Welfare Studies (www.ccws.dk), <https://www.un.org > esa > socdev > egms > docs> [accessed:30.12.2021].

⁵ B. Rothstein, Social traps and the problem of trust, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 2005. B. Rothstein and USLANER, E.M. Uslaner, *ALL FOR ALL: Equality, Corruption, and Social Trust*, *World Politics*, 2005 58(1), pp. 41-72.

⁶ OSCE, ODIHR, Preventing and responding to hate crimes a *resource guide for NGOs in the OSCE region 2009*.

such as human rights defenders, community centers or places of worship, can also be targets of hate crimes. The perpetrator can also be a friend, career or acquaintance who exploits their relationship with the victim for financial gain or some other criminal purpose.

Hate crimes can take a form of threats, property damage, assault, murder or any other criminal offence committed with a bias motivation.

Hate crimes differ from any other crimes as they have greater and wider impact, affecting an individual, community and society. Hate crimes leave victims in fear of future attacks and are the sign of rejection, creating a sense of extreme isolation. Lack of reaction and help from proper institutions or denial can lead to secondary victimization - greater humiliation, degradation and isolation. They have also a destructive impact on the community members, family and friends of the victim and on others who share the same characteristics which became the object of hatred behind the attack.

Hate crimes present the serious threat to society cohesion when are ignored by legal institutions leaving the perpetrators free to continue their activities. The absence of protection from hate crime violence, enhance the sense of insecurity among minority communities, negative perception of law enforcement and government institutions. In the extreme cases, hate crimes can cause revenge attacks creating a spiral of violence⁷.

Hate crimes pose serious threat to the security of individuals and to social cohesion and can lead to conflict and violence on a wider scale. They are an important indicator of social fragmentation, an early warning about societies moving towards social or ethnic conflict⁸. Hate crime touches the emotional and moral sphere of individuals and can escalate to a group, community, society or a nation (ethnic cleansing) with a genocide as its extreme manifestation.

Rudolph Rummel (1994) distinguishes between different forms of state violence "genocide," "politicide," "mass murder" or "democide" and "terror"⁹.

Genocide: among other things, the killing of people by a government because of their indelible group membership (race, ethnicity, religion, language).

Politicide: the murder of any person or people by a government because of their politics or for political purposes.

Mass Murder: the indiscriminate killing of any person or people by a government.

Democide: The murder of any person or people by a government, including genocide, politicide, and mass murder.

Terror applies to government killing, whose meaning is usually that of the extrajudicial execution, slaying, assassination, abduction or disappearance forever, of targeted individuals.

They overlap and are sometimes used interchangeably¹⁰.

⁷ Ibidem.

⁸ Ibidem.

⁹ R.J. Rummel, *Genocide*, University of Hawaii, 1994. Available at: <https://www.hawaii.edu/powerkills/GENOCIDE.ENCY.HTM> [accessed: 22 December 2018].

¹⁰ Ibidem.

In the United Nation Convention on Prevention and Punishment genocide *means any of the acts committed with intent to destroy, in whole or in part, a national, ethnical, racial or religious group. They include two main elements:*

1. *A mental element:* the "intent to destroy, in whole or in part, a national, ethnical, racial or religious group, as such"; and
2. *A physical element,* which includes the following five acts, enumerated exhaustively:
 - a) Killing members of the group
 - b) Causing serious bodily or mental harm to members of the group
 - c) Deliberately inflicting on the group conditions of life calculated to bring about its physical destruction in whole or in part
 - d) Imposing measures intended to prevent births within the group
 - e) Forcibly transferring children of the group to another group.

The target of destruction must be the group, as such, and not its members as individuals. Genocide can also be committed against only a part of the group, as long as that part is identifiable (including within a geographically limited area) and "substantial." (Art II).

The International Criminal Court (ICC) accepts this definition and develops it under The Rome Statute, the founding treaty of the International Criminal Court (Art.6 and 7). The ICC defines for the purposes of exercising jurisdiction, the most serious violations of international human rights and humanitarian law (core crimes). These crimes fall into the categories of genocide, crimes against humanity, war crimes and the crime of aggression. The crimes against humanity are: government murder, extermination campaigns, enslavement, deportation, torture, rape, sexual slavery, enforced disappearance, and apartheid¹¹.

The pattern of modern warfare has changed. There is less confrontation between professional armies and more struggle between military and civilians in the same country, or between hostile groups of armed civilians. The *perpetrator* can be a state government or its military, an international organization, a terrorist or guerrilla organization.

Wars are low-intensity internal conflicts, and they are lasting longer. "As wars take on an ethnic, tribal or fratricidal cast, civilians and their children may find themselves the objects of genocidal violence" reads the Report on the Impact of Armed Conflicts on Children¹².

Martin Shaw explains that genocide is generally very similar to war, except that it is directed by one type of actor at another very different type - whereas in war the opposed actors are of the same organized military type. Yet, war is not merely something that one actor does to another and also genocide involves *relationships* between the armed and unarmed actors. Genocide is often thought of as something "perpetrators" do to "victims," but in reality, it is also a form of social *conflict in which* perpetrators must take account of victims' responses, and *vice versa*. The

¹¹ S. Eberhardt, *Core Crimes Defined in The Rome Statute of The International Criminal Court, Cicc*. Available at: www.iccnw.org, [accessed: 22 December 2018].

¹² UNICEF, *Patterns in conflict: Civilians are now the target*, UNICEF. Available at: <https://www.unicef.org/graca/patterns.htm>, [accessed: 22 December 2018].

idea of the "one-sided" character of genocide without resistance of any kind, if only in the minds of "helpless" victims or through proxies, is absurd¹³.

Genocide, no matter under whose authority, is formulated, planned, and conducted by individuals, and it is *individuals* that the ICC will prosecute for the crime of genocide. The International Court of Justice only adjudicates disputes between states, whereas the ICC is a criminal tribunal that will indict *individuals*, issue international warrants for their arrest, try, and punish them (Art. 27).

The genocide refers to only *national, ethnical, racial or religious groups*, is to groups that one is born into (indelible group). The term "as such" means that the groups are *explicitly targeted* for destruction, and such destruction is not the unintended outcome of the intent to achieve some other goal, e.g., to destroy political, ideological, economic, military, professional, or other groups, e.g.: the mass murder of "capitalist roaders," "rightists," and counterrevolutionaries during the Chinese Cultural Revolution (1966-69) would not be genocide. However, the intent to destroy a group can be executed *by means other than killing* one or more of its members. The "in whole or in part" means that there is no *lower limit* to the number of people on which these acts may be committed – committing these acts even on one person is evidence of genocide.

The word "destroy" exclude attempts to eliminate an indelible group from a territory *by ethnic cleansing* (by their forced or coerced removal), or the destruction of the *culture* of a group, as by forced education of their children in a different language and customs.

William Schabas differentiates ethnic cleansing from genocide as, "One is intended to displace a population, the other to destroy it. The issue is one of intent and logically inconceivable that the two agendas coexist. Ethnic cleansing is a warning sign of genocide to come. Genocide is the last resort of the frustrated ethnic cleanser"¹⁴.

The UN Commission of Experts on violations in the former Yugoslavia (Report S/1994/674) stated that the coercive practices used to remove the civilian population can include: murder, torture, arbitrary arrest and detention, extrajudicial executions, rape and sexual assaults, severe physical injury to civilians, confinement of civilian population in ghetto areas, forcible removal, displacement and deportation of civilian population, deliberate military attacks or threats of attacks on civilians and civilian areas, use of civilians as human shields, destruction of property, robbery of personal property, attacks on hospitals, medical personnel, and locations with the Red Cross/Red Crescent emblem, among others. These practices can "... constitute crimes against humanity and can be assimilated to specific war crimes or could also fall within the meaning of the Genocide Convention".

According to Shelly J. Bureson and Alberto Giordano genocide has its own geography and is executed spatially to create homogenous nation on its own territory. The whole process can be divided into three levels: At the macro-level government policy and decision-making processes

¹³ Shaw M., War and Genocide: a Sociological Approach. *Violence de masse et Résistance - Réseau de recherche*, [en ligne], publié le: 4 Novembre 2007; Available at: <https://www.sciencespo.fr/mass-violence-war-massacre-resistance/fr/document/war-and-genocide-sociological-approach>, ISSN 1961-9898 [accessed: 22 December 2018].

¹⁴ J.L. Pigmon, Evil: Genocide in the 21st Century. In *Master of Liberal Studies Theses 2011/ 11*. Available at: <http://scholarship.rollins.edu/mls/11>[accessed: 22 December 2018].

are implemented at the national scale that ultimately lead to the destruction of a targeted population.

At the meso-level (mid-level) organized groups effectively interpret and enforce policies, procedures, at the regional, province, district, and village scales.

At the micro-level individuals at the local or village scale react violently towards individuals identified as the "other," in genocidal rhetoric, including at times friends and neighbors¹⁵.

Contexts for genocide

The acts of genocide take place in the political, economic and social contexts and targeted at a specific group. R.J. Rummel, M. Shaw or Max Roser and Mohamed Nagdy and others discuss the conditions and give reasons for the whole process to start and unfold, focusing on:

1. Political system

Democide, including genocide are facets of totalitarian systems, and to a lesser extent of authoritarian ones. The degree to which people are not democratically free increases the likelihood of some kind of domestic genocide or democide, as in totalitarian Stalin's Soviet Union, Hitler's Germany, and Mao's Communist China; or fascist Chiang Kai-shek's China, Franco's Spain, and Admiral Miklos Horthy's Hungary; or dictator Saddam Hussein's Iraq, Idi Amin's Uganda, and Mustafa Kemal Ataturk's Turkey. The modern democracies are not liable to domestic genocide, or other government domestic murder or extermination campaigns since they respect civil and political rights¹⁶.

Martin Shaw argues that the disappearance of classically totalitarian states, all appear to be associated with a decline in large-scale, ideologically intensive and multi-targeted genocidal episodes. On the other hand, the fragmentation of old empires into larger numbers of nation-states has been associated with an extension of the long-standing trend towards ethnic homogenization, so that genocidal expulsion (often recognized under the euphemistic label 'ethnic cleansing') may actually have become more widespread¹⁷.

2. Circumstances

Whatever the political institutions of a government, the possibility of genocide sharply increases when it is involved in international or domestic wars.

War has always been an excuse, cover, or stimulus for genocide and mass murder¹⁸, yet the acts of genocide also occur outside the context of conventional war¹⁹.

¹⁵ Bursleson, J. Shelley, G. Alberto, Spatiality of the Stages of Genocide: The Armenian Case. *Genocide Studies and Prevention: An International Journal* 2016 Vol. 10: Iss. P.3, Available at: <http://scholarcommons.usf.edu/gsp/vol10/iss3/6> [accessed: 12 October 2020].

¹⁶ R.J. Rummel, op. cit.

¹⁷ M. Shaw, War and Genocide: a Sociological Approach. *Violence de masse et Résistance - Réseau de recherche*, [en ligne], publié le: 4 Novembre 2007; Available at: <https://www.sciencespo.fr/mass-violence-war-massacre-resistance/fr/document/war-and-genocide-sociological-approach>, ISSN 1961-9898 [accessed: 22 December 2018].

¹⁸ G. H. Stanton, How We Can Prevent Genocide. *Building An International Campaign to End Genocide*. Available at: <https://www.hawaii.edu/powerkills/COMM.6.24.03.HTM> [accessed: 22 December 2019]. Por. Stanton G.H., The Ten Stages of Genocide, available at: <http://genocidewatch.net/genocide-2/8-stages-of-genocide/> [accessed: 22.12.2018].

¹⁹ M. Shaw, op. cit.

Economic depression or revolution can also be the triggers for genocide or other types of mass killing. The scapegoat theory explains that a particular group is identified as the cause of the crisis and that the solution is to eliminate the group, whereas the political opportunity theory argues that the crisis creates the opportunity for a group to consolidate their power²⁰.

3. *Differences in identity*

Genocide is not possible where there is no difference among the population in a given state but this difference itself cannot cause genocide if not combined with other factors. Deprivation or inequalities in the allocation of resources: When this inequality is based on the differences in racial, ethnicity grounds, meaning, when some groups are given more privileges than others or when a group is totally excluded from the access to the resources, it may create tensions that may lead to other problems that may soon or later lead to genocide;

4. *Motives*

- *to destroy a group that is perceived as a threat to the ruling power.* Such, for example, was the 1970 parliamentary elections in Pakistan that showed the political power of East Pakistan and threatened the control over it by West Pakistan, and the power of the military government. They thus militarily seized East Pakistan and murdered over a million Bengali leaders, intellectuals, professionals, and any Hindus that the military were able to capture. And such was the case when the Rwandan Hutu majority government undertook to murder all Tutsi within their reach at the time when there was turmoil resulting from a major 1991 incursion of the Tutsi expatriate Rwandan Patriotic Front in the northern part of the country.

- *to destroy those who are hated, despised, or conversely are envied or resented.* The genocide of Jews throughout history and was fundamentally an act of religious and ethnic hatred mixed with envy and resentment over their disproportionate economic and professional achievements. Similarly, with the genocide of the Armenians in Turkey, 1915-18, where Armenians enjoyed wealth and professional status far beyond their numbers, but also were hated as Christians in a Moslem society.

- *to pursue an ideological transformation of society.* Such have been the genocides and democides carried out by communist societies, for example, where those resisting or perceived to be enemies of the ideology are murdered, such as landlords, Kulaks, nationalists, "right-wingers," and "counterrevolutionaries."

- *to purify or the attempt to eliminate from society perceived alien beliefs, cultures, practices, and ethnic groups* – described with terms of "ethnic cleansing," "waste disposal," or "prophylaxis"²¹. Leo Kuper claims that higher ethnolinguistic or religious fractionalization within a country combined with grievances between groups are responsible for acts of genocide²².

- *to gain economic profits* colonial powers or individuals (as in the Congo Free State) mass murdered tens of millions in their colonies who got in the way, resisted the rape of the colony's wealth, or were worked to death;

²⁰ M. Roser, M. Nagdy, *Genocides, Published Online At Ourworldindata.Org.* 2018, Available at: '<https://Ourworldindata.Org/Genocides>'; <https://Ourworldindata.Org/Genocides#Correlates-Determinants-Consequences> [accessed: 22 December 2018].

²¹ G.H. Stanton, op. cit.

²² M. Roser, M. Nagdy, op. cit.

Genocide and all other-forms of mass killing are the complex problem occurring in context of political, economic or/and moral crisis, usually these factors overlap and permeate.

Vandana Shiva notices that "Never before has hate between cultures been so global. Never before has there been a global convergence of three violent trends – the violence of primitive accumulation for wealth creation, the violence of "culture wars", and the violence of militarized warfare"²³. The corporate (economic) globalization is to be blamed for that. Together with effective allocation of global resources, however, it creates the gaps between the poor South and the rich North. Global poverty and uneven economic development can be stopped by creating more even economic growth order sensitive to the issues of social justice.

The World Bank Group latest statistics show that poverty rates have declined in all regions as about 1.1 billion fewer people are living in extreme poverty than in 1990. Yet, progress has been uneven dividing globe into the richer and poorer regions. More than half of the extreme poor live in Sub-Saharan Africa, and their number increased by 9 million, with 413 million people living on less than US\$1.90 a day in 2015, more than all the other regions together. By 2030, nearly 9 out of 10 extreme poor can be living in Sub-Saharan Africa. Also, the majority of the global poor live in rural areas and are poorly educated, employed in the agriculture, and under 18 years of age. The nearest future predictions are not optimistic either: "... if we continue down a business-as-usual path, the world will not be able to eradicate extreme poverty by 2030. That's because it is becoming even more difficult to reach those remaining in extreme poverty, who often live in fragile countries and remote areas"²⁴.

Poverty and lack of basic resources and never-ending conflicts led to massive migrations. The migration crisis (since 2014 1.8 million refugees arrived in Europe, more than 1 million of them in 2015 alone and 102,882 refugees have arrived in Europe by sea in 2018)²⁵ raised the problem of forced returns of unwanted migrants. The example of states returning migrants to areas of extreme poverty and violence. Saudi Arabia which faced crackdown on foreign labor in 2017 sent Yemeni migrants back home where the civil war played havoc and forced some of them to join the Houthi rebels. The Angolan government returned over 300, 000 migrants to the Democratic Republic of the Congo where they suffer from extortion, arbitrary detention, and lack of shelter and food. Being unwanted is the first indication of social conflict to start.

At November 2018 summit the leaders of the European Union, United Nations and African Union made an effort to elaborate the management-migration partnership built around the concept of "safe and dignified return and readmission, as well as sustainable reintegration"²⁶. This is an example of how much the international policy is harmonized with state policies and democratic maturity of societies. This seems to be the right direction as G.H. Stanton indicates both global

²³ V. Shiva, *The Polarized World of Globalization*, Global Policy Forum 2005; available at: <https://www.global-policy.org/component/content/article/162/27674.html> [accessed: 22.12.2018].

²⁴ The World Bank Group, Poverty overview (24 September 2018). Available at: <https://www.worldbank.org/en/topic/poverty/overview> (accessed: 22 December 2018).

²⁵ The Guardian, What is the current state of the migration crisis in Europe?, 2018, available at: <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2018/jun/15/what-current-scale-migration-crisis-europe-future-outlook> [accessed: 23.12.2018].

²⁶ *Top 10 Migration Issues of 2017*. Available at: <https://www.migrationpolicy.org/programs/migration-information-source/top-10-migration-issues-2017> [accessed: 22 December 2018]. <https://www.migrationpolicy.org/programs/migration-information-source>.

and state dimensions of genocide prevention claiming that the horror of mass murder by tyrants can be stopped only by fostering democratic freedom which should be supported by the international institutions that unite and organize democracies as an international force against it²⁷.

Hate crime including genocide being the overt and extreme manifestation of the lack of social cohesion should be considered not only at the global, state but also individual level. The concept of inherent dignity of a single human being constitutes the core of the problem. Together with the right to life and liberty, freedom from slavery and torture, freedom of opinion and expression, the right to work and education, and others, it fosters not only a peaceful cooperation of states but also co-existence of social groups and individuals. These rights should also constitute the backbone of the moral values system of every single individual. Telling difference between what is wrong and what is bad is a pre-condition of peace.

The profile of hate crime perpetrator elaborated by McDevitt, Levin and Bennett (2002) in the United Kingdom embraces four categories of offenders²⁸:

- a) thrill offenders - those who commit their crimes for the excitement or the thrill;
- b) defensive offenders - those who view themselves as defending their 'turf';
- c) mission offenders - those whose life's mission is to rid the world of groups they consider evil or inferior; and
- d) retaliatory offenders - those who engage in retaliatory violence in the belief that by doing so, just desserts is served.

The social development and the environment a single human live in can have positive or destructive impact.

Containing destructive impact and evolution of aggressive instincts in a human requires taking effort by a family, state and international institutions which have instruments to provide positive environment for the social development, educate and bring up the individual, engrain values and principles, mainly the respect to life and another human.

The exemplification of empowering individuals can be The Amnesty Human Rights Academy which with use of advance LMS technologies provides courses to over 45,000 learners all over the world in Arabic, English, Spanish, Russian, German and French and in the near future in Portuguese, Czech, Turkish, Korean and Ukrainian. Human Rights Education reaches the countries where the Amnesty International is not present physically: Egypt, Palestine, Libya, Yemen, Saudi Arabia, Syria, Columbia. The goal to achieve is the world of people who know their rights and are enabled to claim them²⁹.

Since the outbreak of the COVID-19 pandemic, Genocide Watch has implemented the IT tools to fight genocide and other forms of mass murder. For example, Timestream platform provides law enforcement and government policy agencies with software to organize the histories of crimes, conflicts, and other complex social processes.

²⁷ G.H. Stanton, op. cit.

²⁸ J. McDevitt, J. Levin J., S. Bennett, *Hate crime offenders: an expanded typology*. Journal of Social 2002 Issues 58/2, p.17-19.

²⁹ Amnesty International Case Study: *Building Global Human Rights Communities With Learning Technology* by Docebo 2018; www.docebo.com.

New Podcast Series: Conversations on Genocide aims to publish a new episode once a month which will be featuring genocide experts and survivor testimonies (Genocide Watch).

Samantha Lakin describing preventive actions in African countries after Rwanda lesson-learned emphasizes importance of building community resilience and unity through targeted messaging and civil society organizations that document and monitor violence, send a message to perpetrators. She indicates also that prevention should include protection of those civil society workers. Otherwise, the newly established norms will be abolished.

The outcomes of the discussion lead to conclusions in a form of the prevention model.

Prevention model

This model is three dimensional considering the hate crime, including genocide, evolution in all possible context of human activity and citizen-centered considering the target of a preventive actions. The core dimension is a single citizen brought up and educated in a family, schools and local community. It can be characterized as follows:

The moral values and attitudes should build up the individual resilience to any manifestations of hatred and ability to identify it and respond. Yet, an individual can probably react only on conditions that the state possesses sensitive and mature law enforcement institutions.

Raising citizens' awareness of how important the respect for another human being is and how serious the consequences of ignorance and indulgence can be, should be a task of formal and informal education referring to every aspect of human activity.

The process of education should be:

- continuous and embrace all social groups and all generations to nullify overlapping social differences which result in division and disintegration and enhance cross-cutting social differences which encourage diversity and incorporate unity.
- consistent at all levels and start with the well-drawn, thought over and long-term educational policy. The next stage – the policy implementation should be a combined effort of all institutions (family, school, social clubs, media). The practical outcome should be a civil society promoting common good resistance to any destructive centrifugal or centripetal forces. The evaluation stage should include the feedback on if the goals have been achieved and if the program/campaign/course has made a difference. The conclusive remarks are to set directions for future improvements.

All these actions to be efficient must be programmed and initiated and monitored by a state.

The state activity constitutes another dimension which can be defined by democratic values. Democratic governance through which a society reaches consensus on and implements regulations, human rights, policies and social structures, ensures secure contexts for human activities in all areas: military, political, economic, social, cultural or legal. The democratic institutions also help detect and eliminate any vulnerabilities (crises, motives), predict, identify, monitor and eradicate any genocide inclinations but also shape tolerant society. State institutions are responsible for the safe, hate-free internal situation which is also influenced by external occurrences. Therefore, the international cooperation can be a helpful solution.

Global dimensions encompass the international organizations are equipped with a wide range of tools (programs, funds, policies, legal acts, diplomacy) and international legitimacy to support genocide prevention. Their actions are mostly desired when state fails to enforce democracy or its institutions are unwieldy or even pathogenic.

Conclusion

The three-dimensional hate crime prevention model is citizen centered as the whole genocide prevention process aims at bringing up tolerant, hate-free individual and consequently society and protecting every single citizen (and social groups) against genocide, at the same time. The prevention is a continuous process of identifying, defining, monitoring, eliminating any manifestations of genocide with hard and soft power, redressing the balance of the local, state and international security environment in all spheres: economic, political, cultural and social. These activities at every stage of hate crime preventive process should be coordinated within and cross all the dimensions: individual, state and global. This comprehensive attitude helps to minimize the genocidal risks on the local, state, regional and global scale. This is also two-way process since the international organization - state – individual is the way of implementation policies whereas the individual-state-international organization is the way the world community receives the feedback on the implemented actions.

Society, state and international community is equipped with tools and variety of measures to prevent genocide. Yet, what needs to be emphasized is the shift of the target of prevention: from focusing on early conflict detection and peaceful reconciliation of social groups already in conflict to focusing on a vulnerable individual citizen themselves and improving the social context they operate in.

A lot has been done and even more is still to be done to prevent the manifestations of human-to- human hatred.

References:

1. Al-Adab Al-Mufrad 1322 Grade: Sahih, <http://islam.ru/en/content/story/beware-hatred-and-malice-islam>.
2. *de la Cour Venning A., The anatomy of a modern-day genocide. International State Crime Initiative*, Queen Mary University of London, September 2017/18.
3. Belayneh A., *Communique of the 678th PSC Meeting on Preventing ideology of genocide in Africa, 2017* Available at:
4. <https://www.peaceau.org/en/article/communique-of-the-678th-psc-meeting-on-preventing-ideology-of-genocide-in-africa> [accessed: 12 October 2020].
5. Burleson, Shelley J. and Alberto G., Spatiality of the Stages of Genocide: The Armenian Case. *Genocide Studies and Prevention: An International Journal* 2016 Vol. 10: Iss. P.3, Available at: <http://scholarcommons.usf.edu/gsp/vol10/iss3/6>.
6. Della-Giacoma J., Putting Prevention Back in The U.N.'S Vocabulary. *Global Peace Operations Review 2016*, Available at: <https://peaceoperationsreview.org/commentary/putting-prevention-back-in-the-u-n-s-vocabulary/>.

7. Eberhardt S *Core Crimes Defined in The Rome Statute of The International Criminal Court, Cicc*. Available at: www.iccnw.org.
8. Fromm E., *The anatomy of human destructiveness*. Holt, Rinehart and Winston of Canada 1973. Available at: http://lust-for-life.org/Lust-For-Life/_Textual/ErichFromm_TheAnatomy-OfHumanDestructiveness_1973_534pp/ErichFromm_TheAnatomyOfHumanDestructiveness_1973_534pp.pdf.
9. Fromm E., *Man for Himself: An Inquiry into the Psychology of Ethics*. Open Road. Integrated Media. New York 2013.
10. Stanton G.H., *Genocide Watch Report 2020, Genocide Watch 2020*. Available at: <https://www.genocidewatch.com/single-post/2020/07/31/Genocide-Watch-Report-July-2020>; <http://www.un.org/en/genocideprevention/genocide.html>.
11. Genocide. Introduction to sociology. In Lumen. Available at: <https://courses.lumenlearning.com/cochise-sociology-os/chapter/1097/>.
12. International Standard Bible Encyclopedia. Available at: <https://biblehub.com/topical/h/hate.htm>.
13. Lakin S., Q&A: *Lessons in Preventing Genocide in Africa since Rwanda*, The Africa Center for Strategic Studies 2017. Available at: <https://africacenter.org/spotlight/lessons-preventing-genocide-africa-since-rwanda-lakin/>.
14. Little W, McGivern R. *Introduction to sociology*. Ch. 15 Religion, OpenStax College, Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License. Available at: <https://opentextbc.ca/introductiontosociology/front-matter/about-the-book/>.
15. Roberts C, Innes M, Williams M, et al., Understanding who commits hate crime and why they do it. In *Ymchwil gymdeithasol Social research* Number: 2013 38/2013.
16. McDevitt J, Levin J., Bennett S., *Hate crime offenders: an expanded typology*. Journal of Social 2002 Issues 58/2, p.303-317.
17. Ntoubandi Faustin Z., *The Sentinel Project When to act: a state's obligations and responsibilities regarding genocide*. Available at:
18. <https://thesentinelproject.org/2013/06/14/when-to-act-a-states-obligations-and-responsibilities-regarding-genocide/>.
19. *People's Daily online*. Two Major Trends in Today's World: Commentary. Available at: http://en.people.cn/200203/29/eng20020329_93074.shtml.
20. Pigmon, J.L., Evil: Genocide in the 21st Century. In *Master of Liberal Studies Theses* 2011/11. Available at: <http://scholarship.rollins.edu/mls/11>[accessed: 22 December 2018].
21. Rosenberg, Sh.P., Genocide Is a Process, Not an Event, *Genocide Studies and Prevention: An International Journal* 2012 Vol. 7: Iss. 1: Article 4. Available at: <http://scholarcommons.usf.edu/gsp/vol7/iss1/4>.
22. Roser M. and Nagdy M., *Genocides, Published Online At Ourworldindata.Org*. 2018, Available at: 'https://Ourworldindata.Org/Genocides'; <https://Ourworldindata.Org/Genocides#Correlates-Determinants-Consequences>.
23. Rummel R.J., *Chapter 2: Definition of Democide. Death by Government*. Available at: <https://www.hawaii.edu/powerkills/DBG.CHAP2.HTM>.
24. Rummel R.J. Genocide. *Enciclopedia Italiana*. Available at:

25. <http://www.cbgr1971.org/index.php/genocide/what-is-genocide/2-r-j-rummel-on-genocide>.
26. Rummel R.J., *Genocide*, University of Hawaii. 1994. Available at:
27. <https://www.hawaii.edu/powerkills/GENOCIDE.ENCY.HTM>
28. Rwanda Ministry of Education. History. Kigali 2018. Available at:
29. http://www.reb.rw/fileadmin/default/templates/IN-HOUSE_PRODUCED_TEXTBOOK/HISTORY_LEARNER_S_BOOK._S_6_doc__1__1_.pdf .
30. Scheffer D., The United States: Measures To Prevent Genocide, the speech delivered at the Holocaust Museum in a week that recognizes the fiftieth anniversary of the Genocide Convention and of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights 2018, Available at: <https://www.ushmm.org/confront-genocide/speakers-and-events/all-speakers-and-events/early-warning-and-prevention/the-united-states-measures-to-prevent-genocide>.
31. Shaw M., War and Genocide: a Sociological Approach. *Violence de masse et Résistance - Réseau de recherche*, [en ligne], publié le : 4 Novembre 2007; Available at: <https://www.sciencespo.fr/mass-violence-war-massacre-resistance/fr/document/war-and-genocide-sociological-approach>, ISSN 1961-9898.
32. Stanton G.H., How We Can Prevent Genocide. *Building An International Campaign to End Genocide*. Available at: <https://www.hawaii.edu/powerkills/COMM.6.24.03.HTM>.
33. Stanton G.H., The Ten Stages of Genocide, available at: <http://genocidewatch.net/genocide-2/8-stages-of-genocide/>.
34. The Guardian, What is the current state of the migration crisis in Europe?, 2018, available at: <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2018/jun/15/what-current-scale-migration-crisis-europe-future-outlook>.
35. Shiva V., *The Polarized World of Globalization*, Global Policy Forum 2005; available at: <https://www.globalpolicy.org/component/content/article/162/27674.html>.
36. Verdeja E (2016) Predicting Genocide and Mass Atrocities. *Genocide Studies and Prevention: An International Journal*. Vol. 9: Iss. 3: 13-32. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.5038/1911-9933.9.3.1314>. Available at: <http://scholarcommons.usf.edu/gsp/vol9/iss3/5>.
37. Webster's Revised Unabridged Dictionary
38. Whitehorn A., The Steps and Stages of Genocide. *Peace Magazine Jul-Sep 2010*.

Reports

39. Amnesty International Case Study: *Building Global Human Rights Communities With Learning Technology* by Docebo 2018; www.docebo.com.
40. OSCE Hate Crime Reporting. Available at: <http://hatecrime.osce.org/what-hate-crime>.
41. OSCE, ODIHR, Preventing and responding to hate crimes a *resource guide for NGOs in the OSCE region 2009*.
42. The World Bank Group, Poverty overview [24 September 2018], Available at: <https://www.worldbank.org/en/topic/poverty/overview>.
43. *Top 10 Migration Issues of 2017*. Available at: <https://www.migrationpolicy.org/programs/migration-information-source/top-10-migration-issues-2017>; <https://www.migrationpolicy.org/programs/migration-information-source>

44. UN Ethnic cleansing Definition, UN. Available at: <http://www.un.org/en/genocideprevention/ethnic-cleansing.html>.
45. UN Secretary-General Kofi Annan's Action Plan to Prevent Genocide (2004). Available at: <http://www.preventgenocide.org/prevent/UNdocs/KofiAnnansActionPlantoPreventGenocide7Apr2004.htm>.
46. UNICEF, Patterns in conflict: Civilians are now the target, UNICEF. Available at: <https://www.unicef.org/graca/patterns.htm>.

Paweł Rafał OSTOLSKI – ppłk doktor nauk o bezpieczeństwie, Adiunkt Zakładu Dydaktyki Wojskowej Instytutu Działań Informacyjnych Wydziału Wojskowego Akademii Sztuki Wojennej. Absolwent Wyższej Szkoły Oficerskiej Wojsk Rakietowych i Artylerii im. Gen. Józefa Bema w Toruniu z 1997 roku. Dowodził plutonem i baterią artylerii przeciwpancernej w Suwałkach do 2005 roku. Przez rok pełnił obowiązki szefa sztabu w dywizjonie artylerii. Przez trzy kolejne lata zajmował stanowisko oficera sekcji operacyjnej w sztabie pułku. Przez pięć i pół roku był szefem Sekcji Operacyjnej w Ośrodku Szkolenia Poligonowego Wojsk Lądowych Orzysz. Od 2015 roku jest nauczycielem akademickim. Zainteresowania badawcze ukierunkowuje na pedagogikę i dydaktykę wojskową oraz przygotowanie kadr systemu bezpieczeństwa narodowego. Autor, współautor i redaktor naukowy takich publikacji jak: Dylematy przygotowania metodycznego nauczycieli akademickich (Warszawa 2020], Proces kształcenia uczniów wybranych klas mundurowych szkół ponadgimnazjalnych prowadzących przedmiot nauczania edukacja wojskowa (Warszawa 2020], Konstruktywizm i konektywizm. Implikacje dla dydaktyki wojskowej (Warszawa 2019], Obronność Polski w XXI wieku (Warszawa 2017), Aktualne uwarunkowania planowania i rozliczania działalności w resorcie obrony narodowej (Warszawa 2016).

Danuta KAŻMIERCZAK – doktor nauk o bezpieczeństwie, adiunkt w Instytucie Nauk o Bezpieczeństwie w Uniwersytecie Pedagogicznym im. KEN w Krakowie. Autorka publikacji dotyczących zarządzania organizacją publiczną/edukacyjną, rozwojem zawodowym kadr, a także bezpieczeństwa wewnętrznego i personalnego, roli edukacji w przygotowaniu społeczeństwa do reagowania na zagrożenia. Współautorka raportu Unii Europejskiej Science for DRM 2020: Acting today, protecting tomorrow, a także międzynarodowej monografii City Preparedness for the Climate Crisis (pod red. F. J. Carrillo i C. Garner, USA 2021]. Monografie autorskie to: Rozwój zawodowy kadr w systemie bezpieczeństwa narodowego (Kraków 2020], Edukacja w zakresie bezpieczeństwa i obronności w ujęciu procesowym (Kraków 2018).